

Political Affairs

Editorial Board

Joe Sims, Editor
Mike Bayer, Phillip Bonosky,
Norman Goldberg,
Judith Le Blanc, Carole Marks,
Anthony Monteiro, Victor Perlo,
James West

Cover Design: Libero Della Piana,
Mark Eagle

Business and Circulation:
John Urquhart, Rose Goldberg

Special Assistant: Dorothy Kahan

Political Affairs (ISSN 0032 3128) is published monthly, except for combined September/October, by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., 235 West 23rd Street, New York, NY 10011. [This address is for all correspondence.] ☎ 212 989-4994

Manuscripts are invited. If a manuscript return is requested, please enclose a postage-paid, self-addressed envelope.

Subscription rates: \$18 for one year (Individuals); \$27 for one year (Institutions); foreign subscriptions: Canada and Mexico, \$20 a year; all others, on request; single issues, \$1.75. Second class postage paid at New York, NY and additional mailing offices. **Postmaster:** Send changes of address to: *Political Affairs*, 235 West 23 St., New York, NY 10011.



August 1995 Vol. 74 No. 8

- 1 Editorial**
- 4 The Deepening Crisis of the Two-Party System**
Jarvis Tyner
- 10 The Future of Middle East Peace**
Meir Vilner
- 14 The Sour Fruits of Anti-Communism**
Lem Harris
- 20 An American Communist Pioneer**
Mary Licht
- 25 Racism and Science**
John Pappademos
- 32 The Illegality of Nuclear War**
Stanley Faulkner
- 37 Letters**

The Class Struggle & Labor

In June of this year, the Labor Department issued figures on productivity and wages that were so alarming they should have been featured in newspaper headlines and network TV newscasts across the country.

Robert Reich, Secretary of the Labor Department which chronically under stresses the true state of affairs where the working class is concerned, reported to the *New York Times* that there "has been a shift from earned to unearned income, from paychecks to dividends and capital gains." The *Times* was worried enough to devote an editorial to the subject in which it warned that if this trend continued, "the consequences could be explosive."

The *Times* went on to note that while wages fell by 2.3 percent (and have been falling for more than two decades) and benefits (health, vacations, pensions, etc.) were cut by 3 percent, "productivity – output per hour of work – shot up by 2 percent last year and by a gaudy 2.7 annual rate at the beginning of this year ... Profits," it continues, "are near record levels and stock prices have surged 15 percent since January."

A bit uneasy about the implications of its own quoted figures, the *Times* equivocates: "By some measures, these are beautiful times." Obviously, not the measure of working men and women. For workers these figures translate into less food on the table and a sharp decline in living standards. With increasing attacks on "safety net" provisions, the average worker today stands in the greatest peril since the early Depression days.

Practically every day now you can pick up a newspaper at random and read something like the following:

The MCI Communications Corporation, while announcing a 21 percent rise in earnings, said yesterday that it would restructure the company, dismissing 2,500 to 3,000 employees by the end of the year.... (*New York Times*, Aug. 3, 1995)

What's going on? How has it been possible for workers to get into a situation where the harder

they work, the more they produce, the less they get paid? Even worse: the more they produce in a shorter and shorter period, the fewer of them are needed. And so many find themselves "downsized," unemployed, redundant, "too young to die, too old to work."

It's absolute insanity – even from the point of view of corporate America which must realize this process is killing the goose that lays the golden egg. Or is there a delusion among them that they can go on forever driving workers to produce more and more and pay less and less?

Ironically enough, the historic accomplishment of the New Deal of over 60 years ago – which the Republican Yahoos of today want to dismantle – are precisely the cushions which have prevented "explosions" of the type the *New York Times* fears and the removal of which will put them back on the political agenda.

The drive to disaster seems programmed. Finance capital is driven to produce higher and higher profits by the very nature of the system, even though that is the one-way ticket to suicide. Maximum profits is hailed as the law of the land, despite the fact that the mills and factories are literally slaughtering workers, currently at the rate of one killed roughly every hour and a half. This adds up to over a million U.S. workers killed on the job since the 1920s. The words of author Edison Bowers in 1930 hold true: "The workshop is more dangerous than the battlefield."

Big business has no interest in the worker as a human being, but only as a source of profit. Indeed, corporate bosses have no interest even in the goods their factories produce – of which they know nothing – only in profit. Production is a pretext, not an end. If producing frogs legs made a better profit than making steel, the steel mills would be close up in an instant to make room for frogs.

Big Banks run the economy and today are identical with the government, which has degenerated into nothing more than its obedient servant ready to gratify its every wish, including openly transforming the armed forces into bill collectors on delin-

quent customer-countries all over the world.

Although by its nature capitalism always exerts force to lower wages to the level of subsistence – its ideal is the worker who is paid just enough to maintain his or her ability to work and reproduce – the course of labor history shows that workers can create a counter force even greater by means of militant labor action.

But militant labor action is exactly what was missing from the top leadership of labor which presided with remarkable complacency over the decline of the labor movement from the merger of the CIO and AFL in 1955. Small wonder that only some 15 percent of the working class is organized into trade unions.

The leadership of the AFL-CIO under George Meany and Lane Kirkland was governed by the notion so loudly proclaimed by the late David Dubinsky, lifetime president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, that “unionism needs capitalism like a fish needs water.”

As a consequence of this kind of class collaborationist thinking, labor almost completely forfeited the independent political posture of the working class. Workers have few voices to speak on their behalf in Congress or state legislatures, many of which have passed right-to-work laws that did serious damage to the labor movement in those states. Labor has no daily press, no face to show the public on TV. Hollywood, which has slandered workers almost since its birth, only now and then produces a movie that reflects the reality of workers' lives.

Labor has been hemmed in and hobbled by a series of laws, including Taft-Hartley, Landrum-Griffin, the reversal of the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction law – all of it culminating in the “hollowing out” of the National Labor Relations Board so that only the face remains.

The right and power to call strikes has been severely curtailed, not only with devices like the mandatory 60-day “cooling off” period (as though strikes were called in the heat of passion rather than as the last resort), limiting the number of pickets a union can employ and how close they can come to the place being picketed, forbidding “secondary” picketing and boycotts, and so on. Judges can and increasingly do levy huge fines against unions and issue injunctions that effectively break strikes.

On occasion Congress, if “stirred up,” can and has passed laws breaking a strike by forcing the

workers to return to work. The president too has the power to break a strike, as President Reagan (a.k.a. T-10, his code number when he was an informer for the FBI and president of the Screen Actors Guild as well) proved when he broke the Air Traffic Controllers union in 1981.

The notorious “amendment” to the bankruptcy laws – the so-called Chapter 11 – makes it possible for a company unwilling to pay decent wages, or wanting to get out from under pension, health and vacation obligations, to declare “bankruptcy” and then legally cancel all such contracts and obligations, and “reorganize” itself shorn of previous commitments. Thousands of workers have lost wages and benefits by this device.

When whole companies arbitrarily shut down, as did the steel industry in Western Pennsylvania,, Ohio and Illinois, workers suffered enormous losses. Almost overnight their homes – into which they had invested not only their hard-earned wages but much of their lives – lost value; some had to be abandoned as the owners were forced to look for work elsewhere.

What we see in this portrait of the American working class is the “market economy” at its very best. Attempts to revive it with NAFTAs, GATTs and other opiate dreams are calculated to shift the cost of a mammoth redistribution of wealth in the world onto the backs not only of Third World workers but of American workers as well. They will have their short run of hope and illusion and ultimately collapse, leaving the situation even worse than when they found it.

There is only one “cure” for the evils of capitalism and it still is socialism – no doubt a more mature and wiser socialism than before, but socialism nevertheless. Life is a pitiless master but it rewards those who master its lessons.

History is not over. It has just begun. The class struggle has not lessened. It has intensified.

Meanwhile, labor is under direct attack and must defend itself. Part and parcel of the attack are the actions of Congress, the Supreme Court and the White House annulling and reversing certain key advances in the struggle of African Americans, Latinos and other minorities. These attacks must not be seen in isolation from the simultaneous attacks on the rights of labor in general.

Killing affirmative action, cutting projects like Head Start, outlawing electoral districts that allow for African Americans as well as Latinos to be repre-

sented in Congress and in state legislatures are aimed against economic interests as well as civil rights. Affirmative action is tied directly into jobs, Head Start and other projects into training for jobs. Political representation is an economic question as well. Low wages for any section of labor has the effect of lowering the wages of all labor.

Our country cannot survive half-union and half non-union. The old union slogan still applies – an injury to one is an injury to all.

Serious as the situation is for the laboring masses, it is far from hopeless. On the contrary, the signs are multiplying that the long period of setbacks for the working class is definitely over. The brazen, arrogant assault on the hard-won rights of the workers that has been launched in Congress has been a wake-up call to all of labor and all progressive forces in the country, ranging from feminists to environmentalists, who are under attack. In fact, a natural, objective united front of such forces has risen and is taking shape. We are at the beginning of a new phase in the struggle of democratic America for its birthright – for its native, homegrown, people's America.

There are many impressive straws in the winds of change. That Lane Kirkland had to resign while still in office is one of them. Before him the AFL had only three presidents in over 100 years. None resigned, none were defeated in elections, and all lived to a ripe old age. To be forced to resign while still in office is tantamount to a preliminary tremor that presages an earthquake to come.

Another hefty straw in the wind was the extraordinary reception that the AFL-CIO steelworkers local in Warren, Ohio extended to Gus Hall last July. Only yesterday, as time goes, Communists were driven out of office in the AFL-CIO and some locals even refused to accept them as members. To turn the town inside out welcoming the biggest Communist of them all is something nobody could have predicted only months ago!

Another positive note is the unification of three major unions – the United Steelworkers, Auto Workers and the International Association of Machinists. In so doing, the labor movement takes a big step toward reversing the flaws and weaknesses it developed since the Cold War dismantling of the CIO. It will also help accelerate other mergers in labor – construction, railroads and teachers come immediately to mind.

