

THE MILITANT

Published in the Interests of the Working People

Vol. 27 - No. 33 Monday, October 7, 1963 Price 10c

532239

Four Indicted in Test of Cuba Travel Ban

The federal grand jury in Brooklyn which for a month has been investigating the recent trip to Cuba by 38 American students, handed down four indictments on Sept. 27. The charges are "conspiring to recruit and arrange for the trip."

The announcement of the indictment was made in Washington by Attorney General Robert Kennedy and by the federal prosecutor's office in Brooklyn.

Three of those indicted — Levi Lauch, 24, Phillip Abbott Luce, 24, and Stefan Martinot, 24, had gone on the trip to Cuba. The fourth defendant, Anatole Schlosser, 26, did not go.

Two others, Salvatore Cucchiari, 19, and Elin Irene Shalitz, 28, were named as co-conspirators but were not indicted.

The indictment alleged 31 overt acts of conspiracy, such as organizing a committee to promote the trip, meetings in New York and Buffalo, distribution of application forms, etc.

There is no law forbidding travel to Cuba, merely a State Department edict. Thus the prosecution had to base the indictment on the supposed subversion of "national emergency" empowered by the State Department to forbid such travel. Prosecutor Joseph P. Hoey told the court that "a period of national emergency" was now in effect, in regard to Cuba, at least.

Permanent 'Emergency'

A state of national emergency was proclaimed in 1950 when President Truman plunged the U.S. into the "police action" in Korea. It has been continued ever since.

On Sept. 30 all four defendants appeared voluntarily and were arraigned before Judge Joseph C. Zavatt. Defense Attorney Leonard Boudin told the court that he was representing a client in Hartford, Conn. who is suing the State Department for denying him the right to travel to Cuba. Since that trial, slated for Nov. 18, could have a bearing on the students' case, he requested and was granted a postponement till Dec. 2.

All defendants pleaded not guilty. Boudin asked that they be released in their lawyers' custody (Schlosser is represented by Is-



HOLDING ON TO IT. Phillip Abbott Luce holds aloft his passport on return from Cuba. Government says it's invalid because he went there and that he should be jailed for going.

dore Englander). The prosecutor demanded that each be placed under \$5,000 bail, arguing that the fact that they had gone to Cuba indicated that they were untrustworthy and could not be depended on otherwise to show up for trial.

Boudin pointed out that all were residents of New York, that they had appeared voluntarily and had, indeed, returned from Cuba to test the constitutionality of the travel ban.

The judge released them in their lawyers' custody but restricted their movements to New York City and Long Island.

AN IMPORTANT SPEECH BY CASTRO

Affirms Cuba's Independent Foreign Policy

In an important policy speech Sept. 28, Fidel Castro made it clear that Cuba would continue its policy of revolutionary opposition to U.S. efforts to crush his government. He said that while Cuba welcomed the current easing of world tensions, it could not accept a situation where at the very same time the U.S. was increasing its efforts to "tighten the noose" around Cuba.

"Clearly this situation determines our conduct," he told a gathering at the Plaza of the Revolution in Havana celebrating the third anniversary of the founding of the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution. Organized to combat the counter-revolutionaries on a block-by-block basis, the rank-and-file committees also play a major role in administering the country's rationing system and in generally spurring the revolution forward. The rally was also attended by delegates to the congress of the International Union of Architects meeting in Havana.

"We will not accept a situation," Castro declared, "in which tensions decrease while they increase for us. We do not want tensions

What the Algerian Government Stands For

— See special article page 5 —

Can Negroes Win Freedom Now Through Democrats?

6-2-1963
COPY

See page 3 —

Civil Rights Forces Seek New Ways to Press Fight

By William Bundy

OCT. 2 — A serious crisis among civil-rights leaders has developed and a great debate has opened in the movement since the Birmingham murders of Negro children. The Kennedy administration's inaction in the face of them, have made it apparent that the movement led by Martin Luther King, Jr., has reached a blind alley and a search is on for new roads.

