

JULY, 1970

political affairs

Journal of Marxist Thought & Analysis

U.S. IMPERIALISM AND LATIN AMERICA

Daniel Mason

THE MASSACHUSETTS PEACE MOVEMENT

Ray Ellis

COAL: THE INDUSTRY AND THE UNION

Anton Krchmarek

A BASIC PROGRAM FOR PEOPLE'S UNITY

Chilean Parties

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION: LIARS INCARNATE

Herbert Aptheker

60¢

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Comment

The New Program of the CPUSA 1

Daniel Mason

U.S. Imperialism and Latin America:
The Rockefeller Report 2

Ray Ellis

The Massachusetts Peace Movement 15

Anton Krchmarek

Coal: The Industry and the Union 26

Chilean Parties

A Basic Program for People's Unity 35

Herbert Aptheker

The Nixon Administration: Liars Incarnate 48

COMMUNICATIONS

Hosea Hudson

Thoughts on a Scientific Convention 60

BOOK REVIEWS

Robert Phillipoff

Monetary vs. Fiscal Policy 63

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26 Street, New York, N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$6.00 a year; \$3.00 for six months; for foreign and Canada, \$7.00 a year. Single copies 60 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

The New Program of the CPUSA

Just recently there came off the press the *New Program of the Communist Party U.S.A.* A book of 128 pages, it is the fruit of some five years' labor and the deliberations of three successive national conventions, one of them a special convention called for this express purpose.

It is the product of innumerable discussions in Party bodies at all levels, of the collective thinking of the Party.

It is no mere statement of programmatic aims. Rather it is a basic document which spells out the necessity of socialism in the United States, the path charted by the Communist Party for its attainment, and the human forces—in the first place the working class in alliance with the Black people—which can bring our country to the socialist goal. It defines the role of the Communist Party as a Marxist-Leninist party of the working class, heading the fight for socialism.

At the heart of the Program lie the great democratic struggles and movements of today. It is these struggles for peace, freedom and economic well-being, directed against the powerful monopolist rulers of the United States, with which the struggle for socialism is intertwined. The forging of an alliance of all classes and strata which are exploited and oppressed by monopoly capital, the building of a mass people's anti-monopoly party—these are the goals it sets in these struggles. Within the framework of striving for these goals the struggle for a socialist U.S.A. develops and gains strength—not in some remote future but now, today. In all this, the Program bases itself firmly on the working class as the class of socialism, as the revolutionary class in our society. At the same time it places as central the fight against racism and the building of black-white unity.

The Program is thus itself an instrument for advancing these struggles. It is not only a document for the guidance of the Communist Party but a means of educating and mobilizing broader masses of people for the fray. It is a powerful instrument for progress.

It should serve throughout the Party as material for study, for classes. And it should reach tens of thousands outside the Party. Only thus can it exert the influence of which it is capable.

Finally, it is important to note that the Program is not a body of dogma fixed for all time. It is a product of both theoretical development and experience in struggle. As experience grows and theory develops further, the Program will be revised and improved accordingly. We greet the appearance of the present text as a great initial achievement, one in which our Party can truly take pride.

U.S. Imperialism and Latin America: The Rockefeller Report

A new factor has entered into the calculations of U. S. imperialism regarding its future in Latin America. That factor is fear, fear of the rapidly mounting struggles of the workers and peasants for liberation and independence accelerated by the establishment of socialist Cuba and the increased influence of the Soviet Union. But the answer of U. S. imperialism to the swelling demands from Latin America is not acquiescence, but rather repression, tightening the bonds of neo-colonialist domination and new plans for increasing the superexploitation of the peoples and resources of Latin America at the expense of the working people of the U.S.

This has been indicated in the speeches and statements of President Nixon, despite a certain softness of language. It has been made explicit in the report of Nelson Rockefeller, issued August 30, 1969, after a series of visits to Latin America. This report deserves serious examination because Rockefeller is the "expert" on Latin America for U. S. imperialism.

It should be noted that basically what Rockefeller proposes represents no change in Washington's policy toward Latin America. This policy has always been one of promoting and defending U. S. imperialism's objectives there, whether it was President Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor" policy, President Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress" or President Nixon's "equal partnership."

President Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor" policy has often been regarded as marking a complete repudiation of U. S. imperialism in Latin America. But in December, 1933, less than nine months after Roosevelt made his "good neighbor" speech, Washington was faced with the possibility of having to make good on Roosevelt's pledge at an inter-American conference in Montevideo, Uruguay. At that conference, it was expected that Argentina and other Latin-American nations would demand a repudiation by the U. S. of its interventionist policy, particularly as set forth in the Monroe Doctrine. In his instructions to Cordell Hull, his Secretary of State who was to lead the U. S. delegation to that conference, Roosevelt made it clear that Hull was to block any discussion of mutual defense or repudiation of U. S. intervention. He was to try to limit proposals to such harmless matters as plans for an inter-American highway or a network of airfields.

Hull's instructions to the U. S. delegation made Roosevelt's intentions clear. He wrote:

It is not the desire of the Government that the Monroe Doctrine should be discussed at the Conference.

In the view of this Government, that Doctrine has no place in the discussions of the conference as it is essentially a national policy of the United States. . . .

In maintaining its position, the United States has been governed primarily by its own interests, involving its conception of what was essential to its security and its distinctive position in the hemisphere. (U. S. State Department, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1933*, Washington, 1949, Vol. 4, pp. 137-139.)

But while Washington's policy has not changed and U. S. imperialism remains U. S. imperialism, its methods have changed in this period of neo-colonialism under the pressures of the great revolutionary process that is taking place in the Latin American countries. These include infiltration and intervention by the Central Intelligence Agency, "counter-insurgency" training, control of the military forces of the Latin American countries and efforts to subvert their organized labor movements.

Rising Anti-Imperialist Struggles

Time and again in his report, Rockefeller raises the alarm over the rising struggles of the peoples of Latin America for liberation from U. S. imperialism. He writes:

The restless yearning of individuals for a better life, particularly when accompanied by a well-developed sense of social responsibility, is chipping away at the very order and institutions by which society makes it possible for man to fulfill his personal dignity. The seeds of nihilism and anarchy are spreading throughout the hemisphere. (*The Rockefeller Report on the Americas*, Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1969, page 24.)

But what really frightens U. S. imperialism is the qualitative change that has taken place in the struggle of the Latin American peoples. It sees this shifting from rural areas, which the governments have been able to contain, to the cities, with the urban working class now taking the leadership in the struggle for liberation. Rockefeller indicates this obliquely:

. . . the governments of the American republics have gradually improved their capabilities for dealing with Castro-type agrarian guerrillas. However, radical revolutionary elements in the hemisphere appear to be increasingly turning toward urban terrorism,

in their attempts to bring down the existing order. This type of subversion is more difficult to control. . . . (*Report*, p. 34.)

To clear the way for measures to suppress the struggles of the Latin American peoples, Rockefeller raises the specter of communism and the Soviet Union.

. . . In such a setting, all the American nations are a tempting target for communist subversion. In fact, it is plainly evident that such subversion is a reality today with alarming potential (*Report*, p. 34.)

Although Castro's propaganda casts him as a leader of the down-trodden who is opposed to United States imperialism and independent of Soviet communism, it is clear that the Soviet Union presently has an important degree of financial, economic and military influence over Communist Cuba. (*Report*, p. 35.)

But what concerns U. S. imperialism is not losing the ideological battle with Communism. Rockefeller declares frankly:

The forces of nationalism are creating increasing pressures against foreign private investment. The impetus for independence from the United States is leading toward rising pressures for nationalization of United States industry, local control, or participation with U. S. firms. (*Report*, p. 29.)

To destroy the movements for national liberation in the Latin American countries, Rockefeller proposes a program of internal repression, puppet regimes and invasion by U. S. armed forces of any country which should gain national independence from U. S. imperialism. He calls for the creation of a "Western Hemisphere Security Council to cope with the forces of subversion that operate throughout the Western Hemisphere." He proposes that "the name 'Military Assistance Program' be dropped because it no longer reflects the security emphasis we believe important. The program should be renamed the 'Western Hemisphere Security Program.'"

The first point in such a program, according to Rockefeller, is the building of powerful police forces in each country. He writes: "The United States should respond to requests for assistance of the police and security forces by providing them with the essential tools to do their jobs." (*Report*, p. 64.)

But what he conceives is not a police force with the old-fashioned objective of "keeping the peace." What he wants is the creation of a massive armed force for internal repression, as can be seen in his proposal that each such force be given "trucks, jeeps, helicopters, and like equipment to provide mobility and logistical support for these

forces [and] radios and other command control equipment for proper communications among the forces. . . ." (*Report*, p. 64.)

To guarantee that such internal police forces are controlled by U. S. imperialism, Rockefeller proposes that "the training program which brings military and police personnel from the other hemisphere nations to the United States and to training centers in Panama be continued and strengthened." (*Report*, p. 63.)

But Rockefeller is not convinced that such internal police forces, even though they are beefed-up, trained and controlled by U.S. imperialism, can defeat the movements for national liberation. He writes:

One other point not clearly understood in the United States is that no one country today can effectively protect its own internal security by itself. . . .

Only through hemisphere cooperation can these problems, which so vitally affect internal security, be adequately dealt with. (*Report*, p. 62.)

It is in the light of this call for outright intervention into the internal affairs of any Latin American nation that one must see his proposal "to sell aircraft, ships and other major military equipment . . . to the more developed nations of the hemisphere when these nations believe this equipment is necessary to protect their land, patrol their seacoasts and airspace and otherwise maintain the morale of their forces and protect their sovereignty." (*Report*, p. 65.)

The "Overpopulation" Fraud

One of the greatest causes of alarm among U. S. imperialists is the growth of population in the Latin American countries, which they label "overpopulation." They have been able to win over to their side large sections of middle-class Americans on this question by preying on their fears of a decline in their living standards if this "overpopulation" trend in Latin America is permitted to continue.

But U. S. imperialism's concern with "overpopulation" in Latin America is not over its claimed effect on middle-class Americans. Rockefeller makes this clear:

Today's 250 million people in South and Central America will become 643 million in just thirty years. If the current anti-U. S. trend continues, one can foresee a time when the United States would be politically and morally isolated from part or much of the Western Hemisphere. If this should happen, the barriers to our collective growth would become formidable indeed. (*Report*, p. 39.)

In the first place, this "alarming" forecast is extremely inaccurate. Most students of population growth would disagree with Rockefeller.

In a recent essay, T. Lynn Smith, the noted sociologist who has studied Latin American population growth for many years, declared:

The annual rates of increase of population in Central and South America were high during the decade 1940 to 1950. Between 1950 and 1960 they rose to almost unprecedented heights, many of them coming to exceed 3 per cent per year, with the average for the 16 nations involved being at the extremely high level of 2.9 per cent per annum. These high rates probably are being maintained during the period 1960 to 1970, although there seems to be a slight reduction overall. Finally, the present writer believes that between 1970 and 1980 the factors being brought into position to bring about a reduction in the birth rate will begin to become effective and that the annual rate of increase of population will probably start dropping sharply during that decade. (*Studies of Latin American Societies*, Doubleday, New York, 1970, p. 55.)

The problem for the peoples of Central and South America is not "overpopulation." After all, the whole of Central and South America has a population that is not much larger than that of the United States. And in its vast territory are concentrated a major portion of the world's unused land and other resources.

If there is any danger to the world's resources from "overpopulation," it comes from the United States. It has been estimated that a middle-class baby born now in the U. S. will consume in the course of its life fifty times as much of the world's resources as a baby born in one of the "underdeveloped" countries. As Jean Mayer, a special consultant to President Nixon, admitted recently:

Rich people occupy much more space, consume more of each natural resource, disturb the ecology more, and create more land, air, water, chemical and radioactive pollution than poor people. So, it can be argued from many viewpoints that it is even more urgent to control the numbers of the rich than it is to control the numbers of the poor.

The truth of the matter is that the suffering of the peoples of Latin America is not caused by "overpopulation" but by U. S. imperialism's superexploitation. Its policies call for continued "underdevelopment" of Latin America's resources, the maintenance of poverty for a large section of its population.

Let us take, for example, the case of Chile. This is one of the more industrially developed countries of South America, with more than 60 per cent of its people urban. But there 30 per cent of the population is kept economically out of the national market. At least 20 per cent are private servants and more than 50 per cent are employed in ser-

vices. There is not even the opportunity for the creation of a new middle class of entrepreneurs, since the customary interest rate charged by the banks is 18 per cent.

In the less industrially developed countries, of course, the situation is much worse. And this is the direct result of U.S. imperialism's domination of Latin America in its pursuit of superprofits.

But Rockefeller and the imperialists for whom he speaks demand a suppression of population growth in Latin America in furtherance of their plans. He writes: "In country after country, the problem of population growth and the need for family planning to slow that growth was voluntarily brought before the mission . . ." (*Report*, p. 134.)

And to curb the growth of population in countries where it may prove dangerous to U.S. imperialism, Rockefeller calls for forced migration from one nation to another. He proposes the following:

Migration: The United States should stand ready to support the Organization of American States' initiatives toward facilitating migrations within the hemisphere.

Working in cooperation with regional organizations, the OAS can make a major contribution toward negotiating and implementing migration from areas of overcrowding—as in El Salvador, for example—to countries needing more people. (*Report*, p. 54.)

It is clear from Rockefeller's report that U.S. imperialism has no intention of working toward a solution of whatever population problems—mainly economic—afflict Latin America. He writes: "The rate of population growth in many of the nations of the Western Hemisphere is so high that it will prove extremely difficult, if not impossible, to meet the economic and social objectives of steady, meaningful improvement in the life of individuals." (*Report*, p. 59.)

Imperialist Robbery

This pessimistic forecast for the future of Latin America is borne out by its present economic state. In the ten years that have gone by since the Alliance for Progress was first projected by Washington, the Latin American economy has been depressed further, while U.S. imperialism has increased its superprofits from that region.

At the same time that the U.S. imperialists were increasing their exports to Latin America, they cut the prices of the main imports from Latin America, such as coffee, meat, wool, oil, iron ore, copper, tin, zinc and lead. The Latin American countries incurred tremendous losses thereby. These they were unable to make up through increased exports to the United States, because in the same period Washington worked out methods to restrict the import of oil, textiles, and wheat

and other foods. Between 1960 and 1968, Latin America's share of U.S. imports dropped from 27 per cent to 16 per cent.

The Soviet writer Y. Yelyutin states:

In the last decade there has been a marked increase in the financial plunder of the continent. Thus, from 1960 to 1966, the repatriation of profits from direct investments by foreigners, mainly Americans, increased from \$965 million to \$1,579 million, while the collection of interest on credits and loans went up from \$289 million to \$614 million. Profits and interest repatriated from Latin America in those seven years totaled almost \$11,500 million. . . . ("USA-Latin America: Equal Partnership?," *International Affairs*, February-March, 1970.)

According to Y. Seryogin, "between 1960 and 1966, foreign monopolies, mostly North American, invested in the Latin American economy \$2,700 million and pumped out \$8,300 million." (*New Times*, February 3, 1970.)

The effect upon most of the Latin American countries has been disastrous. In Brazil, in the last fifteen years, earnings per ton of exports to the United States have dropped from \$350 to \$78. And this has happened in a period of pronounced inflation in the United States, with the value of the dollar going down considerably. As a result, Brazil has piled up a foreign debt of \$4 billion and has to pay out every year \$500 million in interest to foreign bankers.

