

THE MILITANT

Published in the Interests of the Working People

Vol. 26 - No. 38

Monday, October 22, 1962

Price 10c



AMERICANS PROTEST CAMPAIGN AGAINST CUBA. On Oct. 8, the day of Cuban President Dorticos' speech to the United Nations, over 300 pickets marched in New York to oppose U.S. policy toward Cuba. The demonstration, called by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, took place despite harassment by Cuban counter-revolutionaries.

UN Pickets Condemn Moves to Crush Cuba

NEW YORK — On Oct. 8, the day Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticos delivered his address to the United Nations General Assembly, 300 persons joined a picket line called by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee outside the U.N. buildings in New York.

As the pickets marched and chanted "Hands off Cuba!" and "No Invasion of Cuba!" they heard shouts from surrounding buildings and looked up to see missiles flying toward them. The missiles — containing red paint and glass — crashed to the ground among the pickets, splattering them. One woman was taken to the hospital with a cut leg.

A group of Cuban counter-revolutionaries charged the line but were stopped by police. They then tried to infiltrate the line and start fights. The missiles continued

to come down, but picketing continued with picket signs being held overhead as shields.

The pickets displayed unusual calm and courage, maintaining order and good spirits until the line was disbanded in a disciplined fashion.

At a different point near the UN, Cuban counter-revolutionaries, calling for war, had a picket line of their own. It was smaller than the anti-war line. At one time, five youths who were walking past this point were taken for Cuban sympathizers and attacked by counter-revolutionaries armed with clubs and bricks.

At no time did any anti-war picket or Cuban sympathizer attack anyone, yet the major news media all reported that "both sides" had caused a "riot." The newspapers also failed to report that there were more persons picketing against the hate-Cuba hysteria than were picketing for it.

Phillips Opens National Tour

DENVER, Oct. 7 — Wendell Phillips, the junior college teacher who is fighting to uphold the constitutional right not to be an informer, addressed two meetings here last night and the day before.

Phillips, a former member of the Communist Party and a present member of the Socialist Workers Party, was suspended from his teaching job at Fullerton Junior College in Orange County, California under the Dilworth Act. He frankly answered all questions about his past and present political affiliations at the hearings but refused to name members or organizations on the grounds that this would be informing and that they would be victimized.

His appeal is now in the courts and is regarded as a test case of the right of Americans not to be compelled to be informers. Phillips is making a coast-to-coast tour explaining the issues involved.

On Friday he addressed a Denver University meeting sponsored by the campus YMCA and YWCA. The audience, composed of students and faculty members, gave him an attentive and sympathetic hearing and obviously relished his brand of humor.

The *Clarion*, the student newspaper, reported the meeting in a front-page article noteworthy for its fairness. An editorial ascribed to men like Phillips and President Quigg Newton of the University of Colorado, who is currently the target of Sen. Barry Goldwater, the preservation of what academic freedom there still is.

The following night Phillips addressed a meeting at the Militant Labor Forum. He recalled that in 1938 he had been in Denver as an organizer of the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Union. He was also Pacific Northwest regional director of that union till 1948.

What Dorticos Really Said COMPLETE UN SPEECH OF CUBA'S PRESIDENT

See Page 5

American People Oppose A Military Attack on Cuba

Why We Print Dorticos' Speech

By the Editors

In this issue of *The Militant* we print the full text of the speech made by President Osvaldo Dorticos of Cuba at the United Nations on Oct. 8. We are devoting this space to the speech not only to act in defense of the Cuban Revolution, but as a service to the American people who have been consistently denied the Cuban side of the story.

There has been a deliberate attempt to brainwash the American people and to whip them into line behind aggressive actions against the people of Cuba. The daily newspapers, the radio and television, and all the mass news media have been pouring forth a steady barrage of lies and government-inspired propaganda against the Cuban Revolution. A virtual censorship has been imposed on the news about Cuba which is allowed to reach the mass of Americans. Well-documented evidence presented by Cuban spokesmen about U.S. government activities has been suppressed and has not appeared in the major press. Of all the newspapers in the country, as far as we know, we are alone in making the complete text of this important speech by President Dorticos available to the American people.

Most Americans are already opposed to a military attack on Cuba. How much greater would this majority be if Americans were given all the facts and allowed to read what is being said about the actions of their government in Cuba. We hope that the publication of this speech will help to make these facts known and will do its part in keeping the American people out of the bloody adventures which the White House, Pentagon and CIA are preparing for them.

Kennedy Seeking to Restore Racist South to 'Normalcy'

By Edward Slater

It has become clear that Kennedy intends to limit federal intervention in the racist police-state of Mississippi to the admission of one Negro to the university and imposition of penalties on a few public figures for their actions in the Meredith case. The

administration has ignored numerous requests for protection made by groups like the Student Nonviolent Co-ordinating Committee and has already withdrawn over half the federal troops.

Federal officials have asked that Gov. Barnett be given a heavy fine, but recommended against imprisonment on grounds that he has "ceased his affirmative obstruction and interference." Nonetheless, state officials are still seeking to remove Meredith from the university. Barnett reportedly has been toying with the idea of having him declared insane on the basis of an Air Force medical report. The report described the young Negro as "a man with a mission" who could become highly excited when discussing racial questions.

In neighboring Alabama, the Democratic candidate for governor, George C. Wallace, has made his position clear: "If a federal judge orders me to place a Negro in a white school, I would refuse to do so. They'll have to arrest me." The University of Alabama has been under a federal injunction to admit Negroes since 1956 when a Negro girl, Autherine Lucy, was admitted only to be expelled three days later. Another integration attempt is expected this fall.

In a court hearing which opened Oct. 8, Alabama officials moved to crack down on integration at

(Continued on Page 2)

By Fred Halstead

OCT. 17 — The great majority of the American people are opposed to a U.S. military attack against Cuba. President John F. Kennedy has begun to court this majority sentiment by attacking Republican advocates of immediate invasion. At the same time he continues his own efforts to strangle the Cuban Revolution and preparations for a direct U.S. military assault at some future time.

The Gallup poll reported last week that 63 per cent of Americans interviewed flatly opposed the sending of U.S. forces against Cuba. Only 24 per cent favored a U.S. military attack. The remaining 13 per cent had "no opinion."

This report closely followed results of several opinion surveys taken by newspaper reporters in a number of states during the last month. All these indicated that while the American people have been blinded to the truth about the Cuban Revolution by the propaganda barrage, they are nevertheless opposed to flaunting world opinion or risking nuclear war over Cuba.

This information was available to Kennedy when he made his Indianapolis speech Oct. 13 attacking Republican Senator Homer E. Capehart for demanding that Cuba be invaded. In addition, observers of the Indiana campaign had previously noted that Capehart's "war-on-Cuba" electioneering in the state was strengthening his Democratic opponent, Birch Bayh, by making Bayh seem like an anti-war candidate by comparison.

It had become clear to careful political observers that Republi-

(Continued on Page 4)

Freedom Sail Tests Law in Worthy Case

NEW YORK, Oct. 15 — An all-white group of Freedom Riders and civil libertarians cruised Friday "illegally" out of New York-New Jersey territorial waters, past the Statue of Liberty and beyond the three-mile international limit.

The ad hoc group then "illegally" re-entered the United States "without bearing valid passports." The Columbus Day "Freedom Sail" was designed to challenge the conviction of Boston-born Negro newsman, William Worthy, for "illegally" coming home without a passport.

The test group of U.S. citizens rented a boat in Atlantic Highlands, N.J., and terminated their sail at the Municipal Float in lower Manhattan. They then walked to the U.S. Immigration Service at 20 West Broadway and "surrendered" themselves for arrest for having technically violated Section 1185(b) of the 1952 McCarran Immigration and Nationality Act.

(Continued on Page 3)

'Oscars' for Profit-Making?

By George Breitman

DETROIT — "I think it's past time that we created a few national awards for outstanding efficiency and profitability in industry."

So said Henry Ford II in a speech to the Michigan Chamber of Commerce here on Oct. 2.

Reading this in the paper brightened an otherwise dreary day for me. Imagine the scene: It is Awards Night. The proceedings are being carried by Telstar as well as TV. The nominees are all there, blushing or nervous, and hoping they won't fluff their acceptance speeches — the auto barons, oil magnates, munitions and missile kings, bankers. A preacher blesses the gathering, using the text, Unto him that hath shall be given . . .

Don't Understand Profits

Since a good laugh is rare and I suspected the speech might contain more, I sent away for a copy. (If you want one, the address is News Department, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich., and the title is "What America Expects of Industry.")

A first reading of Ford's speech did reveal material for some smiles or chuckles, and I felt tempted to pass it on here purely for its entertainment value. But a more careful reading led me to the conclusion that the speech raises a serious point for consideration.

Ford is quite worried (sincerely, I think) over what the American people think about the profit system and the corporations, and he wants his fellow-capitalists to help combat the "widespread failure" in this country "to understand the proper role of the business enterprise."

He calls for an attack on "certain deep-seated prejudices": that "profit is sinful, that competition is vicious — or, conversely, that American enterprises do not compete at all — that automation destroys more jobs than it creates..."

Many corporations, Ford com-

plains, "have tended to become somewhat hypocritical. They invariably emphasize in their public postures the non-economic side of the company. They foster the impression that the company is in business mainly to support worthwhile civic causes, lead fund-raising campaigns and march in the Fourth of July parade."

As an example, he cites "the old and heartless and much maligned statement: 'Business is business.' Once 'business is business' meant dog-eat-dog, the devil take the hindmost, the law of the jungle. Today we need that phrase 'business is business' just to remind us that business is not first and foremost a social institution, a charitable agency, a cultural gathering, a community service, a public spirited citizen . . . Too much emphasis on these sidelines tends to obscure the true main purposes of the business organization."

To appreciate what business is, first and foremost, Ford says, "What we need is to juggle up our thinking, to get a new perspective on business, to throw out old yardsticks and think in new categories, to apply a whole new standard of judgment to our thinking about the business system." (Because of such rhetoric, to which he is addicted himself, Walter Reuther used to express high hopes that Henry Ford II would become a really enlightened business-statesman.)

Anti-Subversive Greed

Ford's "new" standard (not to prolong the suspense) is this:

"Business should be publicly proud when it is most profitable and efficient, publicly ashamed when it is least profitable and inefficient. There should be praise for the companies that, in free and fair competition, are most efficient, most productive, most profitable. And should not those who make the greatest contributions to productivity logically be hailed as public benefactors rather than denounced as producers of technological unemployment?" and accused of "greed and gouging and exorbitant profits?" (He is altogether serious about the awarding of business Oscars.)