The debate involves the questions of non-violence versus self-defense, political action, the approach to Congress and Kennedy's civil-rights bill, and tactics of civil disobedience.

The doctrine of non-violence under-all-circumstances is now being widely challenged even by church leaders. For example, Bishop C. Eubank Tucker, of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church declared in Louisville that the Birmingham events have shattered the hope that law and order would be maintained in the Deep South in the face of integration.

"The Gandhi philosophy of non-violence in situations of this kind seems impotent and ineffective. As one of the presiding bishops of a church with a constituency of one million — 70,000 of whom reside in Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi — I call upon our membership in these states here and now to arm themselves to repel any illegal intrusions upon their persons, the privacy of their homes, or the sacredness of their institutions. The same admonition applies to our constituency in Kentucky."

The Rev. Gardner C. Taylor, a leading figure in Brooklyn's Bedford Stuyvesant area — the second largest Negro ghetto in the coun-



HOW LONG? Members of the Albany, Ga. Movement sang as they were being jailed during demonstrations last year. But despite wilderness of 1,200 of them by state jail and despite valiant efforts of Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, movement was stymied by lack of effective leadership on part of King-Wilkins officialdom.

try — has also supported the right of self-defense, as have authors John O. Killens and Louis Lomax. (See statements page 2.)

The seventh congress of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, held in Richmond last week, witnessed an almost frantic search for new tactics and an atmosphere of disillusionment with the Kennedy administration. A detailed plan for civil disobedience was circulated there, authored by Diane Nash Bevel, a

field secretary for the Student Nonviolent Co-ordinating Committee. The plan recommended refusal to pay state and local taxes, a general work stoppage, tying up telephone lines by harassing central switchboards with calls, and blocking of communications between Birmingham and Montgomery by sit-downs on highways, railroads and airfields. The plan was not adopted, but elements of it were mentioned as possibilities by Rev. Wyatt T. Walker, SCLC staff director.

SCLC President Martin Luther King, said the organization would call for a boycott of Christmas gift buying, a measure being pushed by author James Baldwin and the newly-formed Artists and Writers Committee for Justice. The SCLC also approved a civil-rights march on Alabama's capital, Montgomery, and a massive, direct-action campaign in Danville, Va.

White liberals have also entered the debate with plenty of free advice. For example, New York Post editor James Wechsler declared Sept. 30: "It would be a calamity if a call for 'civil disobedience' became the battle-cry of this hour." This, says Wechsler, would only "provide new ammunition for the do-nothings and know-nothings in Congress," and hurt the chances of the civil-rights bill.

The crisis in the civil-rights leadership has been precipitated, not simply by the shock of the first loss of life in Birmingham after 52 unprovoked bombings since 1946, but by the cool reaction of the Kennedy administration to the murders and the Negro leaders' realization that Kennedy is more interested in appeasing the Southern Democrats for the 1964 elections than in defending Negroes.

Kennedy's appointment of ex-football coach Earl Black and ex-general Kenneth C. Royall to in-

(Continued on Page 4)

New York Forum To Hear Luce

NEW YORK—Phillip Luce, spokesman for the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba just indicted for defying the travel ban, will speak at the Militant Labor Forum on Sept. 27, Oct. 11, on the fight against the travel ban and about his trip to Cuba.

Sharing the platform will be Albert Maher, another of the students who went to Cuba. While Albert Maher gave special attention to the status of Cuban artists.

The meeting will be held at 8:30 p.m. at the Militant Labor Forum hall, 116 University Place.

THE TWO-PARTY TRAP

Labor's Failure Is Proof Negroes Can't Gain from Democrats

By Tom Kerry

The Negro Freedom Now struggle is today undergoing the agonizing pangs of a leadership crisis.