With regard to Chile, José Dickman writes:

Chile is being robbed by the U. S. monopolists to the tune of more than \$500 million a year. The bogus nationalization of copper mining, in agreement with the U.S. monopolies, only increased the latter's profits from \$44 million in 1963 to \$126 million in 1968. Stagnation trends are more pronounced: the annual price-adjusted growth of the gross national product has dropped from an average of 2.03 per cent in 1960-67 to 0.59 per cent in 1967-68; industrial output in the first half of 1969 was 2.2 per cent down from the same period of 1968. (José Dickman, "For an Anti-Imperialist Popular-Unity Government," *World Marxist Review*, February, 1970.)

In Argentina, in 1967 and 1968 alone,

. . . 53 industrial enterprises and banks passed from control of the state sector and private national capital into the hands of foreign—U. S., and to some extent West German, Japanese and British—monopolies.

The profits of these monopolies soared. . . . Between July, 1966 and December, 1968, U. S. businessmen invested \$43 million in the Argentine economy and took out of the country nearly \$520 million in profits—twelfefold their investment." (Vadim Listov, "Argentine Developments," *New Times*, August 20, 1969.)

The impact of all this on the people of Latin America is terrifying. One-half of all those employed have an income less than \$120 a year. Two-thirds of them suffer from malnutrition. And almost 25 million workers—more than 10 per cent of the entire population of Latin America—are either unemployed or only partially employed.

Seeking to Tighten the Noose

The Rockefeller report promises only more of the same for Latin America, with the addition of new proposals that will further tighten the stranglehold of U.S. imperialism. It calls for agreements that will guarantee low prices for the raw materials U.S. monopolies import from Latin America, for insurance of U.S. private investments against expropriation and increased taxation, for Latin American economic integration to facilitate trade between the various countries, for preferential treatment of certain Latin American exports to the U.S. to the Latin American countries. It would deny the countries of Latin America the possibility of creating a firm basic-industry foundation for their economies and would maintain the present state of underdevelopment of their agriculture.

Some of these proposals may appear at first glance to be of benefit to the Latin American countries. But further study shows that they serve the aggrandizement of U.S. monopolies.

The heart of the Rockefeller proposals are embodied in this paragraph:

Industrial development requires broad markets for efficient production. Domestic markets in most of the nations of the hemisphere are too limited for broad industrialization. Regional trading agreements offer one constructive way to broaden markets. But even with a rapid development of regional markets, free access to markets in industrial nations will be needed to support the industrial growth required to improve the quality of life through the hemisphere. (*Report*, pp. 72-73.)

The sentence "Domestic markets in most of the nations of the hemisphere are too limited for broad industrialization" makes it clear that U.S. imperialism will oppose the creation of a basic-industry foundation for the Latin American economy and will hamstring any development of agriculture to provide an expansion of the domestic markets for that industrialization.

With regard to the import of raw materials to the U.S. from Latin America, Rockefeller proposes: "The United States should support commodity agreements which operate to stabilize and maintain prices for primary products at levels that reflect fair wages and other costs

of production.”

But then he vitiates that by adding: “Price targets under such agreements should not be set so high as to provide incentives for the development of synthetic materials which will replace natural products. With the tremendous advances in technology, this is a serious consideration.” (*Report*, p. 77.)

This threat is clear evidence that the U.S. monopolies intend to fix low prices for the raw materials they import from Latin America.

The demand for guaranteeing U.S. imperialism’s investments in Latin America is placed thus by Rockefeller:

Private investment, particularly foreign investment, is regarded with suspicion in many quarters. A great many and probably a majority of the citizens of hemisphere nations regard United States private investment as a form of exploitation or economic colonialism . . . Thus realistic steps have not been taken to encourage private investment, to create a framework within which it can operate. (*Report*, p. 89.)

Economic integration of the Latin American countries can be either a good thing or a bad one. It depends on who controls the integration and for whose benefit it is done.

The “regional trading agreements” to which the Rockefeller report refers are already in effect. They have their organizational form in the Central American Common Market and the Latin American Free Trade Association. The only beneficiaries of the activities of these organizations have been the U.S. monopolies and a small section of the national bourgeoisie in the more industrially developed Latin American countries who are their junior partners.

Between 1961 and 1966 Mexico increased its trade with LAFTA countries by 752 per cent, Colombia by 530 per cent and Argentina by 280 per cent. But for Uruguay, Paraguay and Chile the growth figures were a mere 80 per cent, 76 per cent and 31 per cent, respectively. . . .

Development in the CACM countries is also uneven. For instance, whereas the capitalists and landowners in Honduras are complaining about a paucity of profits, their colleagues in Salvador have become the chief exporters in the markets of three of their four partners, accounting for 27 per cent of the entire export of the CACM countries. (José Cademartori, “Economic Integration of Latin America and the Position of the Working Class,” *World Marxist Review*, February, 1969.)

But the peoples of the more developed Latin American countries did not benefit from this increase in trade, since the U.S. monopolies

control most of the local industries which exported these commodities in the two trade organizations’ countries. As the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Colombia, in January, 1966, declared:

Although the development of Latin American trade was the slogan of the bourgeoisie, it is the American monopolies who, in the present conditions of the increasing penetration of imperialism, are benefiting most from this, since exports to the countries of the zone are predominantly items whose production is controlled by U.S. capital, as, for example, petro-chemicals, automobile tires, medicaments, artificial fibers, liquid fuel, etc.

According to Cademartori:

Economic expansion in Latin America, facilitated by the integration, enables U. S. capitalists to ship out ever increasing amounts in the shape of profits, interest and payments for administrative services and technical aid. These remittances grew from an annual \$1,300 million in 1960-62 to something like \$2,000 million in 1966-67, swallowing 15 per cent of export receipts in 1960 and 20 per cent in 1967. (*Op. cit.*)

But the regional trading organizations have not proved to be the success U.S. imperialism had hoped they would become. The increase in this trade has dropped from 30 per cent in 1964 to only 10.2 per cent in 1966. The reason for this is self-evident. The superexploitation of Latin America by the U.S. monopolies has made it impossible for domestic markets to grow in the countries of the trading organizations.

The same factors are involved in Rockefeller’s recommendations concerning preferential treatment of certain exports from Latin America to the United States. He proposes:

The United States should work out a balanced approach to the problem of expanding hemisphere trade in industrial products by moving to a system of tariff preferences for imports from all developing countries. . . .

Tariff preferences should be extended to those items where careful study shows the benefits to United States consumers clearly outweigh the costs of the adjustment. (*Report*, p. 75.)

It is obvious from this that items will be chosen only from those industries in the Latin American countries which are controlled by the U.S. monopolies. It should be noted that one of the biggest sectors of expansion of U.S. imperialism into Latin American industry has been the creation of a network of plants whose only function is the assembling of parts imported from the U.S. into finished commodities, thus stifling the development of local industries that would create these primary parts.

These assembly plants employ semi-skilled labor in the Latin American countries at wages very much lower than those paid workers in similar jobs in the United States. In many cases the wages paid these Latin American workers are as low as \$2 a day.

The vast extent of the expansion of these assembly plants in Latin America by the U.S. monopolies can be seen in Mexico. Three years ago, there were practically none. But last year the U.S. monopolies exported to the United States from Mexico \$145 million worth of commodities assembled from imported U.S. parts.

It is obvious from this that the peoples of Latin America will benefit very little from any preferential tariffs adopted in Washington. They will only add to the burden of superexploitation by U.S. imperialism.

The most shocking proposal in the Rockefeller report—migration of certain segments of U.S. industry—flows directly from the profitable experience U.S. monopolies have had with the assembly plants in Latin America. U.S. imperialism proposes that entire sectors of its industry be transplanted to Latin American countries, where they would exploit the workers with substandard wages. The Rockefeller report declares:

What is needed now is a broadening division of labor among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. At present, the United States is producing, at high cost behind tariff walls and quotas, goods which could be produced more economically by other hemisphere nations. . . . The goods the United States is now producing inefficiently would be imported, mainly from less developed countries. . . .

With abundant supplies of labor and wage levels well below those in the United States, they could export processed foods, textiles, apparel, footwear and other light manufactures, as well as meat and other farm products. . . . (*Report*, p. 102.)

This program would condemn the Latin American countries to a future as satellites to the U.S. monopolies. It would further deform the Latin American economy, making impossible the establishment of a basic-industry foundation so necessary if the countries below the Rio Grande are to proceed naturally with their development. It would prevent the development of skills by Latin American workers. It would freeze for all time a low wage and therefore low living standard for the Latin American peoples.

Effects on U.S. Workers

But it is not only the peoples of Latin America, who are already suffering and will continue to suffer from the program of U.S. im-

perialism, who will be affected by the proposals in the Rockefeller report. Since 1945 the U.S. monopolies have determined to end the policy of bribing a section of the U.S. working class with a small portion of its superprofits from Latin America and other neo-colonialist areas. They are now forcing all U.S. workers to pay for the extraction of superprofits from these areas.

The Rockefeller proposal for the shift of major sections of U.S. industry to the Latin American countries is only a further extension of a process that has been developing for some time. That proposal would condemn to unemployment many millions of U.S. workers. These are the unskilled and semi-skilled workers who make up the labor force in the textile, clothing, food processing and other consumer goods industries. Most of them are Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano. It would help to create the large surplus labor population the U.S. monopolies would like to have to depress the wage standards of the employed workers.

But it is not only the unskilled and semi-skilled workers in the U.S. who are suffering from the neo-colonialist policies of imperialism. The skilled workers are being burdened too.

The vast increase in the number of assembly plants set up in Latin America by the U.S. monopolies, under the umbrella of U.S. preferential tariffs (which Rockefeller wants to extend) affects most of them. In 1966, the U.S. imported from these foreign assembly plants \$113 million worth of finished products which had U.S.-made parts. In 1969, it was \$1.6 billion, a more than tenfold increase. More than half of these products were transport equipment such as cars and airplanes. The next largest sector was electronics. These goods were produced by workers at wages much lower than those paid in U.S. industry.

It can be expected that the U.S. monopolies will accelerate their expansion of these assembly plants in Latin America and elsewhere.

This, however, is not the only impact on U.S. workers of the neo-colonialist policies of U.S. imperialism. Every U.S. worker is forced to pay heavily for the monopolies' extraction of superprofits from Latin America and other areas.

Between 1960 and 1966, profits and interest taken out of Latin America amounted to \$11.5 billion. In that same period, Latin America received in economic aid from the U.S. and the international agencies it controlled \$10 billion. In addition, Washington gave to its puppet regimes in Latin America an estimated \$4 billion in military aid. Thus, almost a third more money was put into Latin America than was taken out in profit and interest.

But while the \$11.5 billion in profit and interest went to monopo-

lies and banks, the \$14 billion in "aid" that was sent to Latin America was paid for mostly by U.S. workers in increased taxes. In addition, most of the \$80 billion war budget, which pays for the maintenance of imperialist military forces throughout the world, is paid for in taxes by U.S. workers. Furthermore, every U.S. working-class family is compelled to contribute its own flesh and blood to the armed forces to enforce the robbery of other peoples by U.S. imperialism.

But the imperialist schemes embodied in the Rockefeller report reckon without the revolutionary upsurge in Latin America, which will certainly drive U.S. imperialism out of the entire area, as it has already driven it out of Cuba. And they reckon without the resistance of the U.S. working class to the destruction of its own living standards, a resistance which is already reaching formidable proportions.

When the most powerful, industrially advanced countries first embarked upon empire-building, they did not doubt the stability of colonialism as a system. A relatively small military commitment—a few gunboats, several regiments—was enough to conquer an economically backward territory and suppress rebellions of the native population.

Today, to seize or try to hold a key point requires a colossal expenditure of money and manpower, and even that is often insufficient. In our age colonialism itself is being torn apart. Attempting empire-building, U.S. monopoly faces the reality of empire-crumbling. It faces the problem, therefore, not only of establishing spheres of empire, but of trying to save the very system of imperialism. All its propaganda catchwords cannot conceal that it acts to halt social change, to thwart the progress of civilization. But U.S. imperialism cannot hope to achieve its designs of empire. It is too late in history for that. This is the age of anti-imperialism.

New Program of the Communist Party U.S.A., page 30

The Massachusetts Peace Movement

The *New York Times*, commenting on the adoption of the Shea anti-war resolution* by the Great and General Court (legislature) of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the spring of this year, described the Bay State as "perhaps the most dovish . . . in the union."

That characterization is accurate. For some years Massachusetts has witnessed a series of political mobilizations and demonstrations with a marked impact on public sentiment. National declarations from scientists and other scholars have been initiated in the area.

New Level of War Resistance

Before the Cambodian invasion a rough calculation showed that about 75 peace organizations were functioning—exclusive of campus movements—with varying approaches and geographical coverage. A sampling would list such groups as the American Friends Service Committee, the Beacon Hill Support Group, the Newton Coalition, and the Cape Ann Concerned Citizens. One state-wide organization, Citizens for Participation Politics, announced in mid-May that it now has 130 affiliates, most of which are community branches. When to this are added the peace activists on campus and in the high schools the number is formidable.

The patient work of earlier years "when the going was tough" laid the groundwork for the qualitative change this spring. There were earlier indications of this when Senator Eugene McCarthy drew his largest national campaign audience with an overflow crowd at Fenway Park in Boston, the home of the Red Sox. Twice on historic Boston Common more than 100,000 have massed to oppose the war and almost that number gathered this May at Soldiers Field near Harvard.

The student movement, in a state where educational institutions abound, now embraces nearly every college and is becoming rooted in a considerable number of high schools. Large centers such as Harvard, M.I.T., Boston University and Boston College have been joined by such diverse schools as the New England Conservatory of Music, the Newton College of the Sacred Heart, and Bryant and Stratton, an old business and secretarial training center.

* State Representative James Shea, distraught over the Cambodian invasion and the Kent massacre, died tragically from a self-inflicted gunshot wound on May 9, 1970.

Thus a higher plateau of war resistance has been reached and it is unlikely that there will be a retreat, even temporarily, from this level as was the case following the dissolution of the McCarthy apparatus.

Even before the crime of Cambodia, representatives of the two major parties in the state sensed that a new political force was on the upsurge and moved to accommodate themselves to the mood among the electorate.

The enactment of the Shea bill was a barometer registering this shift. Passed by a bipartisan vote in the House and Senate, whose majorities are Democratic, and signed by a Republican governor, the measure directs the attorney-general to go to the United States Supreme Court to prevent a Massachusetts soldier from fighting in a war not declared by the Congress of the United States. It is an attempt through the judiciary process to force the executive branch to abide by the Constitution. Apart from the content, however, the bill was recognized as an instrument of anti-war expression. That it was passed by large majorities was in striking contrast to the disposition of a resolution several years ago memorializing Congress against the war. That legislation drew only a handful of votes and died in the House.

Rulers of Massachusetts

American imperialism has deep roots in Massachusetts. It has amassed fortunes for the possessors of capital. At the turn of the century Henry Cabot Lodge was symbolic of the promoters of expansion through the doctrine of "manifest destiny," and his ideology was applauded by the entrepreneurs of Boston, one of the world's important centers of financial investment then and now. As American imperialism penetrated the Caribbean and the Pacific with superprofits flowing to the banks of State Street, the Commonwealth sank into a political and social morass that disgraced the earlier proud record of revolution and Abolition.