Added to that is the new, militant note sounded by John Sweeney, who heads the "New Voices for American Workers" ticket in opposition to the official slate, pledging the unions to "recreate a labor movement that will improve the lives of working people, not just protect them from current assaults." He promises to build "a new progressive political movement. We will remind CEOs and the right-wing zealots in public office that disrespecting working people is a one-way road to hell."

Linda Chavez-Thompson, running for AFL-CIO executive vice-president on the New Voices ticket said during a recent rally in Chicago that the new labor leadership would "change the face of labor. It will be my face. It will be your face." And Richard Trumka, head of the Miners union who is running for secretary-treasurer, told the same rally, "We cannot win by running and hiding but only by standing together and fighting together."

It's an entirely new ball game. The slate is being wiped clean of the do-nothing, class collaborationist past. Old illusions, fears and false hopes are being shed. It's a new working class we see today – more militant, more united, more class conscious, and more left in it outlook.

These developments are so basic that Gus Hall recently pointed to the beginnings of a new period in U.S. political life – an era in which the working class comes front and center into shaping the direction of the class struggle. All developments will from now on relate in one way or another to this new factor.

Already the ruling class has begun to make adjustments. Witness Clinton's recent speech on affirmative action in which he said the program has been good for the country. Witness his sharpened attacks on the Republican budget. Witness most importantly the blunting of the right-wing offensive. The ultra-right drive to force the Contract on America down the throat of the country is beginning to slow down and lose steam in the face of mounting resistance from the people.

Workers, Black, white and Brown are angry and are beginning to take action. And where the working class goes so goes the rest of the country. A working-class explosion is brewing below. It's unstoppable. It's inevitable. It will change America. □

The Deepening Crisis of the Two-Party System

Jarvis Tyner

The 1996 presidential race is well on its way. It is taking place at a time when the danger from the right is very great, when tens of millions of working-class families are experiencing hard economic times, at a time when the rights and well-being of all working people, especially the racially oppressed, are under attack.

Alienation from the two dominant capitalist parties is at an all-time high. A majority of the 18-and-over population is not voting. Millions of American voters are electorally homeless. Over one-third are presently registered independent, and the idea of a third party is supported by a majority of the people. Among African American voters support for a third party is in the high 70-percent range and growing. In most polls well over a majority of trade unionists think we need a pro-working-class third party.

Putting aside right-wing third-party forms, there are presently numerous efforts by progressive forces – nationally, regionally and locally – to bring about and build third-party formations. Tens of thousands vote for and have joined various left-wing and progressive third-party formations. National parties like the Greens and the New Party are successfully fielding candidates for office. Labor Party Advocates (LPA) has signed up tens of thousands of supporters, mostly trade unionists, and are planning to hold a founding convention in 1996. This movement has real support, but is struggling with the question of whether to run candidates and how to build in the communities as well as among trade unionists. Other groups are busy organizing, networking and calling conferences.

There are also many independent forces that are active within the Democratic Party who want to see a third party come about and are ready to cooperate with such a formation. They have seen the way the right wing took over the Republican Party in state after state and gained dominance in Congress by working in the grassroots, outside as well as within the Republican Party structure. They appreciate the

positive impact that an active, viable, labor-based, multi-racial people's party pushing from the left would have. They don't quite see how to bring it about, but are ready to help if they can. At the same time they are concerned that this not take away from their efforts to defeat the ultra-right danger and the effort to put the best possible people into elected office today.

REAL VS. PHONY INDEPENDENCE ■ Real independence means more than independence of the parties of big business – it must include independence from the *policies* of big business first and foremost. That is why conservative forces such as those associated with the Patriot Party and Ross Perot – though he received a lot of legitimate independent votes in 1992 – do not represent real independence. Similarly with the prospect of a bid for the presidency by Colin Powell – while he speaks of being independent he is closely tied in with monopoly capital, particularly the military-industrial complex.

Rather, we're talking about labor forces, elected officials and active voters in the African American, Mexican American and Puerto Rican communities. We are talking about peace, anti-racist, senior, women, youth and student, environmental activists – these are the real independents who want an alternative to an electoral system dominated by the two parties of big business. They want a party that's on the side of the people, where they can elect progressives and fight on issues in an honest and principled way. They must be seen as progressive independents.

Communists are active in the various progressive third-party formations. We see the need for a broad, national, mass electoral party where diverse progressive trends can increase their strength, work together and win.

At the same time, such a formation does not and cannot replace the Communist Party. The Communist Party has a long and heroic history of running candidates nationally and in localities across the country – and in some cases being elected. There is a Communist electoral constituency in

Jarvis Tyner is a member of the National Board of the Communist Party USA.

America that can be built on and expanded. The Communist Party, however, has a revolutionary working-class program that transcends electoral struggles and deals with the need to change society as a whole. Its candidates not only present immediate solutions to today's problems but bring forward a Marxist-Leninist outlook and present more fundamental class solutions up to and including socialism.

We are a contributing stream in the mighty river of progressive politics in America today. We have good working relations with numerous independent grassroots political formations around the country who are involved in building independence from the ground up.

Communist Party Chairman Gus Hall recently pointed out, "Building a nationwide mass progressive peoples party is going to happen sooner or later."

The U.S. body politic is pregnant with the idea of the need to build a third, people's party. The deeper the crisis of capitalism, the fewer solutions the capitalist parties have and therefore the stronger the third-party trend becomes.

While a united third party may not be immediately realizable, we believe a united progressive third-party movement is realizable now. And it must be worked for now. The question is, what needs to be done in order to help guarantee the best preconditions so that the birth will be a success, and that what is born is what the people need and want, and not another form that is basically running interference for the ruling class?

For one thing, what is needed is greater working unity of the progressive independent forces. No one trend is strong enough or diverse enough to meet the national challenge alone. Finding the forms for broad working unity is key.

A PROPOSAL IS CIRCULATING ■ Presently there is a lot of discussion taking place on how to unite independents. There is a proposal for action that comes from friendly independent forces and that we are circulating and discussing. It requires the fullest input from our Party membership and leadership. It is an important proposal.

We favor it because it calls for bringing together all of the independents – including those still within the Democratic Party – based on issues, and to struggle particularly against the right-wing danger and around the growing economic and civil

rights emergency in the country. We favor it because we think independents should come together to support progressive jobs legislation, like the Martinez public works jobs bill (HR 1591), and agree to run candidates all across the country based on a progressive program.

We think independents should end their rivalries and pledge to cooperate and not oppose each other. We think independents should agree to launch a united national effort to democratize the electoral system by making it easier to get on the ballot and by eliminating the influence of big corporate money through campaign finance reform – conservative independents are also involved in this fight. We think independents should come together to agree on a list of ultra-right elected officials to run united independent candidates against (labor can play a big role in this regard). Independents should come together to defend motor voter legislation and promote more democratic methods of elections like proportional representation. We are for grassroots local, statewide and regional conferences, as well as a national conference called together on the basis of action not philosophy. All of this has to be related not only to the goal of a people's party but also to the need to defeat the ultra right in the '96 elections.

ROLE OF THE COMMUNISTS ■ Our party has a role to play in this historic process of building towards a people's party. In local areas we are running as Communists for public office. But we must not rule out a presidential ticket – which I will discuss later. Besides running our own candidates, we must contribute to advancing the broad movement for political independence overall. Independent forces also have a role to play in the immediate 1995 and '96 elections. Like a lot of other forces, Communists must help figure out how to move things forward and positively affect short-term and long-term developments.

This is a difficult challenge, especially when 14 months from now we face a presidential election with such a strong danger from the right.

We must enter this 1996 electoral struggle in a very active way. Our role is very much needed. We must help clarify the issues and link them to mass fightback. We must help build unity and increase the confidence of those involved in the fight. For example, the fight for the Martinez bill would not be complete without having candidates

strongly advocate it.

We are in a very complicated situation tactically. The level of organization and unity of the people's independent forces is far behind what is needed. The sentiments among the working-class masses at the grassroots are beyond the policies of not only the Democratic and Republican parties, but beyond most progressive independent organizations as well.

In reading ultra-right and Republican Party material, it's clear that the enemy is fully aware of the potential for change and is out to block and misdirect real independence. They are well financed, well organized and in motion.

While different independent forces might agree on basics, there are real differences – real contradictions between those working on various levels of the broad progressive movement for independence. Our role is very much needed to help find the ways to build unity and help move things forward. We must move quickly.

DANGER FROM THE RIGHT ■ As we said, the 1996 election struggle is well on its way. The right-wing Republicans are out not only to hold their own but to win the White House and increase their majority position in the Congress. They are working for a situation where they will control the judicial, legislative and executive branches of government. Powerful forces in the ruling class want a situation where passage of their reactionary program is virtually guaranteed. That's why we must accelerate the fight to advance political independence.

Just recently William Bennett, himself a reactionary Republican, accused presidential candidate Pat Buchanan of "flirting with fascism." Buchanan is more than flirting in my view. We must not forget that there is a fascist element out there – not just the KKK, skinheads and Nazis, but forces with a powerful influence in the Republican Party.

As it is, the right-wing measures already being proposed and implemented have created an economic as well as a civil rights emergency in the nation.

The recent racist Supreme Court decisions against affirmative action sound the alarm. This needs to be seen in relation to the anti-immigrant Proposition 187, the effects of a long-term racist propaganda campaign against affirmative action as well as all entitlements, and the vicious attempts to eliminate welfare. These decisions codify the blame-the-

victim big lie and open the floodgates – not only for more racist attacks but attacks on labor's right as well. The ruling class is out to split the working class to make it easier to further worsen our conditions of life.

As their real program is being exposed, the right-wing Republicans who now dominate the Senate and House are losing mass support, but they remain confident they can defeat Clinton in '96 because they do not count on the grassroots of working people being mobilized and organized.

Clinton's tendency is to cooperate with the Contract forces. Efforts like his joint appearance with Gingrich in New Hampshire are his preferred direction. However, he can be moved.

His speech supporting affirmative action shows that despite his politically conservative outlook he can be forced in a better direction. But if he continues to push his balancing-the-budget and other conservative programs, his chances of building a winning electoral coalition by November '96 are slim. For one thing he will build the abstention trend among democratic voters.