In fact, Ford considers any other view subversive. He approvingly quotes a University of Chicago professor who wrote, "If anything is certain to destroy our free society . . . it would be a widespread acceptance by management of social responsibilities in some other sense than to make as much money as possible . . . this is a fundamentally subversive doctrine." Ford says these words are "perhaps too strong," but adds equally strong words of his own: "There's one way to compete successfully — all-out. If believing this makes you a greedy capitalist lusting after bloated profits, then I plead guilty. The worst sin I can commit as a businessman is to fail to seek maximum long-term profitability by all decent and lawful means. To do so is to subvert economic reason."

My purpose here is not to argue whether or not the Fords should

be "hailed as public benefactors" because they make the most profits. But rather to ask: Is Ford right when he says there is widespread failure" by the American people to accept the corporations as benefactors? Are the so-called "prejudices" against the corporations really "deep-seated"? Is he correct in claiming that "The more profitable and successful the business, the more it is likely to be a target of suspicion and unwelcome attention, the more its critics will cry greed and gouging and exorbitant profits"?

Ford thinks so. I think so too. If we're right, then I contend it is a cause for rejoicing by socialists and all others who want to reconstruct our economy and society on rational and humane foundations.

The Last Laugh

Because it means that the American people, despite all the big-business propaganda, despite all the brainwashing, despite all the attempts to persuade them that they are prosperous and affluent, are anti-capitalist in their outlook. It means that below the surface, deep down, the process of radicalization (sometimes described as "molecular") has continued among the American people, even during the period that the radical movement has been weakened and routed. When the conditions become more favorable, this process not only will become more manifest but will lead to revolutionary action.

So Ford's speech is conducive to more than one kind of laugh.

"Th' lawyers make th' law, th' judges make th' errors, but th' editors make th' juries." — *Finley Peter Dunne (1867-1936)*

... Seeks 'Normal' South

(Continued from Page 1)

tempts through a permanent injunction against SNCC, CORE, and the students and faculty of Talladega College, scene of demonstrations last April. Individuals named in the injunction include Robert Zellner of SNCC, Carl Braden editor of the *Southern Patriot*, and Joanne Grant, a *National Guardian* reporter.

While Kennedy's intervention in Mississippi has not proven a sufficient deterrence to racist leaders in either state, a large number of white businessmen in both Mississippi and Alabama are urging a more moderate approach toward integration and compliance with federal orders. The Oct. 10 *Wall Street Journal* admitted that a major cause of this new attitude was the recent selective-buying campaigns waged by Negroes in Birmingham and other Southern cities. At its height, the Birmingham campaign cut sales at some downtown stores 20 to 50 per cent and the Negro community is threatening to resume pressure during the Christmas shopping season.

Labor officials and Democratic Party spokesmen are going to great lengths to attribute whatever gains have been made to "Kennedy and his fight for civil rights." Nonetheless, it is clear that the credit for these gains must go, not to Kennedy's belated and insufficient action, but to the Negro people themselves who have won them through determined struggle. Meredith's ability to force federal intervention is a tribute not only to his own firmness and courage, but to the new mood of struggle being evidenced by the thousands of Negroes he represents. They, like him, will not be satisfied with half-way measures enforced by segregated troops.

Two recent incidents gave a dramatic illustration of the depth and strength of this new mood. On Oct. 13, a Negro policeman at-

THE NATIONAL PICKET LINE

Latest government figures show 17½ million union members in the United States. It isn't the union movement but the leadership, which is getting weaker.

The strike of Telegraphers on the Chicago & North Western railroad has ended with the union winning a binding job-security agreement. The settlement is complex. It provides a guarantee of about five years at the old wage rate for men transferred from eliminated jobs, and furlough pay for men laid off. Some of its provisions are retroactive to five years ago, when the "job slaughter" of Telegrapher's positions began on the C&NW.

In brief, the settlement protects men presently employed, but the "job slaughter" will continue, leaving no room for the youth.

A drive for a New York City \$1.50-an-hour minimum-wage law resulted in partial victory Oct. 11 when the New York City Council passed a bill providing a \$1.25 minimum beginning in November and going to \$1.50 in one year. The drive — sparked by a committee headed by a Philip Randolph, head of the Negro American Labor Council, was supported by most unions in the area.

Conspicuous among those not supporting it were David Dubinsky and other top leaders of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, the city's largest union. Many of the half-million workers in the city getting wages less than \$1.50 an hour are ILGWU members. Many others

are unorganized workers, often employed in shops with ILGWU contracts, in areas or categories which ILGWU leaders allow the employers to keep non-union.

The minimum-wage bill covers all but a few minor categories of workers, but has one loophole which may allow some employers to avoid paying the new rate. The boss can count tips and company-furnished uniforms, laundry service, meals and other fringe benefits as money wages against the minimum.

Charging that the Campbell Soup Co. treats its mushroom pickers as "second rate human beings," the Teamsters Union posted pickets Oct. 16 at four Campbell plants in Sacramento, Calif., Camden, N.J., Chicago and West Chicago, Ill. The pickets are protesting Campbell's refusal to recognize the union of 112 mushroom pickers at West Chicago.

Ten newspaper unions in New York City are preparing a united front for a possible long strike against the publishers of the major dailies sometime between Nov. 1 and next March. This is the period when contracts are being negotiated. In a meeting Oct. 14 over 3,500 union members discussed plans to break up the past pattern whereby publishers took on the unions one by one.

The plans include an agreement by all unions to support the strike of any one, even if it means a general shutdown of all newspaper operations in the city. If that should happen, plans are mapped for a striker-operated emergency daily newspaper. It would be a 32-page tabloid with a run of half-million copies. The printing plant of the Jewish Daily Forward has been made available for this purpose. The suggestion by union leaders at the meeting that this might be the forerunner of a labor daily in New York was loudly cheered.

The Oil Chemical and Atomic Workers, AFL-CIO is involved in strikes at eleven locations this month in what the union has characterized as a concerted effort by major corporations to cut back on established working conditions. Among the firms involved are Mobile Oil, Shell Oil, and Standard Oil of New Jersey. Over 6,000 union members are striking.

Richard Parrish of New York, treasurer of the Negro American Labor Council was elected a vice president of the National Teachers Association.

Weekly Calendar

DETROIT

Socialist Views on City Issues — A Panel Discussion, Fri., Oct. 26, 8 p.m. Debs Hall, 3737 Woodward. Ausp. Friday Night Socialist Forum.

NEW YORK

AN AMERICAN TALKS WITH YEY-TUSHENKO. Hear an account by graduate student George Saunders of his discussions in Helsinki and Moscow with the famed Soviet poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko. Fri., Oct. 26, 8:30 p.m. 116 University Place. Contrib. 75c. Ausp. Militant Labor Forum and Young Socialist Alliance.

Theater Party for the Living Theater production of Brecht's *Man Is Man*. Showing, Sun. Oct. 28, 8:30 p.m. Tickets, specially priced at \$3, available in advance only, at 116 University Place. Meet the director, Julian Beck, at before-the-show-party at 116 University Pl. Ausp. Militant Labor Forum.

INTRODUCTORY OFFER!



A Four-Month Subscription To The Militant for only \$1

Name

Street Zone

City State

Send to The Militant, 116 University Place, New York 3, N.Y.

Pre-Publication Offer

The First Ten Years Of American Communism Report of a Participant

By James P. Cannon

Publisher's price—\$600. Order now through Pioneer Publishers and pay pre-publication price of only \$4.50 prepaid.

This Offer Good Only to November 1, 1962

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

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

British Rail Labor Shows Power in 24-Hour Strike

By Ross Dowson

BRIGHTON, England — The 24-hour railway strike that commenced at midnight Oct. 3 stopped every train over the 50,000 miles of railway track in Britain. London's vast subway network came to a standstill. Steamer services to the continent were cancelled in this massive protest against the Tory government's plans to reduce the industry to a skeleton and deprive 20,000, and possibly 35,000, of their jobs in workshops in the next five years — half of them by the end of next year.

Thousands of railwaymen walked out of the nationalized British Transport Commissions Workshops to march through the strikebound cities in the first national rail stoppage since the General Strike of 1926. More than 2,000 demonstrated through the streets of Brighton, carrying banners and shouting slogans. As they passed by the Labour Party annual conference hall, they handed in a resolution to their assembled brothers:

The British Transport Commission conceded that "Our normal daily movement of three million passengers and 750,000 tons of freight has been completely halted." After studying the reports that came in here from every region, Sidney Green, general secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen, said, "There is no doubt about the response. It is absolutely solid." These observations were confirmed by photos in the daily papers brought into Brighton by autobus. One of Thursday's dailies carried a shot of Piccadilly Circus at 4:50 p.m. — there was hardly a soul in this usually teeming western London square. Another reproduced a photo of Westminster Bridge with the hands of Big Ben in the middle distance pointing to 6 o'clock — there were only a handful of pedestrians.

Scotland Yard Prepared

The 12 days between the railway workers' announcement of intention and their actual strike were utilized by Scotland Yard and business houses to make elaborate preparations to carry on as usual. The police set up an extensive system of one-way streets parking regulations, etc., as part of a "tidal-flow" system. Helicopters were brought into play with radio cars, vans, motorcycles stationed at main roads to provide minute-by-minute reports. Minister of Transport Marples ridiculed the idea that the strike would paralyze London. "We were not brought to a standstill during the war," he said, "so why now?"

The absence of the chaos which everyone expected was the eeriest part of the whole strike and the most startling aspect of its tremendous effectiveness. It demonstrated the absolute indispensability of the railways and the strategic power of the workers. The fact is that no one believed in the efficacy of the arrangements that had been made. Hundreds of firms decided to close their doors. Hundreds of thousands took a holiday. One observer noted workers, instead of heading with lunch boxes in the direction of the city, heading for the country with their families and picnic hampers.

Not only were the ranks of the National Union of Railwaymen solid but they won the support of other sectors of the British working class. The Manchester march of 1,000 was joined by local members of the Electrical Workers who stopped work. The Glasgow and West Scotland NUR was backed up by a 100 per cent support of drivers and firemen members of the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen. British European Airway workers declared that they would "black" (strike) any specially chartered



ROSS DOWSON, veteran Canadian socialist, is the editor of 'The Workers Vanguard' published monthly at 81 Queen Street West, Toronto 1, Canada (Subscription: \$1 a year). He is now visiting Europe.

flights and did black 50 bags of mail at Bristol that had been marked for London. Some 250 NUR members employed at Manchester docks joined the strike despite contrary orders from the leadership to effect the loading of five ships.

