

Spring 1961 #155

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

- The Lesson of Guatemala
- The Monolith Fractures
- The American Civil War
- Socialized Medicine in Great Britain

LATIN AMERICA

Considers the
Example of Cuba



GENERAL LAZARO CARDENAS

Some Key Documents of the Peace Conference

35
CENTS

Correspondence

Editor:

I am in the great army of the **not** working, no jobs, too old to get a job, too young to die—unless I cut my throat, as the big bosses would like me to do. One less then to bother them.

I would like to read Depression Ahead, by Lynn Marcus, an ad I read in the *Militant* about the *International Socialist Review*. Could I borrow it from you and send the money when I once again get some kind of labor? At 56 you know how hard it is to get a 70-year-old Big Boss or Company owner to hire me. They only advertise for 25-30 ages. J.C. Penny here won't hire anyone over 25-27 in new jobs. Sears, Kresses—they are all the same. The Hearst Press (*San Francisco Examiner*) will not take men in clerical office jobs over 30. So what can I do?

About the article in the paper by Tom Kerry on the employers-union Auto Pact, dictated by the White House when it comes to featherbedding, etc., who in the heck does more of it than the First Vice-President corporations, Second, Third or Fourth?

I used to work at Shell Oil during the 1929 "recession" and there was one big floor of VIP's who did nothing all day but lean back on their chairs and put their feet on desks and look out the windows and watch the building sites. They could sit and watch the workers put up the S.F.-Oakland Bridge and even see men being killed on the waterfront—and get BIG pay for it. But who got fired or laid off? I did and some others to cut down on expenses. So this still happens.

They ought to remove profits and then these loafers and conditions might soon get better. Maybe even I could still get work. So it goes. But I wonder if JFK's big-brain cabinet realizes this stuff?

E. H.
San Francisco, Calif.

* * *

Editor:

Would you be willing to be an instrument in teaching my students social democracy and modern problems? I am now facing difficulty in finding good material for them. I have seventy-five top students who are eager to learn and are excited about current events. But their reading material consists of *Look*, *Life* and *Readers Digest*.

Could you possibly send me some 20 copies of *International Socialist Review* back issues. Your magazine is just what I need for background material. They

can be soiled, torn or used. But these old pages of *ISR* are packed full of ideas and facts which the young student needs.

I feel a keen responsibility in helping young people to shape their views. But my small teacher's salary is not enough to pay for the materials needed. For this reason I am writing to you with the hope that you may be willing to give us some help and advice.

S. L.
Baltimore, Md.

* * *

Editor:

In order to survive, the USA must be put to work. Capitalism is unable to put it to work and this is driving the USA relentlessly towards the day when it must purchase the property of the capitalists from the present owners.

The cost will be great but the value of the gross national product will absorb the price if the USA is operated at its full capacity to produce. The USA is face to face with financial disaster and economic defeat in a competitive war and the only way it can raise the funds to put the USA to work is to add the value of its gross national product to its tax collections.

It must quit running to its business rivals and competitors for help and buy all the banks, industries, land, business and housing and add the interest, profits and rentals to its tax collections or the USA will be subdued, crushed and conquered in a war of peaceful competition. Unemployment and part-time employment, recessions and depressions are a way of life in the USA and the competition will bury it in a war of peaceful competition unless the USA is put to work. The value that it is failing to produce could pay for all the banks, industry, land, business and housing in this country within the next decade.

Suppose, for example, that the gross national income from all the banks, industries, land, business, housing, interest, profits, rentals, tax collections and production in the USA is only \$600 billion per year, although it is undoubtedly a great deal more. Then this figure divided by 170 million, or the entire population of the USA, would give each and every person in the USA an annual gross income of \$3,530 regardless of whether they worked or produced anything or not. If there were only two people in the family then its average gross income would be \$7,060 per year. For a family of three the

average gross income would be \$10,590 per year and for a family of four it would be \$14,120 per year.

If it cost them \$240 billion per year which is 40% of their \$600 billion gross income per year to buy the property of the capitalists from the present owners and pay their taxes then a family of four would still have an income of \$6,354 per year, a family of two would still have an income of \$2,118 per year. When I compare what people should have with what they don't have, I conclude that there is something radically wrong with our system of distributing the gross national income and I dare say that there is a more equitable way, a highly superior and more preferable way.

During the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt under the laws of Delaware the government formed a group of corporations with charter powers so broad that they could embrace ownership and management of all business. They were like corporations except that their officers were all officers of the government and the capital stock was all government owned. The amount of capital was in each case nominal, but it was expandable to any degree. What they were formed or what they were for was never published because there was danger of a rebellion against the government of the USA on the part of the capitalists who opposed Federal ownership. There was no danger of a rebellion of the people against the government of the USA. But there was danger of a rebellion by the capitalists against the people and their government because capitalism itself is a government hostile to federal ownership and to any extension of Federal government.

Today there is still a virtual rebellion by the capitalists against the United States government and the elected representatives of the people because the capitalists don't want to let the president elect of the USA even enter the White House which is an inauspicious omen for the Republic which is defined in Webster's dictionary as "government by the people."

Donald White Eakins
Chicago, Ill.

Next Issue

The summer issue will feature an important article by William F. Warde on: "Who Will Change the World? The New Left and the Views of C. Wright Mills." This article will discuss the following questions: 1) Has Marxism failed? 2) Is the working class bankrupt? 3) The revolt of the intellectuals and the role of the students; 4) The relations between the workers and peasants (Cuba); 5) Methods of struggle today; 6) The role of the revolutionary party.

Editorial

An Important Conference

THE press did its utmost to kill the Latin-American Conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation and Peace which met in Mexico City March 5-8. In the weeks before the delegates arrived from every country in Latin America, the press was either silent or pictured the projected gathering as "Communist-inspired" and even a joint financial operation of the Cuban and Soviet embassies. (It was financed by the delegates themselves and by collections taken up in Mexico.) Similar treatment was given the deliberations; main coverage went to a stench bomb planted by disrupters at the opening session. Thus the "free" American press exercised its freedom to lie and distort and deny the public the right to make up its mind about the character of the conference on the basis of the facts.

It was a well-attended conference. More than 1,900 delegates were registered from Mexico, 280 from other Latin-American countries, plus delegations from the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, Guinea, France, the United States and Canada. All the sessions of the conference, including the panels, were open to the public. The first session was jammed with 5,000 people, some 2,000 of them in the street where they listened over loudspeakers. The closing session was transferred at short notice to the Arena Mexico where the audience was estimated at 10,000.

The delegations included prominent intellectuals, congressmen and senators, and representatives of radical trade unions and political groupings. The conference offered a good cross section of Latin-American opinion, ranging from the left bourgeoisie to underground guerrilla fighters and revolutionary socialists.

The main sponsor of the conference was Lázaro Cárdenas. Reactionary commentators dismissed the former president of Mexico as a "Communist dupe." It is difficult to conceive of anything more misleading about Latin-American politics than this lie. The fact is that from the Rio Grande to Patagonia, the man who dared to expropriate the American and British oil interests in Mexico is regarded as one of Latin America's outstanding statesmen. He is a rarity of rarities in the bourgeois political world of today — he really believes in the principles of democracy; he is really concerned about achieving a world of peace; he has become convinced that economic planning is the wave of the future and that it is best to recognize the reality.

This, of course, is not all of Cárdenas as a political figure. In Mexico, despite his retirement from political office, he carries weight as the elder statesman of the left wing of the national bourgeoisie and indeed of the whole Mexican bourgeoisie, especially in its continental interests and its opposition to American imperialism. He carries weight in a narrower sense, too, for he is a power in machine politics due to his strong base in the state of Michoacán.

What weight he gave these various considerations in undertaking to sponsor the conference is, naturally, matter

for speculation. However, he indicated some of his reasons in a rather frank way at a dinner February 24 at which he was host to the staff of the Mexican magazine *Política*. The editors report (in the March 1 issue) his response to a question about his motives:

"It was the cases of Guatemala and Cuba, explained the ex-president of Mexico, that decided him to accept the chairmanship of the conference. He has, nevertheless, no personal interest whatever in putting himself at the head of a political movement or anything similar, whether in Mexico or the continent. He accepted the chairmanship of the conference, together with the Brazilian deputy Domingos Vellasco and the Argentine engineer Alberto T. Casella, only because he considers it a duty to contribute what he can to a successful gathering in which the problems facing the peoples of Latin America can be discussed, solutions proposed, support organized for Cuba and a solid front built to defend the Latin-American countries from the danger of war and foreign intervention in its internal affairs, political as well as economic

"As for Mexico, Cárdenas insisted that it is necessary to stimulate civic spirit, strengthen and unify the parties, in short, create a great democratic political movement. The situation in Mexico, the ex-president emphasized, is critical, and if the popular unrest is not channelized adequately an explosion could occur. This would be bad for the country, since 'unlike what occurred in Cuba, where the people did not engage in destruction, in Mexico they would destroy the national wealth. The first thing a Mexican does when he rises in arms is to burn a bridge or blow up a refinery.'"

Cárdenas did not explain these somewhat cryptic remarks; judging from other sources, what he possibly had in mind was that the Cuban people in singling out the main enemy noted that the biggest property holders were foreigners, while the Mexican people, who are equally discriminating in such matters, would be inclined to locate the main enemy in their own country.

The most astute political leaders among the Latin-American capitalists are keenly aware of the implications of the Cuban revolution. They are also acutely sensitive to the popularity of the Cuban cause. To openly oppose this sentiment, they feel, is relatively swift suicide. The better policy is to go along with it, attempt to gain leadership of it and try to guide it into relatively safe channels where it might even be dissipated eventually. By organizing support for Cuba on sufficient — but not too great — scale, they hope to achieve this objective. At the same time they seek through such tactics to prevent the U.S. from further stirring of revolutionary fires by reckless acts taken in blind rage over the Cuban revolution. A not inconsequential consideration is that this statesmanlike course stands to wring bigger concessions from Washington.

All this testifies to the impact of the Cuban revolution on politics throughout Latin America. While the internal

development of the Cuban revolution itself has been toward greater and greater radicalization, its effect on the wider arena of the continent has been to radicalize politics as a whole. The main trend is definitely toward the left.

The Latin-American Conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation and Peace offered the most palpable evidence of the influence of the Cuban revolution. Although the Cuban delegates themselves played a relatively modest role, the revolution dominated the entire discussion, putting radical content into declarations that otherwise would have had little bite. Such stock phrases as "peace" and "peaceful coexistence," for instance, were specified as meaning a world in which national sovereignty and economic emancipation have been achieved. And these aims, it was agreed without a single voice of opposition, can be won only through militant struggle against the principal barrier, American imperialism. Instead of remaining content with

vague generalities about the desirability of a world of goodwill, and pleading with the imperialist rulers to give up the insanity of their war drive, the conference was much more inclined to get down to realistic discussion of how to win peace through such means as defense of the Cuban revolution and application of the revolutionary lessons of Cuba to other Latin-American countries.

The majority of the delegates were well aware of the great range of political views and the fact that if these views were pressed, the character of the conference would alter until it became a debate over political program. They very consciously steered away from this. They utilized the conference to get acquainted. While differing political viewpoints were freely discussed in an informal way, the question of political program was left open so far as the conference as a whole was concerned. A demonstration of unity was sought in defense of the Cuban revolution against the attack of American imperialism. In this the conference scored a big success.

In the coming period in Latin America a great testing of political programs is certain to occur as the Cuban revolution cuts deeper and deeper into mass consciousness and the decisive question of how to make a revolution grows in acuteness. The final upshot will be the construction of mass revolutionary-socialist parties capable of leading the workers and peasants to power in the most effective way and at least cost.

Many stages in this process still lie ahead despite the extraordinary tempo of events. A conference like this one plays a useful role in the process no matter what the intentions might be of its more conservative participants. It was of great value in registering popular sentiment and in offering a measure of what has been accomplished and what needs to be done. In our opinion, it was also a significant action in defense of the Cuban revolution and in the great struggle for a world of peace.

The resolutions committee received more than 300 documents from organizations, groups and individuals which it distributed to four panels for consideration. These dealt with a great range of topics. Some from Mexican campesinos disregarded the agenda, getting right down to cases and asking General Cárdenas to do something about problems immediately confronting them such as land, water, credit and the illegal actions of public officials.

The final resolutions submitted by the panels to the plenary sessions sought to delineate the main areas of agreement on basic problems but were still rather lengthy. Rather than make extracts, we have selected for translation four other documents which are short. They are sufficiently typical, we believe, to give our readers a fair sample of the kind of questions that were discussed, the tone of the discussion and the attitude of the delegates. These are published in the next pages.

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	34
EDITORIAL	
An Important Conference	35
DOCUMENTS OF THE LATIN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE	
Speech by General Lázaro Cárdenas	37
Speech by Alberto T. Casella	38
Speech by Señora Vilma Espín	41
Closing Declaration	43
THE FRACTURING OF THE MONOLITH	
by Murry Weiss	44
THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR: ITS PLACE IN HISTORY	48
by William F. Warde	
GUATEMALA — THE LESSON CUBA LEARNED	
by Bert Deck	53
SOCIALIZED MEDICINE IN GREAT BRITAIN	
by Carol Curtis	57
PERIODICALS IN REVIEW	62

Vol. 22 — No. 2 — Whole No. 155

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

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.

Price Cut to 50c

Negroes on the March

by Daniel Guerin

One of the best books ever written on the nature, problems and prospects of the Negro struggle for equality.

192 pages, paper cover

(hard cover \$1.50)

Order from

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

"Solidarity, defense, union of the Latin-American republics..."

(The following is the complete text of the opening speech made by former President Lázaro Cárdenas March 5 at the Latin-American Conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation and Peace.)

WE ARE attending an event of great international importance—the inauguration of the work of the Latin-American Conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation and Peace.

As Mexicans we offer you a warm welcome—illustrious representatives of different social sectors of our America and fraternal delegates from peoples of other continents, and we wish you a pleasant stay in our country.

It is just about twelve years since the day a small group of patriots met in the city of Paris to hold the first World Congress for Peace. In that memorable meeting important propositions were reached in favor of enduring peace. The warmongers fought these and sought to keep them from becoming known, but their efforts were futile; the result was to awaken human minds and wills in all corners of the globe until millions of men and women became adherents of the movement for peace.

Latin America has a pacifist tradition. Meetings and congresses in various countries have testified to the spirit that prevails among our peoples in favor of peace. And to realize this great aspiration, in all continents men and women of diverse religious creeds, different schools of philosophical thought and distinct political doctrines, have drawn together. Races, sexes and ages have joined ranks on the road to realizing this common ardent wish. Among all peoples the same desire unites us—to combat imperialist war so that we can undertake our full development.

To speak of peace and to discuss the most adequate measures to achieve it is one of the basic aims of this Latin-American Conference. Carrying out this noble mission, we shall briefly analyze the problems relating to war and peace in the light of the historic conditions in which all peoples live and develop.

On the world scene we encounter two great groups of countries: in one belong the socialist states; and, in the other, the capitalist states.

The nations found in the capitalist system do not represent a homogeneous whole; on the contrary, they are divided into two sectors. On the one hand, a

small nucleus of states with a high level of industrialization, which follows the route of ascending economic development, which concentrates the major part of the world's wealth, which has very high levels of average real per capita income and which possesses great military and political power. On the other hand—constituting the majority of nations—a group of peoples that lives essentially from agriculture, in surroundings of economic and cultural poverty, whose per capita real income is only a small fraction of that enjoyed by persons of the developed countries. Many of these peoples were, until recently, under the political domination of the imperialist powers, others still are, and those which retain their political sovereignty were, or are, dominated economically from abroad, suffering effects similar to those of colonies.

Thus it is that we observe in the world today that inequality in access to wealth, to culture and to power is the norm among these nations.

It is natural that this inequality determines different and contradictory conceptions of justice, of economics and of international politics. While the powerful nations seek to maintain their domination in the world, the oppressed peoples struggle to liquidate once and for all the colonial system and to win their political independence, which means freedom to organize their own life in accordance with their national interests.

We contend, consequently, that so long as any country remains without liberty, so long as nations exist without political independence, so long as national sovereignty is infringed in any way and we face the unjust spectacle of the economic or political submission of one country to another, it is impossible for peace to prevail in the world. Enduring peace is linked to the liberation of the colonial territories, to absolute respect for the sovereignty and the consolidation of the economic emancipation of nations.

To this group of peoples, the little developed peoples, belongs the majority of humanity. To it belong the many peoples of Africa, of Asia, of the Near and Middle East and of Latin America.

Solidarity among the less developed countries is becoming a common practice and, with time, will become one of the strongest in history. The results are already to be seen in the modification of the world situation, in which the democratic forces now have heavier

weight. Collective support of the freedom and independence movements among the weak peoples, and its favorable results, illustrates the possibilities of advancing in the conquest of the economic and political independence of Latin America.

To accept isolation among our own peoples, who have the same history and are united by blood and language, would be a grave error, just as would the wish to remain distant from the development of other continents when it is evident that our problems are not alien to the scene of the world process.

On the other hand, the struggle for peace is found to be linked to the movements under way in each and all of the Latin-American countries to obliterate the economic, social, racial and political inequalities that for centuries have characterized the life of our peoples.

Latin America is endowed with great natural resources; in its extensive territories it can produce all the raw materials for its needs; it has big oil reserves and other important mineral bodies, sources of water power and a population of two hundred million inhabitants. If we utilized these vast riches to the benefit of our own countries, Latin America could transform its poverty into prosperity. The capital goods necessary for this development must be invested by the Latin Americans themselves. Only in this way will the economic emancipation of our nations be gained.

And thus our countries, which are free from any territorial ambition, could come to constitute a pacifist combination that, with its moral force, would contribute, together with the other continents, to friendship among all peoples and, consequently, to world security.

In all of Latin America anachronistic forms are maintained in the economic structure, relating principally to possession and exploitation of the land; in many countries latifundism prevails. The latifundia condition agriculture to monoculture which compels maintenance of the production of raw materials that are exported and worked up in other countries, even to the detriment of the vital consumption needs of the population.