The control of the state was held firmly by the banker-industrialists who murdered Sacco and Vanzetti, whose agent Calvin Coolidge broke the Boston police strike to certify his class reliability, whose Watch and Ward Society stifled cultural and social innovation with the slogan "banned in Boston." There were sparks of rebellion such as the splendid victory of the Lawrence textile workers in the twenties, led by the Industrial Workers of the World, but syndicalism was destined to fade from the labor scene.

In the political field the emergence of such demagogues as James Michael Curley, one-time mayor of Boston, did not endanger or disturb class control by those possessing the means of production. Both Curley,

with his exploitation of legitimate Irish protest against exploitation and discrimination, and the Wasps of State Street played the same game and today their success is recorded in the fact that Massachusetts is a low-wage state of the North with oppressive taxes on low and middle incomes. Boston, for example, ranks with New York and Honolulu as urban centers with the highest cost of living. Rentals in the capital city in a 10-year period rose twice as much as in the rest of the United States. The average increase, nationally, according to the U.S. Department of Labor, was 18.8 per cent; for Boston it was 37.1 per cent.

Throughout the years corruption was commonplace: the Republicans stole for the corporations and the Democrats did likewise, with a collection of fees for services rendered. Massachusetts never experienced the storms of political reform that blew up in so many other areas: LaFollete in Wisconsin, the Non-Partisan League of the Dakotas, Norris in Nebraska, Floyd Olson in Minnesota and Culbert L. Olson in California.

Earlier the national anti-imperialist movement attracted Massachusetts notables outraged over the annexation of the Philippines but its life came to a close when President William McKinley routed William Jennings Bryan in 1900.

In the Roosevelt era Massachusetts was not in the center of the upsurge led by the C.I.O. It was not and is not a basic industry state and some of the major industries such as textile were dwindling because of the shift to the non-unionized South. Moreover, its manufacturing establishments have been scattered throughout the state and in the population center of Boston, service and clerical occupations, more difficult to organize, predominate.

The emergence of the Kennedy dynasty in politics brought no shift of consequence in the prevailing political arrangement. John F. Kennedy entered Congress with the backing of a bought political machine and when he eventually reached the presidency his actions were those of a cold warrior encased in a gleaming suit of rhetoric. He promoted American imperialism with a technique of sophistication—the Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress. He set in motion the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. His domestic program was without meaningful content and he undercut many of his liberal proposals by compromising at the outset. An English journalist has written that Kennedy's sole achievement on the positive side was in defeating the bigotry that denied the presidency to one of the Catholic faith—a judgment that may well stand.

The Kennedys never attempted to reform the corruption-riddled Democratic Party of the state. They wanted support, no matter what the source, for the consummation of their ambitions and they studi-

ously refrained from criticism of the party's feudal lords.

That attitude still holds with Senator Edward Kennedy who remains aloof from the organized peace movement, an aloofness that is reciprocated in large measure. In an exchange of open letters on the war in Southeast Asia with columnist Joseph Alsop on May 19, 1970, Kennedy opposed the America presence and continued: "I am sure that you feel that in taking this position I have allied myself with the naive, the idealistic and the young. I ally myself with no one, and I seek no one to join with me." His concern with the priorities of imperialist aggression is then disclosed: "The longer we remain bogged down in Southeast Asia . . . the more latitude the Soviet Union feels in her Middle Eastern adventures."

He was speaking in the interests of an ally he conveniently omitted to mention—eastern seaboard capitalists whose concern for investments abroad are directed to the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, Europe and Canada. The Kennedy viewpoint, never anti-imperialist, was elaborated recently by Professor James C. Thomson, Jr. of Harvard, who served as an East Asian specialist in the Security Council and the Department of State under both Presidents Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. Thomson described the Cambodian invasion as "a desperate evasion . . . an evasion of the central facts that no President has had the courage to face up and tell his people—that Vietnam was 'lost' to Vietnamese national-communism years ago by French, Americans and Vietnamese; that nothing short of world war could retrieve that loss; that the loss doesn't matter in terms of American national interests. . . ."

Kennedy has unquestionably contributed to the opposition to Nixon's Asian policy. It must be understood, however, that this represents a division *within* the circle of American finance-capital. There are in addition to Kennedy many Senators and Congressmen of the liberal stripe who are ready to back to the hilt the aggressive designs of the government of Israel.

Within the peace movement of Massachusetts there is what seems to be a tacit understanding to shun discussion of the Middle East on the grounds that the subject would be divisive. That is a sweeping-under-the-rug postponement for the problem promises to grow rather than diminish.

Toward Political Independence

As the Kennedys rose to high office, a new development in Massachusetts began to take form. First, many voters moved toward an independent position rather than maintaining adherence to either major political party. Today that independent political bloc is larger

than either the Democratic or the Republican. Second, the electorate did what on the surface seemed contradictory: it would give the Democrats a majority in national elections and vote Republican for many state candidates, particularly for governor. What this reflected in a murky way was approval of reforms that had come out of the New Deal and distrust of local Democratic politicians who merely invoked the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt—a not unfamiliar characteristic of the political scene in other states.

The edging toward a new political alignment came in an almost unnoticed fashion in 1962. It resulted in an overwhelming defeat for progressives but produced a force that was to expand into today's loosely-linked, peace-oriented movement that has the potential of exercising the balance of political power in Massachusetts. Its future is by no means predictable but it does carry the possibility of a break from the two-party prison, first as an independent political body and later as a separate new party. These changes in the body politic provide a valuable study for those desirous of creating an anti-imperialist instrument of action. But their complexity should give pause to the impatient who are prone to draw up utopian solutions without consideration for the influence of class forces and who airily dismiss the maze of *realpolitik*.

The 1962 progressive defeat was suffered by H. Stuart Hughes, Harvard professor who ran as an independent against Edward Kennedy and George Lodge, Republican and descendant of Henry Cabot Lodge. To get Hughes on the ballot for United States Senator a massive signature campaign was required with college youth playing the decisive role. On the eve of the election the Cuban missile crisis broke. Hughes held to a principled position and wound up with about three per cent of the vote.

Those who had worked for the Hughes candidacy were determined to go on despite the defeat, and Massachusetts Political Action for Peace (PAX) was organized. Led by a businessman, Jerome Grossman, PAX has continued in existence to this day, something of a record for peace movements that have tended to fall apart periodically and require reorganization frequently in another form.

In its approximately eight years PAX has made valuable contributions. Its literature distributions have been extensive. It helped break the U.S. Senate color line by supporting Republican Edward Brooke.*

* Senator Brooke sought and got an endorsement from PAX, then reversed his commitment and supported President Johnson on the war after his election. As an illustration of the fluidity of politics he now has one foot in the peace camp. He was a leading strategist in securing the rejection of Justices Haynsworth and Carswell as Supreme Court judges.

It aided the campaign of Eugene McCarthy not only in Massachusetts but throughout New England. It devised what became the National Moratorium.

Whether PAX will continue to be influential and grow remains problematical and here class restraints are coming into evidence. Predominantly middle-class, drawing heavily upon suburbia, its decision-making circle is narrow and heavily weighted by academics and financial angels whose donations are not unrelated to the policies that emerge. It has failed to construct ongoing community organizations that are the reliable sources for the mustering of the electorate. In the main it has been a single-issue organization for fear at the top that a multi-issue approach would offend some of its affluent supporters.

The single-issue restriction holds back the promotion of an alliance with labor and the Black community. It also tends to diminish youth participation for in the schools the war is seen more and more as the foulest expression of a thoroughly sick society.

PAX remained silent during the dramatic postal strike; it remained silent during the Boston school teachers' bitter and difficult strike.

Its initial approach to the Black community was an attempt to coopt selected leaders to assist PAX. And when the discovery was made that that day had gone forever, the problem was shelved as "too difficult." Openings were ignored. This April a broad spectrum of Black citizenry took out a full page advertisement in the *Boston Globe* calling for a fight against repression and warning that while the ghetto was bearing the brunt the violence could soon be turned on the white community. It was a forewarning of Kent. There was a full page advertisement in response by whites but the PAX leadership had no share in bringing this about.

Other instances of lost opportunity can be cited. When the students were murdered at Jackson, Mississippi, PAX—it had denounced the Kent slayings—was silent. PAX could have followed the sensitive response of the high school students in Brookline who promptly demanded and got the lowering of the school flag just as college students earlier had demanded and got the lowering of the statehouse flag in memory of the victims of Kent.

The Congressional Elections

Before the peace movement are the Congressional elections. There will be more contests than had been anticipated but this will not be true of every district. And there is the absence of a state-wide unifying campaign which could have come through candidacies for the U.S. Senate or Governor. Massachusetts is grossly misrepresented by its

Congressmen. Only one can be classified as a consistent dove and he is a newcomer. This is in the face of a thoroughly reliable public opinion poll taken on attitudes toward the Cambodian invasion.

That survey, taken by the Joint Center for Urban Studies of M.I.T. and Harvard in the metropolitan Boston area, revealed that among those expressing an opinion two to one were against the Cambodian invasion. And it is fair to speculate that since that time the opposition to Nixon's Asian policy, spurred by domestic discontent, has increased.

The announced retirement of John W. McCormack of the Ninth District, aging speaker of the House and unfailing supporter of the military, has stimulated a number of candidacies for the Democratic nomination in the September primary. That nomination is tantamount to election, for the district is overwhelmingly Democratic. The Ninth includes the bulk of Boston's ghetto. It also includes areas where such a notorious racist as Louise Day Hicks, city councilor in Boston, has substantial backing. Moves are underway to have a single peace candidate. But this requires turning to the Black community for proposals and advice.

In the Third District a newcomer whose candidacy has aroused national interest is Father Robert Drinen, Jesuit and dean of the Boston College law school. Drinen, whose peace and civil rights record is of long standing, is running against Congressman Philip Philbin in the Democratic primary. Philbin is one of the prominent hawks in Congress.

PAX has an influential part in Drinen's campaign planning. To date, however, its role has been one of top-circle planning and restraint of those who are anxious to ring doorbells. This strategy has disappointed both students at Boston College and the numerous peace activists in Newton. A Drinen victory is obtainable but not if the desire to expend energy is held in leash.

A Congressional campaign of major importance is that in the Sixth District on the North Shore. Here Congressman Michael Harrington, a sturdy proponent of peace, is seeking re-election. He gained the office in a special election following the death of the incumbent in 1969. His stunning upset in a district that had been solidly Republican for generations was an excellent example of the use of coalition behind a candidate who made opposition to the war and to the construction of an ABM site the central part of his electioneering.

Another state peace organization, Citizens for Participation Politics, was prominent in this coalition which also embraced, after the primary, much of the Democratic organization, students, labor, and suburban independents including Republicans.

CPP is an offshoot of the McCarthy organization. Its leaders lean toward independent political positions while collaborating with such Democrats as Harrington. CPP, unlike PAX, is a multi-issue group placing emphasis on community organization. It provides a repository for the energies of youth seeking a stable attachment.

There is much duplication between PAX and CPP, both in program and membership. That both exist is a commentary on the need for strong voices in behalf of close collaboration at the minimum and what is patently a necessity—eventual organizational unity. Sadly, the peace movement like other human associations has its quota of those who prize position above the common welfare.

Ultra-Radicalism on the Campuses

In moving toward the fall elections youth will be engaged on a wide scale. By the thousands newcomers have enlisted and in this engagement there is the potential for changing the situation on campus where a broad-based, anti-imperialist sentiment exists without organizational form. That sentiment is of a temper to engage in both elections and demonstrations but is cool toward the dead-end of ultra-radicalism that wrecked Students for a Democratic Society.

The founding of SDS represented a positive achievement in the creation of a radical center. Although ill-defined programmatically, the positive aspects were substantial and in Massachusetts it generated interest if not agreement. Moreover, it inspired the formation of other student circles of radicalism. But within and outside of SDS there was a tendency to overlook the negative, which continued to grow. There were those who hailed a youth organization that apparently rejected the clichés of red-baiting and opened its doors without discrimination. The red-baiting was there, however, not in the crudities of a Joseph McCarthy but in the struggle over ideology.

As time passed many proclaimed themselves as Marxists or Marxist-Leninists, although in fact they were closer to the anarchy of Kropotkin and Bakunin.* Eventually the slide into dogmatic debate took place with all its sterility interlaced with bourgeois frustration. The ultra-radicals drew more apart from the mainstream on campus, stood in isolation from the community, and in the case of Progressive Labor delivered unheard lectures to wage workers.

With the breaking up of SDS, the open door for police provocateurs

* Ultra-radicalism has its supporters on faculties. For an example of ideological "trashing" see "Notes on Anarchism" by Noam Chomsky of M.I.T. in the *New York Review of Books*, May 21, 1970. This will appear in part as a preface to *Anarchism* by Daniel Guerin, to be issued by the Monthly Review Press, specialists in the publication of Marxist distortions.

and the advocacy and practice of "trashing" by the Weathermen, added to the earlier dissolution of the McCarthy movement, the campuses were in what amounted to an organizational vacuum. This could have been filled if the tactic of the united front had been understood and utilized.

Aware of this vacuum was the Socialist Workers Party. Gaining control of the Student Mobilization Committee in the state by default, the SWP then moved on to take over the New Mobe which in Massachusetts was moribund until the Washington mobilization of November, 1969. With neither PAX nor CPP taking any demonstration initiatives for 1970, the Trotskyites were able to manipulate and control the planning for a desired mass April demonstration on Boston Common.

In the inept and often disorderly planning stages for the demonstration—marred by extreme Leftist squabbling—the program of the Trotskyites emerged. The public face was social democracy designed to attract those repelled by the ultra-Left. But in substance it was this: adhere to a single issue; prevent democratic coalitions; oppose any united front peace candidates and strive for situations where the only candidates would be those of the two major parties and a Socialist Workers Party candidate. Labor, Black people and community were to be ignored and the students elevated to the vanguard. Not all of this was advocated openly. What became repugnant to many without political attachments was the ruthless drive of the Trotskyites toward domination with repeated violations of democratic procedure.

In consequence, when 100,000 massed on Boston Common the dearth of direction from most of the speakers, plus ugly provocative proposals, left a restless audience hungering for a positive program. Thus the stage was set for a spin-off into Cambridge where "trashing," aided and abetted by police agents, did serious damage to the peace movement in the eyes of the general public. The Cambridge event was not unrelated to simultaneous actions in other cities.

The violence which took place in Harvard Square showed that the ultra-radicals had become parasites on the peace movement because of their vanishing ability to attract a following. It is especially clear since Cambodia that the new college upsurge rejects the dead end of anarchy.

Reflective of this was an editorial in the *Harvard Crimson* which declared: "It is precisely the seriousness of the growing political repression that compels one to oppose demonstrations like last Wednesday's. Even those who want a revolution in this country should see that it can come only through long-term organization."

Underscoring this was the *Tufts Observer* which asked "if those

who started the window-smashing and fires can break out of their egocentric shells and are capable of caring about the majority of individuals in that society they are supposedly trying to change."

What of the future? Here is a great, boiling mass movement but it is yet to develop a leadership expressive of a policy which would be approved by an overwhelming majority.