But the British Transport Commission has shown no signs of a change in attitude. On the very eve of the strike, Dr. Beeching, its £24,000 (\$67,200) a year head and a former director of Imperial Chemical Industries, off-handedly rejected any idea that the railways should be run as an essential service with the statement: "I think the railways can be made to pay. This is the first time I have said this so flat-footedly."

There is not the slightest hint from either Beeching or his boss, Transport Minister Marples, that the government is prepared to modify in any way the retrenchment plans that will deprive practically the whole of Scotland, Wales, Northern England and Cornwall of rail services.

Tory Offensive

In fact it is clear that the Tories are not only out to deal a staggering blow to the entire British working class through smashing the railwaymen, whose fate they control through the nationalized industry, but they are out to destroy one of the last areas of public ownership set up by the last Labour Government.

In an attempt to placate capital and assure it that there would be no "creeping socialism," the right-wing Labour Party leadership's 1947 legislation put many restrictions on the operation of the workshops. Now the Tories intend to close them down. When the dieselization program commenced, instead of gearing the government-owned work shops for such production, the British Transport Commission turned the job over to private capital. The shops are restricted from selling any output to anyone except the Transport Board which itself is prohibited from manufacturing for its own use. While they are closing down two shops at Darlington, the Tory bosses of Transport Board are letting a contract to a subsidiary of English Electric for more than 30 new locomotives.

Under the spotlight on the opening day here at the Labour Party Conference, just two days before the general strike, Britain's trade union leadership were models of sobriety and restraint. Far from expounding the cause of the strike and projecting a long-range policy, the conference's composite resolution merely reaffirmed Labour's traditional policy of transport coordination and integration. It was presented by

NUR leader Green with the comment, "I don't want strikes. In fact half my members think I am a conservative."

Transport and General Workers leader Frank Cousins declared that his union "not only supports the motion—it also supports the railwaymen." But only a few days previously he had intervened to block London busmen whose delegated conference unanimously voted to come out with the railwaymen. Today Cousins tossed the block vote of his union behind a motion that labour should launch a drive to bring down the Tory government — not on the industrial arena, not on the issue of the railways, but on the parliamentary plane and on the issue of the Common Market.

Backs to the Wall

Cries for more and longer strikes were reported at the nationwide demonstrations that paralleled the 24-hour general strike. The railwaymen's backs are to the wall. The Tories have revealed not the slightest sign that they will turn back from their murder of the nationalized railways.

The labour staff of the eminent and authoritative London Times has this to say on the strategy of the union leadership. All they want is consultation. "They would prefer something closer to the practice of wage bargaining where the employer names terms rather worse than he will, under pressure, be prepared to concede, and the unions demand improvements beyond what they know they are likely to get. This makes it easier to persuade the rank and file to accept the agreement and helps to assure the popularity of the union leaders when the time comes round for reelection."

But will such a policy "work" in Britain 1962?

... Test Law in Worthy Case

(Continued from Page 1)

In July, in urging Attorney General Robert Kennedy to drop the prosecution of the Afro-American foreign correspondent, 15 lawyers, judges and law professors declared: "Section 1185 is so badly drawn, inconsistent and indefinite as to be invalid as a criminal statute. If any American were to sail or fish outside the territorial water and return into such water, each such trip would be a criminal violation."

At the Immigration Service office, the group was ushered into



William Worthy

the office of Frank W. Wroblewski, acting district director. He twice declined to make any arrests.

James Peck, editor of CORE-lator, organ of the Congress of Racial Equality, acted as spokesman for the group. On two occasions he told the Immigration officials: "We wanted to give you the opportunity of taking us into custody or letting us go free."

New Haven Company Uses Racism to Weaken Strike

By Joe Torello

NEW HAVEN — An ugly dispute has erupted here over the cynical injection of the race issue by the A.B. Hendryx Company into a strike conducted by West Rock Lodge 2120 of the AFL-CIO International Association of Machinists.

The company, which manufactures bird cages, is a small concern which normally employs about 60 workers. For the 93 years of its existence it had followed a strict "white only" hiring policy.

Injunction

The local union, organized some three years ago, has been conducting a militant strike struggle with strong support from the AFL-CIO Central Labor Council and many local unions.

From the beginning the company set out to break the strike by conducting a vigorous advertising campaign to recruit scabs. It sought and obtained a court injunction limiting the number of pickets at the plant gate. It then hit upon the device of recruiting Negro workers in a last ditch effort to break the strike. It was the first time in 93 years that the company had departed from its discriminatory hiring policy.

There are now about 35 Negroes and 15 whites crossing the picket lines. For many of these workers it is their first chance in a long time to earn a regular week's pay.

At the end of last month, the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) Chapter intervened with a leaflet urging the Negro workers not to cross the picket lines. CORE's position was immediately challenged by the local leaders of the NAACP (John Barber) and the Negro American Labor Council (Charles Valentine) as well as a small group of CORE members.

At a special meeting, CORE voted to pursue the following

plan: To organize a committee representing the entire Negro community, to meet with the executive committee of the Central Labor Council with the object of working out an agreement whereby the Negro leaders would endeavour to discourage crossing the picket lines and the CLC would undertake to eliminate job discrimination by the unions.

However, before CORE could put its plan into execution, Shep Brock, CLC Civil-Rights Committee chairman, jumped the gun. He called a meeting to which only the NAACP and NALC representatives were invited.

The meeting was a disaster. Barber and NAACP Vice President Earl Williams, together with Valentine of the NALC, refused to intervene. And worse — the story of the conflict between them and the CLC leadership, broke into the press, with Williams quoted as saying: "This is the union's problem — we're not pulling any chestnuts out of the fire for them."

Company Trap

Vincent Sirabella, CLC president, was then authorized to rebut Barber and Williams, although some cooler heads urged postponing his blast to give Shep Brock and CORE a chance to work something out. Sirabella's response will undoubtedly add fuel to the fire — thus further weakening the Negro-labor cooperation that existed in the past.

It appears that both sides in the dispute have fallen into the company trap. The union movement has alienated large sections of the Negro community by its failure to pursue a vigorous policy of combating discrimination in hiring and upgrading Negro workers.

Negro spokesmen are justifiably bitter about union Jim Crow practices. But the policy of abetting a union-busting employer's attempt to break a strike is self-defeating. The ones who will suffer most are the workers — both black and white alike. Only the union-hating, anti-labor and anti-Negro bosses stand to gain from having the strike at Hendryx degenerate into a race conflict.

Penn Jones, Jr., editor of the Midlothian (Texas) Mirror, had his print shop gutted by a fire bomb recently after he had publicly opposed the use of compulsory high-school assembly periods for John-Birch-like speeches.

JUST OUT!
TROTSKYISM
and the
CUBAN REVOLUTION
— An Answer to 'Hoy'
By Joseph Hansen
14 Pages — 15c
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

**Help to Spread
Revolutionary Cuba's
Inspiring Message!**

**The Second
Declaration of Havana**

25 cents a copy
(Ten or more copies, 20c
each; 100 or more, 15c
each.)

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

**RALLY!
AGAINST!
HUAC***

*House Un-American Activities Committee. Join a Congressional lobby to influence this year's election. Hear William Kunstler, Pete Seeger, Patrick Gorman, Mark Lane, Harvey O'Connor, Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, and many others. Seating will be by Congressional Districts. Rally!

Wednesday, October 24th
8:00 P.M. sharp 99c
Manhattan Center
34th Street and 8th Ave.

NY Council to Abolish HUAC, 150 W. 34, NYC, PE 6-3228

THE MILITANT

Editor: JOSEPH HANSEN

Managing Editor: GEORGE LAVAN

Business Manager: KAROLYN KERRY

Published weekly, except from July 11 to Sept. 5 when published bi-weekly, by The Militant Publishing Ass'n., 116 University Pl., New York 3, N.Y. Phone CH 3-2140. Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y. Subscription: \$3 a year; Canadian, \$3.50; foreign, \$4.50. Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Militant's views. These are expressed in editorials.

Vol. 26 - No. 38

345

Monday, October 22, 1962

Doing the Kennedy Twist

There has been little or nothing in the record of the Kennedy administration to rouse the enthusiasm of the American workers. The record of the congress, if anything, has been worse. Little wonder then that the general mood has been one of pronounced apathy.

Such apathy bodes ill for the prospects of the Democratic Party in the forthcoming congressional elections. In an attempt to stir the workers out of their political lethargy, Kennedy enlisted the aid of his labor lieutenants of the AFL-CIO.

Taking a cue from their "friend" in the White House, the labor statesmen flayed the congress for its failure to support Kennedy's "New Frontier" social-welfare measures. They called for the election of more "Kennedy Democrats" to overcome the dismal shortcomings of the 87th Congress.

In the meantime the Big Boss had changed his line. At a Democratic Party rally in Baltimore last week Kennedy extolled Congress to a cheering mob of wardheelers. "No congress in our time," he declared, "had a more exceptional two years of positive and progressive accomplishment than the Democratic 87th Congress I salute tonight."

If that is so, why then the frantic cry for more Democrats to add to the already substantial Democratic majority in both houses? The lot of a labor statesman is not an easy one in these trying times. As with the man on the flying trapeze — life is just one somersault after another.

... Oppose Cuba War

(Continued from Page 1)

can efforts to gain an advantage in the elections by falsely accusing Kennedy and the Democrats of being "soft on Cuba" had begun to backfire. Warmongering — much to the surprise of some politicians — is not popular with most Americans.

This realization prompted Kennedy to make a demagogic appeal to anti-war sentiments in his Indianapolis speech. Said Kennedy: "Those self-appointed generals and admirals who want to send someone else's sons to war... ought to be kept at home and replaced."

This comes from the president who sent "someone else's sons" to die in the Cuban invasion of April, 1961, who at present is sending "someone else's sons" to die in combat in South Vietnam, and who is prepared to call 150,000 of "someone else's sons" to active military duty to meet the "Cuban crisis."

Kennedy's speech indicates a cooling off in the propaganda for a war on Cuba, but Kennedy's policy remains warlike. A Washington dispatch in the Oct. 14 *New York Times* says "authoritative sources here report that close and occasionally provocative surveillance of Cuba by the U.S. military has met with no resistance from Premier Castro's Government."

In other words, the only reason there haven't been any shooting incidents directly involving U.S. and Cuban forces so far is because the Cubans have refrained from responding to provocation — and the provocations are great. James Reston reported in the Oct. 12 *Times* that the Kennedy administration "is sending its planes over Cuba night and day."

Since Cuba now has anti-aircraft systems, radar and jet fighters, the question must be asked: "Is the U.S. government trying to provoke a shooting incident?"