We want to score a major defeat of the right in '96 because the alternative is unacceptable. As bad as it is now, it could get worse. A right-wing dominance of all three branches of government would mean a terrible road ahead for the people.

Advocating the third-party option alone is not an adequate answer. We should not use efforts towards future strategic goals to run away from present tactical challenges. The economic and civil rights emergency of today has to be top priority in all we do.

LESSER EVIL ■ As the right gets stronger, the lesser-of-two-evils dilemma becomes stronger too. Basically it is structured into all politics under capitalism. After almost a year of the 104th Congress, the idea of the lesser evil is influencing many voters today. Its impact cannot be ignored; it will influence the 1996 elections.

A lot of people are suffering and want relief. The best way to achieve long-term relief is to build a powerful independent movement and party – yet such a party cannot be built devoid of struggle against the right danger. The best way to meet the lesser-evil problem is to establish a "better good" alternative. The big tactical challenge is how far we can go down the road to advancing the building of a "better good" as we meet the challenges of

today.

Simply tailing the Democrats is not the way. The pressures to do that, especially in the presidential race, are very great because the prospects of building a viable national "better good" are more difficult.

But in local and congressional races there are signs that many real independent challenges can be initiated and won. Real victories are possible in 1996 if we understand that, even with the lesser-evil problem most sharply expressed on the level of the presidential race, it is still possible to pressure that election to the left, defeat many right-wing candidates and programs on a local, state and congressional levels, and that these local fights can have a positive impact on the whole electoral struggle. Finding tactics that will move the people is key.

NEW INDEPENDENT TRENDS □ There are some new trends out there that show that independence is gaining strength. Along with the positive results experienced by those building third-party formations – especially those who are building from the bottom up – there are signs that political independence is gaining support among organized strategic forces. The willingness to defy the Democratic Party hierarchy, reject the machine and move outside the two-party system is gaining broader acceptance. The idea of running candidates as independents, including for president, is widely accepted now; it's not considered a "way out" thing to do anymore.

After Clinton's latest budget betrayals which undermined the whole fight against the Contract in Congress and strengthened the right, many progressive forces in the Democratic Party were enraged and openly talked about a break with Clinton.

The pressures for Jesse Jackson to run have gotten very strong. At the recent Rainbow meeting in Atlanta, the slogan "Run Jesse Run" reemerged. At a July '95 meeting sponsored by *Essence* magazine in New Orleans, according to the *Wall Street Journal* the African American leaders there were generally of the opinion that if President Clinton continues moving to the right with such initiatives as his balanced budget and affirmative action review, distancing himself from the leadership of minority and women's organization and other liberals, "Mr. Jackson will feel obligated to run. And if the president fights for their agenda, he won't run ..." The

same article quoted Jackson as saying, "We will not sit idly by and watch the great gains of the past evaporate."

Jackson's aides say that they are studying their options, including the possibility of running as an independent in the general election. This idea is getting a lot of support, including among some Congressional Democrats. Incumbents are saying that among their constituents, Jackson's being at the top of the ticket would help them more than sharing a ticket with Clinton. As of this writing, Jackson has not committed himself. The main tactic at this point seems to be to apply maximum pressure from the left. That is a good tactic and is having an impact on Clinton.

LABOR □ In the labor movement there is growing alienation from the Democrats. Of great importance is the fact that in the platform of both groups vying to replace Kirkland as head of the AFL-CIO, there is a totally new position regarding support of political independence of labor. This trend is all over the labor movement.

At the recent Coalition of Black Trade Unionists (CBTU) convention, First Vice President Willie Baker said that Black workers are no longer the "plow horse" for the Democratic Party. They are saying, "no more *carte blanche*." Candidates will be supported based on issues and "let the chips fall where they may."

In labor, especially in the leadership circles, there is strong pressure that says labor must support Clinton, despite the disappointments, due to the danger from the right. Such pressure is enormous on the level of the presidential race; at the same time, many more top trade union leaders today are ready and willing to break with the machine on the level of local and congressional candidates.

The continued anger in the ranks of labor over the Democrats' betrayal around NAFTA, GATT and the Worker Replacement Bill is creating a more favorable climate, especially for the Sweeney slate. The pressure for change in basic policy in the AFL-CIO is enormous right now. This could be a decisive factor in the coming elections if mobilized.

The platform of the Sweeney group calls for a "new labor movement" and states, "While we must reach out and embrace other progressive forces for change, we must above all build our own power by creating a strong grassroots political voice for work-

ing people in this country." Sweeney says that the labor movement needs to "exact a price" from candidates before endorsing them for public office. This view was frantically attacked by Al Shanker, showing a growing desperation among conservative labor leaders.

Speaking at the recent Jobs with Justice conference, George Becker, president of the United Steelworkers, called for shifting labor's money to elect workers to Congress. Can these openings be a basis for building local coalitions of independent forces around supporting united labor candidates for Congress?

The power that the new mergers will bring to the labor movement cannot be overemphasized. Greater clout in political action is one of the important reasons given for the merger of the Textile unions and the mega-merger of the Auto Workers, Machinists and Steelworkers. These are new openings for approaching labor.

Another challenge is around the recent racist Supreme Court decisions against redistricting. Can independent forces help build broad-based coalitions of all the independent forces in response? Why not coalitions that would work to guarantee the re-election of Congresswomen Cynthia McKinney and Nydia Velazquez? This could be linked to establishing a national list of 20 to 30 extreme right-wing Congressmen to target for defeat.

THE ABSTENTION FACTOR ■ More and more, the ruling class relies on the abstention of millions of working-class voters to guarantee the election of reactionaries. The abstention factor is determining the outcome of most elections today. As we said, tens of millions of voters do not identify with either the Republican or Democratic parties.

In the 1992 presidential election no candidate received a majority. Clinton received a plurality. Over 19 million voters – about 19 percent – voted for the "independent" candidate and billionaire businessman Ross Perot.

In the 1994 mid-term elections only about 38 percent of the electorate came out. While they won a lot of races, the Republicans actually won by default. The overwhelming majority of voters decided not to vote, leaving the field open for the more conservative section of the electorate, and those most taken in by right-wing demagoguery, to determine the outcome. In that and other elections the right has a power far beyond its actual numeri-

cal strength.

Increasingly with the capitulations and moves to the right by the Democratic Party, the working-class majority of the electorate is opting for a "no confidence, no vote" tactic. The danger of this approach is that, by default, it is leaving the field open to domination by a minority of voters who are wealthy reactionaries.

The answer cannot be simply to work harder to get folks to register and vote. The abstention trend is not only a vote against the two dominant parties but is rooted in the growing lack of confidence in capitalism itself. The answer must include advancing the struggle for peace, jobs, justice and equality. It must include the struggle to promote people's candidates, to create a democratic progressive alternative to build the greater good, so that the people will have something to vote for. It's becoming clear that constant, defensive appeals to come out to vote do not hold a lot of sway with large numbers of voters. More is needed.

THE CLASS ISSUE IS KEY ■ According to a recent survey conducted by Curtis Gans of the Committee for the Study of the American Electorate, 60 percent of persons with incomes of \$50,000 or more voted in 1994, up from 59.2 percent four years prior. Only 19.9 percent of those with incomes under \$5,000 came out, down from 32.2 percent. For voters making \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year, only 23.3 percent voted compared to 30.9 percent previously.

The study found that while 46.9 percent of whites said they voted, which was an increase from 1990, only 37 percent of African-Americans and 19.1 percent of those classified Hispanic came out. In each case that was a decrease from 1990.

As our Party has said, the outcome in the '94 elections was not due to an ideological shift to the right by the working-class majority, as some continue to claim, but rather because the active electorate in 1994 tended to be high-income conservative voters.

Yet some use the same results to keep pushing the "angry white men" notion. This idea is pushed in order to hide the class issue and encourage and justify racism. The aim is to take the justifiable anger of white workers toward the system and its ruling class, and misdirect it towards non-white workers.

Most opinion polls show that there has been no rightward shift by working people. As I said earlier,

as the class essence of the right wing's program is more and more exposed, those who advocate the Contract are losing support. Helping to popularize a class understanding is key to unity in advancing political independence and in defeating the ultra right in the coming elections.

For example, while a majority supports a balanced budget and lower taxes, they do not support or trust the likes of Newt Gingrich. And when you get to the specifics of what is to be cut to "balance the budget," a majority do not support the anti-working-class, racist measures proposed by the right wing to achieve it. To support these measures is to support more massive giveaways to the rich at the expense of the people. There is a strong class revulsion against these policies.

Cutting the military budget, cutting "wealthfare" (entitlements for the rich) and taxing the rich are all popular, majority ideas among masses of working people.

Even among Republicans, those presidential candidates who continue to emphasize the right-wing economic proposals in the Contract are falling behind those who have shifted to so-called moral issues.

HOW TO PROCEED ■ Basically what is needed is greater unity of the independent forces working on all levels of the movement for independent politics. This includes sections of labor, African Americans and Latinos, third-party movements, those working to democratize the electoral process and forces who are still organizationally inside the Democratic Party but whose politics are independent and to the left of the dominant forces in the party. This includes grassroots activists, leaders of mass organizations and elected officials.

In the proposal that our Party is in agreement with, there are a number of ideas to build on. For example, independents could come together to agree on a program to convince candidates to run on. One of the most exciting ideas would be that everyone – no matter whether they support the Greens, LPA, the New Party, or if they are a reform Democrat or a Communist – all agree to support the same candidates for public office.

The proposal projects holding a series of local meetings or conferences to help lay the basis for building for a national conference. The purpose of local conferences is to develop local action programs around the economic and civil rights emergency.

They could be organized around targeting particular extreme-right candidates for defeat.

Take Connecticut, where there have been some excellent examples of successful grassroots electoral independence. It is a state where the economic emergency is very severe, and where Governor Rowland is trying to destroy welfare and privatization is high on his agenda. There are municipal elections this year and most independent forces are involved. In New Haven they are working to put a jobs bill referendum on the ballot. In other cities they are working on the municipal elections. They are organizing for a real fight this year. Can there be a coming-together of independent forces to organize and coordinate their efforts?