So long as this agrarian system of land ownership is sustained, economic development will encounter obstacles that in many aspects are insuperable. The latifundia impose systems of exploitation of the labor of men, maintain

an abysmal standard of life and of consumption, and, as a consequence—misery, technical backwardness and ignorance among the great masses of workers.

The peoples living from Patagonia to the peninsula of Lower California want to break up latifundism and the forms of feudal servitude through the complete realization of agrarian reform.

On this structure of the concentration of rural ownership and exploitation of the great peasant masses, stand political regimes, in some countries of our continent, which refuse to solve the grave problem of the land.

These conditions of inferiority and injustice must be superseded through political transformation into positive democratic nations and through changes in the economic structure to permit lifting the level of life by way of industrialization.

Defenders of peace are met with the charge that their struggle is not consistent, since they oppose violence when it concerns the dangers of war yet support violent methods in the struggle against dictatorial regimes, enemies of the peoples' interests.

The charge tendentiously identifies the violence of war with revolutionary violence. Those who seek to confound the one kind of violence with the other forget, or would like to forget, that a revolution is a domestic affair while war is an affair between nations. In our atomic era, the former does not menace humanity, while the latter endangers its existence. The former is promoted by majorities as the only just and viable way out under repressive and antidemocratic conditions, while the latter is decided on by certain minorities, without previously consulting the will of their fellow citizens, as a false solution to the economic crises that these minorities have brought about through their improvidence and their greed for profit. Thus revolutions and wars are in origin and essence different and even antithetical.

In saying this, we are not advocating violence, we are only explaining it. We do not believe that the problems of Latin America must always be resolved precisely through violence. To avoid it, the peoples must organize themselves politically and struggle for democracy as the expression of the civic will.

But, although it may seem paradoxical, the same imperialist tactics that confound revolutions and wars, threaten today, objectively, to convert revolutionary struggles into bellicose conflicts.

The imperialist mechanism through which the popular Latin-American demands tend to become converted into revolutions and these into bellicose conflicts is composed of a pair of forces, a pincers action—the linking of the politics of anti-Communism with the programs of economic austerity.

Anti-Communist politics in Latin America attempts to present as subver-

sive movements, of Communist inspiration, every democratic struggle, every bid for economic independence and every desire to preserve national sovereignty—inasmuch as these three currents confront the interests of big finance capital.

The politics of austerity in Latin America only affects the workers of city and field, through freezing of wages, and signifies exploitation of their productive forces to the benefit of the great international cartels.

The defense of the interests of the working class must be undertaken through its own unity. Dispersed and divided, as it is, it will forever be victim of exploitation.

The Cuban people, headed by incorruptible leaders, brought about the downfall not only of an antinational government, but of the foreign landholders, the telephone, electric and oil companies, the big subsidized dailies, the mercenary armies and the native opponents. This explains why it is the impact of the Cuban Revolution had such repercussions in each and every one of the countries in which the same instruments function that were broken in the largest of the Antilles. It shows in the same way why it is that a strictly internal affair like the Cuban Revolution became converted into an international problem. To any person of good faith and independent judgment, it is clear that the responsibility for the internationalization imposed on a matter that was strictly national in its origins, falls completely and beyond appeal on the big monopolistic cartels. The Cuban government and people are essentially pacifist. They reject and oppose war but they will defend their revolution. They have indicated that they are ready to resolve, through normal diplomatic channels and in a friendly way, the heated conflict with the U.S. government. We hope for success in this, since such an understanding between two neighbor peoples would strengthen continental scrupulousness for the peaceful solution of all conflicts, for absolute respect for the free development of cultural, political and economic life, and for condemnation of any criminal at-

tempt to interfere with the sovereign will of the states.

In the name of the Organizing Committee of this Conference, we offer to the national organizations that have supported its preparation and realization our warmest congratulations for having demonstrated once more their civic spirit and their great patriotism in defense of the general interests of our peoples and for having carried out a big job in making possible the participation of all the social sectors of their countries.

The conference will consider general theses on each of the themes proposed and also on the methods for converting them into reality. We will not have advanced if on concluding our sessions all that has emerged is a laudable wish or healthy intention. We have to put our ideas into practice, not only to determine whether or not they are correct, but, fundamentally, to struggle to achieve genuine freedom for our nations and a human life for our peoples.

In formulating the concrete programs of action for each country, the peculiarities of each must be taken into account, peculiarities that determine their geography, their population, their current development, their juridical system, the historical stage in which they live, and without infringing on their sovereignty. This in itself requires Sponsorship Committees for each country to promote the realization of agreements reached at this conference.

The proposed problems must be studied with serenity, with frankness, with decision. In doing this it is necessary to keep in mind the thought of our great leaders. Let us remember in this the liberator, Simón Bolívar, who in convoking the Congress of Panama, indicated this road for our America: "Solidarity, defense, union of the Latin-American republics, not to fight or conquer anyone, not for making war on anyone, but for defense against common dangers, to instill respect for their sovereignty, for solving differences in an amicable way, and for struggling for their prosperity and progress."

To the delegates, once again, our cordial welcome.

"We reject Monroeism . . ."

(The following is the full text of the speech made March 5 by Alberto T. Casella from Argentina.)

WE HAVE met here under the sponsorship of a great American, don Lázaro Cárdenas, and the warm and generous hospitality of the noble people of Mexico, to undertake together an examination of the past and current causes of some of the grave problems that afflict us, and to acquire, as citizens

of Latin America, a clear understanding of how to bring these problems to a definitive resolution.

We greet our brothers of Latin America and the specially invited fraternal delegations who, in attending this assembly, overcame difficulties of all kinds with which we are all familiar.

One hundred and fifty years ago the majority of our peoples began the emancipating action in which we share. The War for Independence lasted a little

more than a decade and a half, and, at its conclusion, many of the most outstanding figures were refugees in exile, skeptical or disappointed.

José de San Martín, the Great Captain of the Andes, who assured the independence of our peoples through his generous sacrifices, warned us of the danger of domination by some successful military figure.

Simón Bolívar said in discouragement: "We have plowed the sea. The Latin-American countries will fall under the domination of foreign and self-seeking tyrants." This forecast was borne out in good part. Insurrections, *coups d'état*, civil wars, have interfered with peaceful development for many decades. The results, seen by all, are no cause for pride.

Oligarchies of colonial and semifeudal type, based on the arbitrary division of the land among a few without the people sharing, have submitted to the imperialist domination of more powerful countries to assure their own privileges.

Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, whose sesquicentennial is being celebrated this year, said a century ago that the Latin-American countries had remained at the rear of the civilized nations of the earth. Today we know very well where to place responsibility for this backwardness. We must, then, undertake at once the task of obliterating evils that by inertia still persist and still weigh us down.

Such a state of affairs must not, however, discourage us, for since then a half hundred colonial countries have risen to independent life and shown us the wide road to freedom. We shall with them follow the indicated route until we gain full exercise of our sovereignty and economic emancipation in a world of peace and progress.

The long hard experience has demonstrated to us that political independence is not sufficient to assure the liberty and welfare of the people. Equally necessary is economic emancipation.

Already at the beginning of our struggle for independence there were clear and patriotically inspired minds who indicated the necessity of this combination. Thus the Argentine, Mariano Moreno, who died prematurely one hundred and fifty years ago, documented it in his famous *Representación de los Haciendados* and in the proceedings of the May Junta of which he was the first secretary.

We live in an epoch of dramatic although not insuperable contradictions. The development of science and technology, at the same time that it makes possible the well-being of all of humanity, entails risks that place in danger their very existence.

Human and international relations are affected by mutual lack of confidence and the threat of war. The state of anxiety and tension which this creates must not persist a minute more. The

alternatives are of utmost gravity: either we shall succeed in establishing the high moral order that human life merits, or we shall inevitably perish. Hence it is urgent that the immense sums of money devoted to the manufacture and purchase of armaments (more than \$100 billion annually, about \$2 billion for Latin America) be put into works of mutual benefit, so that all the peoples of the world can gain a higher standard of living.

Our America would benefit from this change of po'icy. It could thus utilize, through necessary and important works, its enormous natural resources. The results of this development would benefit all of humanity. With such transformations we would give effective form to the already classic thought which Roque Sáenz Peña expressed at the first Pan-American Congress.

The great statesmen of our America, who stood for arbitration and negotiation in resolving territorial disputes inherited from the colonial past, have enriched international law with doctrines that even today, through their altruism and generosity, can contribute to the solution of conflicts among nations.

Let us revive this spirit, and, with the dignity and vigor characteristic of our forefathers, tell the powers oppressing our continent that to the people, people are sacred, and that any nation no matter how small it may be has the right to decide, without foreign intervention, its own destiny.

A people's right to self-determination and independence is today an axiomatic principle universally recognized. In turn the decline of the colonial system throughout the world at an accelerated rate is evident. We witness the disintegration of colonialism with astonished satisfaction (the systems which it sustained appeared so strong) and we look toward the countries rising today with the optimistic hope that they are going to contribute to organizing a more just, more equitable world, with neither oppressors nor oppressed.

We hereby demand that the colonial possessions still remaining in our America be immediately freed from foreign tutelage. It is transparent that the proclaimed continental doctrines have not been able to win this.

We reject Monroeism and verbalistic Pan-Americanism, inoperative and contrary to genuine Latin-American interests, which have served only in setting up treaties involving our countries in the politics of armaments and war. Thus a pretext has been given to supporting military forces that are beyond our economic capacity and that up to now have forced postponement of the solution to problems as fundamental as those of education, health and homes.

Illiteracy continues to be one of the great evils from which Latin America suffers, extending, according to recent UN data, to forty-nine per cent of the

population. This figure testifies to the fundamental cause of the backwardness of our cultural and scientific development. Cuba proposes to end illiteracy by the third year of its revolution. Can the Latin-American peoples remain indifferent in face of this extraordinary effort which our political regimes have been incapable of carrying out in one hundred and fifty years?

And what shal'l we say of the hunger that reigns in vast areas of our extensive territory, and of the precarious conditions in homes and health still to be found in the big cities but above all in rural zones which embrace millions of square miles?

These are typical traits of the underdevelopment of our countries. The picture is completed by adding to the high figures for illiteracy, infantile mortality, etc., the low figures for production: for power, for steel, for cement, etc.

This situation is not justified by any lack of natural resources, since we possess the best lands in the world, incalculable sources of water power, enormous fields of oil, coal and gas, immense forest regions, great beds of iron ore and the most valuable industrial metals, without overlooking the fact that those of highest interest in our days are the radioactive ones.

To what then must we ascribe the economic backwardness which is the fundamental cause of our evils? Are our peoples perhaps incapable of utilizing these riches to their own benefit and that of humanity? In no manner whatsoever.

The fundamental cause of the backwardness and underdevelopment of Latin America is the deforming imperialist domination of our economy. Another of the causes is the lack of unity among the various sister countries, and of an independent policy that would permit planning the over-all utilization of the soil, taking advantage of the technological resources wherever they are found most accessible in regard to quality and price; that is, exchanging goods without discrimination with all the peoples of the earth. We must not forget that trade is the basis of peaceful life.

Lisandro de la Torre, eminent public figure of Argentina, defended in a memorable parliamentary debate, the right of our countries to transact commerce freely in accordance with their genuine interests and to their own advantage. The struggle against the monopolies and for freedom has been cruel and costly in sacrifices in Latin America: Martí, Sandino, Bordabehere, Gaitán, Candia, Albizu Campos, are some of the outstanding names of the American martyrs. Today in Africa Patrice Lumumba is another of the victims in this long and unhappy universal struggle.

The United States has had since its emancipation an imperialist vocation. Madison affirmed that expansion was the key to resolving the internal eco-

nomic difficulties and maintaining the social harmony of the North American people. Jefferson in turn held that democracy and prosperity depended on a society of agriculturalists and exporters. Theodore Roosevelt thought that expansion must be coupled with extension of the authority of the United States. It is the policy of the Open Door that explains the foreign policy of the USA during the period extending from the crisis of the year 1890 to the year 1961. Already in 1902 Wilson was declaring that concessions obtained in other countries by the financiers must be protected by the state even if it became necessary to infringe on sovereignty. A thought that serves by way of antecedent to explain the policy of the government of the USA is the case of United Fruit in Guatemala. It was likewise Wilson who defined commerce not as the exchange of merchandise but as the conquest of markets for North American exports.

Expansion was considered to be like a natural law. Consequently whoever opposed it violated the will of God. The conquest of markets thus corresponded with the divine will. This being so, all freedom movements and social revolutions must be repelled. The freedom of peoples to work out their own economic and political configuration was considered a negation of freedom itself insofar as it opposed the peremptory necessities of the economy of the United States. The "New Deal" brought nothing new to the classic orientation of foreign policy imposed by the trusts. In all cases, the international order had to adjust itself to the imperious necessity of expansion. An order that crossed it was interpreted as disorder. What was necessary, indispensable, was an international security that would make possible, without obstacles, the policy of the Open Door. Hence the blind opposition of the USA to all liberating movements.

The supposed right of the USA to expansion is incompatible with the right of self-determination of peoples. This explains the contradictions which the USA incurs between its proclaimed decision to respect self-determination and the frequent and aggressive violations committed against this right. Intervention was considered by the USA to be a political measure. The interventions perpetrated in Cuba, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Panama and Nicaragua were transposed into the organization of military forces or police who, in time, were converted into a source of terrible dictatorships of a military character.

It is also the necessity for expansion that shapes international relations in our continent. The USA has dissimulated this necessity behind a military mask. Economic problems were translated into war terms. And since everything opposed to the supposed natural law of expansion is injurious, they disguised the profound reason for their commit-

ments, inventing the danger of extracontinental aggression. U.S. Senator J. William Fulbright said in this respect:

"If there is one factor that explains more than any other the tight spot in which we find ourselves, this factor is our disposition to utilize the specter of communism as a cloak to cover the failure of our own leadership."

Thus we must seek in the necessity for expansion the reason for the existence of pacts like that of Rio de Janeiro. This is likewise the reason for the Inter-American Defense Board and the interventionist clauses in the Charter of the Organization of American States. Similarly hidden propositions are at the bottom of the Declaration of Caracas, making opinion a crime, ideas punishable, and imposing collective armed interventionism. The bilateral military pacts which the USA signed with twelve Latin-American nations are open faucets for the penetration of the trusts in these twelve nations. Secret clauses are one of their characteristics. And since these pacts are inspired by and founded in the Mutual Security laws of the USA, nothing that has been stipulated in them can be aimed at anything other than the benefit of the USA, as these laws themselves stipulate. In this way the U.S. Congress has become converted into the legislative organ of these twelve Latin-American nations.

However, the militarization of the nations of Latin America, the attempted standardization of armaments, the United States military missions stationed in all our nations, are not in reality aimed at making possible the defense of the continent in face of the pretended extracontinental aggression. This has been proved. In the USA they know very well that our armed forces are not equipped to carry out such a mission. The arms which the USA has sold us are mostly old and no longer being manufactured. The military missions are instruments of political infiltration. The USA has in no way hidden this objective. The entire structure of the pacts has the self-same aim, pursuing the subjection of our peoples in order to count on the votes of their governments in the international debates carried on in the UN. The twenty-one American nations represent almost a quarter of the members of the United Nations. The idea of expansion has governed the architecture of the relations between the USA and our nations under appearance of a military organization for the defense of the continent. Defense is not the concern but the creation of special relations with the armed forces of our nations, with an eye to the pressure they exercise on our governments, and to obtain military bases. More particularly the question is to facilitate a limited or deficient improvement of armaments with the aim of converting the armed forces into police forces to bar movements of emancipation or social betterment dedicated

to opposing the aggressive pressure of the United States economy. In Argentina this is manifest in the application of an unconstitutional "state of internal war" and a permanent "state of siege." This has been the constant in the policy of the USA: to prevent our peoples from exercising their freedom to oppose the abuse the U.S. makes of its freedom in stepping beyond its boundaries. The case of Cuba is instructive. Cuba is censured and insulted because it is making correct use of its freedom, a use of freedom in the concrete to oppose justifiably the expansion and robberies of the North American trusts who have done so much evil. The USA uses the word freedom in the abstract in referring to the case of Cuba, because freedom in the abstract is what has made possible for them penetration and subjugation. It is time in Latin America for all of this to be ended definitively.

The reality which we face would be sad and discouraging if we did not have profound faith in the capacity of our peoples to emerge from the stagnation in which they find themselves.

The facts are sufficiently clear and so the attempt is made to cloak them with words. This has been a negative work engaged in by governments, the press, and all those serving the interests of imperialist domination in Latin America. But now is not the time to continue exposing this incongruous, negative verbalism. It is time for action and it is the peoples that must undertake it. They talk insistently about giving us aid, but we have already had bitter experience with such aid throughout our history. We cannot delude ourselves nor continue being naive. The latest instructions, publicly announced, demand the highest returns on foreign investments. The Metropolis is in a crisis and needs aid itself. We must not place confidence in such aid, still less since it now constitutes part of the imperialist plans of domination elaborated by powerful international bodies which, as in the case of Argentina, have set as the basic condition for an illusory later development greater impoverishment of the workers along with unlimited enrichment of big trusts whose balances boast of the most shameless profits.

This situation has made it possible for our countries to be characterized as sanctuaries of lucre for the big international monopolies.

We must begin our task of modernization at once, placing our confidence in ourselves and in the genuine aid which can be given to us by those who will grant it without the economic or political conditions that would make it unacceptable.

We must proceed to draw up an inventory of our wealth and to plan, for example, the joint development of the great natural resources in the mighty cordillera of the Andes, and of the great rivers draining from them and crossing our plains. We must break the

back of economic imperialism, as in Cuba, nationalizing the public utilities and the key sectors of the economy. We must carry out a thoroughgoing agrarian reform, fitted to the needs of each region, based on the concept that the land is a social utility and belongs to those who till it.

We must liquidate illiteracy and carry out the educational reforms that still continue to be an aspiration forty-three years after the Córdoba proclamation which had repercussions throughout the Americas.

We must trade with all the world and struggle to break through the conditions that brought about the deterioration of the terms of exchange.

* * *

The series of facts which we have been outlining give to this conference, in the current circumstances, an extraordinary importance. The quality and the representativeness of the delegates participating in it assure to its decisions the widest possible response and support in Latin America.