The frightful toll exacted by the racist hoodlums for the inching progress made in breaching the Jim Crow barriers; the growing conviction that the Kennedy administration has no serious intention of using the federal power to defend the rights of Negro citizens; the emotional letdown following the Aug. 28 March on Washington, have given rise to a feeling of frustration, indecision and disillusionment.

Writing from Richmond, Virginia, in the Sept. 29 New York Times, reporter M. S. Handler observes: "Delegates to the seventh annual convention of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference departed for their homes today uncertain about the future course of the civil-rights campaign."

Disappointment that the high hopes raised by the Washington march had failed to materialize was the prevalent feeling among the delegates. "It was generally assumed by the Negro people," says Handler, "after the march that the walls of segregation were crumbling down as did the walls of Jericho."

"The walls are still standing," he adds, "and the Negroes are wondering why."

It would be more precise to pinpoint these illusions as being characteristic of the conservative

leaders rather than of the Negro people. The objective of the march, as defined by the prime movers, was to put pressure on Congress to enact the Kennedy administration's civil-rights measures. With the march restricted within this framework, Kennedy was permitted to evade his responsibility as executive head of government, to curb the racist neo-fascists.

The prospects of civil-rights legislation, weak and inadequate as the Kennedy measures are, seems more remote now than before the march. With the pressure deflected from Kennedy to the less vulnerable Congress, the head of the Democratic Party can continue to play politics-as-usual with the civil-rights issue. To offset the feeling among the delegates at the SCLC convention that Congress will again prove to be the graveyard of civil-rights legislation, Handler reports that Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, "sought to re-energize the march," that "contrary to gloomy forecasts a strong bill would emerge from Congress."

Some illusions die hard. Especially when deeply imbedded in a "leader" who has lost touch with reality. A man in a much better position to know the workings of Congress the delegates at the SCLC convention than Representative Adam Clayton Powell Jr. of Manhattan, dismissed the Wilkins statement as so much wishful thinking. Powell, "assured the convention that Congress would not pass President Kennedy's bill this year and that the white man has already given everything he ever intended to give to the Negroes."

Inevitable Result

"From now on out," Powell added, "the Negroes must themselves fight for anything they can get." That is true of "from now on out," has been equally true of the past. Reliance upon the Kennedy brothers along with their hand of liberal supporters, followers and hangers-on, has led to one disheartening compromise after another. An inevitable result of such demoralizing compromises is to lead the Freedom Now movement into a blind alley.

"The delegates gloom," reports Handler, "was deepened during the convention by repeated allegations that the Negro people have been betrayed by Democrats and Republicans and that 'we have been duped or have duped ourselves' in believing that the chains of segregation have been broken."

Therein lies the nub of the problem. The Freedom Now movement is, in its essence, a political struggle. In the South it involves a bitter struggle to win the elementary democratic right of the Negro to vote. In the North, where Negroes have acquired the nominal right, it involves the question of how best to use this weapon to

advance the fight for Negro equality.

This much is certain — so long as the conservative leaders remain at the head of the movement and are able to impose their policy of looking for salvation to be found in liberals of the Democratic and Republican parties, the long and dismal road of betrayal will be repeated without end.

Foer Example

One need only look at the dreary record of the almost identical course pursued by the American labor leaders. Their policy of "re-wilding" friends and punishing enemies, which lies at the root of their coalition with the Democratic Party, has led to political impotence. Like the conservative civil-rights leaders, the union heads are rewarded with an occasional visit to the White House for a friendly "chat" where they are charmed into another rotten compromise at the expense of the people they represent and whom they

The so-called two-party system is the greatest political hoax ever perpetrated upon the people of this country. Both capitalist parties are controlled from top to bottom by the monied interests. The sham battles in which they are periodically engaged are so much snuff to blind the people to their real character as representative of the capitalist ruling class. That is the Negro-Labor-Democratic Party profits, rest on the exploitation of labor, white and black; who favored the Jim Crow system and profit by its continuation; who rule as a minority through force and deception and who find the two-party system perfectly tailored to serve their needs.