In New Mexico a very important national Green Party conference was held. Our party's presence was welcomed by the many independent activist who were there. Virginia Brodine, chair of our environmental commission, took part in a workshop and on a panel of third parties representing our party. She was very well received. We also set up a very successful Party literature table.

Our comrades who attended the Green Party conference in Washington D.C. last month were also warmly welcomed by its organizers. In general, our presence at third-party movement events is appreciated and often openly acknowledged. Many forces may not agree with us on every issue but they respect our contributions, our experiences and our outlook for a socialist future.

In California, defense of motor voter laws, defeating the affirmative action referendum and the ongoing struggle to overturn Proposition 187 are at the center of the electoral struggle. With so many third-party forces there, it would seem that some form of getting together around a concrete issue is possible.

In Oregon there will be a referendum on proportional representation on the Eugene ballot. In New York, the economic emergency is very severe with the presence of a right-wing Republican mayor in New York City and a right-wing Republican governor in Albany – the elections must be linked to the growing fightback. Certainly in Ohio – not only with Rick Nagin in Cleveland but in Youngstown/Warren in particular – we ought to have a Communist candidate to offer all those households who received our message during the homecoming activities a chance to vote for the party of Gus Hall.

Continued on page 24

The Future of Middle East Peace

Meir Vilner

The policies undertaken by Israel's Rabin government have resulted in a prolonged blockage of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. From the moment Gaza and Jericho were handed over to the Palestinian Authority, the government did not carry out, or broke outright, nearly all of its commitments under the Oslo accords. Rabin virtually sanctified his principle that "no dates are holy."

The government continued, and still continues, to carry out confiscations of Palestinian lands throughout the West Bank, a policy which reached its peak with the recent attempt to confiscate additional lands in Jerusalem. New settlements have been created and the expansion of existing ones goes on at a higher pace than under the right-wing Likud government. In contravention of the Oslo Accords, Israeli military forces were not redeployed outside the Palestinian population areas, nor were elections to the Palestinian Council facilitated.

Moreover, thousands of Palestinian prisoners and detainees remain incarcerated. Cruel acts of oppression are still carried out, including torture, which in some cases end in death. The settlers continue their anti-Palestinian pogroms under the protection of security forces.

The economic situation in the Gaza Strip is worse than it was before Oslo, due to the prolonged closure and the tightening of limitations upon Gazan workers' access to their workplaces in Israel. All this leads to an extremely high unemployment rate and horrible poverty – even virtual starvation.

The deterioration of the economic situation and the freezing of the peace process have created widespread bitterness and frustration, all of which greatly facilitates the increased power and influence of the Palestinian opponents of peace, including the Hamas movement. In the present situation, the question arises again and again: is the Rabin government really interested in achieving comprehensive peace? Does its recognition of the PLO and its signa-

ture of the Oslo Accords constitute no more than a maneuver aimed at improving Israel's relations with other Arab and Muslim states? Is the government's main purpose merely to isolate and neutralize the Palestinian movement?

As a consequence, it is increasingly being asked what perspective are we facing, where are we going? Is it indeed possible that, instead of the longed-for peace, we may face the outbreak of a new war?

The peace process is indeed in danger. It seems that Yitzhak Rabin, as well as many of his years-long companions, are not yet fully reconciled to their own step of recognizing the PLO and all that implies.

Nevertheless, we should reject the opinion that the Oslo Accords were from their inception nothing but a trick, and therefore doomed to failure. Such an opinion ignores the background, as well as the local, regional and international factors which brought about this process.

BACKGROUND TO AN AGREEMENT ■ In order to analyze correctly and fully appreciate the developments since the mutual recognition of Israel and the PLO, and in order to understand the present situation, one must not forget the basic reasons that led Israel to recognize the PLO after so many years of refusal to do so, even on a mutual basis. I want to emphasize that those reasons are still valid.

The Yom Kippur War (October 1973), followed by the Lebanon War (June 1982), made the first breaches in the militarist dogmas of the Israeli ruling circles. These wars broke the illusion that the Israeli Defense Force is omnipotent. In the Gulf War, Iraqi Scud missiles sent from afar landed in Israel, causing damage and casualties and a mass exodus from Tel-Aviv and other cities. This further eroded the formerly widespread feeling of arrogant self-confidence, as well as greatly undermining the theory of "security borders."

The Intifada (popular uprising) of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Territories, which broke out in December 1987, greatly influenced Israeli

Meir Vilner is a member of the Political Bureau of the Israeli Communist Party.

public opinion. During the six years of the Intifada the Likud government, as well as the government headed by the Labor Party, used the most brutal methods in their efforts to crush the uprising but failed to bring the Palestinian people to their knees. The Arab Palestinian people showed real heroism and willingness to endure untold suffering and casualties. This, as well as the casualties suffered on the Israeli side itself, convinced many Israelis that it was no longer possible to continue the old way of life, and that perpetuation of the occupation and the wars could have disastrous consequences for Israel.

A further factor greatly influencing the changes in Israeli society is the nuclear danger. Hitherto Israel possessed a nuclear monopoly in the Middle East. The possibility of intimidating Israel's neighbors was one of the main sources for the militarist circles' willingness to undertake an adventurous policy. This was to a large degree rooted in the illusion that Israel will forever remain the sole possessor of mass destruction weapons in the entire region. In the past few years, however, it became clear that the Israeli regional nuclear monopoly is far from certain. Some ruling circles started to realize that it is too dangerous to gamble upon the possibility of "solving" the Israel-Arab conflict under any circumstances by use of the nuclear option – that in fact this was nothing but an option for suicide. The horror of nuclear war can be averted only by making the region, including the state of Israel, completely free of nuclear weapons and all weapons of mass destruction.

A COMPREHENSIVE PEACE ■ In order to remove this threat, the government must make a substantial change in its overall policy regarding the achievement of comprehensive Israeli-Arab peace, of which the Palestinian problem was, and remains, the core. Without a comprehensive solution there will be no stability in Israeli-Arab relations, no security for Israel and stability in the Arab countries, and enormous perils, including nuclear war, will continue to threaten the entire region.

The latest events, and especially the attempt to confiscate lands in East Jerusalem, once again demonstrate the deep solidarity all Arab peoples feel towards the Palestinian people's struggle for their national rights, including the creation of an independent Palestinian state with its capital in East

Jerusalem and a just solution of the refugee problem.

Despite the peace agreement signed between Israel and Jordan, the majority in the Jordanian Parliament voted for severing relations with Israel because of the new land confiscations in East Jerusalem – a position vehemently supported by the majority of the Jordanian people. There was an enormous outburst of anger throughout the entire Arab and Muslim world. Some Israeli commentators claimed that these were no more than formal protests, which may be true with regard to certain Arab and Muslim leaders, but the Arab peoples were sincere and resolute.

Despite the formal peace treaty which has existed between Israel and Egypt for many years, the contact between them never developed into a real relationship between the peoples. Recently, following the Rabin government's anti-Palestinian provocations, the Egyptian intelligentsia and wide circles of the Egyptian public sharply demonstrated their displeasure.

STEPS TO STABILITY ■ In order to achieve stability, bring about peace between the peoples in our region and avert danger to Israel, the government of Israel must ensure that the Arab side will have no motivation to develop nuclear arms. This implies the following:

- Reaching a real comprehensive peace, which must start by making peace with the Palestinian people and granting their demand for an established independent state having its capital in East Jerusalem.

- Reaching peace with Syria and Lebanon on the basis of Israeli withdrawal to the boundaries of June 4, 1967.

- Making our region, including Israel, free of nuclear arms and all weapons of mass annihilation.

To assess the present situation of the peace process we have to understand not only the aims of the Rabin government but also those of the U.S. administration, as well as the present state of affairs in Israeli-American relations.

There were those who believed that in the present international situation, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States would have a lessened interest in Israel – since it was Israel, more than any other single state, which aided the U.S. tycoons and arms dealers in their campaign against the Soviet Union and Communism, against all revo-

lutionary, progressive and national liberation movements throughout the world. Reality has shown, however, that U.S.-Israeli relations, far from being curtailed, were actually deepened, especially on the strategic, military and political levels.

Prime Minister Rabin and Foreign Minister Peres announced that the relations between the Clinton administration and the Rabin government are better than those between their respective predecessors at any previous point in the two countries' history. It is to be assumed that with the approach of the 1996 elections in both the U.S and Israel, the Clinton administration will be even more eager to demonstrate its "friendship" with Israel.

Could the Israeli ruling establishment of either Likud or Labor have maintained a 28-year occupation without the military aid, financial support and political backing of the United States? Of course not.

At present the rulers of Israel and the U.S. are closely coordinating their positions during the negotiations with Syria and the Palestinian Authority. This does not, however, mean that there are no differences of opinion and interest between them, especially considering the U.S. efforts to increase its influence throughout the Arab world.

In contrast to its relationship with Israel, in Washington's relationship with the Palestinian Authority there is a marked tendency to violate the obligations it has undertaken, especially with regard to the financial aid it promised. The anti-Palestinian attitude of the U.S. reached its peak with the imposition of its veto in the U.N. Security Council blocking the very mild resolution on the confiscation of Palestinian land in East Jerusalem. The Clinton administration found itself isolated, with all other 14 members of the Security Council voting against the confiscations.

IMPERIALISM'S STRATEGY ■ To take a wider view, the political developments which created a prolonged freeze in the peace process indicate the existence of an America-Israeli-Jordanian partnership aimed at curtailing Palestinian independence as much as possible. Nearly all efforts of the U.S. "mediators" are concentrated on the Israeli-Syrian negotiations. The policy of Rabin and Clinton seems designed, among other things, to push the Palestinian issue to the sidelines while moving at a snail's pace on the implementation of Palestinian self-rule

on the West Bank. In this context it is worthwhile to pay attention to the warning of writer David Grossman in his famous article published in the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* of April 4, 1995.