Perspectives

Communists see as the first order of the day consultation, cooperation, coalition—whatever the name. To enter into a broad alliance does not require abandonment of varying political outlooks. Minimum agreements can be reached without a sacrifice of principle. To neglect or delay this consolidation is to throw away the bright opportunity of reversing the direction of the federal government and of inviting a quickening of the tempo of repression.

The class enemy of the peace movement has by no means capitulated and is expending efforts in two areas. One is through counter-demonstrations and repression with the use of police power and the stimulation of the worst elements of society—racists and Birchites, whose national headquarters is in Belmont, Massachusetts—and others who can be attracted to the slogan of "law and order." Realizing the immensity of the anti-war feeling in metropolitan Boston, the strategists of reaction are revamping their tactics. When earlier outdoor rallies, blatantly calling for a widening of war, failed to draw more than a few hundred, the switch was to a "pro-America" gathering preceded by a parade with the usual bands and marching units. Bob Hope was the main speaker and the audience was of substantial thousands.

The second area is within the peace movement itself. Stepped up efforts are under way to persuade the peace movement to "restrain" itself, to use "sensible" tactics which in reality means to drop all demonstrations. Already there is evidence, particularly in Democratic circles, of efforts to move in on and dilute the militancy. These persons are not without friends among some middle-class peace proponents whose outlook for social change is viewed through a narrow glass. This bloc also has ties with the Trotskyites who are only too willing to serve as "socialists of respectability."

Then there are the super-revolutionaries whose usefulness to reaction is of such value that they cannot be dismissed. They are part of a phenomenon of the western capitalist world and their activity is by no means limited to Boston and Cambridge.

R. Palme Dutt, in the *Labor Monthly* of January 1970, gave a telling

description of this element when he wrote: "Time was when the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet campaign was conducted under the familiar direct slogans of denouncing the Communist world conspiracy, red subversion and the menace of world revolution. But the discredit of the capitalist world today is such that many of the younger generation are seeking a path of revolt against established institutions. Hence the old poison is dished up with new labels as the latest 'super-revolutionary' gospel; the Soviet Union is dismissed as a 'conservative super-power' indistinguishable from the United States; the Communist parties are disdained as 'not revolutionary enough.'"

There is an abundance of this garbage in Massachusetts and the litter is especially high on campus yards. The Marxist international proletarian answer is far from adequate through the present circulation of the *Daily World*, *Political Affairs*, pamphlets and books. They will be read, if made available, for the interest in socialism is mounting. The Young Workers Liberation League can make a valuable contribution in this respect.

In the time of the greatest crisis in the history of the nation every Communist in Massachusetts must find a place in the peace movement. What we have in embryo is a people's anti-imperialist apparatus and Communists and non-Communists alike have a deep stake in the birth and nurture of this valuable force which can block what could be the great American tragedy.

Coal: The Industry and the Union

"Coal has always cursed the land in which it lies. When men begin to wrest it from the earth it leaves a legacy of foul streams, hideous slag heaps and polluted air. It peoples this transformed land with blind and crippled men and with widows and orphans. It is an extractive industry which takes all away and restores nothing. It corrupts but never purifies." (Harry Caudill, *Night Comes To The Cumberlandlands*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1962, p. x.)

This harsh indictment is quite valid. But it is far from enough to say that coal mining wreaks havoc with nature and man as though this was almost a law of nature. Another, more basic ingredient must be recognized to complete the picture. In a society in which the extraction of surplus value (profit) is the fundamental motivation in production, the lives and safety of the workers and the disruption of nature's balance become secondary items in the scheme of things.

It is a fact that in no other industry has the exploitation of wage workers been more brutal and merciless than in coal mining. This has been the record from the beginning of coal extraction. Profits of mining companies have had their accompaniment in the misery, poverty and slaughter of the men who dig coal—directly and indirectly.

In terms of human tragedy this industry surpasses all others. Thus, 5,600 coal miners have been killed since 1952 and another 250,000 injured. Presently over 100,000 miners are infected with pneumoconiosis ("black lung"). Mine explosions, cave-ins, lung disease have taken a deadly toll of their lives. The total number of working miners at present is less than 130,000.

Historically, some of the most bitter class battles have been waged for the improvement of working and health conditions in the mines. The most recent example is the struggle that took place only a year ago in West Virginia, the main coal producing state.

At issue was a demand for the passage of a bill in the state legislature to provide compensation to those suffering from "black lung" contracted in the mines. They closed down the mines for 23 days and marched on the state Capitol even though their own top union leadership failed to provide guidance and leadership. It was a classic example of a militant rank-and-file movement based upon a critical self-

interest issue. It was waged, of necessity, on both the economic and legislative fields of action. And some progress was achieved.

Structure of the Industry

To get a more comprehensive view of the problems that coal miners now face we must look over the anatomy of the coal producing industry, at least briefly. This is particularly necessary since in recent years there has been a swift and dramatic change in the physical and technological features as well as in the ownership, capital structure and fundamental class relationships in this industry.

For two decades coal mining has been described as a "sick industry" scheduled for obsolescence because of the advent of other more efficient fuels. Thus, in 1947 railroads consumed 25 per cent of total production in the country; this has now declined to less than 1 per cent. Retail and manufacturing demand for coal has declined from 23 per cent in 1947 to less than 5 per cent in 1967.

These changes resulted from a rapidly rising use of oil and gas for energy production and heating purposes. Diesel engines replaced coal burners. Gas and oil have largely taken the place of coal for heating purposes. Beyond that are the growing prospects for the development of atomic energy in some areas of the national economy. Out of these developments arose the assertions that coal was a dying industry.

But despite such dire predictions coal tonnage has been rising over the past ten years. In 1950 over 516 million tons of bituminous coal were produced. By 1960 this had fallen to about 416 million tons, but by 1967 it had climbed to 552 million tons. There is impending an actual shortage in coal reserve stocks.

This was the result of a major shift in demand for coal in a number of important sectors of the economy. Consumption of coal for production of electricity has risen sharply, and has grown from 20 per cent of total bituminous production in 1947 to 60.9 per cent in 1969. Industrial plants, steel mills, cement plants, etc., took another 25 per cent of the total.

While known oil reserves in the U.S. are being rapidly depleted and will last only until the 1980's, according to data compiled by the Bureau of Mines, the outlook is vastly different for coal. By conservative estimates, coal reserves in the U.S. run well over 1.42 trillion tons—enough to last for several hundred years.

The conversion of coal to gasoline and natural gas, now being developed, will have a very strong impact on the demand for coal. Demonstration plants for coal conversion are in operation in Cresap,

W. Va. and in Baytown, Texas. This research is sponsored by the Office of Coal Research of the U.S. Department of the Interior at an outlay of \$40 million. Giant conversion plants are planned for use next to coal mines, and current estimates are that coal conversion to synthetic fuels will become operational in about ten years.

Changes in Capital Structure

A stable, rising demand and increasing profitability in coal mining have served to alter the capital structure and financial control in the industry. Thousands of small coal operators are being eliminated by giant corporations and even conglomerates. These have already established their domination in this field in the classic pattern. In 1949 the top fifteen coal companies produced 26 per cent of all coal. But in 1968 they produced 51.7 per cent.

The changes do not end there. The shift in ownership has taken on entirely new forms, far different from anything in the past. Thus, the three top coal-producing corporations have, in recent years, been absorbed by even bigger formations, mainly big oil companies.

1. Consolidation Coal Company, annual output 60.9 million tons, is now a subsidiary of Continental Oil Company.
2. Peabody Coal Company, annual output 59.6 million tons, is now a subsidiary of the Kennecott Copper Company.
3. Island Creek Coal Company, annual output 30.3 million tons, is now a subsidiary of Occidental Petroleum.

Other major oil companies that have entered coal mining include Humble, Mobil, Shell, Sun, Atlantic, Richfield, Standard Oil of Ohio and Ashland. In addition there are the "captive" mines owned by such corporations as U.S. Steel, Bethlehem Steel, Jones and Laughlin Steel, Ford, International Harvester and others.

All of the above firms are among the 500 biggest industrial corporations in the United States as listed by *Fortune*. All have extensive world-wide investments; they exert a powerful influence on the U.S. government and are among the chief leaders of U.S. imperialism. To give one example, Continental Oil has annual sales of over \$2 billion a year. It has big investments in Canada, Australia, Latin America, Africa, Iran, Saudi Arabia and other countries.

Thus, the class relationships in the coal industry have been radically altered. The coal miners no longer face small, family type mine owners. They are up against huge financial combines with interests in many other fields, which now exercise decisive control of coal production. This will clearly shape the course of the class struggle in the coal

mining industry now and in the future. The lesson should be obvious: the miners can no longer go it alone. Labor unity now becomes crucial for coal miners as for all workers if there is to be any progress for working people.

Automation

In their quest for maximum profits the giant corporations have been impelled to go into the coal industry by two main considerations: (1) rising demand and profitability of coal production; (2) the vast profit potential in the future conversion of coal to gasoline, crude oil, natural gas and other fuels.

The availability of vast quantities of capital has made it possible to introduce basic technological changes in the extraction of coal. The days of the pick and shovel are over. Now, complex mechanization is transforming the mining process, the land, the people and the communities in which they live.

The continuous mining process now accounts for two-thirds of coal production. Huge mechanical monsters gouge out the coal from underground seams and load it on moving conveyors for speedy delivery to the surface. A second method is the use of giant augers that drill directly into the seams in the mountainside, leaving the area in desolation. The third method now in extensive use is strip mining which rips the earth wide open, removing entire hills and mountains by gigantic power shovels to expose the coal seams.

The havoc resulting from stripping creates a scene resembling the craters of the moon. In such areas the entire balance of nature is destroyed, creating new problems of man's relation to nature. It results in ruined land, vast erosion, polluted streams and destruction of wild life. This is an issue that goes far beyond the miners and demands urgent attention of the entire nation.

These methods, highly destructive though they are, have sharply increased the output of coal per worker. In the profit calculations of the corporations this is the decisive factor. Everything else, including the lives and the health of the miners, becomes secondary. In 1940, production per man per day was 5.2 tons of coal. But in 1965, production per man per day was 14 tons in underground mining, 32 tons in strip mining and 46 tons in auger mining.

In that same period of time the number of employed coal miners has declined by more than 300,000—from 439,000 in 1940 to 132,000 in 1965. That number is even smaller now, while total output of coal has gone up. The impact on social and economic realities in the mining

communities is dramatic and quite often tragic. These have become known as the "poverty regions of Appalachia" stretching up and down the eastern part of the U.S. They are a living indictment of a social system based on the principle of profit "which takes all away and restores nothing."

The displacement of miners by automation has had an especially serious effect among Black miners. It is in a large degree their jobs which have been eliminated by technological advance, and today in West Virginia they account for less than 2 per cent of working miners. And now that the industry is on the upgrade and miners are being trained to handle the new equipment, they are being bypassed. At the same time, there are no Black miners in positions of top leadership in the UMWA, although there are a substantial number holding local posts. The fight for jobs and leadership positions for Black miners is vital to the interests of all miners in the fight against the effects of automation.

The United Mine Workers

In many respects the role of the miners' union has been a challenging one. Since its formation in 1890 it had consistently waged militant struggles for the needs of the miners. Beyond that, in the 30's it provided the drive and initiative in the campaigns to organize the basic industries of the country. The degree of support given to John L. Lewis during the years of his presidency from 1920 to 1960 was directly related to his readiness to fight the coal operators, and was given despite his imposition of dictatorial, bureaucratic methods in the conduct of inner union affairs.

This course came to an abrupt end after 1950. Since that time, a period of twenty years, not a single national strike has been called by the top union leadership. This fact becomes even more glaring since this was a period of large-scale introduction of mechanization into the mines, with all the consequences this entailed for the miners. This policy was in sharp contrast to that of the period immediately preceding 1950 when some dozen national strikes took place in a period of about fifteen years.

The 1950 contract signed with the operators opened up an entirely new course completely at variance with the union's past militant history. In exchange for a 30 cents a ton royalty (raised to 40 cents in 1952), paid by the operators into the miners' Health and Welfare Fund, the mine owners were given a free hand to mechanize coal production. Lewis, in fact, deliberately encouraged such technological

changes while at the same time abdicating responsibility for protecting the miners' jobs and their health. These actions roughly coincided with the onset of the takeover by the giant corporations in the coal industry, a situation calling for even greater effort and militancy of the miners and their union.

This period witnessed an intensification of the problems of health and safety, a rise in the number of mine disasters, and elimination of a major part of the work force. All this had a severe impact on the mining communities. But now the militancy of the miners found expression only in rank-and-file "wildcat" strikes which the union leaders helped suppress, punishing those leading them. They were isolated, localized actions lacking any national cohesion and were systematically smothered.

Nor was it an accident that it was in the 50's, a period of rampaging McCarthyism, that the role of the Left in the coal areas was almost obliterated. Traditionally, the Left has provided the initiative and programs of action. The red-baiting campaigns to destroy the Left and progressive forces were deliberate and continue to this day. It is now widely recognized what harm this brought and that it was a major contributing factor to the stagnation of twenty years in the union.

The recent mine disaster at Farmington, West Virginia, in which 78 miners died (they are still entombed in the mine) was the tragic spark that ignited anew the explosive militancy of the miners. A powerful movement shaped up in West Virginia for the passage of a bill in the legislature to make "black lung" compensable, and to force passage of a federal Mine Safety Law by the U.S. Congress. Failure of the top leadership to take part in these vital struggles further widened the scope of opposition to the passivity and the collusive policies of the Boyle leadership.

This rank-and-file movement in West Virginia began to find support from other segments of the people—from organized labor, college students and faculty members, and a group of medical men headed by Dr. I. E. Buff. There developed a new militant role of miners' wives and support grew even among some political figures. Thus, the rudiments of a people's coalition began emerging at whose core were the coal miners themselves. The fight against environmental destruction in Appalachia found support in the national movement on ecology.

The cumulative effect of these developments spilled over and made its impact in the election campaign for the top officers of the UMWA. Joseph Yablonski challenged Boyle for the presidency

—the first such direct challenge in forty years. Yablonski did not win, and his assassination on December 31, 1969 together with his wife and daughter deepened the anger of the miners. It removed a forceful leader around whom the new militant movements of the membership could rally.

The Tasks Ahead

The dimensions of the problem the miners now face emerge even from this brief resume. They are problems of automation and its consequences for job security, of mine safety, of poverty intensified by mass elimination of miners from jobs, of environmental destruction, of ghost towns. They are problems of survival of people and of communities in which they live.

In a basic sense they can no longer be approached in a piecemeal localized fashion. They are essentially national problems demanding national programs for their solutions. Neither the profit-grabbing corporations nor the government they control feel any deep compulsion to provide solutions. That is a consequence of private ownership of the means of production by a small class bent on the extraction of maximum profits.

The need for public ownership of the coal industry has been becoming evident for some time. Nationalization in which democratic control is assured, in which the miners have guaranteed rights and take part directly in the administration of the industry, must become a goal for the democratic forces in this nation.

In the interim there are actions and programs that can and must be undertaken immediately. First among these is mine safety; lives of workers must be placed above profits at all times. The Mine Safety Law will gather cobwebs on the statute books unless its implementation is fought for by mass pressures. The big companies have already notified the Department of the Interior that they will not comply with its provisions. But they can be forced to do so if the miners and their allies move swiftly and decisively.