We say this although it will displease those out to decry its importance, who persist in the mistaken tactic of deluding the people with maliciously slanted news. We say to such organs of public expression that they are defaulting in their duty to serve the public and that they have bowed to the economic interests that still exercise economic dominion over our peoples.

We desire peace because it fosters the greatest conquests of culture and science and serves the welfare of all who aspire. Peace is the basic and irreplaceable condition for the development of our peoples and for gaining full sovereignty and economic emancipation. On the basis of this premise, we consider general controlled disarmament and the definitive cessation of all types of tests with nuclear weapons indispensable and urgent. The fulfilling of this wish will relieve the general worry and alarm over the perspective today, whether accidental or intentional, of a completely destructive war.

* * *

The Cuban Revolution has excited the interest of all the peoples of America and encouraged and inspired them. The tragedy of this country, one of the last to succeed in freeing itself from the Spanish colonial regime, has moved all of America. The sacrifices and the feats of this heroic people have won the respect and admiration of all the peoples of the world. The accomplishments that have already been achieved in the social, economic and cultural fields are an enormous credit on the balance sheet of the Revolution.

We consider the Cuban experience to be a lesson that cannot fail to be learned. We well know the anarchy and disorder associated with the coups d'état in our countries. Here we have been struck by the totally different character of this authentic revolution which has

already transformed, in such a brief time, the conditions of life of the Cuban people, and which stands out as an inspiring example for all the countries of Latin America.

But it is not only the gain in material and economic advantages that makes the Cuban Revolution outstanding. Even worthier of note is the level which this country has attained in the international field by following with dignity an independent policy, breaking the ties that bound it, like other Latin-American countries, to obligations injurious to its sovereignty as a free and independent nation.

Cuba demonstrates anew the bankruptcy of the principles of geopolitics which have been kept alive in America through a fatalism arising from our geographic location and the deformation of our economies.

With their revolution, the Cuban people are realizing the dreams of Martí, and the Latin-American peoples are encouraging them to continue in their struggle to achieve a well-being which

was denied them during fifty years of pseudodemocratic and nonindependent life.

The feeling of the Latin-American peoples is that they must stand by the Cuban people and defend them through active solidarity against all the attacks aimed at returning them to slavery.

* * *

This conference, composed of qualified personalities in various branches of science and culture, of representatives of workers, students and professional organizations embracing millions of members, will have the opportunity to analyze the current situation in Latin America and of proposing practical solutions conducive to its genuine liberation and ultimate development.

This conference is the reply of Latin America to the call of the Sierra Maestra. Our peoples, conscious of their duty to humanity, wish to take into their hands their own destinies and work out in common, in a world of peace, a better life for all.

"On our feet and not on our knees . . ."

(The following is the full text of the speech of Señora Vilma Espín, representing the Cuban delegation.)

In THE name of the Cuban delegation, we wish to extend to all of you — the Mexicans, our Latin American brothers, and the fraternal delegates — our most cordial greetings and our most fervent and deeply felt gratitude. From the warm reception at the airport — where along with the stirring cheers, there was not lacking the inspiring note of revolutionary songs rendered by the typical mariachis — to the revolutionary enthusiasm shown at this magnificent opening session; everything has made us feel, at each instant, that this magnificent Mexican people, and our brothers all over America, and our brothers from other continents as well, are body and soul on the side of our glorious Cuban Revolution.

All this has deeply moved us and we want to begin by saying with profound and sincere brevity: "Gracias, compañeros."

General Lázaro Cárdenas has already expressed, with absolute clarity, in his admirable opening address, what this meeting means at the present moment in the world and in the history of our definitive emancipation. We, like him, are convinced that "among all peoples the same desire unites us — to combat imperialist war so that we can undertake our full development." We also know, as the great Mexican statesman put it, that "So long as any country remains without liberty, so long as nations exist without political independence, so long as national sovereignty is infringed in any way, and we face the unjust spec-

tacle of the economic or political submission of one country to another, it is impossible for peace to prevail in the world." And we affirm with General Cárdenas that "enduring peace is linked to the liberation of the colonial territories, to absolute respect for the sovereignty and the consolidation of the economic emancipation of nations."

Cuba was until yesterday a typical example of a semi-colonial country, underdeveloped, a victim of imperialism. The Spanish-Cuban-American war of 1898 was the first typical imperialist war, the first such war fought between two rapacious nations disputing the possession of colonies. As a result of that war Cuba ceased to be a Spanish colony and became a semicolonial of the United States of North America. The Platt Amendment was the juridical expression — written in the Constitution of the newborn Antilles republic — of its situation of political dependence; the Reciprocity Treaty of 1903 confirmed our economic slavery; the Naval Base of Caimanera [Guantanamo] even now reminds us, anachronistically, of that deplorable colonial situation. An entire costly governmental apparatus staffed by presidents, senators, representatives, etc. — democratic in outward form — served as administrator or overseer for the foreign interests and the native latifundistas, and a well-oiled caste army — professionals in abuse and torture — maintained an order of the graveyard on the Island converted into an immense sugar-cane plantation to sweeten the life of Uncle Sam.

Cuba was an immense sugar-cane plantation — with a little corner left over for tobacco and a few manganese

and nickel mines; and all this was destined for one single buyer, who set the prices and controlled the amount of harvest yields. Cuba was, furthermore, through unilateral and unjust agreements and treaties, subjected to this single buyer, forced to acquire in his storehouses the bulk of our indispensable consumers goods and any number of superfluous items, from rice to Cadillacs, flour or television sets.

Because we were slaves of the dollar and wore its livery, we appeared rich, but the illiterate peasant was starving to death and the workers and civil servants of the towns were dragging through a mediocre existence, with miserably low wages, constantly going downhill. The periodic economic crises characteristic of the capitalist economy — always sharper and more serious in the colonies — engendered as their natural produce the dictatorships which toughened and hardened in our land — from Machado to Batista — excellent foremen in the service of imperialist interests.

The Revolution based itself on the exploited masses of the countryside and the city. It was and always will be a revolution of the poor, by the poor and for the poor. It was born among youth and students, workers and professionals of the city, and grew strong in the Sierra, having taken root in the people of the land, who form the majority of the exploited in underdeveloped countries. It became as any truly organic product, one with the earth itself, and has been forming its consciousness in contact with Cuban reality, living day to day the pain and exploitation, but also the desires of recovery of the peasants and workers and professionals and students, and of men and women of the middle class who hope to breath free air, and of the small manufacturers and native merchants who dreamed of achieving definitive economic independence.

The Revolution was not, and is not, and will never become the adventure of a few, to benefit a new class of self-seekers. It was, and is, and will be the irresistible impulse of a whole people to become absolute master of its destiny, without subjection to any type of colonial rule, to recover its land and its dignity, its right to bread and to culture, to exploit its own riches for its own benefit, and to live in peace and friendship with all the peoples of the world.

That is why the Cuban Revolution started out by destroying the tools of colonial bondage, that is latifundism and the caste army. The Revolution counterposed the Agrarian Reform to latifundist holdings, and created the Rebel Army as against the caste army; the Rebel Army which, in the apt definition of the unforgettable Camilo Cienfuegos, is none other than the people armed in defense of their Revolution. Thus the militias also were born, the entire people ready to fight, in an organized manner,

in defense of their recovered land. Without latifundios to feed off, without a mercenary army and caste army on which to lean, the very possibility of existence of dictators disappears. And with that begins also the exodus, the precipitate flight of the odious caste of self-seekers and time servers of the unjust regime.

Those who could not flee, and were incapable of adapting themselves to the new situation, attempted desperate attacks against the Revolution and are falling victims of their own senselessness. Because — while it is possible to fight against a class, against a dominating group — it is absolutely impossible to defeat an entire people that has taken possession of the land which it waters with its blood and sweat, and which has in addition the courage and more than enough arms to defend that land. A people that is sinking deeper roots every day into the land recovered by the Agrarian Reform.

The Revolution learned in the days of struggle against the dictatorship, in the rigors of the Sierra Maestra and in the plains, that were won bit by bit, that it is not enough to give the land to the peasant — to create a host of small landowners — nor was it possible economically to parcel out the sugar latifundios dividing them up into small plots among the macheteros and the other sugar workers. Modern economic development, mechanization, and technical advances in agriculture, the intimate link between agriculture and industry, and many other reasons, call for a collective effort, for the union of muscles and creative enthusiasm, in order to derive the maximum benefit from the rich lands which were liberated. And so were born the cooperatives and the peoples stores, which have made it possible for the Cuban Revolution to achieve the miracle of increasing production in the second year of the revolutionary process, in sharp contrast to the economists and false prophets of imperialism — economists and prophets who recommended the economic blockade of the island to starve us out.

But they didn't take into account the resolute attitude of the Cuban people, who stepped out into the international market to offer their products and to find buyers and friends first of all in the socialist countries. The United States, which has maintained diplomatic relations with the socialist countries for a long time, and has the further advantage of its excellent markets, has always been insistent on keeping these doors closed tight to its semicolonies, to the underdeveloped countries subjected to its unjust domination. But when the Cuban Revolution shook off the yoke of colonial bondage, it was able to overcome the strangulation to which the imperialist interests sought to condemn it, thanks to the generous and unselfish aid of the socialist nations and that of the brother nations which — like Mex-

ico and Canada — have arrived at a degree of economic and political maturity which allows them to act with a certain independence *vis-à-vis* their powerful and merciless neighbor. And all of the peoples of our America, faced with the harassment of imperialism, have stood up and demanded that their governments defend Cuba's right to win its definitive independence.

Independence that is spelled out in the complete abolition of latifundism, in the nationalization of factories, in the Urban Reform which recognizes the right of every man to possess the roof over his head, in growing industrialization, in the struggle against illiteracy and low cultural levels — the root of all superstitions and fanaticism; in the creation finally of a new consciousness. Everyone who visits Cuba can already feel this new consciousness in the atmosphere, this consciousness which has returned to the Cuban the dignity of a free and independent people which can now stand up erect face to face with its friends and enemies, no matter how great be their stature. Now for the first time we can speak out without having our answers dictated to us. On our feet and not on our knees, which is an unworthy posture, not to speak of being highly uncomfortable for carrying on a conversation. And we are ready to converse with the whole world, including the United States, whenever we are both standing or both seated, which is even more comfortable. But as equal to equal and without any attempt to force the agenda on us beforehand.

We want to live in peace and be friends with everyone, but we are on guard in case they attempt aggression against us. And we are not exporting revolutions. But neither can we prevent the example of the Cuban Revolution from going beyond our borders and revealing to the brother peoples of our America and the world that imperialism is not invulnerable. That when a united people decides to obtain its full freedom and its complete independence, there are no forces which can stand in its way.

They say that when the forces of Lincoln were fighting in the North against the slave-holding states of the North American South, the slaves around the sugar mills and canebrakes of Cuba were singing this chant:

"Avanza, Lincoln, avanza,
tu eres nuestra esperanza."
(Forward, Lincoln, forward
you are our hope.)

We know only too well — and this admirable conference is another demonstration of it — that in the soul of every Indian and every Negro and every Mestizo or white who is exploited, from the Rio Grande to Patagonia, there is today resounding a similar chant, and that the underdeveloped peoples are now repeating in chorus:

"Avanza, Fidel, avanza,
tu eres nuestra esperanza."

And what is involved is not a mili-

tary advance — which would have the illustrious precedent of Bolívar or San Martín, liberators of many nations — but the peaceful spiritual advance such as headed by Sarmiento or Bello, Juarez and Hostos, Martí or Emiliano Zapata, the uncontrollable advance of a new American consciousness, which flowered here in Mexico in 1910 and which is now bearing fruit in our Antillean land;

where a people anxious to live in peace is preparing to defend its threatened soil, and in the face of any attempt to violate its recovered independence, proudly raises its battle cry — which has already been converted into a hymn of victory.

Patria o Muerte! Venceremos!
(Country or Death! We Will Win!)

"We are not alone . . ."

(The following declaration of the Conference was adopted unanimously at the closing session March 8.)

THE NEW stage of liberation has begun in Latin America. The struggle is posed in terms of defense of national sovereignty, economic emancipation and peace.

This struggle will gather together, day by day, all the patriotic and democratic forces against the factors that impede the complete development and utilization of the human and material potential of our countries.

We need to finish with the situation of dependence in which we stand today in violent contrast to the uncontrollable advance of the liberating process and the perspectives which science and technology offer to contemporary man.

The fundamental force that blocks the development of Latin America is U.S. imperialism. Its close alliance with the national oligarchies, the ruinous effects of its economic and cultural penetration, show it to be the principal cause of the general stagnation which prevails in the Latin America of today.

The defeat of imperialism is the fundamental condition of any plan for the development of our countries.

Determined to follow an independent policy, without other aims than its gen-

uine interests and necessities, Latin America demands full respect for the self-determination of its peoples. Such a policy is the indispensable premise for our participation in the world order under conditions of equality.

Without economic emancipation there is no political independence. To consolidate it we need: thorough agrarian reform and preferential attention to the indigenous population, redemption of the national wealth now in the hands of foreign monopolies, stimulation of the basic sources of energy and of the fundamental industries, free access to all markets, technical and economic assistance without injurious conditions.

Our countries require substantial transformations in their political, economic and social structure in order to eliminate the alarming current deficits in the standard of living, overcome technical backwardness and stimulate our indigenous cultures.

We reject the Monroe Doctrine and the policy of proclaimed hemispheric security and defense which infringes on our sovereignty. In opposition to oppressive Pan-Americanism, we stand for a Latin Americanism that would free our productive forces, amplify our possibilities of development, fortify solidarity and cooperation among our peoples and contribute effectively to peace in this hemisphere and in the world.

The works of the Cuban Revolution point the road to ending foreign domination. Its instructive revolutionary process constitutes an effective contribution to our liberating cause.

In energetically reaffirming that they will defend Cuba against all aggression, the Latin-American peoples know that they thus defend their own destiny.

U.S. imperialism has involved Latin America in the politics of the cold war. The imposition of military pacts has placed on our peoples the weight of the armaments race and fixed limitations on our sovereignty and economic development.

We demand the repudiation of all the military pacts and the liquidation of all the U.S. military bases in Latin America.

To contribute to an agreement on world disarmament, to finish with colonialism, put an end to the cold war, assure peaceful coexistence among different regimes and peoples — these are the premises for guaranteeing peace and national sovereignty.

The struggle for independence that is mobilizing peoples today is also ours. The Latin-American process of liberation is inseparable from the consolidation of world peace.

The realization of these aims is a necessity that cannot be deferred if we are to gain the liberty and the progress which we desire. For this, we must unite. Close cooperation and solidarity among all the democratic forces of each country and among all the Latin-American peoples, will permit us to reach these objectives in a brief historic period.

The common character of our problems clearly defines the continental dimension of our struggle.

We are not alone. We are backed by the fraternity of all the peoples that love liberty and peace. But the liberation which we seek will depend fundamentally on our own forces.

READ ABOUT CUBA

Listen, Yankee, by C. Wright Mills
160 pp. paper 50¢

History Will Absolve Me,
by Fidel Castro 79 pp. \$1.00

Truth About Cuba, by Joseph Hansen
48 pp. 25¢

Sartre On Cuba, by Jean-Paul Sartre
160 pp. paper 50¢

Cuba — Anatomy of a Revolution,
by Leo Huberman and Paul M.
Sweezy 176 pp. \$3.50

Reflections on the Cuban Revolution,
by Paul A. Baran 28 pp. 35¢

In Defense of the Cuban Revolution,
by Joseph Hansen 32 pp. 25¢

order from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place,
New York 3, N. Y.

The Fracturing of the Monolith

Despite the claims of cold-war propaganda
the anti-capitalist revolutions have created
for the Kremlin "a world they never wanted"

by Murry Weiss

THE Moscow-Peking dispute over "peaceful coexistence" is a fresh indication that the Kremlin's monolithic control exercised in Stalin's heyday over the Communist parties throughout the world is disintegrating. Nothing but good can come from this for the cause of revolutionary socialism, as Moscow's control has been wielded essentially for the preservation of the status quo. That is the real meaning of the Stalinist conception of "peaceful coexistence," which Khrushchev seeks to perpetuate and which the Chinese CP leaders—though they don't depart from the basic Stalinist policy—challenge in its current application.

Stalin imposed his reactionary foreign policy on the Communist parties thirty-five years ago as an extension of the bureaucratic totalitarian rule he had imposed on the Soviet Union.

Once Stalinism secured its grip on the Soviet workers state, destroyed the democracy of the Bolshevik party, the soviets and the trade unions, it was only a matter of time before his police regime extended over the Communist parties everywhere else. The Communist International was scuttled as a revolutionary force. Supinely subservient to Stalin's bureaucratic machine, the Communist parties substituted class-collaboration for class struggle and reformism for revolution.

The international working class has paid heavily for the domination of the Stalinist monolith over major

sections of the working-class movement. Many revolutionary opportunities were lost, and many actual revolutionary struggles were betrayed. Fascism came to power as a result of the Stalinist course, and the second world war was rendered inevitable. The fascist onslaught in that war nearly destroyed the Soviet Union.

The Stalinist policies of class collaboration achieved their crassest expression during World War II. The Communist parties desisted from all class-struggle activities in those "democratic" imperialist countries allied with the Soviet Union and from national-independence activities in the colonial possessions of the "democratic" imperialists. On the other hand, Stalin's chauvinist propaganda—so alien to the spirit of Leninist internationalism—lumped the German people together with their Nazi overlords. This repelled the German workers and helped prevent them from making common cause with the Soviet Union.

The Grand Alliance

The opportunist policy of the Kremlin was based on the "Grand Alliance" of Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill. Stalin undertook to help stabilize the capitalist system throughout the world under this arrangement. All Communist parties were strictly to refrain from any threats to the capitalist order. In return, the victorious imperialist powers were not to threaten the Soviet

system in Russia nor to interfere with Moscow's political control of Eastern Europe. In this way, the world was to be divided among the Big Three on a status quo basis. This was the essential content of the agreements concluded at the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam international conferences between 1943 and 1945.