The present Kennedy policy toward Cuba has been revealed by a number of well informed U.S. newsmen. One of the most succinct statements of this type is the Washington dispatch by Max Frankel in the Oct. 14 *New York Times*.

He outlines the main measures Kennedy is now taking: 1) Pressure on Latin American governments for sanctions against Cuba

and to prevent movement of funds and persons to and from the island. 2) Pressure on shippers to halt shipping to Cuba. 3) Encouragement of raids and sabotage by counter-revolutionary exiles. 4) Close, provocative surveillance of Cuba by U.S. ships and planes. 5) Frankel hints at assassination attempts against Cuban leaders.

The goal, says Frankel, is to destroy or deform the revolution by creating "economic hardship and physical insecurity." The article ends as follows: "But open intervention, officials here contend, might involve considerable military and diplomatic losses and might not be as effective. They add that, in any case, military intervention will remain an alternative if the present policy fails."

What that alternative entails is indicated by a report from the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo, Cuba, by Holmes Alexander in the Oct. 8 *Los Angeles Times*. "Realistically, because time is running against us," he writes, "we would be lucky if an 'incident' at this naval base provided us with a new chance" to commit U.S. military force in an invasion.

Alexander describes the U.S. response to such an "incident" as follows: "Reinforced from the American mainland and supported by ruthless shelling from our sea forces and bombing from aircraft, we could advance to seize a considerable part of Oriente Province, including the two key cities of Santiago de Cuba and Guantanamo City. Resolute action from Washington could then establish in this remote area of Cuba an anti-Castro Government which could be quickly recognized. We would then have a situation comparable to what we have in many parts of the world — Korea, Vietnam..."

Last week Fidel Castro, welcoming Cuban President Dorticos, back from the UN, characterized the U.S. ambassador to the UN, Adlai Stevenson, as "that supposed liberal" who is "cynical and shameless." Stevenson's cynical shamelessness is of the same cloth as Kennedy's. At the very moment he was demagogically condemning warmongering in his Indianapolis speech, Kennedy and his whole administration were pressing forward plans for continued aggression against Cuba.

Welfare State or Warfare State?

By William F. Warde

Ultra-conservatives condemn Kennedy's administration for its "welfare-state" policies which sneak the deadly serpent of "crawling socialism" into their free-enterprise paradise. The administration's champions loudly boast of its considerateness for the underprivileged. And many gullible citizens are taken in by one side or the other.

Morris K. Udall, Democratic congressman from Arizona and brother of the Secretary of the Interior, has published instructive figures about the federal budget in the Oct. 1 *New Republic*. These show how much — or more correctly, how little — social welfare is coming out of Washington compared with the colossal expenditures for military purposes.

79% for War

According to the official statistics of the Bureau of the Budget, for the fiscal year starting July 1, 1962, \$72.8 billion of all federal receipts has been allotted for defense, diplomacy and costs of past wars. This means that 79 cents out of every tax dollar is being gobbled up by expenditures for previous wars, current ones as in Vietnam, and preparations for future war.

Of the remaining \$20.1 billion portion of the budget only \$6.6 billion goes for welfare purposes. No more than 7 cents of our tax dollar will be devoted to state aid for the aged, blind and disabled, for health, education, labor services, school lunches and vocational rehabilitation.

Less Than 10% for Welfare

The military machine takes almost three-fourths of the government revenue; welfare less than 10 per cent. Under Kennedy, who raised the military budget by \$8 billion, the demands of imperialism are satisfied to the maximum while the needs of the people are held to the bare minimum. Welfare is dwarfed by the monstrous growth of the warfare aspects of the regime.

That is not all. Udall brings out the extent of this trend by comparing the fiscal 1939 with the 1962 budget. In 1939 the U.S.

spent, not 7 per cent, but 44 per cent, of its budget for labor and welfare programs! He calculates that almost twice as much per capita was spent on these programs in 1939 as will be spent in 1963.

"The brutal fact is," the congressman concludes, "that in the past 24 years 'welfare-state programs' have withered to little more than half their pre-war level."

Udall cites these figures to refute conservative charges that the administration is recklessly plung-

ing into more and more "welfare stateism." But they cast glaring light on the pretensions of Democratic liberalism. Today the banquet table is heaped high for the profiteering merchants and manufacturers of death who take the biggest bite out of the budget.

The rest of the population not only receives a meager portion but a relatively smaller share of welfare under Kennedy than they did 24 years ago under Roosevelt!

Warfare before welfare — that's progress on Kennedy's "New Frontier."

Sobell Vigil Urges UN Plea To Kennedy for Clemency

NEW YORK, Oct. 17 — A daily freedom vigil began today at the United Nations to urge international appeals to President Kennedy to free Morton Sobell, now in his 13th year of imprisonment. Sobell steadfastly maintains his innocence of a charge of conspiracy to commit espionage. He is eligible for parole and a hearing will take place in Washington Oct. 30.

The appeals to the United Nations, initiated by the Committee to Secure Justice for Morton So-

bell, began at noon today at United Nations Plaza, 43rd St. and 1st Avenue, and continued till 2 p.m.

Each day henceforth a symbolic representation of those urging Sobell's immediate release will walk with appropriate signs from noon to 2 p.m. at the UN Plaza.

The Sobell committee is asking all persons interested in assisting to be present at the UN or to phone AL 4-9983 to schedule participation.

The U.S. Parole Board, which rejected Sobell's first application will hold a formal hearing Oct. 30, when noted Americans are expected to appear in Sobell's behalf.

Sobell also currently has a legal action pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals. He is asking freedom, a new trial or, at the minimum, a reduction of the 30-year sentence, which his attorneys hold is illegal because trial judge Irving Kaufman lacked authority to impose a wartime penalty.

Despite the reports about the danger of cancer in cigarette smoking, the American public will spend a record \$6.8 billion for cigarettes during 1962 according to an estimate by the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture. That's \$210 million above last year.



Morton Sobell



New Yorker to Discuss Talks With Yevtushenko

NEW YORK — George Saunders, a Russian-studies graduate student, will speak here on his recent discussions with the celebrated young Soviet poet, Yevgeny Yevtushenko.

Saunders, who spent an extensive period of time with Yevtushenko during the World Peace Festival in Helsinki and later in Moscow, will speak on Friday night, Oct. 26, at 116 University Place. The meeting is sponsored by the Militant Labor Forum and the Young Socialist Alliance.

A new poem by Yevtushenko about a Cuban mother whose son was killed during the U.S.-backed invasion of Cuba last year appeared in *Pravda* on Oct. 14. The poem describes the mother as saying:

The sea...
That is where the murderers
came from!
I know —
They can come back again!
The poem ends with the plea:
Happy American mothers,
Look
At this Cuban mother!

Bound Volume of
The Militant — 1961

Price \$6.00

Please include payment with
all orders

Order from:

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

When, in conjunction with the increased size of *The Militant*, we launched the campaign to add 1,200 new readers to our subscription list, we considered it a very modest goal.

We knew, by past experience, that selling subs for a paper like ours was simply a matter of planning, organization and action. Given this preliminary preparation, it could be established with mathematical certainty that the number of subs sold would be in direct ratio to the time spent in canvassing new prospects, multiplied by the number of people participating.

Detroit Comes Through

This has been once again confirmed by the results achieved in the sale of new subs and renewals by the Detroit contingent of the Militant Army. We commend to the attention of all campaign directors the comprehensive report from Detroit which was sent to all areas for your information and emulation!

As you will note, this issue of *The Militant* contains the complete text of the important United Nations speech by Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticos. We are the only paper in this country carrying this complete speech! The expansion of our paper to eight pages made this possible. But the effect of such coverage will be lost unless

our list of subscribers is rapidly expanded. It's up to you.

City	Quota	Subs	%
Detroit	100	112	112
Indiana	10	10	100
Baltimore	10	9	90
Connecticut	30	18	60
Newark	15	8	53
Boston	25	13	52
San Diego	30	13	43
Oakland-			
Berkeley	75	30	40
Philadelphia	75	22	29
Twin Cities	100	25	25
Milwaukee	25	6	24
Akron-			
Cleveland	75	9	12
Seattle	75	9	12
San Francisco	75	9	12
Los Angeles	150	19	12
New York	150	18	12
Chicago	90	10	11
St. Louis	10	1	10
Denver	50	0	0
General	30	31	103

Total (through Oct. 16) 1,200 372 31%

Charles Abrams, president of the National Committee against Discrimination in Housing, recently charged that President Kennedy's failure to issue his long-promised Executive Order barring discrimination in federally-aided housing has left the door open for the return to the states-rights doctrine, not a national civil-rights policy.

Text of Dorticos' UN Speech

[The following is the complete text of the speech delivered by Dr. Osvaldo Dorticos, President of Cuba, on October 8, 1962, to the General Assembly of the United Nations.]

President DORTICOS: My first words must be words of congratulations to you, Mr. President [of UN General Assembly, Muhammad Zafrulla Khan of Pakistan], on your election to the high post that you occupy in the General Assembly.

I also wish most enthusiastically and warmly to welcome the admission to membership in the United Nations of the new states that thus begin on the great adventure of national independence, namely, Rwanda, Burundi, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago.

May I anticipate matters somewhat and also extend our tribute and offer our welcome to the great nation that will very soon enter this Organization: Algeria, which with its admission to membership crowns a lengthy period of strife and struggle for independence, an independence whose achievement doubtless gives the most obvious proof of the fact that we are at present, with great historic fortune for us, contemplating the end of the era of colonialism and oppression of peoples.

Word of Thanks

I think that we are in duty bound also to express the appreciation and gratitude of the revolutionary government of Cuba to the representatives who have with great warmth, support and profound understanding mentioned our country in the statements they have made in the General Assembly. May I express my gratitude to those who have raised their voices here in defense of the legitimate rights of our people.

I wish also to thank those who, without mentioning the name of my country, have supported with warmth and conviction the principles that must form the basis of the entire matter of self-determination of peoples, those principles which must be opposed to any kind of foreign intervention in the future of peoples and their decisions.

This session of the General Assembly is taking place in the midst of the speeding up of preparations for a nuclear war. It is taking place in the midst of an increase of the flow of propaganda for a preventive nuclear war. It is true that we can, with satisfaction and pleasure, note some encouraging signs despite these depressing circumstances. The solution of the problem of Laos, the agreement on West Irian, the independence of new states are all truly great events that nourish our hopes. But, unfortunately, along with these encouraging signs, we must also note that, as on previous occasions, this session of the assembly is confronted with unusually tense circumstances which point to grave danger to international peace, and it is those problems concerning peace — and, therefore, the questions of disarmament and the cessation of nuclear tests, the liquidation of colonialism and of all types of oppression — that constitute the important and essential problems on which the assembly must focus its attention.