Next is the issue of the shorter work week—of a thirty-hour week with no cut in pay. Rising automation, increasing productivity, new technology must bring benefits first of all to the men who work in the mines. It is one way of protecting the miners' jobs and lives. It is well known that most accidents take place in the last two hours of a work day. The thirty-hour week should be high on the agenda of future demands.

A new, up-to-date contract is now urgently needed. The present

contract was adopted in 1941. Since then modifications and amendments have resulted in an agreement that no miner understands. It is a lawyers' instrument out of reach and understanding of the men in the mines. The changes in the industry now make a new contract essential.

It is vital to organize the unorganized. Some 30 per cent of all coal mined is produced under non-union conditions. Most of the non-union mines are operated by the big public utility companies. A dynamic organizing drive, involving the entire membership, will revitalize the entire union.

A fight must be made for union democracy. This has become a burning issue especially now. A revitalization of the democratic union procedures will have a powerful effect in uniting the entire membership. Election of all officers, and rank-and-file control of union policies on all matters are key elements of such democratization.

Electoral activity must be developed. To protect legislative gains and to push ahead for further improvements vital to miners' health and safety requires participation in independent political activity. This was amply demonstrated during the past year in state and national legislative bodies. Election of coal miners to legislative bodies at all levels is needed. There can be no reliance on the representatives of the corporations in the government.

Success in these efforts makes mandatory that the miners establish cooperation with all other sections of organized labor. Independent political activity of all working people is the instrument that can help curb the power of the giant monopolies that dominate the economic and political life in our country. A people's coalition can bring about a change in national priorities in which real steps will be undertaken to master the problems that now plague us; to alleviate poverty, reduce taxes on working people, control pollution and destruction of national resources.

The UMWA can no longer afford to be isolated from the rest of organized labor. Labor unity on a good fighting program can bring lasting benefits to the working people who create the wealth of our country.

In this sense it is an urgent national task to put an end to the brutal slaughter in Asia and elsewhere and to utilize the untold wealth wasted in imperialist aggressions for the improvement of the conditions of the people here at home.

Finally, it is important to popularize among coal miners the conditions enjoyed by miners in the socialist countries. There the health

and safety of miners are properly safeguarded instead of being sacrificed on the altar of profit. There miners are especially well paid and are given shorter hours of work than other workers, and the introduction of new, more efficient machinery serves to reduce their hours still further. There miners can retire at an early age on an adequate pension. There coal mining is not allowed to destroy the countryside and to wreck communities. In few areas is the difference between capitalism and socialism so striking as in mining. The realization of this among U.S. miners will help powerfully to build the movement for socialism here.

While large numbers of Afro-Americans, especially workers, are taking part in the demonstrative actions [against the invasion of Cambodia], it is necessary to continue pressing for special approaches, for special efforts, in this area. . . .

Special efforts are necessary because there are special problems. For the Black community, the war and its escalation is a serious *additional* matter, additional to the escalation of the racist oppression at home. There is murder in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos; and there is murder and hunger in Mississippi, Alabama and Georgia, in Chicago and Los Angeles, and in ghettos throughout the U.S.A.

The Black community is not going to trust or work with peace committees who, for the purpose of show, invite some way-out Black speaker who in most cases represents no one.

There has to be a struggle for a new approach, a new attitude, by those in the leadership of the peace movement. It is necessary to cleanse from its ranks the chauvinism dressed in "Left" radical phrases. In the Black community the most effective leadership is that which can show the interrelationship between racism, imperialist aggression and capitalist profits. In the white community the most effective leadership is that which convinces the community that the struggle against racism is essential to the struggle against the policies of imperialism and reaction.

Gus, Hall, *Our Country in Crisis—The People Must Act!*, New Outlook Publishers, June 1970, pp. 18-19.

A Basic Program for People's Unity*

A New Social Structure: The People's State

A new structure of power will be built from the bottom up, by means of a process of democratization on all levels, and through the organized mobilization of the masses.

A new political constitution will bring about the massive incorporation of the people into state power.

A single organization of the State will be created, built on national, regional and local levels, whose highest organ of power will be a People's Assembly.

The People's Assembly will be the sole legislative body expressing the people's sovereignty nationally. There, the different currents of opinion will come together and find expression.

This system will make it possible to end completely the twin vices of presidential dictatorship and corrupt parliamentarism in Chile.

Specific standards will determine and coordinate the duties and responsibilities of the President of the Republic, the ministers, People's Assembly, regional and local organs of power and the political parties, in order to insure effective legislation, efficient government and above all, respect for the will of the majority.

In order to establish the necessary harmony between the powers that come from the people, and, so that their will may be clearly expressed, all elections will be held simultaneously and at the same intervals.

The formation of every organ of popular representation must be carried out by universal suffrage, secret and direct, of men and women over 18 years of age, civilians and military, literate and illiterate.

The members of the People's Assembly and of all bodies representing the people will be subject to control by the electors, by means of a consultative apparatus that can effect their recall.

A rigorous system of review will be established that will lead to recall or removal from office of any deputy or public official revealed as a spokesman for private interests.

The State's instruments of economic and social policy shall constitute a national planning system, executive in character, with the function of directing, coordinating and rationalizing state activity. Their

* This is the concluding part of the program of common action adopted December 17, 1969, by the Communist, Socialist, Radical and Social Democratic Parties and by the Movement for United People's Action (API) in Chile. The first part appeared in the May issue. The translation from the Spanish is by Patricia Bell.

plans will be subject to approval by the People's Assembly. Workers' organizations will participate decisively in the planning process.

Regional and local organs of the People's State will govern in their given areas, and will have economic, political and social authority. They will, moreover, be empowered to initiate measures and carry out criticism of higher bodies.

However, the regional and local bodies must exercise their authority within the limits fixed by the laws of the nation and by the general plans for economic and social development.

Mass organizations with specific aims will be involved on every level of the People's State. They will have the task of developing initiatives and sharing responsibilities in their respective fields of action, as well as examining and resolving problems within their sphere. This function will not in any way limit the complete independence and autonomy of these organizations.

From the very day it takes power, the People's Government will open up such channels of communication as to insure that the influence of the workers and the masses are brought to bear on the making of decisions and in the functioning of state administration.

These will be decisive steps toward liquidating the bureaucratic centralism that characterizes the present system of administration.

The Organization of Justice

The organization and administration of justice must be founded on the principles of autonomy, dedication to the Constitution and genuine economic independence.

We project the idea of a Supreme Tribunal, whose members would be chosen by the People's Assembly with no other qualification than their innate capacity to serve. This tribunal would freely organize the judicial system, administered by either judges or by panels.

The new organization and administration of justice will come into being in support of the classes that are in the majority, and will, moreover, be expeditious and less burdensome.

In the People's Government, a new concept of the judiciary will replace the present individualistic and bourgeois practices.

National Defense

The People's State will give preferred attention to protecting national sovereignty, which it considers to be the duty of the whole people.

The People's State will maintain an alert stance towards threats to its territorial integrity and to its independence, threats encouraged by imperialism and by oligarchies enthroned in neighboring countries that, along with repressing their own people, encourage expansionist and revanchist ambitions.

It will define a modern, patriotic and people's concept of the sovereignty of the nation, based on the following criteria:

a) National verification of all branches of the armed forces. Rejection of their employment for any type of suppression of the people or in the interest of any foreign power.

b) Public technical development of all contributions of modern military science, in accordance with the requirements of Chile, for national independence, peace and friendship among peoples.

c) Involvement of the Armed Forces in various aspects of the life of society. The People's State will endeavor to make possible the participation of the Armed Forces in the economic development of the country, without interfering with its main task of defense of sovereignty.

On this basis, it is necessary to insure the Armed Forces material and technical means and a just and democratic system of pay, promotions and pensions that will guarantee economic security to officers, non-commissioned officers and enlisted men during their period of service and in retirement, and the possibility of promotion for all, depending solely on their personal conduct.

Building The New Economy

The united people's forces seek as the central aim of their policy the replacement of the present economic structure, ending the power of national and foreign monopoly capital and of the large landowners, in order to begin the construction of socialism.

Planning will play the leading role in the new economy. Its central bodies will be on the highest administrative level and its decisions, democratically arrived at, will carry executive weight.

Area of social property

The process of transformation of our economy will begin with a policy directed toward creating a predominant state sector, composed of industries owned by the State at present, together with expropriated industries.

As a first measure, the basic resources will be nationalized, such as

the great copper, iron, nitrate and other mines now in the hands of foreign capital and domestic monopolies.

Thus, this sector of nationalized operations will include the following:

1. The great copper, potash, iodine, iron and coal mines.
2. The financial system of the country, especially private banks and insurance companies.
3. Foreign commerce.
4. Large factories and distributive monopolies.
5. Strategic industrial monopolies.
6. In general, those fields that influence the economic and social development of the country, such as production and distribution of electrical energy; railroad, air and sea transportation; communications; the production, refining and distribution of oil and its derivatives, including liquid gas; metallurgy, cement, petrochemicals and heavy chemicals, cellulose, paper.

All of these expropriations will be made with full regard for the interest of the small shareholder.

The Area of Private Property

This sector comprises those areas of industry, mining, agriculture and services in which private property in the means of production remains in force.

This will include the largest number of enterprises. For example, in 1967, of 30,500 industries (including handicrafts), only some 150 held monopoly control over all markets, taking state subsidies and bank credit and exploiting the rest of the industrial enterprises of the country, by selling them raw materials at a high cost and buying their products cheaply.

The industries that compose this private sector will be helped by national overall economic planning.

The State will secure the necessary financial and technical assistance for the industries of this sector, in order that they may be enabled to carry out the important function they play in the national economy, giving attention to the number of persons who work in them, as well as to the volume of their production.

Moreover, the system of obtaining patents will be simplified for these enterprises, as well as the customs duties, taxes and fees, and they will be assured a sufficient and fair market for their products.

In these industries, the right of workers and salaried employees to fair wages and working conditions must be guaranteed. Respect for

these rights will be protected by the State and by the workers of the particular enterprise.

Mixed Area

This sector will be mixed because it will be composed of enterprises that combine both State and private capital. Loans or credit extended to industries in this area by development agencies could be made in such a way as to make the State a partner instead of a creditor. The same arrangement could be made in cases where the State or its institutions provide security for loans to these enterprises.

Deepening and Extending Agrarian Reform

Agrarian reform is seen as a process to be carried out simultaneously with, and complementing the general transformations to be carried out in the political, social and economic structure of the country. Its fulfillment is inseparable from the rest of this overall policy. The already existing experience in this matter, and the evidences of weaknesses and instability that can be deduced from it, lead us to reformulate the policy of distribution and organization of land, based on the following directives:

1. Speed up the process of agrarian reform, expropriating landed property that exceeds the maximum established limits to be set according to conditions in the different zones, including orchards, vineyards and woods, without giving the owner a choice of what he shall reserve. Expropriation may include all or part of the assets on the given property, (machinery, tools, animals, etc.).

2. Immediate cultivation of abandoned or badly developed state land.

3. Preferably, the expropriated land will be organized in the form of cooperatives. Farmers will have title to the house and garden assigned to them and will hold title to their corresponding rights in the indivisible cooperative land.

When conditions permit, land will be assigned as personal property to farmers, encouraging the organization of work and marketing on a basis of mutual cooperation.

Lands will also be assigned for the development of state farms with the most modern technology.

4. In authorized cases land will be assigned to small farmers, sharecroppers and agricultural laborers who are qualified farmers.

5. Reorganization of small plots by means of increasingly coopera-

tive forms of agriculture.

6. Extending to small and middle farmers the advantages and services of cooperative functioning in their area.

7. The integrity of indigenous communities threatened by take-over must be defended, and their democratic direction protected and broadened. The Mapuchis and other indigenous peoples shall be insured sufficient land, technical help and credit.

Policy of Economic Development

The economic policy of the State will be carried forward by means of a nationwide system of economic planning by the exercise of control, orientation, extension of credit to manufacturers, technical assistance, tax policy, and foreign trade, as well as through the efforts of the state sector of the economy itself. Its objectives will be:

1. To solve the immediate problems of the great majority. To do this, the productive capacity of the country will be turned from the production of superfluous and expensive articles destined to satisfy the rich to the production of articles of popular consumption that are inexpensive and of good quality.

2. To guarantee employment to all Chileans of working age at a fair rate of pay. This will mean drawing up a plan to generate a vast number of jobs, making adequate use of the resources of the country and adapting technology to the demands of national development.

3. To free Chile from subordination by foreign capital. This will entail expropriation of imperialist capital, and carrying out a policy of increasing self-sustaining activities, fixing the conditions under which unexpropriated capital may operate, to achieve greater independence in technology, foreign transport, etc.

4. To insure rapid decentralized economic growth, leading to the maximum development of the productive forces, and procuring the optimum utilization of available human, natural, financial and technical resources, in order to increase the productivity of labor and to satisfy the need for independent development of the economy, as well as to satisfy the needs and desires of the working population compatible with a humane and worthwhile life.

5. To carry out a foreign trade policy directed toward increasing and diversifying our exports, opening new markets, and achieving growing technical and financial independence in order to prevent disastrous devaluations of our currency.

6. To take every measure to stabilize our currency. The struggle against inflation will be resolved essentially by the structural changes outlined. They must, however, include measures that will supply a

sufficient flow of currency to serve the needs of the market, control and redistribute credit and prevent usury in the exchange of money. Distribution and trade must be rationalized, and prices controlled. The structure of demand power resulting from high profits must be prevented from causing a rise in prices.

The guarantee of the fulfillment of these aims rests on control over political and economic power exercised by the organized people, expressed in the state sector of the economy and in its overall planning. Only the power of the people will insure the fulfillment of the tasks outlined.

Social Tasks

The social aspirations of the Chilean people are legitimate and can be satisfied. They want, for example, decent homes without rent increases that eat up their incomes, schools and universities for their children, adequate wages, an end once and for all to the rise in prices, steady work, medical attention when needed, public lighting and sewer systems, safe drinking water, paved streets and walks, social insurance applied without special privilege that will be fair and workable. They want no more starvation doles. They want telephones, police protection, playgrounds, athletic fields, beach and vacation facilities that will be available to all.

The satisfaction of these just desires—which really are rights that society must recognize—will be given priority by the People's Government.

Basic points in this government program will be:

1. The establishment of a policy on wages, proceeding to create immediately agencies which, with the participation of the workers, will determine the levels of living wages and minimum salaries in the different parts of the country.

While inflation lasts, automatic adjustment of wages to rises in the cost of living shall be provided by law. Such adjustments shall take place every six months or each time that the cost of living shall have increased five per cent.

In all government departments, especially in leading executive positions, salaries shall be limited to a figure compatible with remuneration elsewhere in the country.

As soon as the technical problems involved permit, a system of minimum wages and salaries shall be established, whereby equal work will command equal pay, whatever the industry in which the work is performed. This policy shall be initiated in state employment, and from there extended to the entire economy, unaffected by differ-

ences in productivity among different enterprises. Wage discrimination due to sex or age shall cease.

2. The social security system must be unified, improved and extended, preserving the gains already made, eliminating abusive privileges, inefficiency and bureaucracy, speeding up attention to the needs of beneficiaries, extending protection to workers not now covered, and placing the administration in the hands of the recipients, to be run according to the standards set by the plan.

3. Assure to every Chilean medical and dental attention, both preventive and curative, paid for by the State, the employers, and the social security institutions. The whole population will be enlisted for the job of protecting public health. Medicine will be adequately supplied at low prices, through strict control of cost in the laboratories, together with the rationalization of production.