I would advise all of us not to underestimate the apprehensions of Palestinians with whom I talked. Perhaps they sense, much earlier than us, a newly-forming reality: that the 'entity' which Rabin is willing to 'grant' them may turn out to be no more than a hybrid between autonomy and confederation, cut all through by 'Israeli' roads and fences, dotted with numerous settlements in strategic locations - in short, an arrangement which will ensure the continuation of the conflict. A demi-state.

In the recent Arafat-Peres agreement, July 1 was defined as a target date by which an agreement should be signed on the army's redeployment outside the Palestinian population centers and holding elections to the Palestinian council. The date was later pushed back to September. Should the Rabin government regard even this date as "not sacred," the situation would rapidly deteriorate; in that case we face not only the possibility of reversion to the pre-Oslo situation, including an Intifada renewal, but also the possibility of an even more grave, unprecedented situation.

Writers and intellectuals such as David Grossman, as well as many others in left and peace circles, have recently voiced sharp warnings about the dangers to the peace process and about the Rabin government's responsibility for this danger. Among the grassroots membership of Meretz there is increasing criticism of their party's leadership, and in particular of its representatives in the government.

COMMUNISTS AND THE LEFT SCORE VICTORY ■

The confusion in Meretz, as well as in the dovish circles inside the Labor Party, increased after the impressive May 22 parliamentary success of the Communist Party of Israel (CPI) and the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality (DFPE) when, following the DFPE motion of no-confidence, the Rabin government was forced to retract the new East Jerusalem land confiscations and form a ministerial committee to deal with the confiscations issue.

The organs of the CPI and DFPE decided to present the motion of no-confidence following the declaration of the new Jerusalem confiscation. It was

also motivated by the government's overall policy which caused an almost complete stoppage of the peace process with the Palestinians.

The DFPE also conducted various protest actions against the deportations, as did Gush Shalom (the Peace Bloc) and other peace seekers. Following the government announcement of the confiscations freeze, Knesset Member Hashem Mahameed, head of the DFPE parliamentary faction, informed the plenum that his faction was withdrawing its motion of no-confidence. He stated:

Mr. Speaker, Fellow Members. The government has decided to accept the DFPE request and demand to change its decision on the land confiscations in East Jerusalem, and this was officially announced by the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Therefore, the DFPE - while continuing to closely monitor the implementation of the agreements, especially towards the July 1 deadline - presently withdraws its motion of no-confidence.

As these words make clear, the withdrawal of the no-confidence motion in no way means that the DFPE accepts the Rabin governments' many other acts to the detriment of the peace process. Still less does it imply that the DFPE will accept such acts in the future.

The DFPE has always been committed, and remains so, to a policy of preventing, by all means at its disposal, the formation of a Likud government, or a right-wing government of any other variety. At the same time, the latest motion of no-confidence made clear to the government and its leaders that there will be no automatic DFPE support for that government in the framework of the "blocking majority." Rather the DFPE's role as part of Rabin's "blocking majority" is closely linked to its government's policies, and in particular to its policies with regard to Israeli-Palestinian peace which is the key issue for any comprehensive peace in the region.

RABIN GOVERNMENT'S ANTI-PALESTINIAN POLICY ■

A sober political analysis requires us to recognize that the Rabin government, though forced to give way on the issue of the new East Jerusalem land confiscations, has not yet changed its overall policy towards the Palestinian issue. In his latest visit to Washington, Foreign Minister Shimon Peres told President Clinton that "an Israeli-Syrian peace is different from an agreement with any other state, as it

would bring about the end to the state of war in the Middle East and the inception of a comprehensive peace between Israel and the Arab World." (*Ha'aretz* 5/5/95) In a television interview, Peres added the assertion that "peace with Syria will be the last peace agreement in the Israeli-Arab conflict."

This contemplation of a so-called "comprehensive peace between Israel and the Arab world" which does not include a just solution to the Palestinian problem is very grave. It is particularly regrettable that these words were uttered by Shimon Peres, a man who in recent years adopted more realistic positions than those he espoused in the past. We must never forget what was the strategic aim of Menachem Begin, head of the right-wing Likud government between 1977 and 1983, when he decided to sign the Camp David accords of 1978: to isolate the Palestinian issue and prevent the Arab Palestinian people from realizing their national rights. This was the main consideration which led to the return of the entire Sinai Peninsula to Egypt in the framework of the Camp David Accords. In short, the main purpose of this was safeguard "the Greater Israel."

To sum up: two extreme conclusions must be avoided. It is not correct to assert that the Rabin government, having given up the latest Jerusalem confiscations, has already changed its basic overall policy towards the Palestinian issue. On the other hand, it is also incorrect to assume that the entire peace process is doomed.

Of course, if there is no basic change in the current policy of the government of Israel - in particular with regard to the Palestinian issue - there will be an increased danger to the future of the entire peace process. But at the moment there is still a chance for peace, even if the struggle for its achievement will be extremely hard.

A lot will depend on the struggle inside Israel for a comprehensive peace. The duty of ourselves, CPI and DFPE, is to conduct the struggle against the continued occupation and for a comprehensive peace until its final success. Our recent success in the struggle against the confiscations is very important, but the main struggle is still ahead.

Our struggle is in the interest of the Israeli people no less than in that of the Palestinian people. There is no conflict of interest between our two peoples. While retaining our independence and uniqueness, we should maintain our basic policy of constant cooperation and joint struggle, together with all peace forces. □

Anti-Communism & U.S. Foreign Policy

Lem Harris

Just eleven days after the death of President Roosevelt, President Truman received Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov at the White House for a courtesy visit. Molotov was on his way to San Francisco to take part in the formation of the United Nations. With Hitler defeated but the war with Japan still raging, the invasion of Japan's main islands appeared imminent. It was urgent that the Soviet Union fulfill its pledge to attack the Japanese forces in Chinese Manchuria.

Despite this situation, Truman used the occasion of the visit to insult Molotov and the USSR. Using what was described as "Missouri mule driver's language," he broke all diplomatic traditions by cussing out Molotov and the Soviet government for good measure. Charles Bohlen, who served as interpreter, stated that "he had never heard a top official get such a scolding."¹

Truman had consulted in advance of the interview. Secretary of War Stimson, General Marshall and Admiral Leahy had opposed insulting the representative of our wartime ally. Only Secretary Forrestal had approved Truman's intentions - Forrestal, who not long thereafter went stark raving mad shouting, "The Russians are invading the United States."

What motivated Truman? It was Stalin's insistence that the postwar Polish government must be friendly to the Soviet Union. At both wartime conferences in Teheran and Yalta, Stalin had made it very plain that Poland was the corridor through which Russia had been attacked three times since 1914: first by Germany in World War I, second by intervention of the Western imperialist countries following the revolution, and third by Hitler. Stalin insisted at both conferences that future safety from attack required a friendly Polish government.

Unlike Winston Churchill, Roosevelt - though also opposed to forcing the Lublin government on Poland - did not allow this to mar the basic agreement between the USSR and the USA, the best guarantee of a world at peace.

But Truman chose to make Poland a *casus belli* which he used as an early justification for the Cold War, with all its disastrous consequences. He thus betrayed Roosevelt's fondest hope for a world at peace. The Cold War inevitably led to the nuclear arms race, endangering all living beings on the planet and costing countless billions.

Truman's next move was to abruptly, without warning the nations concerned, order the termination of lend/lease support for both the USSR and Britain. Churchill, though no longer prime minister, reacted angrily. He found it difficult to believe that the Americans "would proceed in such a harsh and rough manner as to hamper a faithful ally who had held the fort while their own armaments were being prepared." When Truman sent Harry Hopkins to Moscow, Stalin said that if advanced warning had been given, the cancellation of lend/lease would not have caused hard feelings.²

COLD WAR POLICY IN KOREA ■ With the surrender of the Japanese Empire and two days before the landing of the American occupation force under General John R. Hodge, a constitutional convention was held in Seoul by representatives of the Korean national resistance to Japan's occupation of their country. This convention, with representatives from all parts of Korea and from many patriotic groups, of course included some Communists who had resisted Japanese occupation for many years. This convention formed the People's Republic government. They sent a delegation to welcome the arrival of General Hodge and the American troops.³

Lacking instructions to cooperate with the new government, Hodge ignored it. Worse, he invited Japanese administrators and Korean collaborators to remain and help establish a Korean government more in line with American interests.

Charging that the "liberators had become oppressors," the new all-Korean Republic government established its authority everywhere it could. It organized a Congress which General Hodge ordered dissolved. The Congress refused. General

Lem Harris is a contributor to *Political Affairs*.

Hodge declared its activities unlawful. Shortly after, Hodge sent for Dr. Syngman Rhee, head of an exile Korean government. Rhee was known as extremely right-wing – his supporters were the landlords and conservative business elements.

Forcing Rhee on the Korean people did not go smoothly. When democratic elections were allowed a few years later he was defeated. The anti-Rhee groups won 120 out of the 210 seats in the Korean Congress. The regime was threatened. At this point General MacArthur stepped in and assured President Rhee that he would defend South Korea as he would the shores of his native land. The president did not resign.

Meanwhile the Russian forces in the northern part of the country, though staying in the background, allowed the Korean Republic government to take power. Kim Il Sung, a Communist who had been fighting Japanese occupation in Manchuria for many years, became head of state.

OUTBREAK OF WAR ▣ Just two years and two months after Rhee was installed as president (June 25, 1950), North and South Korea were at war. Who attacked whom? President Truman, General MacArthur and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles all accused North Korea of invading the South. North Korea to this day flatly states South Korea invaded the North. Where lies the truth?

There has always been widespread doubt about the origins of this war. A widely published photograph of Dulles in a trench at the 38th parallel which divides North and South Korea, flanked by American and Korean army commanders, just four days before the war started, caused many to wonder what he was doing there. With Dulles' departure from the front line, United Nations observers, who had been patrolling the line since June 9, departed June 24. The war started the next day, but there were no observers to record which side crossed the border.⁴

In recent years, a few of the many thousands of restricted documents from U.S. sources in Seoul have been made public which throw much light on the mystery. Here are a few:

September 30, 1949: Syngman Rhee, in a letter to a U.S. friend, said, "I am firmly convinced that this is the psychological best moment to resort to aggressive measures ... We will drive Kim Il Sung's people into the hills and gradually starve them out there."