To the best of his ability Stalin kept his promises. Several examples will bear this out. Thus, in Greece, a revolutionary struggle against the Nazi occupation was in progress during 1943 and 1944. It was conducted by the ELAS, primarily a workers and peasants partisan movement, led by the Communist party. ELAS victories over the Nazis, raised the perspective of a workers and farmers government in Greece. But British imperialism didn't cherish the prospect of winning the war against the Germans, only to lose Greece (a virtual British colony prior to the war) to the workers. The revolutionary Greek workers looked to the Soviet Union for guidance. They identified Stalin's regime with the Russian Revolution and hoped, by extending this revolution to their own country, to open new, liberating vistas. But in accordance with Stalin's pledges to his imperialist partners, the Greek Communist party leaders were instructed to allow the British to reoccupy Athens and to place their puppet once more on the Greek throne. Stalin's service to British imperialism won him a compliment from Churchill. "Stalin always car-

ries out his agreements," Churchill said.

The French partisans also had state power within their grasp as they fought the Nazi occupation. Many capitalists who had collaborated with the Germans (it was among the capitalists that the Nazi occupiers found their principal support) fled the country in fear of retribution at the hands of the workers. Others went into hiding until the arrival of the U.S. troops. It was common for the newspapers in those days to describe France as a "power vacuum" and to express fears as to how the "vacuum" would be filled. But Stalin kept his promise that communism would not take over. After the Nazis evacuated Paris, the French CP told the workers, who had been the main force in the partisan movement, to give up their arms. The CP leaders joined in bolstering a new government headed by De Gaulle.

One more example should be cited — that of the policy pursued by the Communist party of this country during World War II. The right-wing labor officials, as might be expected, lined up behind the American capitalist class during the war. They imposed a "no strike" policy on the unions. And the Communist party collaborated to the hilt with the right-wing bureaucrats. They even outdid the latter in trying to enforce the no-strike pledge. In addition the CP leaders told the Negro people that now was not the time to fight for civil rights — "Don't you know there is a war on?" they truculently asked. They also endorsed the government's attacks on civil liberties.

But the capitalists showed Stalin no gratitude in the postwar period. They launched the cold-war against the Soviet Union and began a merciless witch-hunt against the Communist party in the U. S. The right-wing labor bureaucrats — the Stalinists' erstwhile partners in curbing the unions ranks — of course promptly enlisted in the cold war and in the witch hunt.

The foregoing examples disclose what the Kremlin's "peaceful co-existence" policy looks like in practice. But Stalin's hopes for an indefinite preservation of the status quo — one which would allow the

privilege-seeking Soviet bureaucracy to rule unhampered at home — was rudely shattered by the course of history. Not only did American imperialism break the status-quo arrangements by launching the cold war, but in a number of key areas of the globe the revolution broke through despite Kremlin policy and made impossible any lasting world stabilization by agreement between the Kremlin and imperialism.

Stalin lived up to his Teheran-Yalta-Potsdam commitments as long as he could. He even attempted for a time to maintain his deal with the imperialists in Eastern Europe. Capitalism was to be preserved there through a coalition of the Communist parties with the bourgeois parties, although these countries were recognized to be clearly within a Soviet zone of influence. To preserve capitalism meant that the working-class movement had to be curbed. And the Red Army commanders actually threatened the workers with reprisals should they undertake to change the property relations. But the East European capitalists had no stomach for the Red Army occupation even on those terms. They fled to the West with whatever wealth they could salvage hoping to come back one day in the wake of imperialist armies. The West, through the Marshall Plan, attempted to retrieve the concessions they had given Stalin, thus breaking their end of the "peaceful coexistence" bargain. It was only then that the Kremlin responded by abolishing capitalism in Eastern Europe and by establishing planned economies.

A Distorted Revolution

This social transformation was carried out by military and bureaucratic methods, preventing the working class from accomplishing the change in its own name and with its own revolutionary objectives. The development of the Eastern European countries was further distorted when the plans were so drawn up and executed as to serve principally the needs of economic reconstruction in the Soviet Union. In plain words, the Kremlin fleeced Eastern Europe. Nevertheless the economic aid which the industrialized sections of East Europe are now able to provide for the struggling underdeveloped coun-

tries was made possible by the new property relations.

Moreover, the new mode of production — despite the Stalinist tyranny that had been imposed alongside of it — won firm adherence from the East European working class. The new social relations gave rise to the demand for socialist democracy, and this demand led, in 1956, to revolutionary upheavals against bureaucratic despotism in Poland and Hungary. In the creation of workers councils in these two countries during the revolutionary events, informed observers saw the revival of the institutions of workers' democracy — the soviets — which in October 1917 replaced the institutions of capitalist rule in Russia. Thus by transcending his policy of "peaceful coexistence" in Eastern Europe, Stalin unwittingly laid the basis for new revolutions which though aimed immediately against his brand of dictatorship, promised to carry the anti-capitalist struggle onto higher and firmer ground.

But even before the explosions in Hungary and Poland, the Yugoslav Communist Party had brought the conflict between the Kremlin and revolution to general public attention. The Yugoslav CP had led the working class and peasantry in their struggle against the Nazi occupation. The Yugoslav king was in exile in London, waiting for the British to return him to his throne. To accomplish this, the British armed and financed a highly publicized "partisan" force under the reactionary General Michaelovitch. This outfit spent most of its energy fighting not the Germans but the Proletarian Brigades organized by Tito and his associates. Stalin, in accordance with his agreements with the British, ordered the Yugoslav Communists to disband the Proletarian Brigades into an amorphous partisan movement and to establish harmonious relations with Michaelovitch, the British agent. He also ordered the Yugoslavs to confine their objectives to defeating the Nazis militarily.

The Yugoslav Communist party had been under Moscow control up to that time, but under the given circumstances the leaders found it impossible to carry out Stalin's or-

ders. The struggle against the Nazis could not be waged without rousing the proletarian and peasant mass against all their exploiters — the native capitalists and landlords (most of whom collaborated with the Nazis) as well as the fascist occupiers.

The Titoists subsequently learned that Stalin's sabotage of their struggle consisted not only in trying to foist a ruinous policy on them — which fortunately they disregarded. Stalin also refused to send them arms and medicines and actually sent this vitally needed material aid to Michaelovitch. And while the Tito-led partisans fought the Nazis at the front, Michaelovitch shot at them from the rear — with Russian as well as British-made bullets.

To win their national-liberationist struggle the Yugoslavs had to carry through a socialist revolution. By 1948, the Yugoslav CP had established a workers state and launched a planned economy. Unlike other CPs in Eastern Europe, it did not owe power to Soviet military occupation. Stalin feared the potential independence that possession of a popular base in the country gave Tito and his associates and began maneuvering to get rid of them so as to absorb Yugoslavia on the same terms as the other East European countries. When the Yugoslav leaders resisted, this led to near military collision between the two countries, and the Titoites were once more compelled to mobilize the working masses in defiance of the Kremlin.

Tito's later deals with imperialism in no way diminishes the principled significance of the earlier struggles. The Kremlin had clashed with the Yugoslavs *when the latter were moving left*. The Yugoslavs had successfully defied the Kremlin and thus established the first great schism in the Stalinist monolith.

East Germany

The next big open break appeared in June 1953, a few months after Stalin's death. Two million East German workers organized a general strike for economic improvements and democratic rights. The presence of 300,000 Kremlin troops did not deter them. The German Communist party was temporarily shattered by

this uprising. Sections of the bureaucracy turned toward the strike movement; other sections stood aside waiting for its force to spend itself so that they could inflict punitive action on the workers. The Stalinist military and police terror had temporarily lost its effect.

The East German workers did not win that round of the struggle, but the repercussions of their revolt spread throughout the world. All of Eastern Europe was shaken. And in the Soviet Arctic Circle, the political prisoners in the Vorkuta concentration camps waged a political strike upon hearing the news from East Germany.

Khrushchev Reveals

New and insistent demands were made on Stalin's heirs by the Soviet workers and students. The pressure of fifty million Soviet workers on the ruling bureaucracy was unmistakably evident at the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party in February, 1956. It forced Khrushchev to make his "secret-session" speech denouncing Stalin. Khrushchev sought to shift the blame for bureaucratic tyranny from the shoulders of the parasitic caste of privilege-seekers, in whose interests Stalin had ruled, to those of the individual dead leader. He wanted to prevent the Russian workers from organizing against the bureaucracy and to raise their hopes that conditions would steadily improve now that Stalin was out of the way. The result of Khrushchev's admissions about Stalin's true role was to create new cracks in the world Stalinist monolith and to deepen the fissures already opened by the extension of the revolution.

It was in the wake of the Twentieth Congress that the Polish and Hungarian uprising broke out. In both countries sections of the Communist parties supplied much of the leadership to the insurgent workers and students. As monolithic structures, these parties disintegrated in the red-hot fires of revolt — with their worker and intellectual adherents lining up against the bureaucrats. In Hungary, the Soviet bureaucracy was able to defeat the workers and youth only through the naked armed force of the Russian troops. In Poland, Khrushchev allowed Gomulka, one of

Stalin's purge victims, to take the helm of the country but prescribed strict limits within which reforms might be carried out. The threat of Russian military intervention kept the Polish revolutionaries from pressing their demands for a regime of workers councils. Since October 1956, when Gomulka came to power, his government has taken back many of the freedoms and economic concessions won in the revolutionary days. However, the Gomulka regime still retains a measure of independence from the Kremlin, testifying to the continuing tendency of world Stalinism to produce cleavages within itself.

There was hardly a single Communist party anywhere in the world that was not shaken to its roots by Khrushchev's revelations at the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party and by the Hungarian and Polish upheavals. American, Italian and Chinese party leaders openly criticized the Soviet leadership for not going far enough in attacking the Stalin cult or for its handling of the Hungarian uprising. In the Soviet CP itself, the Twentieth Congress and its aftermath touched off two major power struggles within the bureaucracy from which Khrushchev emerged victorious both times.

By the end of 1957, the unity of world Stalinism as well as the unity within the separate Communist parties had been more or less restored. But many genuinely revolutionary forces who had heretofore been held captive in the Stalinist movement were liberated from it as a result of the crisis that shook the monolith in 1956. In this way new gains for the revolution were made possible. For example, in Japan last year, the leadership of the magnificent demonstrations against U. S. imperialism was in the hands of left-wing formations which had broken off from the CP sometime after the Hungarian events. (One of these groups had fused with the Trotskyists.) Significantly, too, the schisms in international Stalinism had weakened the influence of the Japanese CP and thereby lessened the effect of the party leaders' attempts to place a brake on the demonstrations. Thus as a direct result of its inter-

national crisis, Stalinism was being outflanked on the left.

An even more outstanding example of this outflanking is the victory of the socialist revolution in Cuba, which by-passed the Communist party entirely. Unhampered by Stalinist ideology, the cadres led by Fidel Castro learned from experience that their revolution could not be confined within a bourgeois-democratic framework, that the realization of their objectives required the creation of a workers state and a planned economy. The Cuban revolution in turn widened the already existing fissures in the Stalinist movement, permitting fresh, revitalized forces to regroup and push toward new revolutionary victories.

Moscow-Peking

Meanwhile, the unity of the world Stalinist movement, re cemented in 1957, has again been disrupted by the current Moscow-Peking dispute over summetry. This dispute began in the summer of 1958, but manifested itself as a difference of doctrinal pronouncements in September 1959. The Chinese CP leaders insisted then that any peace-like moves of the U.S. government were in reality designed to screen imperialist war preparations. The Soviet CP leaders, on the other hand, praised President Eisenhower for joining with Khrushchev in establishing the so-called "Geneva spirit" and declared that his intentions were of the best. After the U-2 incident last year disrupted the "Geneva spirit" the Soviet CP leaders have aimed at restoring it at a new summit conference with Kennedy. The Chinese leaders, on the other hand, have denounced the Democratic administration in the same terms as its predecessor. Moscow has emphasized the need to revise Lenin's teachings that imperialism breeds war, whereas Peking has reaffirmed them. Moscow also proclaims the possibility of peaceful evolution to socialism in "democratic" capitalist countries, whereas Peking upholds the classic Marxist-Leninist standpoint that the capitalist class will seek to block, by violent means if necessary, the change to socialism anywhere in the world.

Although the Soviet CP leadership

and the Chinese CP leadership forego naming one another in their denunciations of "dogmatism" and "revisionism," and although they have joined in common resolutions, their dispute is known to be bitter and deep-seated. And if Moscow now elevates "peaceful coexistence" to the status of a new Marxist "scientific" principle and Peking publicly subscribes to this doctrinal pronouncement, the struggle between them will nevertheless continue, muffled but irrepressible. Its roots are too deep to be covered by new terminology. Indeed, though waged between two groups of Stalinist-type bureaucrats, what underlies the conflict is once more the clash between revolution and the reactionary nature of Stalinism. For the Maoists, in leading China's revolutionary upheaval — second in importance only to the Russian Revolution of 1917 — had their own set of "experiences" with the Kremlin.

Stalin had a consistent policy of opposition to the socialist revolution in China dating back to 1925. Moscow at that time forced the Chinese Communist party leadership to support Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang, a policy which resulted in a counter-revolutionary bloodbath of workers and peasants, as Chiang established his brutal dictatorship.

Again, at Potsdam, Stalin agreed that China should be a neutral country under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek. In 1945, the Soviet government recognized Chiang's regime as the lawful government of China although he had already opened civil war against the Chinese Communist party. As the civil war unfolded, the revolutionary workers and peasants of China rose to free themselves from ancient feudal enslavement as well as from the exploitation of foreign and domestic capitalists. Chiang, acting for the imperialists and the landlords, sought to crush the revolution by means of a liberal supply of U.S. arms. All to no avail. The revolution proved to be more powerful than American imperialism, than the Kuomintang — and than the policies of Stalin.

The Chinese CP leaders, though they sought at first to abide by Stalin's deals, had to violate them or

face defeat in the civil war. After their conquest of state power in 1949, Mao and his associates still tried to keep the revolution within bourgeois-democratic channels, in accordance with the established Stalinist policies for underdeveloped countries. But in 1950, American imperialism counter-attacked. It intervened in the Korean civil war, hoping to use Korea as a base against China. U.S. troops massacred millions of Koreans and Chinese in the effort to halt the tide of revolution in Asia. This, however, accelerated the revolution in China forcing the Chinese CP to expropriate all foreign capitalist holdings and to turn in the direction of a planned economy.

Although the hot war in Asia came to an end, the Chinese CP leaders have remained locked in struggle with American imperialism to this day. Washington refuses to extend diplomatic recognition to Peking and uses the Chinese territory of Taiwan — ninety miles from the mainland — as a staging area for further attacks on the Chinese revolution. The Kremlin, in the last few years, has evidently sought to conclude "peaceful coexistence" deals with American imperialism without giving the Chinese the slightest guarantee that such agreements would provide for the end of U.S. non-recognition of China. Nor does the Kremlin seem to have been seriously pressing for the evacuation of American forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits. The Chinese CP leaders, as a result, don't trust Khrushchev to protect China's interests in his negotiations with imperialism and have put his policy of seeking summit conferences with imperialism in question.

In this way, the problems of the defense of the Chinese revolution, whose victory Stalin's policies never provided for in the first place, have created a new fissure in the Stalinist monolith. Every Communist party in the world is bound in time to be affected by the Moscow-Peking division.

For nearly four decades, the working class struggle for socialism has been perverted by Stalinism. It seemed to many people that the Soviet bureaucracy, through its man-

(Continued on Page 56)

The American Civil War: Its Place in History

by William F. Warde

THE historical significance of the American Civil War, which began a hundred years ago, has to be appraised from two standpoints: one national, the other international. What place does this immense conflict occupy in the development of American society? And what is its place in the world history of the nineteenth century?

The most penetrating liberal historians, headed by Charles Beard, have correctly designated this event as the second American revolution. But they have failed to explain clearly and fully its essential connection with the first American revolution.

The First American Revolution and the Second

The second American revolution had deep historical roots. It was the inevitable product of two interlacing processes. One was the degeneration of the first American revolution, which unfolded by slow stages until it culminated in open counterrevolution. The other was the rise of capitalist industrialism with its contradictory effects upon American social development.

The interaction of these two fundamental factors, the first rooted in national soil and the second stemming from world conditions, constituted the principal driving force in American history between the close of the first revolution and the outbreak of the second.

It is impossible to understand the necessity for a second American revolution without grasping the dynamics of these two interpenetrating processes out of which it emerged.

The first American revolution took place in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. The second unfolded in the middle of the nine-

teenth century. Separated as they were by an interval of almost seventy-five years, these two revolutions are customarily regarded as totally different and completely disconnected events. This view is superficial and false. In reality the first American revolution and the second form two parts of an indivisible whole. They comprised distinct yet interlinked stages in the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the United States.

THE bourgeois national revolutionary movement in North America had five main tasks to fulfill. These were: (1) to free the American people from foreign domination, (2) to consolidate the separate colonies or states into one nation, (3) to set up a democratic republic, (4) to place state power in the hands of the bourgeoisie, and (5) most important of all, to rid American society of its precapitalist encumbrances (Indian tribalism, feudalism, slavery), in order to permit the full and free expansion of capitalist forces of production and exchange. These five tasks were all bound together, the solution of one preparing the conditions for the solution of the rest.

The first revolution solved the first three of these tasks. The Patriots' struggles liberated thirteen colonies from British rule; the ensuing class contention for power (1783-1788) led to the creation of the Federal Union; the new nation set up a democratic republic. It went quite otherwise with the last two. Although the revolution cleansed the colonies of much feudal rubbish and cleared the ground for the swift growth of American capitalism and American nationality, it failed to place the scepter firmly in the hands of the big bourgeoisie or to effect a thoroughgoing reorgani-

zation of American society on a bourgeois basis.

These deficiencies of the first bourgeois revolution were not immediately evident and took time to manifest themselves in full force. At first the revolution seemed entirely successful and its outcome satisfactory to the Northern capitalists. They had attained the paramount position in the new Republic which they governed together with the Southern planters with whom they had waged the war, written the Constitution, and formed the Union.