4. Sufficient funds shall be allocated to launch an adequate housing program. By developing housing construction along industrial lines, prices will be brought under control, and the profits of private or mixed enterprises which operate in this area will be limited. In emergency situations, property shall be assigned to families in need of it, and technical and material aid extended to provide them with homes.

The goal of the housing policy of the People's Government shall be to make every family owner of its own dwelling. The system of increasing rents will be eliminated. Monthly payments for home purchase or lease will not exceed, as a general rule, ten per cent of the family income.

The People's Government will advance urban renewal, in order to slow down the flight of low-income groups to the outskirts of cities, guarantee the interests of those living in the remodeled neighborhoods, and of the small businessmen who operate there, and assure the occupants of living space in the future.

5. Full civil rights for married women shall be established, as well as equal rights of all children born in or out of wedlock, and an adequate divorce law fully protecting the interests of women and children.

6. The legal distinction between laborers and white collar workers shall be abolished, establishing for both the common status of workers, and extending to all the right of union organization.

Culture and Education

A New Culture for Our Society

The social process that begins with the people's victory will bring in a new culture, oriented to consider human labor as the supreme value, to express the will for national independence and integrity,

and to achieve a critical concept of reality.

The profound transformations to be undertaken require a socially conscious and united people, educated to exercise and defend political power, scientifically and technically prepared to develop the economy of the transition to socialism, intensely ready to create and enjoy the most varied expressions of art and intellect.

If already today the majority of intellectuals and artists struggle against the cultural distortions characteristic of capitalist society, and try to reach the workers with the fruits of their creation and to link themselves with the historic destiny of labor, in the new society they will occupy a vanguard role from which to continue their activity. Because the new culture will not be created by decree, it will rise from the struggle for the idea of brotherhood against that of individualism, for recognition of the worth of human labor against its detractors, for the national heritage against cultural colonization, for the access of the popular masses to art, literature and to the communications media, and against their commercialization.

The new State will seek to involve the masses in intellectual and artistic activity, as much through a radically transformed educational system as through the establishment of a national system of people's culture. A wide network of local centers of people's culture will give impetus to the organization of the masses to exercise their right to culture.

The system of people's culture will stimulate literary and artistic creation and multiply the channels that connect artists and writers to an infinitely larger public than at present.

A Democratic, Unified and Planned Educational System

The new government will be oriented toward supplying the broadest and best educational opportunities.

The general improvement of the condition of the workers will have an important bearing on the success of these plans, as will the study, in their own field, of the responsibilities of educators. In addition, a national Scholarship Plan will be established, sufficiently broad to insure participation and continuation of attendance to all Chilean children, especially to the children of workers and peasants.

The new State will also develop an extensive plan of building schools, supported by national and local funds mobilized by the basic organs of power. Buildings needed to establish new day schools and boarding schools will be expropriated. By these means, there will be established at least one unified school (elementary and middle) in every rural community and in every part of the cities of Chile.

In order to provide for the necessary development of preschool children, and to enable women to take part in productive labor, a system of nursery schools and kindergartens will be rapidly initiated, giving priority to the most needy sectors of our society. By means of this policy, the children of workers and peasants will be better prepared to enter into and benefit from the regular school system.

To make the new education effective, methods that put emphasis on the active and critical participation of the students in the educational process must be applied, instead of the passive and conformist attitude they are required to maintain today.

So that cultural and educational deficiencies inherited from the present system may be eliminated as quickly as possible, a wide mobilization of the people will take place, designed to do away with illiteracy in the shortest period and to raise the educational level of the adult population.

Adult education will be chiefly a function of workers' centers, so as to make general, technical and social education permanently available to all workers.

The transformation of the educational system will not be the work of specialists only, but a task to be studied, discussed, decided and executed by the organizations of teachers, workers, students, parents and responsible authorities, within the general compass of national planning. Internally, the school system will be planned in accord with the principles of unity of learning and its continuity, correlation and diversification.

The community organizations already mentioned will play an important part in the executive direction of the educational apparatus through local, regional and national Educational Councils.

With the object of achieving planned education, and a unified, national and democratic school system, the new State will take private establishments into its charge, beginning with those that select their students on the basis of social class, national origin or religious affiliation. This will be carried out by integrating into the educational system the personnel and other facilities of private education.

Physical Education

Physical education and all sports activity, in the basic levels of the educational system and in all social and youth organizations, will be the constant and systematic concern of the People's Government.

Democratization, Autonomy and Orientation of the University

The United People's Government will give full support to the

process of university reform and lend resolute help to its development.

The democratic fulfillment of this process will be reflected in important contributions of the universities to the revolutionary development of Chile. On the other hand, the reorientation of the academic functions of the faculties, and the extension of their functions in the sphere of national problems will be advanced by the accomplishments of the People's Government.

The State will assign to the universities sufficient resources to insure secularization and democratization. Consequently, the university administrations will respond to the needs of their respective communities.

To the extent that the entire educational system eliminates class privileges, the entrance of workers' sons to the universities will become possible and adults will also be permitted to enter courses of higher learning, either through special scholarships or through systems of simultaneous work and study.

Mass Media

The means of communication, such as radio, book publishing, television, newspapers, and movies are fundamental to the formation of a new culture and a new man. For this reason, it is necessary to imbue them with an educational orientation and free them of their commercial character, adopting means by which community organizations may make use of these media and do away with the evil presence of the monopolies.

The national system of people's culture will concern itself especially with the development of the moving picture industry and with the preparation of special programs for the mass media.

Foreign Policy of the Peoples' Government

Objectives

The foreign policy of the People's Government will be aimed at:

Affirming the full political and economic independence of Chile;

Maintaining relations with all the countries of the world, regardless of their political and ideological position, on the basis of respect for self-determination and the interests of the people of Chile.

Ties of friendship and solidarity will be established with independent or colonized peoples, especially with those developing their struggle for liberation and independence.

A strong feeling of Latin American and anti-imperialist solidarity will be promoted, by means of a foreign policy directed toward peoples rather than governments.

Resolute defense of self-determination of peoples will be given impetus by the new Government as a basic condition of international coexistence.

Consequently, its policy will be vigilant and active in the defense of the principle of non-intervention and in rejecting all attempts at discrimination, pressure, invasion, or blockade by the imperialist countries.

Relations with socialist countries, exchanges and friendship, will be reinforced.

Greater National Independence

The position of active defense of the independence of Chile implies denunciation of the present Organization of American States, as an instrument and agent of North American imperialism, and a struggle against all forms of Pan-Americanism promoted by this organization. The People's Government will look toward creation of a truly representative body of Latin American countries.

It will be indispensable to revise, denounce or cancel, according to the particular case, all treaties or agreements that limit our sovereignty, and specifically all treaties of reciprocal aid, mutual help and other pacts which Chile has signed with the U.S.

Monetary help and loans granted for political reasons, or that imply forced sale of investments as a result of these loans, under conditions that violate our sovereignty and go against the interest of the people, will be rejected and denounced by the Government.

Similarly, all types of investments involving Latin American raw materials, such as copper, will be rejected, as will be obstacles put in the way of free trade that have for many years prevented the establishment of collective commercial relations with all the countries of the world.

International Solidarity

The struggles being waged for national liberation and for the building of socialism will receive the effective and militant support of the People's Government.

All forms of colonialism or neo-colonialism will be condemned, and the right to rebellion of all peoples subjected to these systems will be recognized. Similarly, we shall condemn all forms of economic, political or military aggression provoked by the imperialist powers.

In its foreign policy, Chile must maintain a position of condemnation of North American aggression in Vietnam, and of recognition and active solidarity with the struggle of the heroic people of Vietnam.

In the same manner, we shall join in solidarity with the Cuban Revolution, advance guard of the revolution and the building of socialism on the Latin American continent.

The anti-imperialist struggles of the people of the Middle East will also receive the solidarity of the People's Government, which will support the search for a peaceful solution on the basis of the interests of both the Arab and Jewish peoples.

All reactionary regimes that practice racial segregation and anti-Semitism will be condemned.

Latin American Policy

In the Latin American field the People's Government will project a foreign policy affirming the Latin American identity in the world order.

Latin American integration must be based on economies that have freed themselves from imperialist dependence and exploitation. Nevertheless, an active policy of bilateral agreements will be maintained in those matters of interest to the development of Chile.

The People's Government will act to resolve pending border disputes on the basis of negotiations that will exclude the intrigues of imperialists and reactionaries, keeping in mind the interests of Chile and of the peoples of bordering countries.

Chile's foreign policy and its diplomatic expression must break with all types of bureaucracy and rigidity. It is necessary to approach other peoples with the double aim of taking lessons from their struggles for our own socialist construction and sharing our experiences with them so that the international solidarity we fight for can be built.

HERBERT APTHEKER

The Nixon Administration: Liars Incarnate

Exactly eight years ago, in this magazine, we wrote:

The United States government, quite illegally and altogether by-passing any effort to ascertain American public opinion—let alone world public opinion—has embarked upon this frightful and barbarous effort to repress the heroic struggles of a long-suffering people eager for liberation and a decent life. The United States is today doing in South Vietnam what the “butcher Weyler” did in Cuba in the 1890’s at the behest of the Spanish monarchy; what Americans did in the Philippines from 1899 to 1903; what the Germans did in the Ukraine in the 1940’s; what the French did in Indo-China in the 1950’s and in Algeria later in the 1950’s and until only yesterday. In every case the harvest was immense suffering and unforgettable bitterness; it brought glory to none and travail to all. Persistence in the present murderous United States policy in South Vietnam will have the same harvest for our Government and our people. (*Political Affairs*, July, 1962, pp. 28-29.)

Would we had been mistaken!

Professor Hans J. Morgenthau rightly complained some time ago in the *New Republic* (October 28, 1967) that “deception [by the U.S. government] is being practiced not occasionally as a painful necessity dictated by reason of state, but consistently as a kind of light-hearted sport through which the deceiver enjoys his power.” But *why* that government pursues that “sport” was not elucidated by Morgenthau.

The “sport” has been indulged in with abandon by the U.S. government ever since the end of World War II; under Nixon one observes a kind of psychotic fury in the practice. The entire post-1945 foreign policy of the United States government has been based upon lie after lie because it is a policy in the service of an obsolete and therefore regressive social system—imperialism, in an advanced stage of decay. A regressive social system adopts a repressive domestic and an aggressive foreign policy; both require a facade of prevarication and this is especially true in this country with its significant democratic and equalitarian and revolutionary traditions, entangled

as they have simultaneously been in the most blatant racism and the most parasitic economic foundations.

Especially since the end of World War II, the United States has sought to replace *Pax Britannica* with *Pax Americana*; but this is the 20th century, not the 18th and not the 19th. This is the century not of Disraeli and Bismarck, but of Lenin and Du Bois. This is the century of the demise of colonialism and of capitalism and the victory of national liberation and of socialism. It must be the century simply of *Pax*; a peace of, by and for humanity and not a spurious “peace” imposed by one fraction of the human race upon the vast majority of people—a “peace” marked by impoverishment, torture and slaughter for most and affluence for a metropolitan elite.

Because the social system of the United States is obsolescent, the foreign policy pursued by its rulers moves from disaster to catastrophe, despite the nation’s might and wealth. This is why the United States—which is not a “pitiful giant” but is rather a land ravished by its murderous misleaders—after 25 years of napalming the tormented earth from Greece to Cambodia, and after NATO and CENTO and SEATO, finds itself without allies and with only a handful of bought-and-paid-for clients.

The Lies About Indo-China

George McT. Kahin, Professor of Government and Director of the Southern Asia Program at Cornell University, stated at the Congressional Conference on the Military Budget and National Priorities held in Washington in March, 1969, that most of the American people “have been led by Alice through Wonderland for so long now that it is difficult for them to perceive the reality on this side of the mirror” concerning “the political facts of life in Vietnam.” He went on to enumerate the four main “myths,” as he called them, which have been fed to the American people by the dominant political parties and means of communication for the past decade; namely, “the allegation that what is basically a civil war is a case of outside aggression; that an unpopular and narrowly based military oligarchy in Saigon enlists the support of a majority of the South Vietnamese people; and that the National Liberation Front is a puppet of Hanoi without significant popular backing in South Vietnam”; and that it was Washington which, “in contravention of the Geneva Accords, helped to create and sustain a separate South Vietnamese state, and we who chose the leadership of that state that in turn invited us in to protect it.”*

* In Erwin Knoll and Judith McFadden, eds., *American Militarism, 1970*, Viking Press, New York, pp. 50-51; this book contains the proceedings of that conference as a whole and is illuminating.

Professor Kahin, in this same paper, made public certain facts that are unknown to 95 per cent of the American people but are vital for a comprehension of events in Asia. Thus, he noted that the military influence of Nationalist China (financed by the United States, of course) remains significant in Burma and in Laos, and that in northern Thailand "around 1,200 square miles of territory are now under the *de facto* administration of Kuomintang troops." He reported also on "the United States' decision to transport large numbers of Cambodian South Vietnamese, trained with our special forces and with the South Vietnamese army, across Cambodia to the Thailand frontier where they regularly mount incursions into Cambodian territory." The reader is reminded that Professor Kahin is talking in March, 1969—over a year before Nixon announced an *incursion* into Cambodia.

It was also in March, 1969 that the United States, having finally halted—or, better, interrupted—the bombing of North Vietnam, diverted its planes to the bombing of Laos; then, as Richard Fernandez—Director of Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, who visited Laos and North Vietnam in April, 1970—reports, "the saturation bombing of primarily civilian targets began" with the sorties amounting to 1,500 per month. As the Reverend Mr. Fernandez states,* this "was one of the most serious escalations since the war began" and it "was not occasioned by an upsurge of Pathet Lao military operations." It was provocatively and aggressively—and secretly—undertaken by the United States government, which lied about this to the American people.

It was only in June, 1970, that the American people were finally told of action secretly taken back in 1962 in connection with Laos—whose neutrality was supposed to be binding upon Washington. Dr. John A. Hannah, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, admitted, as the Associated Press stated, "that the United States aid program was being used as a cover for operations of the Central Intelligence Agency in Laos." There is special irony here since Dr. Hannah was president of Michigan State University when it became known in 1967 that one of the "scholarly" enterprises ostensibly sponsored by that University actually had operated in South Vietnam from 1955 to 1959 as an adjunct of the C.I.A.!

The same day that this disclosure was made there was finally made public testimony taken back in November, 1969 before a

* Richard Fernandez, "Escalation in Laos," *Christianity and Crisis*, May 25, 1970, p. 118.

subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which disclosed that a secret agreement had been entered into by Washington and Bangkok in 1967. This provided that the United States would supply Thailand 50 million dollars a year for sending a division of combat troops into South Vietnam, that the United States would also increase its military assistance program to Thailand by \$30 million annually and that it would supply that country with a battery of Hawk anti-aircraft missiles. When rumors of this deal gained some currency, the Thai Foreign Minister, on December 16, 1969, said: "There has been no payment from the United States to induce Thailand to send its armed forces to help South Vietnam defend itself against Communist aggression"! Needless to say, not only were the people of the United States told nothing of this deal with the sadistic Thai government—after all, it was only their money that was being given that government—but the Congress of the United States knew nothing of the deal and this includes the Senate which is supposed, under the Constitution, not only to advise the President in questions of foreign policy but is also supposed to ratify all treaties entered into by the United States.