For the Negro people and the white working class the two-party system has proven to be a cemetery of slightest expectations. Upon its grisly gate should appear the warning inscription: Abandon All Hope, Ye Who Enter Here! The Negro-Labor-Democratic Party coalition, which embraces millionaire and wage slave, Negro and Dixiecrat, labor and capital, is a grotesque product of the two-party system.

So grotesque in fact, that those who stand determined to maintain the party-bully structure, are fearful for its continued existence. I refer here, not to its capitalist beneficiaries, but to those who presume to speak for the masses and who quake in fright at the revolutionary consequences attendant upon the collapse of the coalition — the labor officials, the conservative Negro leaders, and yes, some who even call themselves "socialists."

All these, and more, have rallied to assault the advocates of a Freedom Now Party who call for a break with the coalition, constancy and an end to the two-party swindle. As against the Freedom Now Party and an independent labor party they advance the prospect of "reforming" the two-party system. That is, to work for the creation of a genuine two-party system, with all the "liberals" in one party and the "conservatives" in another.

Political Quackery

This has become known as the policy of realignment. As one might expect, this slick piece of political quackery was conceived in the fertile brain of labor's foremost windbag, Walter Reuther. It was subsequently taken up and adopted by the political pundits of the Norman Thomas Socialist Party. The August 31 issue of the SF paper, *New America*, devotes a full page to the subject entitled: "Socialists and Civil Rights," written by Michael Harrington.

The only solution to the fight for Negro equality, says Harrington, "must be a political realignment in America." "It's a two-party system," he adds, "but no real party alternative, no party



DETERMINED PARTNERS. Kennedy and Eastland may express differing views on some issues but they are equally dedicated to advancement of the party that is the source of political power for both of them.

a civil-rights fighter can wholeheartedly support. If there were a realignment, if Negroes and whites with the same urgent need for social change pooled their resources in a single movement which was uncompromisingly for civil rights and housing, and education, and a decent wage, then there could be real progress in the land."

Harrington is purposefully vague about the real character of his proposed genuine "second party." This is characteristic of all advocates of "realignment." When forced to be more specific they are compelled to admit that what they have in mind is a second "liberal" party of capitalism within the framework of the American two-party system. The two-party system itself is considered a sacrosanct and inviolable aspect of American political life. The idea seems so neat and simple. The only hitch is that the liberals have no intention of joining any such movement. As practical politicians they are primarily concerned with the arithmetic of political power. The coalition suits them perfectly.

Kennedy's ilk and the Dixiecrats, the one-party South gives them tremendous power in Congress when the Democrats are in control and a balance-of-power role with the Republicans. With the exception of a few lunatic-fringe mavericks they show no desire to surrender their favored position.

As the Dixiecrats, the one-party South gives them tremendous power in Congress when the Democrats are in control and a balance-of-power role with the Republicans. With the exception of a few lunatic-fringe mavericks they show no desire to surrender their favored position.

As a result, Kennedy clings to the Dixiecrats, the liberals cling to Kennedy, the union officials cling to the liberals, the conservative Negro leaders cling to the union heads and the liberals, with the Norman Thomas-Michael Harrington "socialist" little red wagon tagging on behind.

In essence, what the so-called policy of realignment amounts to, is the admission that the Negroes wait until the liberals and labor statesmen are ready to move; to go slow and not upset the coalition appeacer.

How Cuba Overtook Race Discrimination

By Harry Ring
16 pages 15 cents
Pioneer Publishers
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

But the Negro Freedom Now fighters are learning through bitter experience that they will have to upset more than one appeacer before they achieve the goal of full and complete political, economic and social equality.

The great merit of the Freedom Now Party is that its success will mean the shattering of the reactionary coalition alliance that serves as a prop for the whole Jim Crow system.