But the merchants, financiers and manufacturers proved incapable of maintaining their hegemony. After a brief though important period in supreme authority during Washington and Adams' administrations, their direct political representatives were compelled to turn over national leadership to the plantation aristocracy. The bourgeois conquest of political power had turned out to be premature. This was confirmed by the fact that the mercantile capitalists were subsequently unable to recover the supremacy they relinquished in 1800 to the slavocracy and had to rest content with second rank.

THIS dethronement of the big bourgeoisie of the North by the Southern planters provided positive proof of the shortcomings of the eighteenth century revolution. But this political reversal was rendered possible by the underlying social relations and their channels of development. Why was the Northern bourgeoisie unable to hold the predominant position it had won? Precisely because the fifth and most fundamental task of the revolution—the liquidation of all precapitalist social forces—had not been completely carried out. Thus mercantile

capitalist rule fell victim to the economic backwardness of American society. The first revolution unfolded in a colonial country with a relatively low level of economic development based on agriculture. The contradiction between the extremely advanced political regime in the United States after the revolution and its still immature and unindustrialized economy was the primary cause of the political weakness and downfall of the big bourgeoisie.

The social structure of the United States at the end of the eighteenth century was a composite of slave and free labor, of precapitalist and capitalist forms and forces of production. To complete the reconstruction of society along bourgeois lines, it would have been necessary to break up the soil in which slavery was rooted. This proved impossible under the prevailing conditions. The slave interests were sufficiently powerful at the time of the revolution to prevent any tampering with the institution in its Southern strongholds and even to obtain constitutional warrant for its perpetuation. The opponents of slavery could do no more than restrict its scope by providing for the abolition of the foreign slave trade at the end of twenty years, for emancipation in certain Northern states where slavery was of slight economic importance, and for its prohibition within the unsettled Northwestern territories.

Chattel slavery was becoming so unprofitable and burdensome a form of production to many planters toward the close of the eighteenth century that opponents of slavery consoled themselves by looking forward to its withering away in the South as in the North. The problems it presented would thereby have been automatically resolved by a gradual transition from slave to free labor.

These expectations were nullified by the rise of King Cotton. This economic revolution in Southern agriculture imparted such virility to the moribund slave system that its economic masters and political servants not only wrested command of the national government from the Federalist bourgeoisie with the accession of Jefferson to the presidency in 1800 but managed to maintain their sov-

ereignty unimpaired for the next sixty years.

The struggle for supremacy between the pro-slavery forces centered in the South and the free labor forces headed by the Northern bourgeoisie was the decisive factor in the political life of the United States in the period bounded by the two revolutions. From 1800 on the big bourgeoisie kept ceding political ground to the planters. Supreme political power inevitably gravitated into the hands of the economically predominant cotton nobility. The capitalists could not regain their lost leadership until the economic development of the country had produced a new combination of social forces strong enough to outweigh the slavocracy and its allies and then to overthrow it.

Thanks to the achievements of the revolution and to exceptionally favorable international economic circumstances, the United States took tremendous steps forward during the first half of the nineteenth century. The productive forces of the nation, agricultural and industrial, slave and free, grew by leaps and bounds. The gains accumulated as a result of the revolution and the ensuing economic progress were distributed, under pressure from the people, in the shape of numerous small gradual democratic reforms. This part of the planter-bourgeois regime was a comparatively pacific period in domestic politics. The chief disputes which arose among the governing classes (including those issues directly pertaining to slavery) were settled by compromise.

AROUND 1850 a radical reversal of these processes set in. The rise of large-scale industry in the North and the expansion of small farming in the Northwest upset the economic equilibrium upon which the planters' power had rested and led to a new correlation of social forces. Goaded by the prospect of losing supreme power and by the economic decline and social disintegration of the slave system, the planting interests absolutely opposed themselves to progressive tendencies in all fields of national life. Their despotism became increasingly intolerable. Not only the

Negro chattels but the entire American people were being made the victims of the arrogant, unrestrainable slave owners. To check this growing reaction and to assure continued progress in the nation, it was imperative to break the grip of the slave power.

The most eligible candidate for leadership in the fight against the Southern planters was the second-born of the bourgeoisie, the manufacturing class. This section of the capitalists had long been striving to regain the position of political supremacy in the U.S. which its elder brother, the merchant aristocracy, had lost in 1800. The smouldering struggle between the planters and industrialists, which flared up periodically, had been smothered by compromise in 1820, 1832 and 1850. With the organization of the Republican party in the fifties, the industrialists launched their final struggle for the conquest of supreme power.

Two methods for delivering the people from their bondage to the slave power were proposed by representatives of different social strata in the North. The spokesmen for the ascending industrial capitalists hoped to depose the planters by class compromise and by peaceful constitutional means after the precedent set by the English industrialists in the West Indies. The political agents of the British manufacturers had come to terms with the landed aristocracy at home, as well as with the West Indian planters, and in 1833 instituted compensated emancipation of the slaves in the English colonies by parliamentary enactment.

The American way of abolishing slavery, however, was to differ from the English. Nor did it follow the course of political and social reform envisaged by the conservative Republicans. It took the revolutionary trail pointed out by the radical abolitionists. These pioneers of the second revolution, reflecting the views of the plebian democracy (small farmers and wage workers in the North and the chattel slaves in the South) advocated root-and-branch extermination of the slave power.

Very few Americans considered so radical a program desirable or so drastic a prospect feasible during the fifties. But the alarming aggressions

of the slaveholding reaction and the sharpening of the social crisis swiftly transformed the general outlook. In its early stages the slaveholding reaction developed upon the political foundations laid down by the eighteenth century revolution. But the democratic institutions had become unbearable fetters upon its activities which the slavocracy yearned to cast aside.

Southern secessionism, the frankest expression of these reactionary tendencies, aimed at nothing less than a total reversal of the aims and achievements of the first American revolution. Its program explicitly called for an unconditional denial of its democratic and equalitarian principles, the destruction of the Union, and the shackling of the nation's productive forces to the anachronistic slave system. Secession implicitly entailed the abandonment of representative republican government and even threatened the loss of national independence to the imperialist vultures of Europe, France and England, hostile to the Union. Thus all the gains of the earlier revolution, embodied in the most prized traditions and institutions of the United States, were threatened by this retrograde movement.

The victory of the Republican party in the presidential elections of 1860 and the ensuing departure of the slave states brought to a head the struggle between the Southern planters and Northern bourgeoisie, the pro-slavery and anti-slavery camps, the counterrevolution and the revolution. The secessionist coup d'état revived all the problems of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, including those which had presumably been forever settled.

AT THIS critical point three main perspectives opened out before the American people. A victory for the Confederacy would have effaced the remnants of the revolution and fastened the hated dictatorial rule of the slaveholders over all America. Another ineffectual compromise between the contending camps would have permitted the struggle to drag along and exhaust the people. A victory for the revolutionary forces would clear the way for a full and final disposal of the unfinished busi-

ness of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The developments of the Civil War soon excluded any middle course or ground for compromise, leaving open only the two extreme variants. The favorable alternative triumphed. The bourgeois Republicans, who had taken power on a program of restricting the slave power, found that they could hold it against the assaults of the Confederacy only by resorting to increasingly revolutionary measures leading to the overthrow and abolition of the slave power. *In order to conserve the conquests of the first American revolution, it was found necessary to extend them through a second.* A supplementary upheaval of social-economic relations was required to support the political overturn of 1860.

In the course of this second revolution, the most radical representatives of industrial capital and their plebeian allies completed the tasks initiated by their predecessors in the first. Placing themselves at the head of the anti-slavery forces, the Radicals took complete control of the Federal government and concentrated its apparatus in their hands. They defeated the armies of the Confederacy on the battlefields of the Civil War; shattered the political and economic power of the slave oligarchy; consolidated the bourgeois dictatorship set up during the war; and remodeled the Republic into conformity with their own class aims and interests.

This second American revolution not only installed a new governing class in office but, by abolishing chattel slavery, scrapped the principal form of property and labor in the South. The great political and social problem which had agitated the United States ever since the first revolution—how to dispose of the slave power and “its peculiar institution”—was definitively settled by the second.

The second revolution also concluded the progressive political role of the American bourgeoisie. After it helped annihilate the slave power and slavery, its political usefulness was utterly exhausted. Like the plantation aristocracy before it, the new ruling capitalist oligarchy rapidly transformed itself into a thoroughly reactionary force, until it came to

constitute the main obstacle to social progress not only within the United States but throughout the world.

The Course of Revolution in the Old World and the New

Just as American historians have ignored the organic affiliation between the first American revolution and the second, so they usually overlook the affinity between the revolutionary movements in the United States and Europe during the mid-nineteenth century. Yet the upheaval in the New World cannot be completely and correctly understood unless its connections with the revolutionary processes then going on in the Old World are made clear.

At every stage of its development American history has been a product synthesized from interactions between international and intranational forces. Western Europe, which dominated the New World during its discovery and colonization, continued to determine the main lines of social and economic development in America decades after the United States achieved political independence.

The second American revolution was not simply necessitated by unsolved problems rising from the first. It was no less the outgrowth of the whole course of historical evolution in the Western world since 1789, and more particularly, since the world-shaking political events of 1848 in Europe. These developments posed new problems before the American people. They also provided ways and means for solving the old problems along with the new.

Between the close of the first American revolution in 1789 and the beginning of the second in 1861 a far greater revolution took place in the Western world. This revolution occurred in the field of production. The introduction of power-driven machinery transformed the technological basis of production, gave birth to the factory system, and made possible large-scale industry. With the establishment of large-scale industry, the capitalist method of production for the first time stood upon its own feet and began to assert its mastery in the decisive spheres of economic life. The age of industrial capitalism succeeded the age of commercial capitalism.

The rise of industrial capitalism,

which began toward the end of the eighteenth century and lasted until the beginning of the twentieth century, was a turbulent epoch in world history. With furious zeal the emissaries of capitalism attacked and destroyed the remnants of feudal and barbarian civilizations and erected a new world on their ruins. In the wake of the extension of the exchange of products, capital, labor and culture acquired an unprecedented mobility. Capital ranged throughout the globe, seeking openings for trade and investment; millions of people were redistributed in the greatest mass migrations in history from the Old World to the New; culture became more cosmopolitan. Science and invention urged onward the fast pace of capitalist industry.

The second American revolution occurred during the height of this development. From 1852 to 1872 industrial capitalism experienced its most impetuous growth. The unprecedented volume of world trade during this period indicates the extraordinary tempo of economic expansion. After rising from 1.75 billions of dollars in 1830 to 3.6 billions in 1850, the volume of world trade leaped forward to 9.4 billions in 1870 — an increase of well over two and a half times. This rate of increase has never been surpassed by world capitalism. It was during these hundred years of industrial revolution and, above all, during the decades from 1850 to 1870, that the modern capitalist world took shape.

THIS epoch of the most rapid expansion of capitalism, from 1847 to 1871, was likewise a period of wars and revolutions. There were three consecutive phases of war and revolution during this period. The crisis of 1847 produced the first mighty wave of uprisings. These were cut short by a series of victories for the reaction and by the economic revival following the California gold strike of 1849.

After a prolonged period of prosperity, the world crisis of 1857 gave rise to a second sequence of wars and revolutions. This began with the first Italian War for Independence and was followed in rapid succession by the American Civil War of 1861, the

Polish Insurrection of 1863, Napoleon the Second's Mexican adventure and the campaign against Denmark in 1864 which opened the series of Prussian Wars led by Bismarck. This revolutionary impulse was felt as far away as Japan where, through the Meiji Restoration, the rulers of Japan partially adapted their economy and regime to the demands of the new industrial system.

The third and final period, initiated by the crisis of 1866, witnessed the continuation of Bismarck's campaign of expansion with the attack upon Austria in 1866 which was triumphantly concluded with the victory over France in 1871; the Republican uprising in Spain which toppled Queen Isabella from the throne; and the last of Louis Napoleon's adventures which culminated in the crashing of the Empire in 1871.

The Civil War in France following the downfall of the Second Napoleon, where for the first time in history the proletariat seized power, was the historical highwater mark of this epoch. With the crushing of the Paris Communards and the restoration of bourgeois order in the Third Republic, the revolutionary tide receded for the rest of the century.

Thus, for almost twenty-five years, the entire Western world was a fiery furnace of war and revolution. These were the most turbulent years mankind experienced since the Napoleonic wars or was to know until the first World War. Within this furnace were forged not only the imperialist powers of modern Europe which were to rule the earth until 1914, but the nation destined to outstrip them as the mightiest of world powers: the capitalist United States of North America.

The second American revolution must be viewed within this world-historical setting. Our Civil War was neither an isolated nor a purely national phenomenon. *It was one of the most important links in the chain of conflicts that issued directly out of the world economic crisis of 1857 and constituted the great bourgeois-democratic revolutionary movement of the mid-nineteenth century.* While the revolutions of 1848 and 1871 in France were the chief events in the first and final stages of that movement, the revolution starting in 1861

in the United States was the central event in its second chapter. This was the most important revolutionary struggle of the nineteenth century as well as the most successful.

Results of the Mid-Nineteenth Century Revolutions

The development of the bourgeois-democratic revolutionary movements of the mid-nineteenth century proceeded at different tempos, assumed different forms, and had different results in the various countries. From Ireland to Austria the uprisings of 1848 in Europe uniformly ended in disaster and the restoration of the old order — with superficial changes at the top. At the same time these frustrated assaults made possible numerous reforms in the ensuing decades and prepared the way for further advances by the progressive forces.

The revolutionary movements of the second and third wave were more successful in attaining their objectives. The triumph of the Union in the United States was of far greater historical importance than the failure of the Polish insurrection in 1863. The conquest of national unification and independence by the German and Italian peoples was more significant than the fact that it was achieved under monarchical auspices.

Even where the revolutionary struggles failed to reach fruition, they engendered valuable reforms (extension of the franchise in England, national autonomy for the Swiss cantons, limited constitutional liberties in Hungary, etc.). By 1871 the bourgeoisie had secured liberal constitutional governments in most of the leading countries of Western Europe with the exception of Germany, Russia, and Austria-Hungary. These retarded nations had to pay their long overdue debts to history in double and triple measure when the next all-European revolutionary tide rose during 1917-1918.

Except for the United States, social reforms were largely restricted to the removal of the vestiges of feudalism which hampered capitalist development. Thus the revolution of 1848 led to the abolition of serfdom in Hungary; in 1863 Alexander II decreed the emancipation of the serfs within Russia's dominions. In the United

States alone did a really revolutionary transformation of social relations take place.

Here the problems of the bourgeois revolution were solved with maximum success. Here the magnates of industrial capital became the sole rulers of the Republic by destroying the slavocracy and slavery. Elsewhere, as in Germany and Italy, the bourgeoisie faltered for lack of revolutionary energy, fell short of its goals, and remained footmen of the upper classes who retained the reins of government in their hands.

The American bourgeoisie was able to fulfill its historical mission so brilliantly because of the exceptional character of American social development. Their drive for power was based upon the great achievements of the first revolution. The American people had already attained national independence, got rid of the altar and the throne, and enjoyed the blessings of republican democracy. These advantages gave the American bourgeoisie a head start that made it easier to outdistance the Europeans.

MOREOVER, the economic power, political independence, and social weight of the capitalists in the United States considerably surpassed that of their German and Italian compeers. The American masters of capital were no political tyros. They had taken almost a century to prepare themselves for this final showdown; they had once held supreme power and felt it was theirs by right. They had already created their own parliamentary institutions and taken legal possession of the state apparatus before the battle was joined. They entered the arena with their own party and program.

The role of the bourgeois Republicans as defenders of the Union and its democratic institutions enabled them to rally around their banner the progressive forces within the nation and throughout the civilized world. The North could count on support from the Negroes in the South whose sympathy weakened the Confederacy even where the Union leaders feared to encourage their self-action. They succeeded in winning over the mass of small farmers to their side, while the slaveholders failed to draw their

sympathizers among the governments of Western Europe into the conflict. The importance of these alliances can be estimated when it is remembered that the rebel colonists were enabled to defeat their British overlords through the military intervention and financial aid of France, Spain and Holland.

The economic strength and manpower of the Northern bourgeoisie were no less superior to that of their adversary. The boom preceding the crisis of 1857 poured streams of wealth into the coffers of the Northern industrialists and financiers and placed large resources of capital and credit at their disposal. The Unionists had an extensive and solid industrial and agricultural base beneath their feet. The Confederacy, on the contrary, had neither an adequate industrial foundation (they exhausted their energies trying to improvise one under stress of the civil war), quantities of liquid capital at their command, nor easy access to the resources of the world market. The war, which depleted the assets of the Confederacy, crippled its slave economy, and cut off its great saleable crop from the market, only lent an impetus to the expansion of industry and agriculture and the accumulation of capital within the loyal states.

Finally, the clear-cut and irreconcilable antagonism between the slavocracy and industrialists on the one hand, and the immaturity of the proletariat on the other, enabled the radical bourgeoisie to carry through the struggle against their class enemy to the end. The German bourgeoisie had to reckon at every stage of its conflict with the princes and Junkers to its right and with a distrustful working class on its left. Except for a brief explosion in the middle of 1863, the industrial workers in the United States did not assert themselves as a powerful independent factor in the revolutionary struggles.

The revolution was led by the Radical Republicans, the most resolute representatives of the bourgeoisie. The Radicals were the last of the great line of bourgeois revolutionists. Thrusting aside the conciliators of every stripe and crushing all opposition from the left, they annihilated their class enemy, stripped the slaveholders of all economic and

political power, and proceeded to transform the United States into a model bourgeois-democratic nation, purged of the last vestiges of pre-capitalist conditions.

AFTER the Civil War and Reconstruction, the capitalist magnates who enjoyed economic and political mastery saw no need for further fundamental changes in American society. And it was true that the time for revolutionary transformations within the framework of capitalism had ended. That did not mean, however, as the upholders of that system taught, that all possibility of revolution had forever been banished from the United States.

This most successful of bourgeois revolutions had still left important things undone. For instance, it carried out agrarian reform in a highly inequitable manner. The Homestead Act of 1862 gave the small white farmer free access to the untenant territories in the West belonging to the Federal Government and awarded huge tracts of the best land to the railroad corporations.