October 7, 1949: Syngman Rhee, in an interview

with the United Press, boasted that the South Korean Army could take the North Korean capital of Pyongyang within three days.

October 19, 1949: At a divisional commander's conference in Seoul, American General W.L. Roberts declared, "From now on, the invasion of the territory north of the 38th parallel is to be carried out only on the basis of orders of the American Military Mission."

Three months later the general was more precise and declared, "The campaign against the North has been decided upon and the date for carrying it through is not very far off."

June 19, 1950: After John Foster Dulles assured the South Korean Parliament that "the Communists will lose their rule over North Korea," Syngman Rhee followed him to the speaker's podium and stated, "If we cannot defend democracy in a cold war, then we will achieve victory in a hot war."

July 30, 1950: One month after the outbreak of war, an information officer on General MacArthur's staff declared to a press conference in Tokyo, "When the war began on the 25th of June, the North Korean army had not carried out its mobilization plan. Only six divisions were ready, although the North Korean plans call for 13 to 15 divisions in case of war."

U.S. FORCES INTERVENE ▣ So President Rhee and General MacArthur got the war they had planned. But President Rhee did not "drive Kim Il Sung into the hills and starve him out." Instead, the American-armed and trained South Korean army was forced to retreat to a small sector on the southern tip of Korea. Only the intervention of American forces prevented the overthrow of the Rhee government and the unification of all Korea.

General MacArthur, with superior land and naval forces, did drive the North Korean army far to the north, ignoring a warning from the Chinese government that any advance of American forces to the Chinese border at the Yalu River would be considered an act of war against China. As MacArthur approached the Yalu River, the Chinese struck with overwhelming force and drove MacArthur's forces all the way back to the 38th parallel, the starting point. So Dulles' boast to the South Korean Parliament "that the Communists will lose their rule over North Korea" came to nothing.

Though nothing was gained, the cost in human

lives was frightful. Of the dead and wounded as a result of the war, it is estimated that North Korea suffered 520,000, South Korea 1,300,000, American dead 54,246, and the 15 other participating United Nations forces, though minimal, suffered 3,360 losses.⁵

Two years after the stalemate that ended the Korean War, the United States exploded the first hydrogen bomb on the Pacific Island of Kwajalein. The U.S. Congress was told that the explosion obliterated the island, tearing a hole a mile wide and 175 feet deep. The 3,400 native inhabitants who had been removed beforehand could never return to their homeland. There was worldwide apprehension when it was reported that the crew of a Japanese fishing trawler 80 miles away from the blast had received lethal fallout burns.

Just seven months later, the Soviet Union exploded an H-bomb in the Arctic. These events drove home to already apprehensive nations that an atomic war capable of destroying cities and even continents could occur.

TARGETING CHINA ■ Apparently learning nothing from his role as one of the chief architects of the Korean disaster, Dulles – now Secretary of State under President Eisenhower – plunged ahead with his anti-Communist obsession. This time his target was the People's Republic of China. With lofty moral fervor and thundering threats of “massive retaliation” and of “going to the brink of war,” he guaranteed the protection of the 7th U.S. Naval Fleet to Chiang Kai-Shek holed up on the island of Taiwan (Formosa).

Chiang had been driven from the Chinese mainland by the revolutionary armies of the People's Republic of China. Upon the defeat of Japan, Chiang's armies had taken over Taiwan. Chiang's officials, in typical fashion, pillaged the Taiwanese. Efforts at revolt by the unarmed citizens were met by a massacre of thousands. Just ten days after his inauguration, President Eisenhower, no doubt in accord with advice from Dulles, announced that he would permit Chiang to attack the Chinese mainland but that the U.S. fleet would prevent any Chinese attacks on Taiwan.

The president submitted a joint resolution to Congress asking for authority “to use the armed forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the purpose of protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack.” This included two islands close to the Chinese mainland, Matsus

and Quemoy, held by Chiang. The resolution was passed by the House 409 to 3 and by the Senate 85 to 3.

Here was a blank check authorizing the president to start a war against China at any time. This appeared to make war over Taiwan inevitable since China considered it to be part of its territory.⁶

Armed with this Congressional resolution, Dulles went into action. He declared that the U.S. was ready to go to war for Southeast Asia against the “expansionist aims and ambitions of China.” He assured an assembly of U.S. ambassadors in the Far East that there would be no more retreats in Asia and that “Communist aggression” would be avoided by a policy of unswerving firmness. In Washington, Dulles charged that the Chinese Communists sought “desperately” to take “the forward positions of freedom in Asia.” He did not add that most of the world thought that they were merely trying to take possession of their own islands.⁷

NUCLEAR SABER-RATTLING ■ On nationwide television and radio, Dulles threatened to use against the Chinese “new and powerful weapons of precision which can utterly destroy military targets without endangering unrelated civilian centers” – that is, tactical atomic bombs!

As reactions of disbelief and horror were registered worldwide, Dulles tried to soften the impact of his words by saying city-destroying atomic bombs would not be used. President Eisenhower backed up Dulles by stating that such baby A-bombs were for use “just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else” on “strictly military targets.”

This led the South Koreans to ask for the atomic cannon. The *New York Times* military commentator, Hanson W. Baldwin, wrote that precision bombing with A-bombs was impossible. Our “least powerful atomic weapon” had an explosive force of 3,000 tons of TNT. Its chief advantage was compensation for aiming error. He warned that the use of such weapons “might destroy an enemy while losing on the ideological battlefield.”⁸

Dulles had overreached. In Australia he was plainly told by the premier that Australia would not go to war for Quemoy and Matsus. He got the same message in Canada. Japan announced that she would not permit the use of her military bases for a war on China. Dulles had succeeded in isolating the

U.S. from our allies. If the U.S. declared war on China, we would have no allies other than the Philippines and maybe Thailand.

When the normally conservative Senator George made what Dulles must have considered an almost treasonable suggestion that "the real hope of avoiding war is through some high level conferences between the leading powers," Dulles replied the next day. In a grim warning tone he made a speech aimed to inflame the public mind against the Chinese. He declared their "aggressive fanaticism" was akin to Hitler. He thought the Chinese were "more dangerous and provocative of war."

But Dulles and the advocates of a "preventative war" were in disarray. His thunder went unheeded. The White House was deluged with urgent messages, many of them from conservative groups urging an international conference to attain a settlement without war. To go to war over Matsus and Quemoy was recognized as absurd. President Eisenhower responded by turning away from war in China.

The warhawks who had dominated American foreign policy since the Truman Doctrine seemed defeated as the war crisis passed. But for the moment only. The anti-Communist complex remained as virulent as ever.

THE LONG LIST OF U.S. INTERVENTIONS ■ The list of hostile foreign interventions by CIA agents and American armed forces is a long and terrible one. Any country with an administration of any shade of progressivism, from pink to red, has been a candidate for some form of intervention, and always in the name of anti-Communism.

Item: 1953 – Iran. The CIA publicly boasted of its role in masterminding the overthrow of the government of Mohammed Mossadegh, whose "crime" was his intention to nationalize Iran's oil industry.

Item: 1954 – Guatemala. Apparently feeling its oats, and again boasting about it, the CIA, assisted by warplane flyovers, overthrew the liberal administration of President Jacobo Arbenz Gusman. His "crime" was not related to oil but restricting the operations of the American-owned United Fruit Company.

Item: 1961 to the present – Cuba. In 1959 Fidel Castro, with wide popular support, overthrew the Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista and became prime minister of Cuba. Relations with the United States government became strained when Castro

publicly made clear his opposition to the Cold War. They became outright hostile when the American-owned oil refineries in Cuba refused to receive crude oil from the Soviet Union. With but one month of oil reserves available, Castro nationalized the U.S. and British refineries. Washington then canceled all sugar imports from Cuba. The Soviet Union met Cuba's desperate crude oil needs.

Planned under CIA auspices in the Eisenhower administration and launched under President Kennedy, an army of Cuban exiles trained in Guatemala attempted a Cuban invasion but were defeated in one day of fighting at the Bay of Pigs. The invaders expected support from the Cuban people which they did not get.

Cuba was then subjected to a tight embargo on all trade with the United States from then to now, a period of 34 years and counting.

Even more shameful were the repeated plots by the CIA to assassinate Fidel Castro. These attempts included using poison, sniper fire, and three separate attempts to kill him during his visit with President Allende of Chile. The CIA did not hesitate to put mob leaders Roselli, Trafficante and Giancana in charge of the assassination efforts.

President Nixon's administration added its special touch to the anti-Castro campaign. The CIA seeded rain clouds over Cuba, causing torrential rains in non-agricultural areas and leaving the cane fields arid.

A U.S. intelligence officer passed a vial of swine fever virus to a terrorist group. Smuggled into Cuba, within six weeks Cuba suffered the first outbreak of swine fever ever in the Western Hemisphere. Hog herds were decimated.⁹

Item: 1964-73 – Vietnam. When Vietnam under its beloved Communist leader Ho Chi Minh defeated the French colonial army at Dien Bien Phu, the United States intervened and forced a "temporary" division of the country into North and South Vietnam. President Eisenhower stated that had he not so acted, undoubtedly Ho Chi Min would have ruled the whole country.

The result was similar to the division of Korea – a war involving a huge number of troops and casualties and lasting nine years. In all, the United States under presidents Johnson and Nixon sent nearly 550,000 troops to Vietnam. The Army of the Republic of Vietnam, (ARVN) under American advisors, was said to mobilize 500,000 troops. South Korea

sent 48,000 men in support of the Americans. Opposing this force were the combined armies of North Vietnam and the liberation forces within South Vietnam, who built their strength to over 250,000 soldiers.¹⁰

In the end the northern forces triumphed, the Americans withdrew. Vietnam became one country.