On more than one occasion in the past Cuba has clearly made known its position on each of these questions which are to be discussed at this session of the assembly. Our Prime Minister made Cuba's position clear on these matters at the 15th regular session. Today, as then, we stress once again our concern in all the activities, conduct or agreements that may or can assist in the achievement of general and complete disarmament, not only because this will ultimately lead to the liquidation of the material possibilities of war, but also be-



APPEALING TO WORLD OPINION. Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticos at the United Nations presenting his indictment of U.S. aggression against his country.

cause, as many speakers have stated in this assembly, it will permit the utilization of the vast resources which will be liberated through disarmament in the economic and cultural development of all countries of the world, especially the underdeveloped regions.

Our viewpoint is also clear-cut regarding the cessation and the prohibition of all nuclear tests, in the atmosphere, in the stratosphere, under water and underground.

So far as my country is concerned, since it has an open economy dependent to a large extent on international trade, as well as for basic reasons of principle, we advocate the widest freedom of trade and we are ready to support the holding of an international trade conference that will study and adopt measures and agreements that will abolish those things which today limit free trade and which in the future will limit free trade even more.

We repeat again our feelings in favor of the urgent restoration to the People's Republic of China of its rights in the United Nations. The exclusion of the People's Republic of China is more than absurd; its exclusion from assembly matters jeopardizes the effective implementation of any international agreements which might be arrived at in the assembly.

Independence

We wish to contribute to the utmost to accelerating the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

Together with the other voices that have been raised in this assembly, and specifically because we are exceptional eye-witnesses of what military intervention can be, we urge the withdrawal of foreign troops.

[At this point there was a disturbance in the public gallery by Cuban counter-revolutionaries.]

When all is said and done, interruptions of that nature do not really disturb us. Lately, during the last few days of my sojourn in this country, we have been victims of this type of disturbance. This merely gives us even greater proof of the fact that this is a country in which sufficient guarantees are not offered to the Organization to ensure its functioning.

President KHAN: If this kind of demonstration continues I may have to direct that the galleries be cleared of all visitors. Will the President of Cuba kindly proceed.

President DORTICOS: I shall endeavor to continue, because of course, what has to be said here by us will be said. I repeat, we insist on the withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea and from South Vietnam.

[At this point there was an interruption from the public gallery.]

May I ask to be allowed to

continue.

President KHAN: At the very next interruption, I shall adjourn the assembly for five minutes until all the visitors are cleared from the galleries.

President DORTICOS: May I continue now?

These are matters that concern you all; these are questions that are closely tied to the problems of peace and war. Whenever we are given the opportunity, and in keeping with these general outlines I have just given you, the delegation of Cuba will make known its views clearly and with the firm conviction of the principles on which we stand.

The Threat of War

These are not the only problems which today jeopardize world peace. We have appeared before the United Nations specifically because surrounding the so-called Cuban problem or question, there is being created a series of circumstances and an entire atmosphere that, despite our will and despite our determination, transformed this question, or endeavors to transform it, into a case which implies or carries within it the threat of war. That is why I think it is appropriate for me, with a knowledge based on facts and without speculations that are marginal to the events of recent history and of the present day, to put before you exactly what the Cuban situation is and what is the clear-cut position of the revolutionary government of Cuba. First and foremost, let me recall the following.

Today it is said that Cuba constitutes a threat to peace on the American continent because, in accordance with its Marxist-Leninist orientation, it promotes subversion. And this is taken up and made into the basic and fundamental question.

I repeat that it is well to recall that the tense situation existing with relation to my country — that is, the tense situation existing between the United States and Cuba — began a long time before our revolutionary process acquired the socialist characteristics which it displays today.

The promulgation of our laws affecting the interests of the North American monopolies in our country and the promulgation of the agrarian reform law at a stage in our revolutionary development that was not yet in conformity with the principles of socialism — these sufficed to bring about the start of the aggressive actions against our country on the part of the government of the United States. Then began the series of insolent diplomatic notes and the piratical incursions into the air space over our territory. These were closely followed by the cutting of the sugar quota on the North American market and the discontinuance of the supply of oil to our country together with

diplomatic activities aimed at the isolation of Cuba in the continent. In a word, there was a whole series of pointedly aggressive actions which gave rise to the present state of tension — I repeat — long before we proclaimed the socialist character of our revolution.

And what happened thereafter? I believe it would tax your patience unduly if I were to rehearse the list of North American aggressions against Cuba. I think it is sufficient to mention all the attempts made to create subversion in our country, the acts of sabotage, the attacks against individuals and the espionage activities on our soil. And finally, it is sufficient to recall to this assembly the armed invasion of our country by mercenary forces militarily financed, militarily trained and militarily protected and directed by the government of the United States — the invasion at Playa Girón.

And after Playa Girón, after that fiasco, that ridiculous event, what happened? Did they perhaps learn the great lesson of history? Did they show an awareness and a knowledge of the tremendous power of a people firm in its determination to achieve liberation and independence? No, they did not. We were immediately made the victims of new aggressions, of infiltrations, along our coastline, by agents trained by the Central Intelligence Agency. There were new attempts at sabotage; there was the military training of groups to carry out the subversion within our country that had not yet been achieved; there was an intensification of economic pressure on our country — a weapon which, moreover, has been stubbornly and persistently wielded in the hope that economic pressure can bring about a failure of the revolution in our country, and consequently the achievement of the sole objective sought, that is the overthrow of the revolutionary government of Cuba.

Economic Development

Despite the fact that they cut us off from participation in the North American sugar market, despite the fact that they cut off our supply of oil, despite the fact that they completely and finally severed trade relations between our country and the United States, hoping thereby to bring about the collapse of our economy, we can nevertheless appear today before this assembly of the United Nations; and we could also take a great deal of time listing all the successes which we have already achieved in our economic development, successes which are easy to see and which constitute...

[At this point there was an interruption from the public gallery.]

With all due respect, Mr. President, may I request a guarantee that I shall be allowed to continue speaking.

President KHAN: I request the President to continue. Nobody can give a guarantee that someone may not behave foolishly, but we shall take every precaution to see that the President is not unduly interrupted.

President DORTICOS: I will lose neither my calm nor my patience.

As I was saying, we can today proudly point out before the United Nations a long list of economic achievements. We can point to an industry criminally deprived of its supply of spare parts but nevertheless able to show today, in so short a time and in the face of all the difficulties, a growth of 7 per cent, except in the sugar industry. We can point to our agricultural development and to the organization and planning of our economy, promising a balanced and accelerated growth in the near future directed fundamentally to the achievement of national self-sufficiency.

The setting up and creation of

exportable reserves to be ploughed into our agriculture, the development of our international trade, and the obviously necessary preliminary stages that will lead to a later industrial development, will entirely transform the characteristics and the structure of our underdeveloped industries. And hand in hand with this there are measures of health improvement that are a privilege in this continent, and there are fundamental achievements in our educational policies.

It is these, along with other things, that allow us today, with pride and with deep-felt satisfaction, to say that on this continent, so filled with uneducated people, this continent of countries with alarming statistics of illiteracy, Cuba today, because of its revolution, is without illiterates. But we have had to carry this out beset at every step by multiple aggressions, and the very campaign against illiteracy in our country in itself, in its development, in its growth, had to go through some painful and dramatic moments because the counter-revolutionary bands, organized and supplied by the government of the United States, went so far as to murder teachers, young men or students who were teaching, who had gone out to our fields to wipe out the scourge of illiteracy among our peasants.

Aggressions

All this progress, all this advance — which I think warrants the support and applause of those who may have differing ideological viewpoints from ourselves — all this success, and the enemies' failures, have also not taught the great lesson.

The aggressions continued; the provocations continued; the training of counter-revolutionary groups on North American soil and on the soil of Caribbean countries continued; the provocations coming from the American naval base that is still rooted in our country continued; and the violation of the territorial waters and the air space of my country continued. Because of lack of time it would be impossible for me to narrate all these violations. They shall however be distributed to members of the assembly. But those aggressions continue and the American warships continue bordering the coast of our ports, and those of us who live in Havana daily have to see with our own eyes those warships lurking around our island, with their warlike aspect, and if not warlike as yet at least with the aspect of preparing for war.

This is the present picture. But we can add that the present situation is qualitatively different from that which existed prior to the invasion of our country at Playa Girón. I say that qualitatively speaking it is different, for the following reason: Prior to Playa Girón, the government of the United States more than once stated that it had no aggressive intentions against my country. Naturally, after Playa Girón, the President of the United States himself publicly and officially had to recognize his responsibility; he had to recognize his participation in that invasion.

And today the situation is different because, although it is true that we are being told again and again — and the head of the United States delegation here in the assembly stated it — that there is no intention to attack my country, there exists, on the other hand, a precedent. There is a background of literature, official declarations and official resolutions which authorize and legitimize in advance, armed aggression against Cuba. And the idea, as we read it in the text of a declaration of the U.S. State Department, the guiding motive of the foreign policy of the United States regarding Cuba is clearly

(Continued on Page 6)

'Forced to Strengthen Our Military Defenses'

(Continued from Page 5)

and obviously that of overthrowing the revolutionary government of Cuba and destroying our glorious revolution and its fruits.

This is taking place in the middle of, and surrounded by, a press, radio and television campaign that fills the political stage of the United States with a warlike hysteria. Together with this, there are the reiterated and insolent and insulting statements made by senators and representatives of the United States. The most wholehearted use is being made, in the most absurd fashion, of all circumstances in order to feed this campaign of aggressive hysteria against our country, culminating, for example, in the ridiculous statement that the establishment in our territory of a fishing port, following on friendly and amicable relations with the Soviet Union, also implies a threat of armed aggression which jeopardizes the security of the United States itself. They are raising to the level of a threat of war the use of codfish and herrings.

We know that this atmosphere of hysteria, this campaign, this interminable series of slander and libel are part and parcel of pressures being exerted by the United States government — and on it, too — so that once and for all there will be a decision taken for armed aggression, direct armed aggression, against my country. We know that these pressures exist. But we also believe that, when all is said and done, it is the United States government itself that is responsible for the existence of these pressures, which are the inevitable corollary, the unavoidable result, of the policy of constant and permanent aggression and harassment that the United States government has followed since the new administration took over in this country.

Meeting at State Dept.

Everyone can see and watch the maneuvers, the activities that are being carried out under the tutelage of this climate of anti-Cuban hysteria and aggression.