The Gulf of Tonkin Hoax

In a way, the daddy of all U.S. governmental lies about Southeast Asia—or, at least, the daddy of the current crop of such lies—goes back to the Gulf of Tonkin affair. It is on the basis of the alleged attack upon U.S. naval vessels by ships of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, that the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, demanded by President Johnson, was adopted by the U.S. Senate back in the summer of 1964. It was with this Resolution—empowering the President to take whatever action he thought necessary to protect the United States from foreign aggression in that part of the world—that Johnson justified his massive bombing of North Vietnam and his pouring of hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops into combat in South Vietnam.

At the time of the alleged "attack" in the Gulf of Tonkin, there were only 16,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam and Johnson was campaigning for the Presidency with such pledges as: "We are not going to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."

But we now have a full and careful study of this affair by the well-known Washington correspondent, Joseph C. Goulden.* His study shows that the affair represents "a medley of misrepresenta-

* J. C. Goulden, *Truth Is The First Casualty: The Gulf of Tonkin Affair* (Rand McNally, New York, 1969).

tions, contradictions, and half-truths" (p. 242); that the Administration's account of it to Congress was "mendacious and misleading—and deliberately so" (p. 19); that there were several deceptions, namely, "a deception of the Congress and the American people . . . a deception of the Johnson Administration by the military . . . and a deception of the Johnson Administration by itself, in its overeager acceptance of unconfirmed field reports as justification for a grave act of war" (p. 239).

Some months after he had the Resolution he wanted in his pocket, President Johnson privately admitted: "For all I know, our Navy was shooting at whales out there" (p. 160).

On August 2, 1964 the first shots fired were by the U.S. naval vessel, *Maddox*; on August 4, the only firing was done by U.S. vessels and aircraft and they were firing at nothing. The *Maddox* was not an ordinary naval vessel, as McNamara lyingly testified, but a highly complex spy-ship; it was not thirty to sixty miles off the coast of North Vietnam as Washington insisted but came as close as two or three miles; the patrolling was not routine in any case—even as intelligence work—for the vessels were also being used as decoys for attacks upon the coast of North Vietnam then being carried out by South Vietnamese vessels (lately "sold" to Saigon by Washington). The Goulden book establishes all this without question; yet the story told the United States public and Congress was the opposite and was nothing but a provocative set of lies. (It is worth adding that the Goulden book confirms in every detail the statements made by the North Vietnamese government; throughout one finds in U.S. sources confirmation—finally—of the general accuracy of statements from Hanoi.)*

Senator Fulbright, in a very recent article, has summarized the more glaring examples of deception practiced by Washington, commencing with the Gulf of Tonkin affair, with these words (*The Progressive*, June, 1970, p. 17):

We were deceived about the Gulf of Tonkin in 1964; we were deceived about the Dominican Republic in 1965; and, as a special subcommittee headed by Senator Stuart Symington has shown, we have been deliberately and systematically deceived over the past several years about the extent of military involvement in Laos. Now, by invading Cambodia and re-escalating the war without notice or authorization, the Executive has deceived the

* While the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, under Fulbright, brought out much of this reality it halted the hearings very abruptly and did not press the inquiry to a conclusion and did not call all witnesses. The full story seemed too painful and too harmful—politically—even for Fulbright.

Congress and the country once again, with consequences that cannot easily be foreseen. The term "credibility gap" is a tame euphemism for the practices to which it refers.

Nixon's Lies About Cambodia

On December 8, 1969, President Nixon said that "the people of the United States are entitled to know everything that they possibly can with regard to any involvement of the United States abroad." It was generous of him to admit that we have the rights that we do have; I did not know that their existence depended upon his acknowledgement of them. Those rights in fact are not "granted" by any President of the United States—let alone the likes of Nixon—and he is mistaken if he thinks he may grant them. When he prevents such knowledge and when he purveys false information and when he deliberately lies he is guilty, of course, of crimes. It must be confessed, however, that mere persistent falsification is among the least of the crimes that bespatter this Nixon.

Specifically, now on Cambodia. First, as Professor Kahin stated, active military interference in Cambodia by the United States commenced in late 1969; at that time serious "incursions" began. And we now know that in the Spring of 1969, Henry Kissinger successfully urged upon Nixon the idea of bombing alleged "communist bases" inside Cambodia.*

The attacks upon Cambodia, on the ground, launched from South Vietnam actually began not in the end of April—when Nixon made his nationally-televised speech—but certainly no later than March 20, 1970 when armored and infantry thrusts penetrated at least five miles into that country in the so-called "Parrot's Beak" area. Some of these drives were reported at the time but all were denied by Saigon and Washington officials; the denials were lies. Other significant attacks were carried out on April 13 and April 20; it was not until April 30 (Washington time) that Nixon affirmed that the incursion was in process.**

These dates are of some consequence, too, in the light they shed upon statements and testimony by leading Administration figures shortly before the Nixon speech of April 30. On April 23, the Secretary of State, William P. Rogers, told a House Appropriations subcommittee that*** "we have no incentive to escalate" the war, and

* Harold Munthe-Kaas, in *Far Eastern Economic Review*, Dec. 25, 1969, p. 668; see also Peter Dale Scott, in *New York Review of Books*, June 18, 1970, p. 28.

** These facts are confirmed in the *New York Times*, May 15, 1970.

*** See the story by E. W. Kenworthy in the *New York Times*, May 10, 1970; and somewhat fuller quotations in *The Progressive*, June, 1970, p. 4.

that: "We recognize that if we escalate and if we get involved in Cambodia with our ground forces, that our whole program is defeated." At the same time—that is, one week before Nixon's announcement of the invasion of Cambodia—Senator Robert P. Griffin of Michigan, who is the assistant Republican leader, said on television, "The Nixon Administration has no intention whatsoever and is giving no consideration to sending American troops into Cambodia." Indeed, as late as April 27, Secretary of State Rogers met in closed session with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate for two and a half hours. The Chairman of that Committee, Senator Fulbright, later publicly declared: "He gave no indication of any kind of the imminence of an American-supported South Vietnamese intervention in Cambodia. That was two days before exactly such an operation was announced, and it is inconceivable that it was not then in an advanced state of planning."

Just after the April 20 speech by Nixon—announcing the planned withdrawal of 150,000 U.S. troops within the ensuing year—a press-briefing officer, "produced as is usual on such occasions," as John Osborne wrote (*New Republic*, May 16, 1970), "said that the Communist forces [note no nationality stated] known to be in action within Cambodia against Cambodian forces totalled no more than 5,000 troops, operating in units of a few hundred." Furthermore, reports Mr. Osborne, Defense Secretary Laird had stated "in another special briefing at the Pentagon that the movement of Communist supplies from North Vietnam 'sanctuaries' in Cambodia into the bordering Delta and Saigon areas of South Vietnam had dropped 'to zero' in the weeks just preceding the American attacks upon those sanctuaries." (Italics added.)

At the very moment that the United States planes by the scores had resumed massive bombings of North Vietnam—a fact not admitted by the Administration until Hanoi's announcements and American reporters' questions could no longer be denied—Hugh Scott, the Republican leader of the Senate, was announcing, as the *New York Times* later noted (May 4, 1970), "that renewed bombing of the North was a remote contingency."

Nixon's April 30th Speech

Having seen what the Republican leader and assistant leader of the Senate said, what Nixon's Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense said, and what his briefing officers had told the press, all in the week preceding his April 30th speech—which gave the lie to everything they had said—we are now in a position to turn to that speech itself. By now surely it will surprise no one to discover

that it was a tissue of lies from beginning to end; since it also managed to be terribly dull one must believe Nixon in only one particular—he probably did write it himself, heroically remaining at his desk, as he informed the nation, until 5 a.m. to do it. Better he had gotten his normal rest!

In that speech Nixon dealt with relations between the United States and Indo-China in general and Vietnam in particular; he dealt specifically with relations between the United States and Cambodia; and then he went into tactical-military conditions necessitating, according to him, the invasion of Cambodia. We turn briefly to each of these.

President Nixon said: "United States policy in Vietnam in particular and Indo-China in general has been to uphold the right of self-determination of the people and to protect them against outside interference." The reader is referred to the myths enumerated by Professor Kahin earlier in this article; the President's statement is a succinct summary of every one of these myths.* The 1954 Geneva Agreements provided for the temporary division of Vietnam and asserted that Vietnam was one nation historically and was to become one nation factually. It was the U.S.-backed South Vietnamese government which refused to allow the nation-unifying elections scheduled for August, 1962—because, as President Eisenhower said in his memoirs, it was certain that Ho Chi Minh would emerge with a vast majority. In 1963 the United States participated in the overthrow of the Diem government and in his murder; thereafter its intervention in the civil war in the South intensified until—its puppet facing total defeat in the latter part of 1964—the United States began the bombing of North Vietnam and the massive taking over by U.S. troops of the fighting in the South. (It is within this context that the Gulf of Tonkin hoax, examined earlier, belongs.)

President Nixon said: "American policy since the Geneva Agreements of 1954 has been to respect scrupulously the neutrality of the Cambodian people. From 1965 to 1969 we did not have any diplomatic mission whatsoever in Cambodia, and for the past five years we have provided no military and no economic assistance to Cambodia." This is fantastic even for so colossal a liar as Nixon. The fact is that the United States had no diplomatic mission in Cambodia from 1965 to 1969 because the government of Cambodia had demanded that the mission withdraw since it had discovered that

* For detailed refutation and historical data, see the present writer's *American Foreign Policy and the Cold War* (New Century Publishers, New York, 1962), pp. 341-360; and *Mission to Hanoi* (International Publishers, New York, 1966), with sources cited in both works.

the United States—through the C.I.A.—had been deeply involved in an effort to overthrow the government and had twice tried to assassinate the head of that government, Prince Sihanouk. The Prince also knew, of course, of the U.S. financed transportation of mercenaries from South Vietnam into Thailand from whence repeated attacks had been made into Cambodia, as mentioned earlier. He knew, also, that the Right-wing Khmer Serei group had been provided with radio facilities inside Saigon to broadcast anti-Sihanouk propaganda.

The absence of military and economic assistance to Cambodia from the United States stemmed from this near-break in relationships and from the fact that Cambodia had neither asked for nor would it have welcomed such "assistance." All this was in accordance with the Cambodian central effort—namely, to maintain its neutrality in the face of the ground fighting raging to her east and the air attacks upon Laos, and North and South Vietnam launched by U.S. planes from Thailand to her west.

President Nixon said: "Beginning in mid-April 1970, North Vietnam intensified and enlarged its military operations in Cambodia." In fact, as Nixon's own Cabinet officers informed the United States Senate, there was no evidence at all of such a build-up; on the contrary, as we have seen, the testimony of the Secretary of State and of the Secretary of Defense, offered in April, denied such build-up and actually referred to a diminution in military activity.

In addition, Nixon in his April 30 speech offered two specific military-tactical reasons for the military attack upon Cambodia. These were: 1) that "the enemy" was "concentrating his main forces in the [Cambodian] sanctuaries where they were building up to launch massive attacks on our forces [in Vietnam]" and 2) that in the border areas of Cambodia, adjacent to South Vietnam, were located "the headquarters for the entire Communist military operation in South Vietnam." These being the alleged facts it was only natural that the military invasion of Cambodia was labelled Operation Total Victory, but within a few days of the assault, when its fabric of lies crumbled under the weight of reality, this name was forgotten—as were the announced reasons for the attack.

As James Reston reported from Washington May 2, Nixon was pretending that his expanding of the war would lead to its termination, "by destroying the critical enemy sanctuaries *which everybody knows really exist elsewhere.*" (Italics added.)

Anthony Lewis added, after the attack had gone on for some weeks:

The headquarters has not been found; hardly anyone believes any more that it ever existed. Nor did our invading armies find

the slightest evidence of Communist troop concentrations prepared for a "massive" attack on South Vietnam; virtually no enemy troops were in the border areas. (*New York Times*, June 6, 1970.)

Nixon's May 8 Promise

In the face of the protests that convulsed the nation after the invasion of Cambodia (and the related killings in Kent, Jackson and Augusta), Nixon was forced to call a press conference on May 8 and to announce that all U.S. troops would be out of Cambodia by June 30 and that he "would expect that the South Vietnamese would come out approximately at the same time that we do because when we come out, our logistical support and air support will also come out with them."

Almost at once, Vice President Ky—Saigon's Agnew—characterized the latter remark by the President of the United States as representing "a silly argument of silly people." Thereafter, Washington let it be known that perhaps the President meant to say that U.S. *combat* troops would all be out of Cambodia by the end of June and that on the one hand he did say and on the other hand he did not say that he thought all South Vietnamese troops also would be out at about the same time because U.S. logistical support would be withdrawn. These diametrically opposite interpretations of what the President means (there is no doubt of what he *said*—that was quoted above) developed on June 2, quoting the *New York Times* (June 3):

... during a long and occasionally acrimonious briefing [when] newsmen again questioned Mr. Ronald L. Ziegler [the President's press secretary] on this point. The results of the briefing were such that the United Press International and the Associated Press filed reports that were quite at variance—one saying that Mr. Ziegler had suggested new restrictions on American involvement in Cambodia after June 30, the other suggesting an enlargement of the American role.

One month after the assault upon Cambodia, the United States Army headquarters in Saigon issued a communique detailing the great victory: the body count (comment on the accuracy of this is superfluous) of "enemy" dead was 9,658; captured were not quite 12,000 infantry hand weapons, 2,145 crew-served weapons, a thousand tons of ammunition, 5,000 tons of rice (uncooked?), fifteen tons of medical supplies, 2,000 gallons of (banana?) oil, 2,000 spools of thread, five bolts of flannel and 500,000 buttons (the latter three decisive items of booty were immediately sent to Barney's clothing store in New York). Oh, yes, the liberating invaders suffered 3,834 casualties during the

first thirty days of their noble enterprise; i.e., one and a half casualties for every spool of thread added to the free world.

Nixon's June 3 Speech

So with this release, and with the U.S. military "being required to hail it [the Cambodian invasion] as a tremendous strategic victory while they privately believe that the most they have gained is a short-term tactical advantage," as James Sterba reported from Saigon in the *New York Times* (May 30), the nation's chief liar returned to the airwaves on June 3 with his Victory Report. "All our military objectives have been achieved," he announced. The entire effort, he declared with characteristic restraint, was "the most successful operation of this long and difficult war."

He said not a word of how the action had appalled the majority of American people and astounded world public opinion; not a word on the uproar in Congress; not a word on the manifest weakness of the Cambodian "government"; not a word on what faced the nation after June 30 and after the monsoon season in Asia and after the thieves in Saigon and in Bangkok finished with "saving" Cambodia. No, and he also *said not a word about the "sanctuaries" and the "supreme command headquarters of the Communist forces" the destruction of which he had stated on April 30 was the purpose of the entire crusade.* No, he counted up the loot and showed prepared photographs of rice and bullets for all the world like Arthur Godfrey selling soap.

In the past imperialist mass murderers and liars had a certain flair; Mussolini was at least bombastic and Hitler was histrionic. This Nixon comes on like a whimpering puppy and fades out like a dead mackerel in the moonlight, shimmering and stinking up the atmosphere. This is, no doubt, further evidence of the deepening decay of imperialism in the final stage.