It provides a way out of the blind alley into which the civil-rights struggle is being led by the conservative Negro leadership.

It gives proper perspective to the struggle for Freedom Now.

Above all, it can clear the road for a genuine alliance between the exploited working class and the Negro people, both of whom confront a common enemy — the white power structure, otherwise known as the American capitalist ruling class.

The argument that the Negroes, as a minority of the population, are therefore unable to take the initiative in the formation of their own political party is perniciously false and downright dishonest. What benefits have been brought the Negro people by being included in the majority Democratic Party coalition? What benefits has it brought the white working man and woman? What, if any, to other minorities?

By boldly striking out on their own, the Negro masses can spark a political revolution in this country, capable of lighting the way for a genuine alliance of equals between a Freedom Now Party, led and controlled by Negroes and an independent labor party, based on the trade unions. That is the only realignment revolutionary socialists find worthy of fighting for.

Jack Scott

Vancouver Sun Columnist
Takes a Second Look at Cuba

A section of this top-notch report on Cuba was serialized in *The Militant*. Now the complete report is published by the Canadian Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

35 cents

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

DEEMED
BY YOUR LOCAL
CENTER
TO BE
HAD A JOB

A BASIC RIGHT. The right to a decent job is an essential ingredient in establishing Negro rights. Like the labor movement, Negroes face two-party opposition to effective program to expand job opportunities.

Local Director

- BOSTON: Boston Labor Forum, 205 Boston Ave., Room 200
- CHICAGO: Social Workers Party and Institute, 801 South Wacker St., Room 210
- CLEVELAND: Eugene V. Debs Hall, 200 S. 20th Street, Ave., Cleveland 3, Ohio
- DENVER: Militant Labor Forum, 1237 Colfax
- DETROIT: Eugene V. Debs Hall, 7177 Woodward, Temple 1-1212
- LOS ANGELES: Socialist Workers Party, 1001 East First St. All letters to W-3 5-2425. Open 11:30 to 3 p.m. daily and Saturday
- MILWAUKEE: 180 E. Juniper Ave.
- MINNEAPOLIS: Socialist Workers Party and Labor Book Store, 700 Hennepin Ave. All letters to W-3 5-2425. Open 11:30 to 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, Saturday, 11 a.m.-2 p.m.

- NEWARK: Newark Labor Forum, Box 20, Newark, New Jersey
- NEW YORK CITY: Militant Labor Forum, 119 University Place, AL 5-2833
- OAKLAND: Socialist Workers Party, 1000 12th St., Oakland 12, Calif. W-3 8-2771
- PHILADELPHIA: Militant Labor Forum and Institute, 1000 Locust St., P.O. Box 511, Philadelphia 1, Pa.
- SAN FRANCISCO: Militant Labor Forum, 1000 Market St., 4th Floor, Telephone 3-3336. Book Store, 1418 Fulton St. W-3 8-2771
- ST. LOUIS: Phone Main 1-3833. Ask for Dick Clark.
- SAN DIEGO: San Diego Labor Forum, P.O. Box 100, San Diego, Calif. All letters to San Diego 426 College Ave. W-3 8-2771
- SEATTLE: 115 2nd N.E. Library, Bookstore, Open 11:30 to 3 p.m. Saturdays. Phone W-3 8-2771

THE MILITANT

Editor: JOSEPH HANSEN

Managing Editor: GEORGE LAVAN Business Manager: KAROLYN KERRY

Published weekly, except during July and August when published bi-weekly, by The Militant Publishing Ass'n., 118 University St., New York 7, N.Y. Phone CR 5-1818. Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y. Subscription: All a year, Canadian, \$3.00; foreign, \$4.00. Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Militant's views. Those are expressed in editorials.