For example, not in the United Nations, but with obvious contempt for the United Nations, an invitation is sent out to the foreign ministers of Latin America to meet at the State Department. They are invited to conspire, to join in the domestic subversion of my country. Once again, the so-called inter-American system is wielded, that system which the United States government itself has been good enough to disdain. Why was the system not invoked at the time of the aggression? Why was the system sidestepped at the time of the invasion of Playa Girón? Doubtless the same system will also be overlooked in the case of a new armed aggression against my country.

We have noticed that the Secretary of State of the United States is not even present at the United Nations. He has not shown any concern for disarmament, peace and tranquility. He has been outside our organization, taken up with his work of subversion, of conspiracy against my country.

We also know full well that at the meeting of Latin American foreign ministers respectable representatives of countries of Latin America, despite their ideological differences with our revolution, defended the principles of non-intervention and the self-determination of peoples. From this rostrum I praise some of those foreign ministers. I challenge them to tell us what was discussed at that meeting, and what was discussed outside the meeting, too, so that one and all may know that it is not Cuba that is upsetting peace in this continent; it is not Cuba that is attacking sister republics; but it is Cuba that is the victim and doubtless will be the next victim of interference and new aggression and new obstacles to its development.

Outside the Organization of American States, and without consulting any of the international bodies, showing contempt for one and all, the United States government takes unilateral decisions and continues to engage in activities which flagrantly flout and violate the principles of the United Nations Charter.

On the one hand, there is the policy of the Alliance for Progress, a policy of opportunism that is set up in this continent only because of and in view of the example of the Cuban Revolution. On the



Fidel Castro

one hand, a decision is proclaimed to support the development of the backward countries because of and in view of the case of Cuba, which also has an underdeveloped economy, whose people are filled with aspirations for economic development and cultural development.

On the other hand, there is an entire policy of creating economic difficulties, of trying to stifle and strangle the forces of the revolutionary government of Cuba. And to all that has been done are added these official decisions — officially proclaimed — to use coercion and reprisals against any shipping firms whose ships carry any cargo to supply and feed the Cuban people: raw materials for our industries, fertilizers and tools for our land. Reprisals and coercion are used to force a naval blockade of our island. In full daylight, openly, pressures are exercised on the countries of NATO to make them stop their ships from carrying cargo to our country.

And if that is unsuccessful there is still another tool: reprisals against ships that do carry cargo to my country, even to the detriment of the interests of shipping firms flying flags of countries friendly to the United States.

This, in the first place, is the most obvious and tacit confession of failure on the part of those who predicted the economic collapse of Cuba. It was said that because of the historic roads that our revolution was following, our country would be led to hunger, famine and disaster. The fact that they now have to use these maneuvers, these reprisals, this repression, to cut off maritime trade with Cuba proves that those predictions were wrong. Now they have to destroy the Cuban Revolution by the artificial establishment of economic difficulties, fully aware as they must be and are that the economic development of my country depends, and will depend for a long time, on the strengthening and expansion of our trade relations with other countries.

This pressure for blockades, this carrying out of unilateral acts to force blockades: I ask myself, and I ask you, gentlemen, whether in a time of peace these are or are

not acts of war? I ask you, gentlemen, whether the United States government is entitled or empowered — outside this international organization, showing its contempt for this organization — to take such unilateral decisions with such repercussions?

I ask you whether this can be made to jibe with the purposes of improving and widening international relations that led ultimately to the setting up and establishment of the United Nations. I ask and I wonder whether the United Nations can impassively watch such events take place. And I wonder and I ask whether this blockade against my country is or is not an act of war, preparatory to war, facilitating war, and whether, in view of this fact and event, the United Nations can remain silent. Cuba asks the condemnation of such aggressive acts, a condemnation from the United Nations.

The guiding principles of the freedom of trade are attacked. But these principles are an ancient victory of mankind. Naturally, no one would dare to submit to an international organization the right to exercise a duty or a privilege that is not theirs. Without such a right, without such privilege, they act as though they had it — and naturally, this being the case, the representative of the United States has not brought this matter up to the assembly. But it is our responsibility, it is our duty, to refer to it — to violation of the principles guaranteeing freedom of international trade and commerce, the carrying out of an act of war in times of peace, and the absurd and haughty adoption of measures of this nature by a great country against a small nation.

But these efforts will fail again, as they failed in the past. Cuba does not stand alone. Cuba has friends. It has the international solidarity of peoples. And Cuba has friendly governments on its side, and they will allow Cuba to enjoy international trade.

But this is not all. There is something on which I must dwell emphatically and to which I must draw the attention of the assembly.

The Congressional Resolution

I said at the beginning of my address that the state of United States-Cuban relations prior to the invasion of Playa Girón was different, qualitatively speaking, from what it is today. And I said this because now official declarations and resolutions have been made known, in a vain attempt to legitimize, in advance, direct armed aggression against my country.

You all have before you the joint resolution of the American congress. To understand this, you need merely glance through the operative part of that joint resolution, as approved by the Congress of the United States. I quote the document:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the United States is determined

"(a) To prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms" —

I repeat that: "including the use of arms" —

"the Marxist-Leninist régime in Cuba from extending by force or threat of force its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;"

This is most bizarre. We can only turn to recent history. Was it perhaps Cuba that carried out aggressive or subversive activities against other countries of this hemisphere? No, it was quite the contrary. Cast your minds back for one moment and recall the invasion of Playa Girón, supported and organized, as President Kennedy himself admitted, by the government of the United States. The mercenary troops were trained in a Central American country, and these troops set forth to in-

vade another American nation. Was it Cuba that carried out subversive activities in this hemisphere, or was it rather these other governments which, in one way or another, supported that invasion? In so doing, in committing this international crime, they were guilty of it. Cuba has said in the past, and repeats it here, that we do not intend to carry out, nor shall we ever carry out, any activities extending the ideology of our own revolutionary process to any other countries or parts of this hemisphere.

But let us go back to this joint resolution of the United States of America in Congress assembled. In its third operative paragraph, it says:

"To work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans" —

And may I enter a parenthesis here: Cuban counter-revolutionaries —

"to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination."

Let us see what this means. Does it mean: to continue to support the subversive and aggressive activities against our country; to finance, to protect, to cover new piratical incursions on our shores; to finance and militarily to cover and protect new armed aggression against our country?

This paragraph of the resolution adopted by the United States of America in Congress assembled is the official, categorical, open statement of the decision of that country to interfere in the domestic affairs of my country, thus given the light of day publicly and officially by the Congress of the United States of America; and, in a ridiculously contradictory fashion, this is declared in the same resolution in which Cuba is accused of being guilty of upsetting peace on this continent.

U.S. and Cuban Security

In sub-paragraph (b) of this joint resolution the Congress of the United States of America states that it is determined:

"To prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States."

In other words, the Congress of United States *a priori* legitimizes armed aggression, against my country to prevent the setting up in Cuba of a military capacity which might endanger the security of the United States. Cuba endangering the security of a great power — Cuba, the victim of aggression, Cuba, the invaded country. This country, Cuba, fills the leaders of this great power with panic, and their hearts tremble! I do not think I need to stress to you, gentlemen, the ludicrous nature of such a declaration.

Because of this joint resolution passed by the Congress of the United States — I have heard a representative describe it as a reply to the problem of Cuba — the United States government is calling up reservists and intends to train Cuban contingents, within the regular United States army, to be used against the Cuban Government. That, according to the joint resolution, is because of the danger that Cuba represents — because Cuba could become militarily capable of endangering and upsetting the peaceful daily life of the American people, and of endangering the security of this great power.

What can we say about this? We can say that Cuba has armed itself. We have a right to arm ourselves, to defend ourselves, and the question that must be asked is, "Why has Cuba armed itself?" It is undeniable that we would have preferred to have channeled all those human and material resources, and all the energies that we have had to expend in the strengthening of our military defense, towards the development of our economy and the growth of

our culture. We have armed ourselves against our will, against our better nature, because we were forced to. We were forced to strengthen our military defenses. Otherwise we should be jeopardizing and undermining the sovereignty of our country and its independence.

We have armed because the Cuban people has the legitimate right, given to it by history itself, to defend its sovereign decisions and to lead its country down the historic roads which, in the exercise of its sovereignty, it has chosen for itself. And I ask you gentlemen — you do not have to answer me, but can answer sincerely within your heart of hearts — what would have happened, had we not strengthened our military defenses, when a division armed and trained by the United States government invaded our country at Playa Girón. Obviously, our revolution would not have been overthrown. Our historic movement would not have been stopped. But it would have been a long and bloody fight. Many more human lives would have been lost, and much more material wealth would have been destroyed.

We wiped out that invasion within the space of 72 hours. We repelled that haughty and unjustifiable aggression against our country in 72 hours because we had exercised in time our right to strengthen our military capacity for defense, in order, as I have said, to safeguard our sovereign independence and our revolution.

Forced to Arm

That is why we armed. We still hope that we shall be able to throw all these weapons overboard. We are a peace-loving nation; we want peace; we do not want war. The people of Cuba have only one desire — to achieve great conquests in the development of their nation's future, but to do so by peaceful work, by creative labor.

We were forced to arm — not to attack anyone, not to assault any nation, but only to defend ourselves. And to the joint resolution of the American Congress we replied in due course with a declaration, agreed to by our own Council of Ministers, which says in its pertinent paragraphs:

"Were the United States able to give Cuba effective guarantees and satisfactory proof concerning the integrity of Cuban territory, and were it to cease its subversive and counter-revolutionary activities against our people, then Cuba would not have to strengthen its defenses. Cuba would not even need an army, and all the resources that are used for this could be gratefully and happily invested in the economic and cultural development of the country."

Were the United States able to give us proof, by word and deed, that it would not carry out aggression against our country, then, we declare solemnly before you here and now, our weapons would be unnecessary and our army redundant. We believe ourselves able to create peace.

Furthermore, we are not obliged by anyone or anything to explain to the Congress of the United States what we do to defend our territorial integrity. We arm in whatever way we deem necessary to defend our nation, not to attack anyone. I repeat, we do not have to render an account to any power or to any foreign congress. While present tense circumstances require it, we shall continue to strengthen our military defense, to defend ourselves, not to attack anyone. If we are attacked, the enemy will meet the resistance of our weapons; but, at the same time, he will meet the resistance of our patriotism.