Item: 1965 - Dominican Republic. American intervention is an old story in the Dominican Republic. In 1916, President Wilson ordered the U.S. Marines to occupy the country. They remained in control for eight years. Wilson explained that the Marines were ending a state of anarchy. A year later, 1917, the year of the Russian Revolution, "anarchy" was replaced by "Communism" as the excuse for interventions by capitalist countries. The eight-year occupation of the Dominican Republic brought some "progress in education and public health, but it also brought military rule, press censorship and economic exploitation by U.S. business interests, and it was bitterly resented."¹¹

In 1965, President Johnson intervened with 20,000 American troops. He expressed "fear of another Cuba." A moderate president, Juan Bosch, had been overthrown by a military coup. Supporters of Bosch, a combination of farmers and labor, tried to reinstate him. But the Johnson administration suspected Communists might be involved. His intervention put an end to the efforts of the Dominican people to form a government of their own choosing.

Item: 1970-73 - Chile. In 1970, the people of Chile elected Salvador Allende Gossens president, a socialist running with Communist support. Parliament confirmed his election upon his pledge to respect Chile's democratic institutions and free press. Two years later congressional elections greatly increased his parliamentary support.

On September 15, 1970, President Nixon met in the White House with CIA Director Richard Helms, Assistant for National Security Affairs Henry Kissinger and Attorney General John Mitchell. The president made it clear that he considered it unacceptable for Allende to be president of Chile.

Director Helms took notes which were later subpoenaed and made available to the Senate Select Committee of which Senator Frank Church of Idaho was chairman. Helms' notes reflect Nixon's fierce opposition to Allende:

One in ten chance perhaps, but save Chile
not concerned risks involved
no involvement of embassy
\$10,000,000 available, more if necessary
full-time job best men we have
game plan
make the economy scream
48 hours for plan of action.¹²

Seldom are the expenses revealed for such subversive plots. But the hearings of Senator Church included an exhibit listing CIA expenses as follows:

Techniques of Covert Action¹³

Expenditures in Chile, 1963-'73 (to the nearest \$100,000)

Propaganda for elections and other support for political parties	\$8,000,000
Producing and disseminating propaganda and supporting mass media	\$4,300,000
Influencing Chilean institutions: (labor, students, peasants, women) and supporting private sector organizations	\$900,000
Promoting military coup d'etat	less than \$200,000

In September 1973, President Nixon's wishes were fulfilled, in spite of - or more likely because of - increased parliamentary support for President Allende. General Pinochet, with the support of the army, murdered President Allende and many thousands of Chileans in a bloodbath.

Item: 1979 - Nicaragua. The Sandinista Front of National Liberation (FSLN) drove Nicaraguan dictator Somoza into exile. Like some other Central American countries, the dictator and his family held great tracts of the best arable land. The dictator's supporters were the elite, owning much of the remainder of the best land. Most people lived as peons on the great estates. The new Sandinista government promptly distributed Somoza's holdings to former peasants.

Earthquakes and the Somoza regime had left the economy in shambles. President Carter pushed through the U.S. Congress \$75 million in long-term aid. But when Ronald Reagan became president he promptly canceled the unspent balance amounting to \$15 million. The Reagan administration rapidly developed a hostile relationship, claiming the FSLN land policy and the presence of some Cuban advisors were a threat to American interests. Soon the CIA was training and arming an army - called the

contras – which planned to invade and overthrow the Sandinista government.

In 1984 the CIA sowed mines in Nicaragua's ports as a form of blockade. Nicaragua appealed to the World Court at the Hague to order the United States to halt the mining and to cease aiding attacks on its territory. The Court ruled on May 10, 1984 that the United States should immediately halt any actions to blockade or mine Nicaragua's ports.

The Sandinistas won popular support in a second election, but the economy continued to suffer, mostly due to the necessity of maintaining a large, well-equipped army to confront the contras. In the third election, a conservative coalition won, although the Sandinistas remain an influential force there.

Item: 1983 – Grenada. Situated on a small Caribbean Island, Grenada is an independent country 21 miles long and 12 miles wide. Its population of about 120,000 is 95 percent Black. President Reagan ordered U.S. Marines to invade the island and overthrow Grenada's elected government for the flimsiest of reasons:

- He referred to some Cuban construction workers as possible soldiers, though when the Marines invaded no Cuban soldiers were to be found.

- Much was made of the extension of Grenada's sole air strip to accommodate normal commercial planes, a necessity for building up the tourist trade which is a major part of Grenada's economy. It was suggested that the new strip might be used by Soviet planes.

The real objection was Grenada's friendly relationship with Cuba, and public expressions of support for socialist principles. About the only actual policy of Grenada's government that could carry a socialist tinge was the policy of free milk for all infants! The case of Grenada is surely the *reductio ad absurdum* of all the anti-Communist wars and interventions.

THE FREE ENTERPRISERS' FEARS ■ This long and sorry record of U.S.-inspired wars and interventions – and these are only some – should surprise no one. Long before socialism was a force in the world, every capitalist nation boasting its devotion to “free enterprise” sought to conquer foreign lands for purposes of commercial exploitation. The United States entered the field late and garnered relatively small prizes in the Caribbean and the Pacific.

But when backward Czarist Russia adopted a socialist economy and began its development into a powerful modern state, a great fear gripped the hearts of the “free enterprisers.” John Foster Dulles expressed it best with his domino theory, according to which the “virus of Communism” was spreading from Russia to China to Korea and all Southeast Asia and who knows where else. In plain fact, the fear was that there might really come to pass governments of the people, by the people and for the people.

Today the free enterprisers chortle over the “death of Communism.” But they betray deep fears that the death may be exaggerated. Why else does Washington insist on an armament policy permitting major wars on two fronts? Why else does it maintain the multibillion-dollar stealth bomber, that was designed for a major opponent of which there looms in their imagination but two: Russia and China?

In this respect the free enterprisers fear that Communism is far from dead. In those countries where society's priorities were once inspired by the ideas of Communism, there are millions who fondly recall the benefits once assured the common person. I still hear the voice of an impoverished cowherder on a Russian state farm who, after loud complaints about present conditions, said to me, “Under Communism life was much better.” □

REFERENCE NOTES

1. D.F. Fleming, *The Cold War and Its Origins*, Vol. 1, p. 268, Doubleday, 1961.
2. *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 269.
3. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 590.
4. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 597.
5. *Encyclopedia Americana*, International Edition, 1983, Vol. 16, p. 565.
6. Fleming, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 707.
7. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 713.
8. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 714 & *New York Times*, March 7, 8 & 9, 1955.
9. Warren Hinkle & William W. Turner, *The Fish is Red – The Story of the Secret War Against Castro*, Harper & Roe, 1981.
10. *Encyclopedia Americana*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 28, pp. 112ff.
11. *Ibid.*, Vol. 9, p. 273.
12. *Alleged Assassination Plots Involving Foreign Leaders – An interim report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities*. United States Senate, 94th Congress, 1st Session, Report No. 94-465, Vol. 7. Covert Action, Sept. 4 & 5, 1975.
13. Hearings before the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities of the United States Senate. 94th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 7. *Covert Action*, Dec. 4 & 5, 1975, p. 95.

An American Communist Pioneer

Mary Licht

If we ask how and when was Communism introduced in America, many would answer that it was September 1919, with the formation of the Communist Party and Communist Labor Party. This is not so.

Before these clubs were organized, a movement of utopian socialists developed, reacting against the intolerable conditions of workers in the factories, especially the exploitation of women and children. Amongst these utopian socialists, an English manufacturer and philanthropist – Robert Owens – came to America in 1824, and established a number of cooperative colonies where private property rights were abolished and therefore so was exploitation. These enterprises attracted wide attention. Owens was invited to speak to Congress in 1825. However, by 1828 all his colonies had perished.

Besides Owens' colonies there were agrarian colonies, land reformers as well as consumers' and producers' cooperatives which eventually died out because they were not based upon the realities of material conditions. The utopian socialists proposed to "reconstruct" capitalist society, leaving the exploiters their money and power and the exploited no way to wage class struggle.

Nevertheless, these utopian socialists performed a useful service with their condemnation of capitalist exploitation. As Marx and Engels would point out, they were definitely the forerunners of scientific socialism.

Still, Communism was yet to come to America. It was October 25, 1857 at a meeting of 30 people at 148 Fulton Street in New York City that the first Communist club was organized. Clubs were then formed in Newark, Boston, Cincinnati, Chicago and Philadelphia.

Who was the Communist who organized these clubs? That is the story not only of a pioneer of socialist and Marxist theory, but of the first American Marxist leader, organizer of mass movements and leader in

the struggle against slavery: Joseph Weydemeyer.

Joseph Weydemeyer was an army officer in Germany in the 1840s who became a constant visitor to the newspaper office of the *Triersche Zeitung* (*Trier Times*) in Cologne, Germany where a discussion group met to discuss social problems. This group had such a decisive influence on him that he decided to leave the army and devote himself to this revolutionary/democratic movement. He became an assistant editor of the *Trier Gazette*, a radical paper which played an important part in spreading democratic and socialist ideas in the home town of Karl Marx during the years before the Revolution of 1848.

In 1844, Frederick Engels wrote *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, describing the social and economic conditions created by modern large-scale industry. This study gave German socialists, who tended to satisfy themselves with empty philosophical phrases, a grounding in real life. Weydemeyer was among the first to recognize the significance of Marx and Engels' concept of the material basis of social development. He agreed with Engels' rejection of the tenets of utopian socialism as idealistic chatter, and therefore resolved to concentrate on social and economic problems.

In the summer of 1845 Weydemeyer became co-editor of the newspaper *Westphalische Dampfboot* and was soon the leading writer on socioeconomic problems. He defended the point of view of scientific socialism against idealistic and utopian concepts. The paper opened its pages to Marx and Engels, who at that time worked out in detail the newly formulated theory of the materialist conception of history.

Unsuccessfully, Weydemeyer tried to establish a socialist publishing house in order to publish Marx's book *The German Ideology* which laid out the scientific basis for the materialist conception of history. Marx then proposed that portions of the book be published in the *Westphalische Dampfboot*, which was done.