Vol. 27 - No. 35 145 Monday, October 7, 1963

The Test-Ban Treaty

The Senate vote on the limited nuclear-test-ban treaty occasioned no celebrations by Americans because its ratification was regarded as a foregone conclusion. The common people of this country — and of the world — are overwhelmingly for such a ban because they want an end to the poisoning of the earth's atmosphere. They also hope that this marks the beginning of nuclear disarmament.

But it would be a grave misconception to think the 80 senators who voted for the treaty — or the Kennedy administration which submitted it — were motivated by such feelings.

The pack of cold warriors, jingoes, crooks, racists, demagogues and hired hands of big business, who constitute the Senate — and the administration — would go on poisoning the atmosphere indefinitely if it were to receive their collective profit. They certainly did not ratify the treaty out of hopes of disarmament. They regard war preparations as "the health of the state" and the economy.

They voted for it for other reasons. Its greatest merit in their eyes was that it drove a wedge between the Soviet Union and China. And any further U.S. steps towards a relaxation of tensions will be carefully calculated to deepen this split, to isolate China further, with the long-range goal of destroying first one, then the other. One of Kennedy's short-range goals undoubtedly is a deal whereby Khrushchev abandons Cuba.

A second consideration was that the treaty would give U.S. imperialism's "image" some badly needed "peace-loving" and "concerned-for-the-welfare-of-humankind" make-up at little real cost.

That four-fifths of the truculent Senate voted for the treaty — even to garner the advantages listed above — was because the U.S. surrendered little or nothing. The top brass reassured the senators that nothing was yielded, that the U.S. was getting the better of the USSR in the deal. Underground testing — the U.S. specialty — remains unlimited and will be stepped up. (It also poisons the atmosphere through venting of gases into the air.) No hindrance is put on the stockpiling of more nuclear weapons or the arming of U.S. allies with them.

While those who agitated for a test ban may justifiably feel gratified — inadequate though the treaty is — they must not slacken the anti-war struggle on the assumption that commensurate has now prevailed in Washington and things will automatically get better. They must make the banning of underground tests and total nuclear disarmament their objectives. And above all they must be on the alert for any moves against China or Cuba.

Why Bosch Was Overthrown

The military coup which overthrew Dominican President Juan Bosch is a typical of the alternating pattern of army rule and phony democracy in most of Latin America.

Bosch's government was a regime born, destined and designed to be overthrown.

The extremes of poverty and wealth in the Dominican Republic and most other Latin American countries are too great to permit parliamentary democracy. The U.S. interests and the tiny, native ruling classes there can maintain their economic dominance only by force. L.E. military rule. Allowed true representative government for an extended period of time, the impoverished masses of workers and peasants would redress too many of their economic wrongs — or might try to change the economic system completely. There is no large middle class in these countries on which the capitalists and landowners can safely base a political democracy.

So a military or "strong-man" regime is the basic and "normal" form of government. But when a dictator becomes too discredited or is toppled, an interim regime is needed. Such a regime will promise social and economic reforms and is permitted to operate under the trappings of democratic rule. But its tenure of office is intended to last only until the popular off-sweepings have been quieted down enough to allow the reinstallation of dictatorship.

In the first months of the Cuban Revolution the moneyed classes of Cuba and U.S. imperialism thought Castro was of this class type. They believed he would soon forget all his talk about changing things for the benefit of the poor, that he would soon see "reason" or succumb to the corruption of office. On the other hand, they figured, should he prove to be an incorrigible idealist and dreamer, then such a fool would not be difficult to overthrow. But the Cuban Revolution and its leader were not of the familiar pattern and the Cuban ruling class and Washington learned a bitter and terrifying lesson.

But Bosch is the kind of reformer Washington approves of. He served his purpose well. The only convincing note of regret detectable amid Washington's lamentations and crocodile tears for him concerns the timing of his overthrow. Less than eight months in office — it was a bit hasty! Since the Cuban Revolution public opinion in the U.S. as well as in Latin America must be taken more into account. Otherwise too many people will catch on to the game.