But the Negro cultivators of the soil, who had contributed so much to victory over the planters, were shabbily treated. Although the Republicans emancipated the slaves, they refused to give the freedmen the material means for economic independence ("40 acres and a mule") or to guarantee their social equality or democratic rights. In the disputed presidential election of 1876, to ensure continued sovereignty in Washington, the Republican leaders sealed an agreement with the Southern white supremacists which erased the last of the equality and democracy the Negroes had won for themselves during Reconstruction.

The failure of the bourgeois regime to solve the Negro problem has plagued our country to this day. It appears that this job, left unfinished by the nineteenth century revolution, will require a struggle of comparable magnitude before it is performed.

AMERICAN democracy was defended and extended by the coalition of class forces that fought and won the Civil War. But at its

(Continued on Page 61)

Guatemala 1954 –

The Lesson Cuba Learned

by Bert Deck

ON JUNE 18, 1954, Castillo Armas, heading up an "army" of 154 mercenaries, crossed the border into Guatemala from Honduras. His aim: to overthrow the government.

Armas called on the Guatemalan people to rise up against the "Red" regime of Jacobo Arbenz but only a handful, at the most, showed any interest in the project. On the contrary, the position of the elected government seemed impregnable: the army had declared its determination to put down rebellion; the major political parties, including the Communist party had signed a joint statement of support to the government; the mass unions of workers and peasants through their Communist leaders offered to take up arms themselves, "if necessary," in defense of the government. It appeared that Armas' 154 hired soldiers had taken on a fight with a united Guatemalan nation of three and a half million people. The prospects, it would seem, were rather dim.

But nine days later, President Jacobo Arbenz resigned. The constitutional government gave way to a series of military juntas, which in turn paved the way for the establishment of the dictatorship of Armas just three weeks after his soldiers crossed the Guatemalan frontier. How explain such a rapid reversal?

A social revolution had begun in Guatemala and the crushing of that revolution was the driving motivation for the Armas plot. The workers and peasants, the majority of the population, were firmly committed to the revolution; they had already won important economic and political concessions and had much to lose with a victory of the counterrevolution. Yet at the decisive moment their wills were paralyzed and their actions were fitful, sporadic and ineffective. A tiny minority defeated the majority.

How did it happen? What meaning did the Guatemalan events have for the

revolution in the rest of Latin America? The more serious revolutionists, including the future leaders of the Cuban Revolution, studied Guatemala; for in the tragic defeat of June 1954 might lie a key to future victories.

* * *

It is impossible to refute the Latin-American charge that Guatemala is a U.S. colony. Apologists are always eager to explain that the U.S. does not have colonies in the "strict" British and French meaning of the term. But notwithstanding some secondary differences the essential relationship of a "mother" country to a colony is expressed in the domination of U.S. corporations over the Guatemalan economy.

For Latin America, imperialism has been personified by the United Fruit Co. with assets in 1953 approaching \$600 million. Its reported land holdings in ten Latin American countries were 3 million acres. The company maintained 77,000 head of livestock. It owned and operated 1,700 miles of railways and tramways and a vast amount of rolling stock. It owned a fleet of 65 vessels. It owned the first and biggest radio communications system in Central America, the Tropical Radio Telegraph Company. It owned and operated newspapers, schools, hospitals, recreation centers, housing projects, commissaries, agricultural experimental stations and medical research laboratories. It was the biggest single enterprise in Central America and its budget sometimes exceeded that of Central American governments.

In 1953, United Fruit owned 565,000 acres of land in Guatemala alone. It also had contracts with independent producers covering an additional 14,630 acres. It controlled the International Railroads of Central America as well as the wharfage and port facilities at Puerto Barrios. It owned and operated two hospitals, 18 dispensaries, 35 com-

missaries, 49 schools and a great amount of housing and other construction.

In addition to United Fruit and its railroad company (IRCA) there is the U.S. corporation, the Electric Bond and Share Co., which dominates the Guatemalan power supplies and charges exorbitant rates to users (such as \$50 a month or private residences).

The analogy between the U.S. corporations in Guatemala and Cuba is an obvious one.

The Tyranny

The rule of capital was not easily established in Guatemala. Before money can be transformed into capital, an exploitable labor force must be provided.

The communal landholdings of the Indians were abolished in 1871. This very soon resulted in big plantation owners gobbling up large tracts of land. But this was not enough. The dispossessed Indians were not interested in becoming wage workers for the planters. The government, through a wage-contract system and later a series of vagrancy laws, with force and violence drove the Indians on to the plantations to become wage slaves. Maintaining a supply of forced cheap labor became the major function of the state and imparted its brutal dictatorial aspect to it. And as the best lands passed into the hands of foreign corporations, the government took on the character of a colonial, albeit "independent," regime.

The imperialist domination of the country thwarted the growth of an indigenous middle class. What middle class there was rankled at the sight of the wealth produced by Guatemalan workers and peasants flowing into the hands of foreign corporations. The crude foreign exploitation of the country left little living room for the sons of the Guatemalan middle class. Spearheaded by a student revolt in 1944 the petty bourgeoisie overthrew the tyranny of Ubico and established its own political

rule with the aid of the army. The new regime, led by a Social-Democrat, President Juan Jose Arevalo, introduced a certain expansion of political democracy. Ballot rights were extended; the unions were legalized and began a rapid growth. At the same time, however, the government bureaucracy mushroomed.

The expanded state apparatus provided the means for many of the petty-bourgeois "revolutionaries" to solve their own personal career problems. Thus their enthusiasm cooled for a direct struggle with the North American corporations, a struggle that might threaten the privileges already won.

But on the other hand the revolution had awakened the hopes of the workers and peasants. Unlike a section of the "revolutionaries," the masses had not yet solved their social problem. The mass grew dissatisfied with the government's slowness in proceeding with promised reforms, especially on the land. The broad coalition that had made the 1944 revolution began to crack and break up into its class components.

With the election of Arbenz in 1950 the revolution veered to the left. The Agrarian Reform Law was passed in 1952; in 1953 and 1954 the government expropriated over 70 per cent of United Fruit's land and distributed it to the peasants.

The Counterrevolution

Arbenz had come into political life via the army. He was confident that his friends in the army would back up his deep-going reform program. In other words Arbenz attempted to begin a serious land reform with the bourgeois state apparatus and army intact and the workers and peasants unarmed. In such a situation the counterrevolution held all the aces and the Arbenz land reform took on the aspect of a gambler's bluff. This adventurous invitation for an imperialist intervention was accepted by the U.S. State Department.

Washington forced an anti-Guatemalan resolution through the Organization of American States and assumed the role of bill collector for United Fruit's expropriated land. The Guatemalans had offered to pay for the land at its tax-value rate. When United Fruit refused to accept payment the government deposited the proper amount in escrow. The bill presented by the State Department was ten times the value of the land which United Fruit had itself set for tax purposes. Finally Eisenhower sent in John E. Peurifoy as the new ambassador with explicit instructions to overturn the Guatemalan government.

The army, frightened at the growth of the worker and peasant movements, and under pressure from Peurifoy, demanded that Arbenz open a witch hunt against the Communist party. Soon after the Armas attacks, when Arbenz realized that the army was not going to support his regime, he went to Peurifoy to discuss terms. The U.S. ambassador's

terms were: unconditional surrender. Arbenz chose to accept and resigned. Peurifoy continued to serve as the "impartial" arbitrator between the various factions and soon engineered Armas into power.

* * *

The Communist party was, by 1954, the dominant political tendency in the workers' movement both in the cities and the countryside.

The party was extremely young in composition and as an organization. The old Communist party of the nineteen twenties had been destroyed by the Ubico dictatorship. As an organized tendency it did not reappear until 1947 and then only as a secret caucus of forty members within the left petty-bourgeois party of Revolutionary Action (PAR). The caucus, named the Guatemalan Democratic Vanguard, soon divided into two factions led respectively by José Fortuny and Victor Gutiérrez.

Gutiérrez was a young teacher at the time of the 1944 revolution. He founded the Teachers Union, became its Secretary General and a representative to the CGT, the big labor federation.

In 1946, at the age of 24, he was elected to the top post in the CGT and was, until the victory of the counterrevolution, the undisputed leader of the Guatemalan labor movement.

Gutiérrez charged Fortuny with having a middle-class approach to the revolution. He proposed an immediate break with the PAR and the formation of an open Communist party as a party of the working class. He favored recruitment almost exclusively from among the militant workers, and the party's raising of the slogan of agrarian reform.

Fortuny's strategy of penetrating and taking over the PAR received a setback at the March 1949 convention of the PAR. The Communists withdrew and formally launched their own party in September.

But the Fortuny and Gutiérrez groups remained unreconciled. Gutiérrez resigned from the newly formed Communist party two months after the founding convention taking with him the bulk of the leaders of the rapidly growing CGT.

The Gutiérrez faction launched the Revolutionary Workers party of Guatemala and successfully attracted the more militant urban workers to its banner. Thus, for two years there were two separate open parties in Guatemala speaking in the name of Communism.

Early in 1952, after the intervention of leading Latin American Communists (Toledano from Mexico, Prestes from Brazil and Rocca from Cuba) and a trip to Moscow by Gutiérrez, the two groups were reunified. This ended Gutiérrez' five-year attempt to formulate a revolutionary proletarian policy for Guatemala.

The political basis of the unified movement was firmly established at its December 1952 Congress. The party adopted a seven-point program which became known as "The Guatemalan Way." The program was essentially reformist in that it foresaw the carrying out of the agrarian reform and basic improvement in the position of the working class within the confines of a capitalist society and in collaboration with a section of the bourgeoisie.

Fortuny, however, did promise the party that the capitalist stage need not be prolonged, as evidenced by the experience of China. He reminded his comrades that Stalin himself had pointed out that the bourgeoisie was not sufficiently revolutionary to carry out the bourgeois anti-imperialist revolution and that this could only be done under the leadership of the working class. Nevertheless, Fortuny warned, inasmuch as Guatemala was so far from the Communist countries it inevitably must pass through a capitalist stage.

The Guatemalan CP eschewed any hope for an anticapitalist revolution for the foreseeable future. Its central tactic was to construct a "national liberation front" — "A united front of the democratic, progressive and anti-imperialist forces." This program conformed entirely with the political line being developed by the Communist parties in the rest of Latin America.

Cuba and Brazil

The policy of the Cuban CP was explained by Alfredo Gomez in *Political Affairs*, October 1954, as follows:

"Such a solution [of the vital problems of the country] could be brought about only by the constitution of a Democratic National Front government, that is, a government representing the alliance of the working class, the farmers, the city petty bourgeoisie, and the democratic and progressive sectors of the national bourgeoisie, and capable of applying a program of national independence, democracy and peace under the leadership of the proletariat and its party."

Luis Carlos Prestes, reporting as head of the Brazilian CP to its 1954 Congress, was explicit on the nature of the "Democratic National Front."

He said, "Let us take, for example, such an important problem as the party's position with respect to the national bourgeoisie. We now expressly proclaim that 'the democratic national liberation government will not confiscate the enterprises and capital of the national bourgeoisie,' while in the August 1950 program we demanded the nationalization of the banks and 'all the big industrial and commercial enterprises of monopolistic nature or having a predominant influence on the nation's economy.' We also called for the 'complete nationalization of mines, water power and all public utilities.' This means that whereas in the new proposed program

we do not attack the bases of capitalism, we committed the error in August 1950 of thinking it impossible that a considerable part of the national bourgeoisie could, under the conditions of the people's fight for liberation from the imperialist yoke, take a position supporting the people or at least one of benevolent neutrality. That is to say, we had a wrong idea of the nature of the revolution in our country.... The Communist party of Brazil is convinced that the democratic transformation needed by our people can be achieved only by a democratic government in which along with the working class there would participate the peasant and intelligentsia, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. The Communist party is fighting for Socialism, but it is convinced that in the present economic, social and political conditions in Brazil socialist transformations are impossible. But it is quite possible to fulfill the task of replacing the present anti-national and anti-people's government by a people's government which would free Brazil from the domination of the U.S. imperialists and their lackeys — the owners of the latifundia and the big capitalists."

The Communist parties of Latin America, including the Guatemalan CP, held that the struggle for national independence was incompatible with an immediate anti-capitalist struggle, for this would break up the necessary alliance between the workers, peasants and the progressive national bourgeoisie. The latter, of course, would not agree to an alliance if it meant its own expropriation. And since the national capitalists would accept only a capitalist regime, the workers must not attempt to establish their own regime but rely on the "progressive" capitalist government to defend them against counterrevolution. Meanwhile the Communist party would struggle for a maximum of social re-

forms compatible with the maintenance of the multi-class alliance and the "progressive" government.

How it Worked

There is no doubt that the Guatemalan CP actually believed that the Arbenz regime and the army would fend off the Armas counterrevolution.

Alfredo Guerra Borges, editor of the CP's *Tribuna Popular*, in a special dispatch to the *Daily Worker*, June 22, 1954 wrote, "The invaders penetrated 15 miles around Chinquimula and Izabel without any repulse by the National Army, which sought to avoid provocations at the frontier and to prevent false accusations against Guatemala of aggression against Honduras."

Thus at the very moment that the army was planning to use the invasion to force the government to make an attack on the labor movement, the CP explained its moves to the workers as a clever strategem to outwit the counterrevolution.

Two days later Borges wrote, "The government is in full control here, and the people have organized themselves into brigades and are ready to bear arms if necessary. Business establishments, and government offices are functioning normally in Guatemala City."

The *Daily Worker* had already reported without comment the fact that the CP had placed full confidence in the government and the army. It quoted Castillo Flores, head of the Peasant Union Federation as saying, "Every farm worker's organization has turned its membership lists over to the national army." Victor Gutierrez announced that the CGT had placed its members "at the disposal of the President and the Chief of the armed forces."

On June 27, the government, the one which *Tribuna Popular* had described as

being in full control, resigned, leaving the army (which now had the membership lists of the peasant organizations and the CGT "at its disposal") free to turn the power over to the counterrevolution.

Self Criticism

How did the Communist movement explain this crushing defeat of the working class? In the August 1954 *Political Affairs* A. B. Magill analyzed *The Rape of Guatemala*. "Among the negative factors," he wrote, "the most decisive proved to be the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leadership of the Guatemalan struggle, which resulted in rapid surrender once the invasion began.... the government failed to mobilize the people for the defense of the country and did not permit the trade-union and peasant movements, the Communist and other democratic forces to mobilize them. Whether this ban was imposed at the orders of the army high command, as seems likely, is not known. The paralysis inside Guatemala was all the more striking in view of the fact that up to the moment of the invasion the country had been seething with all kinds of patriotic activity. And on the military plane the resistance was half-hearted."

"It is evident that the paralysis of mass action and the perfunctory character of the military action was the course dictated by frightened bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements lacking faith in the people, in order to pave the way for surrender to imperialism. Thus, the Guatemalan people were not defeated in battle; they were stabbed in the back.... Guatemala in fact confirms the lesson of Spain: toleration of reactionaries in the government and army tightened the noose around bourgeois democracy."

By June 1955, *Political Affairs* added one more to the list of the guilty — "The inadequacy of the support rendered by the working class of our country thanks to the policy of the Right-wing AFL and CIO leaders who backed the overthrow of the democratic, anti-imperialist government."

Everybody was guilty, it would seem, but the Communist party. The latter was willing to fight as soon as it could get permission from its "allies" in the government who in turn were waiting permission from the army high command. For this permission they all waited and waited.... and waited. The workers trusted the CP; the CP trusted Arbenz; Arbenz trusted the army; and the army trusted Peurifoy, agent of U.S. imperialism. Thus the mass movement was paralyzed and the initiative passed to the State Department.

The CP's intentions concerning the arming of the masses were thoroughly honorable in relation to the army. They envisaged marriage, not rape. They truthfully proclaimed that they had no intention of replacing the army. They saw armed workers brigades merely as

Socialism and Democracy

by James P. Cannon

In the same easy and highly readable style for which he is well known, Cannon makes clear the basic Marxist view on socialism and democracy. He says: "What is needed is not a propaganda device or trick, but a formulation of the issue as it really stands; and indeed as it has always stood with real socialists ever since the modern movement was first proclaimed 109 years ago." Cannon tells how the real view has suffered distortion and falsification by Stalinism, Social Democracy and the American ruling class. Send 15 cents for this attractive 21-page pamphlet.

Pioneer Publishers

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.

auxiliary forces for the regular army. But the professional army leaders feared even this. They might have trusted the Communist leaders but could they trust the workers themselves once they had arms in hand? It was too risky! Permission was never granted and the Communists gave up without a fight.

All the cries, "We were betrayed," could not cover up the big questions, "Why did you permit yourself to be betrayed? Why did you base your whole strategy on such unrealiable allies?" The CP's criticism of its former allies boiled down to a charge that the bourgeois politicians turned out to be . . . bourgeois.

The failure of the CP and Arbenz to arm the workers and disarm the old army was not a mere oversight. This "mistake" was thoroughly consistent with the policy of the "Democratic Front." This policy, in fact, made the mistake inevitable. As though a capitalist-controlled government and professional army had ever "granted permission" for the working class to independently arm itself!

In the following years, the Guatemalan CP was forced to conclude that it had relied too much on middle-class elements, that it had too much confidence in the OAS and the UN, and that it had failed to neutralize the army. Fortuny was purged from leadership as the scapegoat for the old policy.

But the basic line of the "Democratic Front" remains unchanged. The CP still feels that its crucial task is to convince the "democratic bourgeoisie" to ally with the Communists rather than with discontented military cliques and pro-U.S. groups. Thus it is preparing itself for a new fiasco a la 1954.

But something new has been added to Latin-American politics — in fact, to world politics. The victory of the Cuban revolution.

Future Prospects

For the first time in Latin America the revolution broke its dependence on the "progressive" national bourgeoisie and the result was the most far-reaching social program yet achieved in this hemisphere. In Cuba the revolution did not wait for the Communist party to secure "permission" from the liberals and the army to independently arm the workers and peasants. Instead the revolution smashed the old army completely and politically expropriated the liberals.

The experience of the Cuban revolution not only demonstrated that an alliance with native capital was incompatible with a real social program — Guatemala had already proven that — but confirmed the fact that the revolution could actually win once it had divested itself of its so-called allies and based itself on the working masses.