(Space requires holding over the concluding section of this essay. In it we shall consider why Nixon undertook the invasion of Cambodia; what it has done to that country and to the larger war in Asia; acute dangers of further escalation, including the possibility of a land invasion of North Vietnam and the employment of tactical atomic weapons; what patriotism has been and is in the face of one's own government waging unjust war; and what the possibilities are of forcing a change in U.S. foreign policy.)

COMMUNICATIONS

HOSEA HUDSON

Thoughts on a Scientific Convention

There was much to be learned by television viewers from the broadcasts of the convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science held in Boston December 27-30, 1969.

In the first place I was unable at any time to see any young people or Black or Brown Americans among all those scientists. However, on one of the panels—on hunger—I did see among the panelists two Black women. One of these was a young woman from the South, who told the audience of scientists it was high time to stop all this gathering of information about the hungry men, women and children in the U.S. She said it was time to do something about all this starvation instead of just talking about it.

She raised such a storm of applause from the audience that the other Black woman, a Mrs. Ellis, representing the Nixon Administration, was forced to get up and defend her bosses in Washington. But all she could offer the starving mothers and children was piecemeal answers.

Mrs. Ellis said that there have always been hungry people among us since the early days of man. But her only proposal to solve some of the problems of starvation was to single out pregnant women among the poor and give

them special care so that their children would be born healthy. She did not seem to care what had happened or would happen to the children already born in various parts of the rural South, in the counties of Mississippi, in Appalachia and in many other areas.

Much time was spent in the convention on a report which predicted overpopulation and a world shortage of food in the near future, presenting mankind with the danger of famine.

As I watched and listened to these speakers, I did not find anything that would lead me to believe that they had a proper scientific outlook on future developments that would benefit all the people of the world. It seemed to me that their world outlook was based on profits for the few and not on what would benefit all the people, rich and poor.

We are told from day to day by our public leaders about our crowded cities and towns resulting from people leaving the South and the countryside. But we are not told why these people left these areas.

I believe that many poor farm-

* Publication of the following communication was unfortunately considerably delayed. However, its content remains timely.

ers—Black, Brown and white—have been forced out of farming first because they could not get land to farm and second because they could not get proper support from the local or national government agencies. This has helped the big capitalist farmers to push the small, poor farmers off the land and out of the farm markets all over the country. And the government is not doing enough to encourage these little people to return to their land.

I did not hear these scientists address themselves to this question at all when they were speaking of a food shortage not too far ahead. It seems to me that these men of knowledge should have told the public that we are paying high prices for necessities like food and clothing today because big finance and the big farming outfits have captured the farm markets of the country from the little farmers and are exploiting them to get high prices and superprofits.

We hear these scientists, who are almost all men, talk about the danger of the world becoming overpopulated, about the need for women to use birth control pills to cut down the number of child-births. But this brings me to the question: what about birth control pills for men also? It seems to me that these superior male scientists who are so willing to have young women take the risk of cancer in order to cut down on childbirths ought to give equal weight to pills for men as well.

I also listened to a report on drillings into the ocean bottom and the finding of various miner-

als, and on ideas on how to use these rich findings as the property of the nations of the world. But as I listened I could see a danger in the whole affair. The reporter pointed out that for a company or a government body to be successful in its drilling efforts it must have property or territorial rights to the bottom of the sea. As I see it, right from the outset this man was already making plans for some big Wall Street company to take possession of these new discoveries to make more profits for the rich and not to fill the needs of the poor masses.

Secondly, these discoveries would not be distributed fairly with the smaller, less developed nations which are ill-equipped to match the technically developed big nations. Here I can foresee conflicts in the years ahead between the little nations and the bigger nations which have cheated them. There is also a danger of conflicts between nations over division of the bottom of the sea, just as wars have been fought in the past for control of markets and division of the world up here on land. This time the young men and women would be called upon to offer up their lives not on land but in a war for the oceans.

As I said at the beginning, I did not see Black, Brown or Yellow people in that convention in any noticeable numbers. The people should want to know why, and where were they?

It is my firm belief, after listening to the panelists on the various issues confronting us, that if this world is to be saved from the ruins of this corrupt system, the

young people—Black and white, Brown and Yellow—and the adults who have a mind for progress must unite around a people's program. And it is my belief that this world *can* be saved, once the masses of people wake up and lay aside petty differences, and unite around a program that deals with the burning day-to-day problems of the people—local, national and international.

Youthful initiative and adult experience must be united around a broad program that will meet the needs of all people regardless of race, color, sex, religion or political beliefs. All should have full right to participate in working to bring such a people's program to life. The program should include:

1. Peace with all nations.
2. Use of all new scientific discoveries for improvement of the lives of all the people and not for the profits of the rich few.
3. Rollback of the skyrocketing living costs of the masses.
4. Restoration of the railroads for the transportation of the

masses of working people at reasonable prices they can pay.

5. A program for small and poor farmers that will re-employ idle farm hands and for people of the towns and cities who would return to the countryside once they recognize that they could receive financial support from the government.

6. A government-sponsored program that would guarantee proper education for the youth.

7. A guaranteed yearly income for youth and unemployed people who are unable to find suitable jobs.

8. An end to all discrimination against women.

9. Abolition of the high tax burden on the low- and middle-income masses to pay for big military spending.

10. Rollback of high medical and hospital expenses for the poor masses least able to pay for health services.

The workers in basic industry have a fundamental interest and a leading role to play in this united people's movement to bring such a program to life today.

BOOK REVIEWS

ROBERT PHILLIPOFF

Monetary Vs. Fiscal Policy

In recent months the question of appropriate application of fiscal and monetary policy has received increased attention in administration circles and in academia in view of the increasingly apparent inability of the Nixon administration to control inflation.

A typical presentation of views is to be found in the recent book by Milton Friedman and Walter W. Heller.* Friedman, the monetarist, is the Paul Snowden Russell Distinguished Service Professor of Economics at the University of Chicago, while Heller, the fiscalist, is a Regents Professor of Economics at the University of Minnesota.

The book consists essentially of a defense by Heller of the fiscal and monetary policies practiced by presidential administrations since World War II (Heller was Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under the Kennedy Administration and a special consultant to President Johnson), together with an attack by Friedman on the effectiveness of fiscal policy in general. Heller, for example, staunchly defends the Vietnam war surtax as an

anti-inflationary device and regrets that it was not passed sooner, while Friedman questions the extent to which that policy actually produced the professed intent.

As defined by economists in this country, fiscal policy refers to federal taxing and spending as vehicles for regulating the economy. For example, in the glossary of terms in the book under review fiscal policy is defined as "the use of changes in the level of taxes and expenditures (either transfer payments or other budget expenditures) to serve national economic goals." (P. 93.)

Monetarists stress the importance of changes in the money supply and credit. In the words of Milton Friedman (pp. 79-80):

I believe that the reason why the world has done so much better, the reason why we haven't had any depression in the [post-World War II] period, is not because of the positive virtue of the fine tuning that has been followed, but because we have avoided the major mistakes of the interwar period. Those major mistakes were the occasionally severe deflations of the money stock.

In the views of the monetarists, as exemplified by Milton Friedman, because of the essentially

MONETARY VS. FISCAL POLICY

sound nature of the economy, less rather than more government regulation and intervention are to be desired. The monetarists favor a fixed increase in the supply of money and credit, supervised by the Federal Reserve Board, an increase which matches the growth in the economy.

In fact, however, there appears to be less precise knowledge concerning the composition of monetary aggregates than of fiscal aggregates; there is confusion surrounding the present state of monetary statistics upon which monetary decisions are made. According to Tilford C. Gaines, Vice President and Economist at the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, in a speech in late August before the American Statistical Association (editorial, *American Banker*, September 2, 1969):

... the demand deposits on bank ledgers [the basic source of official data] inherently are inappropriate as the base measuring the theoretically meaningful money supply. The only way in which the money supply aggregates could be developed would be through a carefully constructed sample survey of money holders.

One may hope that the demand-deposit-ownership survey which the Federal Reserve proposes to initiate will be used to learn enough about the demand deposit universe to make possible the eventual construction of a reasonably reliable survey of the money supply.

An example of serious distortions in monetary statistics has been the exclusion of U.S. bank borrowings of billions of American dollars on deposit in banks

abroad—Eurodollars—as deposits not subject to domestic reserve requirements. This has enabled the banks to loan and invest far more than usual, and, in the case of Eurodollars, they are not bound by any interest ceilings.

Preliminary data from a computer-aided study now under way by the Federal Reserve Board on the actual effects of changes in the money supply on the economy—the most comprehensive study of its kind to date—are now available. These indicate that monetary policy, in the form of open-market purchases and sales through which the Federal Reserve pumps or withdraws reserves into or from the commercial banks, may have a more potent inflationary or deflationary effect than has been claimed by most economists. But they also indicate that the time lag is longer than with fiscal measures, which work more quickly.

The monetary view, as exemplified by Milton Friedman, with its plea for a return to more pure competition and less government interference also is more anachronistic than the fiscal view, since state monopoly capitalism can not be changed to pure competition. Also it is more demagogic: Milton Friedman was a key adviser to Barry Goldwater in 1964 and to Nixon in 1968. Given a more reactionary lineup of political forces, a greater rollback of government reforms is possible, and this fits neatly into the analytical apparatus of the monetarist view. For example, in his book *Capitalism and Freedom* (University of Chicago Press, 1962), Friedman states his oppo-

* Milton Friedman and Walter W. Heller, *Monetary vs. Fiscal Policy, A Dialogue*, W. W. Norton, New York, 1969, \$3.95.

sition (in the name of individual freedom) to present social security programs, rent control, minimum wage laws and public housing (pp. 35-36).

The dominance of state monopoly capitalism has entailed increased government regulation of the economy including the use of both fiscal and monetary policy. Since World War II, military spending, more than any other single factor, accounts for the alteration of the present cycle of capitalist production in the United States and the recent eight-year period which has been relatively free of serious recessions. The war spending is due, fundamentally, to the inherent drive of imperialism to engage in wars of aggression, not to the inherent wisdom of the new Keynesians.

Fiscal and monetary policies have been used by state monopoly capitalism to serve its interests. A recent instance is the announcement by the Nixon Administration of a 75 per cent cutback in federal domestic construction expenditures, an "anti-inflationary" measure which will deprive the vast majority of the American people of much-needed schools and other facilities, together with the employment that their construction would provide. Another example is the exceptionally high interest rates, which swell bank profits. Certain sections of the ruling class tend toward the fiscalist approach, while others, such as certain banking interests, tend toward the monetarist.

What is needed is economic pol-

icies that are in the interest of the vast majority of the American people, not those in the interest of state monopoly capital. The relevant criterion is the class nature of fiscal and monetary policies, but this is precisely what the neo-Keynesians, in their classless world of consumption, investment and savings functions, multipliers, and equilibrium of marginal supply and demand increments completely ignore.

Since 1929 important reforms that have been wrested from monopoly capital have been neither fiscal nor monetary but institutional. Examples are the Tennessee Valley Authority and public employment programs such as the Civilian Conservation Corps. These and others such as federal low cost housing and transportation are vitally needed today. Progressive fiscal and monetary policies that can be won from the ruling circles by the working class and its allies include tax reform, redirection of government expenditures from war to peace and the public interest (remodeling the cities, removal of pollution, etc.), and reduction of interest rates.

These progressive fiscal and monetary policies would be anti-inflationary since a necessary condition for their significant achievement is cessation of imperialist wars, the main inflationary factor. Capitalism would still be capitalism, however, and the miseries caused by it can only be resolved fundamentally with the achievement of socialism.

THE BETTY GANNETT MEMORIAL FUND

Some weeks ago the mail brought a letter from two Los Angeles readers, Max and Marian Miller. It was accompanied by a check for \$100. The letter said in part:

We feel such a deep personal loss with the passing of our dear friend and comrade Betty Gannett that we go on reading over and over again her letters which she sent as her health and work permitted. They were more than just answers to our inquiries. They were warm with a feeling of personal interest in our well-being. We don't know just how to put it, but Betty's letters were like letters from home. . . .

We are enclosing a check for \$100 as a start of a Memorial Fund in Betty's name. We are sure that her friends and readers of *Political Affairs* will respond to such an undertaking, in whatever form the editors decide will honor her memory best.

We think it's a good idea. And so, with this issue we are launching a Betty Gannett Memorial Fund with a goal of \$7,500, to be raised within the coming year. The money will be used to maintain and increase the circulation of *Political Affairs*—to reach more readers, to get the magazine into more libraries, to make its influence more widely felt.

We appeal to you, our readers, to help make the fund a success. In the last year, in response to the many personal letters which Betty sent out, we received nearly \$7,500 in contributions. We are sure that in honor of Betty's memory you will help us to exceed this amount.

If you are already a regular contributor, whether on an annual, quarterly or monthly basis, we urge you to increase your contribution. If you are not a regular contributor, we urge you to become one.

If you prefer to make a single lump-sum contribution, that too will be welcome. Who will be the first to match Max and Marion's \$100?

The Editor

NEW PAMPHLETS

- HARD HATS AND HARD FACTS** by Gus Hall
A "man-to-man talk" by a former "hard-hat" construction worker about the real meaning of the recent actions in New York "in defense of the flag" and what construction workers must do to truly protect their interests.
24 pages—25c
- OUR COUNTRY IN CRISIS—THE PEOPLE MUST ACT!** by Gus Hall
Report to emergency meeting of Communist Party National Committee, May 16-17, 1970, on political and Constitutional crisis created by invasion of Cambodia and violent repression of dissent.
40 pages—40c
- THE FIGHT AGAINST THE NIXON-AGNEW ROAD TO DISASTER** by Gus Hall
Report to National Committee of Communist Party, U.S.A. January 16, 1970.
48 pages—60c
- NEW PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.**
Complete official program adopted by the 19th Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A.
128 pages—50c
- OF THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE**
Pictorial highlights of fifty years of the Communist Party, USA, 1919-1969. Includes 143 photographs and illustrations, plus brief history. 9" x 12" booklet.
32 pages—\$1.00
- BLACK AMERICA AND THE WORLD REVOLUTION** by Claude M. Lightfoot
Five recent speeches showing the growing revolutionary character of the Black liberation struggle and its relationship to the worldwide revolutionary process.
96 pages—90c
- LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKERS** by V. I. Lenin
Centennial edition, with an introduction by Gus Hall and a history of the famous Letter by Art Shields.
40 pages—45c
- ENTER FIGHTING: TODAY'S WOMAN** by Clara Colón
A Marxist-Leninist view on the struggle for women's liberation.
96 pages—85c
- WORKING-CLASS APPROACH TO WOMEN'S LIBERATION** by Gus Hall
Talk at meeting of National Women's Commission, Communist Party, U.S.A., January 5, 1970.
16 pages—30c
- THE FIGHT AGAINST TROTSKYISM** by Hyman Lumer
A brief history of Trotskyism, and a discussion of its counter-revolutionary role in the United States.
16 pages—20c
- ABOUT THE IDEA OF A PALESTINIAN STATE** by Emile Touma
Analysis, by an Arab leader of the Communist Party of Israel, of various proposals for establishment of a secular Palestinian state.
16 pages—15c

At bookstores or order from

NEW 'OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS

32 Union Square East • Room 801 • New York, N.Y. 10003
Orders must be prepaid (no stamps). Add 20c postage on orders under \$2.00. New York purchasers include sales tax.

WRITE FOR COMPLETE LIST