Obviously, the most serious point in this resolution of the United States Congress is that it takes upon itself the so-called right unilaterally to decide when,

(Continued on Page 7)

'Cuba Is Not a Hemisphere Problem, the U.S. Is'

(Continued from Page 6)

its opinion, these conditions set forth in the joint resolution have been fulfilled, at which time the United States will be able to carry out what previously was made legitimate, namely, aggression against my country. And this is a matter of grave concern because, according to the resolution, it is sufficient for the United States government to declare that one of these conditions has been fulfilled or it to feel empowered to attack us directly through armed aggression.

Surely this constitutes unheard of contempt for international law; surely this is a barefaced flaunting of an international organization; surely this is a violation of the United Nations itself. By this artificial means, pretexts for aggression are prefabricated and a pretext for aggression is drawn from the supposed possibility that, by armed force, Cuba may try to take over the territory at present occupied by the United States military base at Guantanamo.

We have stated more than once, and we repeat, our right to recover that territory. That region was torn from us by force following an American incursion. International conferences, such as the Elgrad Conference, fully recognized and expressly stated the right of the Cuban Government to recover that territory. We know that that military and naval base is for today. It is to recruit and train counter-revolutionaries, to undertake acts of provocation against our frontier posts, to offend and insult our citizens, to infiltrate agents of conspiracy, espionage and subversion into our territory.

Will Give No Pretext

Once more I take this opportunity of reiterating to this assembly that we shall exercise our right in due course, but we shall not do so by means of armed force. We shall exercise that right when we deem it appropriate through the procedural channels of international law and before the international bodies competent to deal with such a claim. We shall not make a gift to the United States of a pretext for aggression. We hope that this will be a controversy which will one day be settled by peaceful means, but until that day dawns, and while we wait for the moment to exercise our right in accordance with international law, we denounce from this rostrum any effort to use as a pretext for aggression any provocative act emanating from the Guantanamo base.

Where do we stand in the face of this aggressive conduct? From the beginning of the deterioration of Cuban-United States relations, Cuba has constantly been ready to negotiate, to negotiate through formal diplomatic channels or by any other adequate means, to negotiate the differences between the United States and Cuba.

As our Council of Ministers stated in its declaration, Cuba was then prepared to indemnify American citizens and interests that might have been affected by the wars of the revolution, had it not been for the economic aggression, and the government of the United States been ready to negotiate on a level commensurate with the sovereignty, dignity and independence of our people. Our eagerness for a negotiated peaceful settlement was published many times; it was included in official letters sent to the United States government. Our purpose and our willingness to negotiate were early stated. The repeated refusals of the United States government to negotiate proved conclusively that it had one single aim, namely, the overthrow of the revolutionary government of my country, the destruction of the Cuban Revolution and interference in the exercise of self-determination by our people.

When there was a change of ad-



THE NEW WORLD has never before seen such crowds as those which rally to Cuba's revolutionary government. Shown above is the Jan. 2, 1962 celebration of the revolution's third anniversary.

ministration in the United States, when President Kennedy assumed the presidency, we again reiterated our willingness to solve by peaceful means the situation of tension that existed. The replies to these words and the answer to those offers of peace were very clear. They were embodied in the continuation of the aggressive policy of the previous administration, the aggression against and the invasion of our country and the carrying out by the present government, as President Kennedy acknowledged of the plans of aggression and invasion of Cuba that had been drawn up by the previous administration.

Cuba sought peace, but the United States wanted war. But there are times when one turns a deaf ear to the lessons of history and the lesson of Playa Girón. After that failure and fiasco that so greatly undermined the prestige of those who were just undertaking the responsibilities of power [the Kennedy administration], the aggressions continued and the refusals to negotiate were repeated. The situation today is the lamentable consequence of that stubbornness, pride and arrogance of those who had aggressive intentions against my country.

Ready to Ease Tension

Cuba, and I say this clearly, has been ready and is ready to do everything we deem useful to lighten the tension that surrounds Cuban-American relations and that threaten world peace. Since Cuba is ready to do this, we therefore have a moral right to challenge the delegation of the United States government to tell us whether that government is equally ready to take the necessary and useful steps to overcome the present international tension which surrounds Cuba. Unfortunately, we are pessimistic, and we can anticipate the answer that will be given to us with regard to those steps towards peace, those steps which we are ready to take and which we request the United States government to take, or, rather, we ask the United States government if it is ready to take those steps. Unfortunately, and you can stand as witnesses, those steps will not be taken.

We would like those steps to be taken. We are lovers of peace and we wish to work and to accelerate the progress of our country. We do not want war; we do not want to fight, but we have to follow the lead of patriotism, of serenity and of the responsibilities of the leaders. Unfortunately, the road followed by the United States of America is not this. Their road is the road of arrogance, hunger for

domination and panic in the light of the Cuban Revolution.

Cuba is not an aggressive country; it is a peace-loving nation. Cuba does not possess any monopolies devoted to the manufacture of weapons, and, therefore, so far as our country is concerned, war is bad business. We in Cuba do not want war; we want peace. Cuba wants to live in peace and in friendship with all the countries of this continent and, indeed, with all the countries of this planet.

We would have liked to have lived at peace with the United States, yet, despite that desire, we have had to live in constant vigilance, constantly on the alert and with our weapons at the ready, with our fighters awake, ready at any and every moment to work creatively and in peace, but, by the same token, awake and alert for the armed strife which we do not seek but which, if it becomes inevitable, we shall confront with the historic courage of our people.

Self-Determination

It has been very often stated that Cuba is not a bone of contention between the East and the West. Cuba is a problem of sovereignty and independence. The problem of Cuba is a question of the sovereign decision of a people and the right of that people to self-determination. Cuba does not wish to add its name to the roster of those involved in the cold war. Cuba only wishes to develop its economy and advance its culture and to plan and carry out a good future in peace.

Cuba is ready at any moment to prove its aims, and if it be true that there is no intention to attack our country, and if we can believe that to be a fact, then in this assembly we urge the head of the United States delegation to be good enough to stand here and give us true guarantees that his government does not intend to attack Cuba. But we urge him to give us these guarantees not only in words, but, over and above all, with deeds — guarantees of words were offered to us before Playa Girón.

When the invasion took place, many of you here heard the representative of the government of the United States declare that such an invasion had not taken place, that it did not exist and that his government had not sponsored that invasion. Yet, after a few days, the president of the United States of America himself publicly and officially assumed the responsibility for that invasion. Therefore, because of the past, we have a perfect right in

the United Nations to ask for guarantees of non-aggression, but, as I said before, not the guarantee of words but, over and above all, guarantees strengthened by deeds.

Let us not be told that the problem of Cuba is not a bilateral difference between Cuba and the United States, that Cuba is really a problem of the hemisphere. We have said before and we have repeated, and we repeat once more, that we respect the principle of non-intervention. We have always proclaimed our respect for the sovereignty and independence of the rest of the countries of Latin America.

Cuba is not a problem of this continent nor of this hemisphere. Under-development is a hemisphere problem; we are not a hemisphere problem. Hunger, famine, need are hemisphere problems, but Cuba is not. Lack of education and illiteracy are hemisphere problems, not Cuba. United States interference in the domestic affairs of the countries of this continent is a hemisphere problem, not Cuba. The training and preparation of armed forces, specifically on the part of the government of the United States, in various countries of this continent to be used in the suppression of popular movements in the continent until the danger of a new colonial war has been controlled in the Americas — this is a hemisphere problem, not Cuba.

Cuba is not a hemisphere problem; the United States is, because of its lack of respect for the sovereignty of other states. Cuba is no problem for the countries which respect it. Cuba can be a problem only for those governments which fear it — not our capacity for subversion or for hypothetical aggressive intentions, but only the example of the Cuban Revolution.

Non-Intervention

The revolutionary government of Cuba, as was stated in the decision of the Council of Ministers of Cuba, once more affirms that the foreign policy of our country is based on the principle of non-intervention, on the right to self-determination of all nations, on recognition of the sovereign equality of States, on freedom of trade, on the settling through negotiation of international disputes, and on the will to live peacefully with all peoples of the world.

Faithful to these principles of its international policy and to the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, Cuba constitutes a danger to the security of no nation whatsoever of our continent, nor has Cuba harbored, in the past or at the present time, any aggressive intentions against any of them. Rather have we shown the greatest and most absolute respect for the policy of non-intervention, convinced as we are, and as demonstrated by our own national history, that it is up to each and every people to decide, in its sovereignty and without the hateful interference of foreign countries, its own historic destiny.

Cuba, far from having violated this norm of international conduct, has, on the contrary, since our revolution, with all the loss of riches and of lives that so unhappily accompanied it, been the victim constantly of interference in its internal affairs and of aggressions from the territory of other countries of the continent, not only the United States but also several Latin American countries whose governments, admittedly or with concealment, have joined the chorus of imperialist defamation led by the government of the United States, thus turning deaf ears to the genuine sentiments of their respective peoples.

That is our policy: a policy of peace and co-existence, imbued with the firm and profound desire to enjoy the best possible relations with all nations of this con-

tinents.

But if, in spite of this fact, we are attacked, we will defend ourselves. I repeat, we have sufficient means with which to defend ourselves; we have indeed the necessary weapons, the weapons which we would have preferred not to acquire and which we do not wish to employ. Moreover, we can count on the unyielding patriotism of our people and we can count also — and history here has offered us eloquent proof enough — on the solidarity of peoples. We can rely with satisfaction on friendly countries and governments firm in solidarity and ready to defend the right of Cuba to independence and to safeguard the integrity of its territory.

From the bottom of our hearts we wish to see no past error committed again. We sincerely hope that the government of the United States will make no new mistake. If it learned no lesson from Playa Girón, let it at least pause in its haughty march and listen to the loud voice of international wisdom. But if such error is again made, then despite ourselves and against our wishes we warn the United Nations organization right now of our determination to fight. If they make the mistake, we give warning that the aggression against Cuba, despite ourselves and against our every desire, can become transformed, as has been pointed out here, into the start of a new world war.

International Solidarity

We hope and trust that that will not occur. We hope and trust that that error will not be committed. We hope and trust this because we are concerned, concerned not only for the destiny of our people but for the destiny of all mankind. We do believe in the sincerity and in the value of international solidarity, and that is why we believe in the sincerity and in the value of those statements of solidarity that have been made by the government of the Soviet Union.

If the government of the United States does not believe it, it is because it does not understand what a policy founded upon principles is. We have faith in principles; we believe in principles; we fight under the aegis of principles and we direct all our work and all our creative labor towards principles. We believe in principles, and that is why we believe in the solidarity I have referred to. We do not want the mistake to be repeated; we want peace. I repeat here we are ready to take any useful step towards the guaranteeing of peace. We can only point out the possible ramifications for the United Nations of the dangers we have gone through.