The Guatemalan defeat, followed by the Cuban victory has broken the ideological grip of Moscow on the young revolutionary movements in Latin

America. Not that the CPs have disappeared — they still exist and propagate the program of the popular alliance with the liberals. But alongside the CPs, and to the left of them, have appeared new revolutionary currents described generally as "Fidelista."

As a Cuban revolutionist in C. Wright Mills' *Listen, Yankee* explains:

"The plain fact is, our revolution has outdone the Communists on every score. From the beginning up till today, always at every turn of event and policy, the revolution is always faster than the Cuban Communist party, or individual Communists. In all objective facts, then, we are much more radical, much more revolutionary than they. And that is why we are using them, rather than the reverse; they are not using us. In fact they are being very grateful to us for letting them in on the work of the revolution.

"In fact, this is the case generally with local Communist parties in Latin America. In a real revolution today, in Latin America at least, the local Communists are to the right of the revolution. Here in Cuba, certainly the revolution has outpaced them and does on every front. They always arrive too late and with too little. This has been the case in Cuba and it is still the case: they lag behind the revolution.

"The Communist parties in Latin America generally go for 'popular front' and 'national democratic coalitions' and so on. They haven't got sufficient popular support to make a revolution, and so they sacrifice immediate revolutionary action — and even thought — for 'national movements of liberation.' They are small everywhere, although sometimes rather well organized. But they are not really very well adapted for Latin American conditions of revolution. They are too much like some 'Society of Friends of the Soviet Union,' and they won't even go into 'the China Question' when you raise it; and the Chinese in Latin America, they don't fool around at all with the Communist parties here. They go directly to the left-wing element!"

The Cuban revolution has shattered the old structure of radical politics in Latin America by providing a new example to follow. New currents and tendencies are emerging. Two roads present themselves to the Latin American revolutionists: "The Guatemalan Way" or "The Cuban Way." Fidelismo, a more revolutionary alternative to the Communist parties, already exists. The possibility of avoiding the trap of popular front politics has been improved immeasurably.

In this new, open situation the Marxists have an unprecedented opportunity to win support for a consistent revolutionary program. In the complex process of political realignment now taking place within the workers movement lies the hope of avoiding future Guatemalas — lies the hope for a Socialist United States of Latin America.

... Monolith

(Continued from Page 47)

ipulation of the Communist parties, possessed an unassailable monolithic structure capable of indefinitely maintaining its control over the revolutionary sections of the proletariat. The post-war period has seen the overturn of capitalism in Yugoslavia, Eastern Europe, China and, most recently, Cuba. As a result, the Stalinist monolith has been fractured in many places — although it is certainly not yet shattered. The fate of the world revolution is tied to the further disintegration of Stalinism and its eventual pulverization.

Ever since 1924, the Trotskyists, equipped only with the ideological weapons of Marx and Lenin have fought against the Stalinist bureaucracy. Today the power of revolution is delivering hammer blows against it. This will help immeasurably in assembling forces within a genuine world revolutionary socialist party whose ascendancy in the working-class movement is essential to the victory of world socialism.

BOOKS BY TROTSKY

The Third International After

Lenin, 400 pp., cloth \$4.00,
paper \$2.50

The Revolution Betrayed, 308 pp., cloth \$3.00, paper \$2.00

Literature and Revolution, 256 pp., cloth \$2.98, paper \$1.50

Stalin's Frame-Up System and the Moscow Trials, 144 pp. \$1.00

My Life, 599 pp., paper \$2.45



PIONEER PUBLISHERS

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

Socialized Medicine in Great Britain

by Carol Curtis

FEW domestic issues seem to arouse so much impassioned controversy in America as the question of socialized medicine. When the Forand bill, providing only limited health care for older people under the social security system, was introduced in the last Congress, one newspaper screamed in large print, "This isn't creeping socialism — it's galloping socialism!"

The problem of medical costs for people over 65 in the United States is a severe and often tragic one. According to the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 77% of the people in this age bracket have chronic ailments while 48% have family incomes of less than \$2,000 a year, and only one-quarter are covered by insurance. Still, this modest, inadequate bill, strongly backed by the AFL-CIO, was defeated.

The bill was fought by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It urged employers to provide paid health insurance coverage for all retired workers and made no bones about the fact that its move was aimed at heading off a government health plan under the social security system. "Successful private plans will provide the Chamber with the evidence it needs to combat the compulsory approach," it said.

The strength of the American Medical Association, considered the most powerful medical organization in the world, was pitted against the Forand bill. The AMA asked its members to "fight with all our resources any effort to add medical care to the re-

tirement benefits provided by the social security system."

The resources of the AMA are enormous. In 1950 alone, this organization waged a million-dollar advertising campaign against what it called "the dangers of socialized medicine and the threatening trend toward state socialism."

The *Yale Law Journal*, in an article on the AMA, said that it has "acquired such power over both public and practitioners that it can channel the development of American medicine . . . Measures assured of passage have been voted down, buried in committee, or substantially amended upon announcement of AMA disapproval."

Due in part to the influence of the AMA on the press and in part to the general atmosphere of ignorance and fear of anything termed "socialist," it is very difficult to get a realistic appraisal in this country of socialized medical plans elsewhere. Nevertheless, there are several countries that have some kind of health scheme available to their people, without having achieved socialism, creeping or galloping. They have accumulated considerable experience in planning health care and have made steady progress toward making life a little healthier, a little happier and a little more civilized than it was before. Apart from the countries in the Soviet bloc, health plans, varying in effectiveness, exist in New Zealand, the Scandinavian countries, Great Britain, and they have the start of one in Canada.

Here we shall deal with socialized medicine in Great Britain, perhaps the most advanced medical system outside the Soviet bloc, whose history began on July 5, 1948, when the National Health Service came into existence.

The Background

Before 1948 there were two main types of hospitals: the Voluntary and Municipal Hospitals. Many of the former originated in institutions founded by monastic orders in the Middle Ages. With the break with the Catholic Church in the middle of the sixteenth century, the monastic orders were dissolved, but in many cases the hospitals carried on, and today some of them still bear the original names, such as St. Thomas's and St. Bartholemew's of London (or "Tommy's" and "Bart's," as the medical students irreverently refer to them). The vast majority of the Voluntary Hospitals, however, were founded during the "Age of Philanthropy" in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

As the name implies, the Voluntary hospitals were charitable organizations for sick poor. Local citizens with wealth founded and financed them. The medical staffs were made up of men who gave their services free.

The big drawback was that these hospitals could be set up only in areas where there were people with sufficient money to finance them, and where there was a large enough

practice to enable doctors to give a few hours a week for charity work.

Even before the last world war it was obvious that something would have to be done. Fewer people were available to finance these hospitals, and there were fewer private patients to keep the doctors going. Although charges were by then imposed on the patients in accordance with their means, together with sums of money which local authorities gave them, the Voluntary Hospitals were increasingly unable to carry out their functions.

The Municipal Hospitals were started under the system of Poor Law Relief established at the end of the sixteenth century. With the earlier dissolution of the monasteries, the poor lost many of the charity organizations which at least had kept them alive, if only barely so. In the so-called "Golden Age" of English history, when English seamen sailed around the world and the first steps were taken to construct the rich and powerful British Empire, there was, at the same time, such an increase in poverty and misery that some action had to be taken. That action resulted in the Poor Law Relief system that established charity hospitals and workhouses for the poor. The system continued to expand during the next three-and-a-half centuries, until a network of such institutions had spread throughout most urban areas in the country. Conditions in the vast majority of them were absolutely deplorable.

In 1930 responsibility for these institutions was transferred from the Poor Law Boards of Guardians (groups of charitable men and women who gave time voluntarily) to the County or County Borough Councils (composed of men and women elected by the local inhabitants to run these institutions.) They were given permission to turn the workhouses over for use as hospitals and in the next few years most of the wealthier and more progressive councils had done so. These new Municipal Hospitals, which in some cases began to compete with the established Voluntary Hospitals, had full-time, salaried, medical staffs. However, there were many Councils that were neither wealthy nor progressive,

and in those areas hospital facilities were sadly lacking.

In addition, of course, there were a number of private hospitals. These were either very expensive, exclusive organizations for the wealthy, or run for the poor by various religious bodies.

In 1943, teams of experts were set up to undertake a complete survey of all the hospitals in the United Kingdom. Much of the subsequent hospital planning has been based on their reports.

What They Found

As far as the family doctors were concerned, there were in existence a number of different insurance schemes. The largest started in 1912, the National Health Insurance Scheme. It provided general practitioner service for all workers earning less than £250 a year, or approximately \$750. This was later raised to £420, or about \$1,260 a year. For the payment of additional dues, extra benefits, such as dental and ophthalmic treatment could be received. (The conversion of pounds into dollars is here made for a rough approximation on the basis of \$3 for £1. The actual exchange rate fluctuates around \$2.85 for £1.—Ed.)

Under this plan, both the employee and his employer paid a contribution. If the employee fell ill or was unemployed, he received sickness or unemployment benefits and free medical care from a general practitioner, together with free medicines. However, this didn't include any hospitalization that might be needed, nor did it cover the retired old people, the wives of the workers or their children, with the result that only about one-half of the population was insured with the National Health Insurance. The rest had to pay the full doctors' fees or join either one of the more expensive schemes or one of the numerous sickness clubs under which the people paid the doctor a few pennies a week and received medical treatment when ill without provision for covering the cost of medicine or hospitals.

When the National Health Insurance Scheme started in 1912, it was decided to pay the money to the different health insurance agencies already in existence. Some were coop-

erative undertakings, some were run by trade unions, and some by insurance companies, so that there arose the anomaly of a national, compulsory insurance scheme being administered through separate, private insurance organizations. The benefits tended to vary. While the sickness benefit remained fixed by law, some of the wealthier organizations gave additional services, dental care, eyeglasses and so on, while the poorer ones gave only the minimum.

In addition to the general practitioners there were also some Public Assistance doctors who looked after the destitute sick. As a general rule, medical help received by this means was not of a high standard.

There were also local health authorities which were responsible for certain aspects of public health. These included clinics, midwifery, maternity and child welfare, water supplies, sewage and refuse disposal, control of epidemics and the provision of domestic help for families unable because of illness to look after themselves.

The main difficulty lay in the fact that there were over 400 authorities, many of them too small and too poor to carry out their functions. In addition, there were no home-nursing services available other than midwifery.

In 1942, Sir William Beveridge (now Lord Beveridge), a Liberal member of Parliament, proposed a comprehensive health service which would "ensure that for every citizen there is available whatever medical treatment he requires in whatever form he requires it, domiciliary or institutional, general, specialist or consultant, and will ensure also the provision of dental, ophthalmic and surgical appliances, nursing and midwifery, and rehabilitation after accidents."

Great interest was stirred by this idea and when General Elections were held in 1945, one of the main planks in the Labor party platform was the formation of just such a comprehensive health service. The Labor party won the elections with a large majority in the House of Commons.

The British Medical Association opposed the Health Service as bitterly as the American Medical Associa-

tion does here. They held a plebiscite among doctors and the whole idea was voted down — not so much by the doctors in poor urban and rural areas as by the majority of doctors who were centered in the cities and around the hospitals.

The National Health Service

However, under the leadership of Aneurin Bevan, then Minister of Health, the Labor party steered the necessary legislation through parliament and in November, 1946, the National Health Service Act became law. As before mentioned, it came into effect on July 5, 1948. It applied only to England and Wales, but very similar laws were passed at the same time for Scotland and Northern Ireland.

The National Health Service is available to every man, woman and child in the country without any qualification. In addition, any visitors to the country from abroad are entitled to use the Service, without charge, should they fall ill while in the country. Any visitors, however, who go to Britain deliberately to get medical treatment, are expected to pay for it.

The Service is regarded as a charge on national income in the same way as education and the armed services. It is recognized that it is as necessary to spend money on healthy bodies and minds as it is to provide education for the people.

Most of the cost of the Service is paid by the National Exchequer — that is, out of taxes. About half of the Local Health Service expenses are met from local property taxes. In addition, contributions are collected from the people.

These contributions have risen slightly since 1948. The cost today is 2s. 4d. (about 30c.) per week for a man, of which 1s. 10½d. (about 25c.) is paid by the employee and 5½d. (about 6c.) by the employer. Women, youth under 18, the self-employed and the non-employed pay somewhat less. However, it is important to remember that eligibility for any necessary treatment does not, in any way, depend upon the payment of contributions. If a person has never paid a contribution in his life, he or she is still entitled to whatever medical care may be required.

Under the National Health Service Act of 1946, the only charges were for the renewal or repair of glasses or dentures if it was considered that they had been lost or broken through carelessness, and for domestic help or nursing requisites needed at home. Any one could, if they wished, pay extra for more expensive eyeglass frames, or gold fillings in teeth, or such extra benefits which were not medically necessary. It was also possible if a patient wanted privacy in a hospital but was not sufficiently ill to need a private room, to pay a fixed sum (not more than 12s., or about \$1.80) a day for private accommodation, although nothing was paid for treatment. And, of course, if someone preferred to have private treatment and not come under the Health Service at all, he or she was free to do so.

There was, as expected, and as the British Medical Association had direly warned, a sudden rush to the doctors. This came mostly from women and children excluded from the previous National Health Insurance Scheme who had needed medical help, perhaps for years, but had not been able to afford it.

There were, of course, some people who saw a chance to get something "free" and ran to the doctor's office for every headache or minor scratch. Malingeringers still exist, but on the whole, after the first few months most of those who overdid the visits to doctors realized how unnecessary this was, considering that both the doctor and the Health Service were going to stay. They stopped going unless they genuinely needed help.

Gaitskell Intervenes

In 1951, claiming the scheme was too expensive, Hugh Gaitskell, then Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Labor government, introduced legislation imposing charges on dental treatment. This aroused great controversy within Labor's ranks and Aneurin Bevan resigned in protest. But the right-wing element won the day, and so set the precedent for future increases in charges.

The following year the Conservatives, who were by then in power, added additional charges to the service. These were increased again in

1956. Today, there are charges for eyeglasses, dental treatment, dentures, day nurseries for children of working mothers (made free in 1948) and for each item on a prescription for hospital out-patients or patients of general practitioners. Any patient unable to meet these charges may apply for help to the National Assistance Board. This, however, to many people has overtones of the hated means test that workers, unemployed and the aged had hoped was gone forever.

Nevertheless, in spite of these charges, the National Health Service remains largely a "free" service available to all.

On July 5, 1948, 2,688 out of the 3,040 existing hospitals came under the National Health Service. These included mental hospitals, convalescent homes and certain types of clinics, as well as straight hospitals. The remaining hospitals outside the Service are run mainly by religious bodies, and there are still a few exclusive private institutions.

The Hospital Service includes specialist and consultant facilities, maternity accommodation, both ante- and post-natal care, child-guidance clinics, tuberculosis sanatoriums, infectious-disease hospitals, psychiatric hospitals, V.D. clinics, convalescent homes, rehabilitation centers, all kinds of specialist treatment such as plastic surgery, blood transfusions, radiotherapy, physiotherapy and occupational therapy, orthopedic and eye, ear, nose and throat treatment, and the provision of surgical and medical appliances such as artificial limbs, etc. Hospital in-patients are not charged for anything unless they choose to go in on a private basis.

The institutional part of the Service is organized into 15 regions, each associated with a university having a teaching hospital or medical school. The daily administration of the hospitals is carried out by Hospital Management Committees. The members of both the Regional Boards and the Hospital Management Committees serve voluntarily, the aim being to stimulate local interest and responsibility.

Nearly all the specialists and consultants take part in the service, either on a full or part-time basis. Those who participate only part-time

can accept fee-paying private patients outside the Service. In order to see a specialist within the system, it is necessary to get a referral from the family doctor. The specialist usually sees patients at the hospital, but will visit the patient at home if he is too ill to go out.

Since 1952, hospital out-patients have to pay 1s. (about 15c.) for each item on a prescription for drugs and medicines (unless administered at the hospital), and there are charges for elastic hosiery, surgical abdominal supports, surgical footwear and wigs. Exceptions to these charges are made for patients receiving National Assistance and their dependents, war pensioners receiving medicine for war disabilities and patients being treated for venereal disease. Children under 16, or older ones who are still attending school fulltime, are exempted from charges on surgical appliances.

By the end of 1959, there were 76 distribution centers providing free hearing aids, an item which, before 1948, was not covered by any of the insurance schemes. Batteries and maintenance are also free.

The family doctor, dental, pharmaceutical and ophthalmic services are administered on the local level by executive councils whose members serve voluntarily. Twelve members of each council are elected by local doctors, dentists and pharmacists; eight are appointed by the local health authority and five by the Minister of Health.

Nearly all the general practitioners in the country take part in the Service. This does not prevent them from having private, fee-paying patients as well if they wish. They are paid according to the number of patients they accept on their list, or panel, as it is called. They receive 18s. (about \$2.70) per patient per year and they are limited to a maximum of 3,500 patients for a single-handed practitioner. If the doctor wishes to take on more patients, he can only do so if he takes in a partner or assistant. The average yearly income for doctors today is £2,426 (about \$7,275); but it is important to remember that these figures mean more in England where the average national income is about \$30.00 a week.

In addition, the doctor receives 12s. (about \$1.80) for every patient between 501 and 1,500 on his panel. Also, interest-free loans are provided for doctors wishing to improve their waiting rooms and other facilities.

All doctors who joined the Service in July, 1948, were free to continue practicing where they were. However, any doctor wishing to join since then must receive permission from the Medical Practices Committee, consisting of nine members, seven of whom are doctors, six of them in actual practice. The Committee may only refuse a qualified doctor if the number of applications exceeds the number of vacancies in a given area. The Committee surveys the country's medical needs and classifies each area as "restricted" (no additional doctors needed), "intermediate" (additional doctors may soon be needed) and "designated" (more doctors required).

Free Choice of Doctors

Everyone is free to choose his or her own doctor and the doctor is free to accept or reject a prospective patient. A patient may change doctors at any time, either because he or she is dissatisfied or has moved. In an emergency, any doctor will give treatment, whether or not the patient is on his panel; and if someone falls ill while away from home, he will receive treatment where he is. The doctor receives additional fees under the Health Service for treating these extra patients.