A View of the Nuclear Pact

Attempt to Isolate China a War Danger

By Hugh B. Hester

The cardinal question posed by the treaty is ban partially further bomb testing is whether this will prevent, in the long run, the international tensions by generating greater trust among the sovereign states. It is already obvious that the test ban is a general public belief through greater hopes of avoiding thermonuclear war.

President Kennedy, Premier Khrushchev and many other top officials have noted this and have expressed the hope that this is only the first short step on the long and necessarily difficult journey to a non-competitive world society. Judging from the mass information media of the West, Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union and elsewhere of the uncommitted world, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev have scored a great political victory. Despite some discordant notes, the vast majority of the people of both the United States and the Soviet Union approve of the test ban. And this is probably true of the vast majority of mankind, so great is the fear of thermonuclear war. It is so, at least, as far as the public hopes it is — that the great popular enthusiasm generated by this short step will encourage — force — a more appropriate world order — the leaders of the world to take the longer and more important ones necessary for achieving the ultimate goal of a world without want, a peace of plenty, possible now for the first time.

The leaders of the United States have, from the President down, verbally at least, been extremely cautious in forecasting further progress in reducing tensions with the Soviet Union. The test of the President's message to the U.S. Senate, setting forth the things that the treaty does not do, unfortunately, if taken literally, leaves precious little latitude for hope. Premier Khrushchev on the other hand, much more encouraging as to its possible meaning and merit.

This may merely reflect the different views of the test ban. But it may also reflect the President's fear that the United States Senate is as yet unprepared for any such law in the Cold War and only by downgrading the treaty's meaning can ratification be secured. George Rockefeller's move to vigorously oppose ratification of the treaty (N.Y. Times, Aug. 12, 1963) and that of other prominent personages supports this fear. But if this is true, that if the leaders of the United States are so fearful of any real progress toward peace, little if anything will have been accomplished by ratification of the partial bomb test ban.

If, however, the massive public support of this small move toward accommodation with the present major opponent, the Soviet Government, emboldens the President to move vigorously toward ending the Cold War, then this treaty could mark an historic turning point in man's struggle for survival. For it is always dangerous to move from the national to the international scene for purposes of comparison, the result of the President's all-out support of the civil rights is encouraging. For no public leader can remain wholly immune from, or permanently devoid of, the great popular desire for a warless world in the thermonuclear age.

Mr. Kennedy has really decided to pursue this course, he must start soon a massive educational program for this purpose. And judging by the magnitude of the support he is now receiving in his civil-rights struggle for human dignity and equality of opportunity for all, an all-out struggle for peace still might win, despite the well organized and financed opposition to it in the United States. It is certainly worth

About the Author

General Hugh B. Hester

(Ret.) is a long-time spokesman for peace and social progress. We are glad to publish his views on the test-ban treaty and invite other views on the issue. Our own estimate of the treaty is presented in an editorial on this page.

the try. But this will mean the President must work for all the things which he said in his message to the United States Senate the treaty does not permit, and many more, such as non-restricted travel for all people and non-discriminatory trade throughout the world.

For this treaty alone will not stop nuclear testing and it will not in the end limit or restrict membership in the Nuclear Club. This can be achieved only by the destruction of the nuclear weapons themselves coupled with greater freedom of travel and trade. Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union can no more maintain a monopoly of nuclear weapons than could the United States at the end of World War II, and for the same reasons. (See Professor Joseph P. Morray's excellent analysis of why the Harech Plan failed in his book, "From Yalta to Disarmament," a Monthly Review Press publication.)

If the Soviet leaders could not trust the United States Government, their World War II ally, with a permanent monopoly of thermonuclear weapons, why should any reasonable person expect the Chinese to trust their security to that very same government now that it has covered its enemy number one, or even to their ally, the Soviet Government? The latter is particularly pertinent now with the apparent rapprochement between these polar powers.