Our position is this, and it is very clear — we are ready to do what is necessary to achieve peace, but if once again arrogance, the greed for domination, or fear of the hemisphere example to be drawn from the Cuban Revolution dictates an error to the American government, the people of Cuba, ready as always to live in peace, are also ready to fight with weapons for their independence.

That is our position. The press and the radio of this country have taken it upon themselves during the last few hours to prophesy that we shall receive answers from the delegation of the United States. We know that in the United Nations this is not usual because of the function and the position I occupy in my country, but I am not worried about that.

We really do not care who has the last word in this General Assembly. We really do not care who rises last to address the assembly. The last word will be spoken by history in the future. The people of Cuba trust that future and rely on the history that will be written, because for the first time it is the people of Cuba who, in entire freedom, are forging their own history.

Backs Rights Of Student at U of Colorado

The hottest issue so far in Colorado's election campaign is the controversy over articles in the student newspaper at the University of Colorado. Arch reactionary Barry Goldwater, the senator from adjoining Arizona, demanded the expulsion of Carl Mitcham, the student author of an article blasting him and his record. U. of C. President Quigg Newton refused. Articles about President Kennedy and ex-President Eisenhower, who recently spoke in Denver, likewise didn't mince words and have brought howls from politicians of both big-business parties.

When Democratic Senator John A. Carroll denounced the student author, Tom Leonard, Socialist Workers Party candidate for U.S. senator challenged Carroll to debate the issue. The *Denver Post* (Oct. 11) quotes Leonard as saying, "Were it not for the courage of many students and professors, young Carl Mitcham would have no one to defend his expression of honesty and idealism."

The *Rocky Mountain News* of the same date reports: "Carroll was castigated for his statement by Tom Leonard, SWP candidate for the U.S. Senate, who said the insulting words in the [student] paper 'characterized Goldwater and Eisenhower pretty much as millions of people see them.'"



JOSEPH JOHNSON is the Socialist Workers Party candidate for U.S. representative from the Fifth Congressional District in Minnesota.

Death Sentences Set Aside In Theft Cases in Kentucky

FRANKFORT, Ky. — The Kentucky Court of Appeals has granted a new trial to Robert Jones Jr., 25, who had been sentenced to death for a robbery in which he got \$200.

Jones was the second man to whom the court granted a new trial after protests by the Committee for Clemency for Jones and Brown. The other man was John Brown Jr., 38, who had been sentenced to die for taking \$137 in a robbery.

Jones is a Negro and Brown is white. Both are residents of Louisville. The committee that took up their cases in an interracial group headed by the Rev. William H. Bell, chairman, and Mrs. Verna Pfuhl, secretary.

Other leading members of the committee include Bishop C. Ewbank Tucker of the AME Zion Church and Dr. M. M. D. Perdue, both directors of the Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF), New Orleans.

The clemency committee point-



STREET SCENE IN NEW YORK. SWP candidates are speaking at meetings like this one at 6th Ave. and 8th St. in Manhattan to put their program before the widest possible audience.

Hit San Francisco's School Segregation

By Maria di Savio

SAN FRANCISCO — Free speech was given free reign on Sept. 18 when, for seven hours — before an audience of over 1,200 persons — the San Francisco Board of Education heard 52 speakers from various organizations in the community argue both sides of the question of integrating this city's public schools.

The opposition of private-property interests to integration was frankly and viciously stated. But the majority of speakers favored integration and the establishing of a citizen's committee to study means to implement it by next year's fall semester. The board, however, after listening to the speakers, refused to issue any policy statement and moved to appoint a committee of board members to "report" on the situation by April, 1963.

This meeting was the most recent episode in an increasingly hot battle that began last January when the Congress of Racial Equality and the Council for Civic Unity asked the Board of Education to correct the *de facto* segregation — based on segregated neighborhoods — in the city's schools.

First speaker was Hayden Perry, former candidate of the Socialist Workers Party for City Supervisor. He demanded immediate in-

tegration of city schools based on the 80-per-cent-white to 20-per-cent-Negro population ratio. He proposed implementing this by "crisis measures, to meet this very real crisis our city faces. Negro students," said Perry, "have to be taken out of predominantly Negro schools and placed in all-white schools. White students should be assigned to former all-Negro schools. School districts have been gerrymandered to keep Negroes out. Now they must be redrawn to put Negroes into all-white schools. Where necessary to effect this, students should be transported by bus to schools out of their neighborhoods until every school has an approximate 80 per cent, 20 per cent white-Negro ratio."

Perry also stressed that Board of Education members should be elected — rather than being appointed as at present — and should be subject to recall. He said board members presently "are appointed by a mayor who responds to the wishes of the business community which desires the least possible disturbance of the *status quo*."

Brink of Blowup

Expressing the increasing militancy of the Negro people here, CORE spokesman Wilfred Ussery warned: "This country is on the brink of blowing up over this issue of second-class citizenship." Terry Francois of the NAACP bitingly called attention to the various "neighborhood groups" opposing changes. He pointed out that "in the South, similar advocates of racial separation call themselves White Citizens Councils."

Mrs. Beverly Axlerod, CORE lawyer, attacked the argument for "natural evolutionary integration," by noting that all segregation has been deliberately instigated and forced. Mr. MacTurner of the California Lawyers Guild assailed the board's use of phony legalistic technicalities to subvert all desegregation measures.

After the meeting ended at 2:45 a.m. some 20 members of CORE "sat-in" in the auditorium until 7:00 a.m. to protest the board's inaction. They began their protest sarcastically by singing Dixie. CORE spokesmen declared their intention to continue pressure on the board for a clear policy statement.

The *Sun Reporter*, San Francisco's Negro newspaper, reported Sept. 22 that "several persons have indicated they will work for a recall vote of Board of Education member, James Stratten." Stratten is the only Negro member of the board and yet it was he who moved the "do-nothing" resolution.

N.Y. Independents To Speak Nov. 2 For SWP Ticket

NEW YORK — A number of prominent independents will speak at a rally here Nov. 2 for the candidates of the Socialist Workers Party in New York state.

Among those scheduled to appear are Dr. Annette T. Rubinstein, literary critic and author of *The Great Tradition in English Literature — From Shakespeare to Shaw*; Dr. Otto Nathan, the economist chosen by the late Albert Einstein as an executor of his estate; Julian Beck, initiator of the General Strike for Peace movement and co-director of the internationally famous Living Theatre; and William A. Price.

Price is one of the eight First-Amendment defendants whose convictions were thrown out by the U.S. Supreme Court last summer, but who are now being re-prosecuted by the Justice Department.

Julian Beck is facing trial for civil disobedience during the memorable Times Square peace demonstration of last March. He was severely injured by a policeman's club during that demonstration which protested President Kennedy's announcement of the resumption of nuclear tests in the atmosphere.

Also speaking at the rally will be Paul Krassner, editor of *The Realist*, satirist and uninhibited exponent of free expression. Folk-singer Dave Van Ronk will entertain. The affair — at which the SWP slate, headed by Richard Garza, candidate for governor, will appear — is set for 8:30 p.m. at the Central Plaza, 112 Second Ave., Manhattan.

Garza was interviewed on CBS-TV last week. He said a working-class political party could wipe out discrimination immediately

whereas the Republicans and Democrats move against Jim Crow at a snail's pace.

"Everyone knows discrimination exists right here in New York in housing, schools and particularly in jobs. The Democrats and Republicans are controlled by people who profit from discrimination, by the real estate interests and the financiers who invest in segregated housing, by the employers who pay the low wages to Negro and Puerto Rican workers in New York City," Garza declared. "It will take revolutionary measures to wipe out discrimination. That is, the mass of the people who directly suffer from discrimination must be actively organized and involved in the enforcement of laws and rules against it."



Dr. Otto Nathan

Socialist Workers Quicken Election Campaigns in West

In addition to the candidates whose campaign activities are reported elsewhere on this page, candidates of the Socialist Workers Party are speaking out against the cold war and for independent working class political action in other areas.

In the key state of California, where Governor Edmund Brown and former Vice President Richard Nixon are the unappealing nominees of the Democratic and Republican parties, the Socialist Workers Party is conducting a write-in campaign for Oscar G. Coover for governor, and Frances James for U.S. senator.

Although restrictive election laws make it impossible for the names of these candidates to appear on the ballot, their campaign provides a real alternative for California voters. More information on the California campaign may be obtained from the SWP at 1702 E. 4th St. in Los Angeles, 563 16th St. in Oakland, or from the San Diego Labor Forum, Box 1581, San Diego 12, Calif.

In Minnesota, the campaign for Joseph Johnson, SWP candidate for congress in the Fifth Congressional District is also entering its final stages. Johnson, who is opposing Republican incumbent Walter H. Judd and Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party candidate Donald M. Fraser, is a hospital worker and a member of Local 113 of the Building Service Employees Union. Campaign headquarters are located at 704 Hennepin St. in Minneapolis.

Wayne Leverenz, a worker and resident of Milwaukee, is campaigning for the post of U.S. senator in the state of Wisconsin. Leverenz, who was SWP candidate for governor in 1958, is known in labor circles for his work in the United Packinghouse Worker Union and on the CIO council. Information on his campaign is available from the SWP at 150 E. Juneau St. in Milwaukee.

New York SWP Radio-TV Time

- Sat., Oct. 20, 2-2:30 p.m. Ch. 2, Carl Feingold.
- Sun., Oct. 21, 2-3 p.m., Ch. 4, Allen Taplin.
- Sun., Oct. 21, 11:05-11:30 p.m., Ch. 5, Richard Garza.
- Tues., Oct. 23, 6:30-6:45 p.m., WNYC-FM, Carl Feingold.
- Tues., Oct. 23, 9:45-10 p.m., Ch. 11, Carl Feingold.
- Sat., Oct. 27, 11:05-11:30 p.m., Ch. 5, Carl Feingold.
- Sun., Oct. 28, 2-3 p.m. Ch. 4, Carl Feingold.
- Sun., Oct. 28, 9-9:30 p.m., WKCR-FM, Richard Garza.
- Mon., Oct. 29, 2:15-3 p.m., WCBS Radio, Leroy McRae.
- Sun., Nov. 4, 11 a.m.-12 noon, Ch. 4, Richard Garza.
- Sun., Nov. 4, 2-3 p.m., Ch. 4, Richard Garza.

N.J. Nominee on Radio

Mrs. Ruth Shiminsky of Newark, Socialist Workers Party candidate for congress from New Jersey's 12th Congressional District, will speak on the radio program, "Campaign 1962," over station WJRZ (970 on the dial), Thursday night, Oct. 25, at 10:35 p.m.