Dentists are free to have private patients as well as patients under the Health Service. Patients do not have to register with a particular dentist, but may go to anyone who is willing to accept them. The dentist is paid for the treatment given each patient. Since 1952, there has been a charge on dental treatment. The original examination is still free, but there is a maximum charge of £1 (about \$3.00) for any treatment required. If dentures are needed, the patient pays something like half the cost — up to a maximum of £4/5s. (about \$12.75). Free dental care is provided for children under 21, expectant mothers, or women who have had a child during the preceding twelve months.

Free sight testing is available to

all. However, since 1951, if eyeglasses are required, the patient pays 10s. (about \$1.50) for each lens and the full cost of the frames. Children's glasses, however, are free in standard frames. If treatment or surgery is required, it is referred to the Hospital Eye Service and comes under the free Hospital Service. The optician is paid for individual treatment given.

As stated earlier, there is a charge of 1s. (about 15c.) on each item on a prescription. Most of the pharmacists are now under the Health Service, and they take turns to ensure that a pharmacy is open in each area in the evenings, on Sundays and on holidays. A patient has to pay the full cost of the drugs or medicines only if he has chosen to go to a doctor on a private basis.

In addition, there exist Local Health Authorities, mainly concerned with providing care for patients in their own homes. For some of these services, such as domestic help, there are charges in accordance with the patient's means. But, on the whole, most of the services such as midwifery, home nursing, etc., are provided free.

One area in which there has been great improvement is in mental health work. Mental and physical health have been brought closer together to the extent that most hospitals now have mental wards attached. In fact, 44% of the hospital beds are today reserved for mental patients. All treatment is available free.

Broadmoor Institute for insane criminals is now regarded less as a prison and more as a treatment center. Since 1948, it has been run under the Minister of Health instead of the Home Secretary who is responsible for the prison system.

While there are many improvements that still can be made, the National Health Service has brought tremendous help to the British people. Today, no one says, "What if I should fall ill? How could we manage?" It is bad enough to be ill, without having the additional worry that your family is mortgaging its future to pay doctors' and hospital bills. That worry has now been lifted, and patients are able to receive full care without their recovery being hampered.

ered by anxiety over the cost of treatment.

Perhaps the greatest advantage is the growth of preventive medicine. When people feel a pain, they no longer have to put off seeking help until it's too late. Regular physical check-ups, even before symptoms appear, are no longer the privilege of the rich. In this way many lives are saved and much suffering is prevented.

Furthermore, since doctors are assured of their income, they tend to go out to the poor urban and rural districts where an extreme shortage of doctors used to exist. Today some excellent work is being done in small country hospitals that previously had only second-rate medical staffs and few facilities.

Many attempts have been made to whittle away the original gains made by the British working people. Today the Conservative government is engaged in trying to force through legislation designed to increase the charges still more. If they are successful, and with their present large majority in the House of Commons there is every reason to believe they will be, the weekly contributions will be raised by 1s. (about 15c); prescriptions will be doubled to 2s. (about 30c.) per item; the cost of dentures will rise to a maximum of £5 (about \$15.00); private hospital beds for patients receiving medical treatment under the National Health Service will cost twice as much as before; and welfare foods for children such as orange juice, cod liver oil and vitamin pills, previously free or only nominal in cost, will now carry a substantial charge.

The Labor party is fighting these increases and parliament is engaging in many late-night sittings while the question is hotly disputed. As leader of the Labor party, Hugh Gaitskell is complaining loudly and bitterly that the Conservatives are gradually beginning to move away from the conception of a Welfare State. "Naturally," he says, "we are strongly opposed to these moves." Naturally — but it was Gaitskell himself who imposed the first charges.

In spite of these increases the National Health Service has become so much a part of British life, that it would not be possible for anyone

to suggest abolishing it now. The British people have accepted it and would not tolerate its removal, and many members of the medical profession would now support them.

An indication of the opposition that might be expected is shown in the demand from a branch of the National Union of Mineworkers for a 24-hour general strike in protest against the latest charges, together with a call for the nationalization of the drug and medical supply industry and a cut in the arms program.

At the same time, the London Local Medical Committee, which represents about 2,500 general practitioners, consultants, medical officers of health and private practitioners in the County of London, passed a resolution with only one dissenting vote, against the increased prescription charges. Part of their resolution states:

That the committee opposes charges on prescriptions on principle, since they create a financial barrier between the patient and the treatment he or she requires;

That the committee supports col-

leagues who do their own dispensing in their objections to the collection of these taxes for the Government.

Even the Conservatives recognize that to attempt to abolish the Service would create a situation with which they would be unable to deal. It was a Conservative Minister of Health who stated:

"The National Health Service, which started on July 5, 1948, is an agreed Service from the point of view of politics. All three of the major political parties have accepted it and played their part in its planning, and it is therefore wrong to refer to it as 'Socialized Medicine' as though it were a feature of one party only. All three parties are committed to it, and it is not expected that a change of government would make any serious difference to the scheme as a whole, although details might be altered."

It will be a great day for the American people when a spokesman from, say the Republican party, can say the same thing about a similar medical plan in this country.

...The American Civil War

(Continued from Page 52)

best this democracy has remained restricted. At no time since have the mass of American people exercised decisive control over the national government. Whether Republicans or Democrats held the White House and Congress, the plutocrats have ruled the country and determined its major policies in war or peace.

This formal political democracy is still further abridged by the industrial autocracy of the big capitalists who own and operate the national economy for their private profit. The workers who produce the wealth of the United States have no control over its distribution.

By 1960 the monopolists held the same position in American life that the slaveholders occupied in 1860. They are an obsolete social force, the major brake upon national progress, the fiercest enemies of democracy. Instead of leading progressive move-

ments in the interests of the people, they have become the organizers of counterrevolution and the allies of reaction throughout the world.

Their course is slowly but surely creating the preconditions for a mass resistance to their rule which will culminate in a third American revolution. This new movement of emancipation, based upon the workers, will have a socialist program and aims and be directed against capitalist reaction. But its organizers and leaders can learn much from the Radicals of Civil War years who met the challenge of the slaveholders' counterrevolution head on, crushed their resistance on the field of battle, confiscated four billions worth of their property, and totally uprooted their outlived social system. They showed by example how to deal with a tyrannical ruling class which refuses to retire peacefully when the time has come for it to go.

Periodicals in Review

by Tim Wohlforth

THE CAMPUS

From out of the American academy has come another student publication, *New University Thought*. It has many similarities with *Studies on the Left* which is entering its second year of publication. Being written primarily for graduate students and young professors, it is published at the University of Chicago, which, by no mere coincidence has a large and relatively unchanging graduate student population. It even looks much like *Studies on the Left*.

There are differences, of course, outside of location (*Studies on the Left* is published at the University of Wisconsin), minor and major ones. For instance, one gets the impression that the political science department predominates in the U of C journal while the history department runs the show in the Wisconsin effort. A more important difference is the political one. *Studies on the Left* is an openly socialist journal while *New University Thought* is a liberal publication published by liberals and those socialists who appreciate being mistaken for liberals. The Autumn issue boasts an editorial that lukewarmly supports Kennedy in the election. The back cover features a quote from who we suspect was their real candidate — Adlai Stevenson.

The appearance of two new left-wing student journals in the past year or so is an extremely important development. It is a sign on the intellectual front of the same beginnings of ferment on the campus which produced the action movements around the sit-ins, HUAC, Civil Defense, etc. These publications signify that the intellectual currents on campus today are seeking independent forms of expression. Most of the campus intellectuals of a few years ago had nothing to say and therefore felt no pressing need for their own organs of expression. Those few who did wish to express themselves were well satisfied with the publications of their elders.

It is saddening, but we suppose quite natural, that the intellectual expression of rebellion in these two publications seems so pallid when compared to the fresh actions of the students. Both publications have a lifeless, detached quality to them. Exciting ideas are

noted more by their absence than their presence. Even the articles written in both publications commenting on the actions of the students lack much of the spirit of the actions themselves. Nor are the authors able to make up for this lack through a deep and original analysis of the significance of the actions. The writers, rather, appear as spectators in the tradition of their academic elders — especially those of the sociology department.

Most ironic of all, these young academicians are unable to break themselves from the stultifying jargon and phoney "objectivity" of the academic community even to the extent that a number of the older radical academicians have. The young contributors to these new journals seem to be writing with more concern with what their professors will think of what they write than with communication with their fellow students — the bulk of whom, believe it or not, are not academic careerists. None of these young writers are able to even approach the spirit and style of C. Wright Mills; most of them do not even come up to the mark set by such "old" radicals as Professors Sweezy and Baran of the *Monthly Review*.

Someone seems to have sold these young intellectuals a bill of goods that in order for an article to be worthy of publication it must be dull and written in a language that no "ordinary" educated intellectual can understand. In this respect the more radical *Studies on the Left* is, paradoxically, far more guilty than its liberal rival from the University of Chicago.

The most important thing of all about the appearance of these two publications is not their various weaknesses politically and stylistically. The important thing is that they have appeared at all. What they really symbolize is the beginning of a new intellectual ferment on the left in American universities. Before this ferment is over many fine intellectuals will, as they did in the nineteen thirties, move into the camp of the working class and become revolutionary Marxists.

The errors of these young intellectuals today are the errors of infancy. It is interesting to note that the "infantile disorder" we are witnessing in their efforts is one of mimicry of the elders rather than any sort of ultra-left complete rejection of the elders. This in itself is a sign of how overbearingly conservative American society still is and what a great distance we have to go, for mimicry is natural to the pre-school set while parental rejection is generally associated with adolescence.

MR'S LOOKING GLASS

The current debate that has been going on between Moscow and Peking on peaceful coexistence has had an interesting impact on at least one in-

fluential radical journal in the U.S. — the *Monthly Review*. The editors of *MR*, in a three-part series of articles on "The Theory of U.S. Foreign Policy" (September, October, and November, 1960), have definitely come out on the side of Mao in this discussion. (See also *A New New Deal?* February, 1961.)

Their theory is no mere carbon copy of the Chinese thesis. As one has come to expect from these talented intellectuals, the theory is quite original in many respects and certainly deserves comment in its own right.

It goes something like this:

1) "The primary purpose of foreign policy under conditions of developed monopoly capitalism is to provide the justification for the maintenance of a huge (and growing) military establishment."

2) This aggressive cold-war anti-Communist foreign policy runs into direct conflict with the "national interest of the underdeveloped countries." This is the main reason for the series of defeats suffered by U.S. foreign policy.

3) "These defeats have led to no modifications, still less alteration, of foreign policy for the simple reason that as yet they have had but little impact on the domestic economy."

4) Soon the continuation of this trend of defeats will begin to have its effect on the large monopoly corporations that run this country as the shrinking of the "free" world will cut down their ability to exploit abroad. However, despite this, American foreign policy will not change. "The United States is going to plunge along its present disastrous international course, suffering defeat after defeat, even after these defeats have begun to inflict increasingly direct and serious losses on the giant corporations that dominate American life" (emphasis in original). The main reason given for this conclusion by the editors is that a change in foreign policy would necessitate a dismantling of the whole structure of anti-communism set up in this country and setting upon a policy of a "new New Deal." This would not be tolerated by business.

5) The colonial revolution will continue to threaten U.S. positions throughout the world. In reaction to the colonial revolution the United States will apply pressure, as in Cuba, that will force these revolutions in the direction of socialism. "The course of Cuban-American relations in the last two years shows the whole process, in microcosm as it were. This is a case in which history is likely to repeat itself not once but many times in a future which it is probably safe to measure in years rather than decades."

6) The triumph of socialism in most of the world will not doom capitalism. The editors do not think that under such conditions economic collapse is likely to occur. Rather they state: "structural changes in monopoly capitalism that would permit it to survive as

'capitalism in one country' are conceivable." They end their three-part series with the vision of a fascist America with an autarchic capitalist system in a sea of socialist states — the existence of these states being at least partially due to the foolhardy policies of the U.S. itself.

The theory, taken as a whole, contrasts rather sharply with the theoretical approach of the USSR. Carl Marzani, in an article in the January *MR*, while noting that the *MR* editors "stand on strong theoretical grounds of classical Marxism," observes that "the major stand of present Soviet foreign policy is geared to a judgement that American foreign policy can be made to change." There is no doubt that the *MR* editors have performed an important service, a service similar to that of the Chinese, in fighting the illusions emanating from the Kremlin that the essential nature of U.S. foreign policy can be altered without altering the social system.

This contribution is particularly important when one realizes that the bulk of the readers of the *Monthly Review* have been quite susceptible to this type of reasoning — as, in fact, have the editors in the past. The editors of *MR* have been following a pretty consistent political path since the shake-up of the Stalinist world at the time of the Hungarian Revolution which loosened them from their previous political moorings. Thus, earlier, they had been among the strongest supporters of the Chinese Communes at a time when the official Soviet line was quite critical of these developments. More recently, they labelled Cuba "socialist" while the official Soviet line was that it was capitalist and that every effort must be made to keep it capitalist.

However, there is a certain strain of reasoning that runs through all these articles which seems to reflect the editors' previous views. The editors seem to be saying that a deal that would "stabilize" the world (i.e. guarantee to the capitalists unchallenged rule over most of the earth's surface) is a good thing to work for — however, it is unrealizable under current conditions. In other words they seem to differ not so much with the aims of the Soviet bureaucrats as with their judgment on the possibility of achieving these aims. As the editors themselves put it: "Today conditions are completely different, and the meaning of peaceful coexistence has also changed." Likewise, on the domestic scene, the *MR* editors seem to be saying not so much that they oppose another new deal as a disguised form of capitalist rule, but rather that, sadly, such a new deal just isn't in the cards right now. This is important to note for should the international or domestic situation change, the editors themselves might change too.

Perhaps the greatest weakness of the editors' theoretical construction is not so much in what they say, but in what

they leave out. As has become common in radical intellectual circles in both Europe and this country, the *MR* editors completely ignore the role of the working class in the advanced countries. The editors see socialism triumphing only in the colonial areas and even there not under working class leadership. In the advanced countries the editors see only the prospect of fascism. They express an attitude of complete fatalism towards the struggle of the workers in the advanced countries to change the imperialist foreign policy by fundamentally changing the social system through revolution. Rather, they replace the working class revolution with the colonial revolution. Needless to say if the working class revolution is futile in the advanced countries it makes no sense to waste one's time trying to construct a party capable of leading that revolution. Therefore the *MR* editors' conception of their own political role — commentators on the passing scene rather than active participants in the struggle to build a revolutionary party — flows logically from their world view.

Other aspects of their theoretical construction also deserve attention. The view of the *MR* that U.S. foreign policy has been formulated solely as a rationale for armaments spending which in turn keeps the economy going is, we feel, somewhat simplistic. Marzani, on the other hand, feels that "the Truman-Dulles foreign policy, begun in 1945, has as its primary purpose the domination of the world entailing war upon the Soviet Union to weaken it or destroy it." Interestingly, this view gives less support for Marzani's peaceful coexistence theory than does the *MR*'s view he is polemizing against. We feel Marzani is also a little simplistic if he feels that the dominant section of the ruling class ever really envisioned that they would be able, in the immediate postwar period, to declare war on the USSR. However, Marzani gets considerably closer to the truth than do the *MR* editors.

While armaments spending is important to the U.S. economy, that does not necessarily mean that our foreign policy has been determined solely by this factor. We suggest that both the armaments build-up and our foreign policy are instruments essential to the ruling class's attempt to control a section of the world and keep this section open for its economic operations. U.S. foreign policy has been motivated primarily by these imperialistic considerations because, contrary to the theories of the *MR* editors, the U.S. capitalists do not feel they can survive isolated in a socialist world. The capitalists quite correctly seem to agree with Lenin that capitalism in one country is just as impossible as that other pet theory of the *MR* editors — socialism in one country.

Carl Marzani does make one other valid point against the *MR* editors. He accuses them of "an underestimation of the degree of self-consciousness in the

ruling class." We are not at all sure that the U.S. will continually repeat the pattern of its relations with Cuba — constantly pushing bourgeois democratic revolutions in the direction of socialism. While under certain conditions such a "hard" policy will be utilized by the capitalists either through stupidity or in the hope that they can completely crush the revolution, under other circumstances it is not out of the question that the capitalists will recognize that the revolution cannot be crushed. Under such circumstances, they will attempt to limit the revolution — to contain it within "safe" capitalist bounds. Is that not what the British did in Iraq with Khrushchev's help?

So, while we agree with the *MR* editors that a complete worldwide stabilization is out of the question precisely because the leaders of the USSR could not guarantee maintenance of such a division since they do not completely control the revolutionary forces of the colonial world, we do feel temporary deals can be made and will be made by the capitalists. Under such conditions the attitudes of both the USSR and China are critically important. It is interesting to note that the editors of *MR*, the leaders of the USSR, and the Chinese leaders all seem to agree on one thing — that what should be done in Laos today is to restore to power the "legitimate government" (to quote the *MR*). In other words, rather than the Pathet Lao carrying through a revolutionary struggle for power in the interests of the workers and peasants of Laos, they all favor a coalition government with the capitalists which would keep Laos securely in the framework of capitalism — even if of the "neutralist" variety. This, perhaps, gives us "in microcosm" the *MR*'s real views on peaceful coexistence.

While we are pleased to see the editors of *MR* bring into question some of the precepts of the peaceful coexistence theory as practised by the Kremlin, we still feel that the editors should look more thoroughly into this theory. Perhaps they will then agree with us that the theory needs more than renovating — it should be totally discarded.

Subscribe

International Socialist Review
116 University Place,
New York 3, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$2.50 for my subscription for the next eight issues.

Name

Street Apt. No.....

City Zone

State

***In Defense
of the
Cuban Revolution***

**A Marxist answer to the State Department's "White Paper"
and Theodore Draper's attack on the revolutionary leadership**

By Joseph Hansen

**Also, "Stop the Crime Against Cuba!" a statement by the
Socialist Workers party on the invasion**

32 pages 25c

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

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

**Why Can't Everybody
Have a Job?**

presenting the socialist program against unemployment

By Fred Halstead

10¢ per copy

13 copies \$1

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

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