If deGaulle cannot trust Kennedy, the leader of the Capitalist bloc, why should Mao Tse-tung trust Khrushchev, a leader of the Socialist bloc? Again, why should the Chinese leaders be expected to renounce their claim these weapons while the United States continues to insist upon supporting the pretender to Chinese power, Chiang Kai-shek? Or might not the question be more appropriately phrased, while the United States Government occupies the Chinese territory of Taiwan, the Pescadores, Quemoy and Matsu? And does this not constitute aggression against China by the United States? Certainly the Chinese think so. And so do many international lawyers.

So long as any nation retains these weapons, will not all nations have the right to them? And will not the other big powers struggle ceaselessly until they too acquire them? And further, will not this struggle in itself generate additional grave international tensions? It is not possible to ignore the fact that both President deGaulle of France and Prime Minister Chou En-lai of China have urged the destruction of these weapons. And the Chinese leader has even called for an international conference to consider this. Should not the United States, the Soviet Union and the other powers accept this invitation?

The temptation of some in power to exploit the mass information media generally to support the partial treaty ban in the stated hope that this will deny the bomb to China is extremely dangerous. Additional efforts to further isolate this great people are certain to increase international tensions to a point where the world for the world in the end, will it ever prove possible to have world peace without Chinese partici-

tion? The answer of most of the experts is no. And without this still be true, even if the Soviet Union and the United States were to make a deal to force an attempt to force peace upon the rest of the world? This time the answer is an emphatic yes, and it is a deal that the U.S. can permanently control the world.

China belongs in the United Nations. The refusal of the United States Government to permit Mao to take her Charter when Mao came to power in 1949 was, if it may divide the great world statesman, Charles Maurice deTalleyrand (1754-1838), "Worse than a crime, it was a blunder." As a leading New England editor remarked to this writer in April 1959, "This single irrational act has done more damage to the United Nations and World Peace than all the Soviet vetoes compounded and multiplied many times over." The prolonged attempt to force an attempt to force peace upon the rest of the world after World War I contributed substantially to the failure of the League of Nations and thus made it impossible to prevent World War II. And its continuance since World War II has contributed materially to the threat of thermonuclear war and all its current war madneses.

The dangerous similarity between this country's relationship with the Soviet Union then and with the People's Republic of China to all informed people. It is also important to understand the likeness between this treaty, with its present limitations, and its prototype, the Kellogg-Brand treaty of 1928. For if progress towards peace stops here, as happened with the Kellogg-Brand treaty earlier, this treaty is likely to prove a great disappointment to the people of the world and, instead, menace peace instead of promoting it as hoped.

It is not now the time for President Kennedy to prove the sincerity of his often expressed desire to increase the power and prestige of the United Nations by urging that this organization be charged with the solution of the problems of Germany, Taiwan, Korea, Vietnam and Cuba? Since these are world problems, should not the world have a voice in their solution? Is not this the time to start liquidating the regional blocs, the Warsaw Pact, SEATO, the Suez Canal, and the others? Many international experts believe all of these to be inconsistent with an effective United Nations and that they constitute a threat to world peace.

It is not now also the time to start dismantling the monstrous nuclear weapons system? Is this not necessary for the survival of man? And is not this the time to start debunking the propaganda lies that miss murder weapons promote national security and peace? Do they not promote the exact opposite? Finally, is this the time to normalize relations throughout the nation-state system and to universalize the United Nations? Will the latter two questions now of any permanent peace? For in China alone, now excluded from this world organization, while the three-quarter of the family of man.

If the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union are serious about the world's standing power and influence for achieving affirmative answers to the above questions, then peace is not a pipe dream. The United States must fall as did the League of Nations earlier. Thermonuclear war then will also become inevitable and much sooner than most seem to think, probably within a decade. For unless these weapons are destroyed, some of them are certain to go off. While there must be a deterrent of terror, although I doubt it, there certainly is no deterrent to error.