Because of changing times, Weydemeyer visited Marx and Engels in Brussels in 1847 to discuss the

Mary Licht is chairperson of the History Commission, CPUSA.

need to lead the German labor movement out of its stage of secret societies and utopian concepts. He wanted to form a political party with a program of activities corresponding to the needs of the time. The decision was to transform the "League of the Just" into a Communist League with social demands based on the *Communist Manifesto*. Weydemeyer proposed that he organize the workers on a class basis with their own social and political program.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1848 ■ Weydemeyer came back to Germany with the task of organizing the Cologne Communist League. Their first demonstration, held in March 1848, turned into a mass revolt and resulted in the establishment of a national assembly. A conference of German democratic societies was held in Frankfurt, June 14, 1848 advocating a "democratic republic" and a written constitution.

Marx returned to Germany and became editor of the *Neue Rheinische Gazette* in Cologne shortly after the outbreak of this revolution. However, because of the maneuvers and compromises by the bourgeoisie with the German nobility, the *Neue Rheinische Gazette* was banned on May 18, 1849, as was its editor-in-chief Karl Marx, who was exiled from Prussia. Germany opened its gates to the Prince of Prussia; the fate of German democracy was sealed. The Communist League had lost its bravest in this combat; those who survived sought exile. It now fell to Weydemeyer and his *Neue Rheinische Gazette* to continue the tradition begun by Marx in his newspaper.

Weydemeyer was one of the few veteran revolutionaries who remained in Germany. He tried to seek a publisher who would print Marx's book *Wage, Labor and Capital* and articles by Marx. No publisher would touch them. The London exiles were torn with dissension. Marx and Engels showered Weydemeyer with requests for money to support the exiles. Marx's new monthly, *New Rhenish Revue*, was very difficult to circulate, and as Weydemeyer told Marx, "No one is in a hurry to pay."

Weydemeyer began reorganizing the Communist League under illegal conditions. By the summer of 1850 he formed a new section of the League. It became more difficult to distribute the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung* (*New German Times*). Finally the paper and editors were banned. He went into hiding when he heard that the police were hunting for him. In June mass arrests took place and documents

were printed in the newspapers that had been taken from the arrested people during searches of their homes. After horrible distortions in these papers, Weydemeyer suggested to Marx that he go into exile since conditions were worsening. Marx and Engels at first were reluctant to lose Weydemeyer. But Engels wrote to Marx stating, "We need a reliable person like Weydemeyer in New York. After all, New York is not out of the world - and we know that if we need him, Weydemeyer can be relied on." ¹

COMING TO AMERICA ■ When Weydemeyer arrived in New York on November 7, 1851, a letter from Marx and Engels awaited him. Their first proposal was that the *Communist Manifesto* be published as a pamphlet in both English and German. Despite Weydemeyer's optimism, he could not find a job and no money was available.

In America he found many Germans who had been active in the uprising of 1848 as well as members of the Communist League of Cologne. He also discovered that many German workers were organized into German-speaking locals of tailors, carpenters and shoemakers. He found German newspapers with a circulation of 20,000 or more distributed in 40 states, because German emigration to America had soared to 200,000 yearly in the 1850s. This influx of political refugees also brought socialist ideas to American workers.

One morning a German worker, a tailor from Frankfurt, came and placed his entire savings of \$40 in Weydemeyer's hands. With this small fortune he set up a German language monthly, *De Revolution*, where he was the first to print one of Marx's most important historical writings, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, which discussed the Bonapartist *coup d'etat* of the 2nd of December. This brilliant study of 19th century struggle, which became a classic of historical writing, gave the causes for the defeat of the fight for democracy. Weydemeyer printed 1,000 copies, with one-third sent to Europe.

Weydemeyer, despite his political work and writing for newspapers, also became a "literary representative" for Marx and Engels. He submitted their articles to the *New York Tribune*, local papers in the Western states, German American newspapers and periodicals. He also arranged for publication and sale of their larger works.

Engels' *Peasant War in Germany* was published in the *Neue Rheinische Revue* in separate installments

throughout 1852 and into '53. Weydemeyer reprinted it in the *New York Turn-Zeitung*. Weydemeyer became successful in making Marx and Engels' articles, which appeared weekly, available to the German American as well as English-speaking press.

ORGANIZING ■ In June, 1852, Weydemeyer founded the Proletarian League, the first Marxist organization composed of the most advanced Marxists in New York City. As a result of the activities of this group, on March 18, 1853 a meeting was called, at Weydemeyer's insistence, to organize German American workers into trade unions, with a perspective of including workers of all nationalities. On March 21, 800 German American workers met and enthusiastically endorsed the formation of the American Workers League.

Within two months 20 wards formed such groups. Weydemeyer considered the League an instrument to do away with the separation of workers by their language groups. He was bent on deepening the social consciousness of workers as a class, and considered the League a driving force in the development of the labor movement. He encouraged trade union unity between German workers, the native born and other immigrant groups.

Weydemeyer personally undertook to make connections with English speaking workers' groups and made noteworthy progress. Furthermore, he set out to connect the political with the economic aspects of the workers' struggles, linking up trade union with legislative demands. Labor historians characterize him as "the most prominent German labor agitator in America of this period," who clarified for America "the principles of the class struggle and the need for a trade union movement and political action by labor."²

With the slump of the summer of 1853, wage cuts were made by the bosses, unemployment grew and the American Workers League had already perceptibly declined.

In 1856, Weydemeyer left New York for financial reasons and went to Milwaukee where he had secured a job as a surveyor. He found himself in the center of a German settlement, established connections with the Illinois *Stat-Zeitung* – the leading German American newspaper of that time – and became a regular contributor, particularly on economic questions. He stressed that free labor could not develop as long as slave labor prevailed within the national economy. Thus he became active in the

anti-slavery struggle.

In Weydemeyer's opinion, the reason for the growing influence and extension of slavery in the U.S. was the increase of cotton exports that created a favorable balance of trade for America. To Weydemeyer, anti-slavery was a vital factor in mobilizing the workers in the election campaign of 1860. Frederick Kapp, in his *History of Slavery in the United States in America*, published in New York in 1860, considered Weydemeyer's articles in the Illinois papers "a valuable piece of work" which he very often quoted directly.

In the autumn of 1857, the U.S. suffered a severe economic crisis which brought mass unemployment and suffering to the American working class. Demonstrations, including marches to City Hall of the unemployed, were a daily occurrence. The New York Tribune of November 3, 1857, headlined the German Workingmen's demonstration in Philadelphia: "The Germans of this city following the example of their countrymen in Philadelphia, got up a meeting and procession yesterday to claim work, and in default of that, bread from what they termed the wealthier class."

Weydemeyer's friends and comrades corresponded with him in Milwaukee, and as a result of these postal discussions the Communist Club was founded in New York on October 28, 1857. Even though this club was small it played a prominent part in the struggle – for example, it used its influence to insist that the anti-slavery struggle had to be recognized as the main task of the working class.

Weydemeyer, in his correspondence with Marx, gave a detailed account of the American labor movement and the activities of the New York Communist Club.

SUPPORT FOR LINCOLN ■ Because of the long crisis of 1857, Weydemeyer left Milwaukee for Chicago hoping to find a job there. On March 17, 1860, the Chicago Workers' Society offered Weydemeyer the editorship of the *Stimme des Volkes* (*Voice of the People*), a labor paper organized by a workers cooperative. Weydemeyer immediately wrote to Karl Marx to make sure that the paper would get his collaboration and that of his friends. Weydemeyer won the support of the important German American community – at that time the largest and best organized immigrant group in the United States – for the nomination of Abraham Lincoln in 1860, thus helping to overcome a threatened split in the young Republi-

can Party.

As a representative of the Workers' Society, Weydemeyer took part in a national conference of German American societies held in Chicago, May 14-15, 1860, two days before the Republican convention. Most of the 200 delegates were "'48ers" and followers of Marx and Engels. Weydemeyer introduced a resolution at the conference which called for the Republican convention to endorse its candidate, Abraham Lincoln, and urged them to strengthen their program on the question of slavery.

When Weydemeyer returned from the conference, he discovered that the "voice of the people" was being sold to a political party. He informed Marx he had resigned as editor of the paper.

Weydemeyer returned to New York and secured a job as engineer and surveyor in the construction of Central Park. In the evenings he went to meetings of the trade unions and the Communist club.

In August he became involved in the 1860 election campaign. The majority of tailors in New York were German Americans living in the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn. It was the tactic of the bosses to hold back work at the height of the season to influence the workers to stand by the South who supplied the trade with materials. To fight this, the Communists and union leaders called a mass meeting in Williamsburg where Weydemeyer made the main speech of the evening. As elsewhere, the elections of 1860 became a people's movement in support of Lincoln.

ANTI-SLAVERY WAR ■ Lincoln was elected, and at his inauguration seven states seceded. When Lincoln issued an order for the organization of a militia, four more states seceded. In Missouri, a border slave state, the governor was determined to take the state out of the union. The North knew that the border states had to be held; to hold Missouri meant to secure the Mississippi line.

Weydemeyer chose Missouri as the place to enlist in the Union Army because he felt he could best utilize his talents there in the struggle against slavery. John C. Fremont, commander-in-chief of the department of the West, had St. Louis as his headquarters. Weydemeyer became attached to Fremont's staff.

Weydemeyer was but one of the many Communists who enlisted in the anti-slavery war. Many

gave their lives. Many rose to high ranks. They included: Fritz Jacobs, who advanced from private to lieutenant before he fell at Fredericksburg; August Willich, an active member of the New York City Communist Club; Robert Rose, also a prominent member of the Communist Club who served in the 45th New York Regiment; Aloio Tillback; and Dr. Benst.

American Marxists had a more profound understanding of the nature of the war than any other group in the country. Based on Marx's teachings, they saw defeat of the slave holders as a precondition for consolidating the nation's productive forces, for expanding bourgeois democracy and for creating a homogenous proletariat advancing its independent class position. As Marx declared, "labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black skin it is branded."

Active in building fortifications, Weydemeyer was promoted to Lt. Colonel and was asked to command a second volunteer regiment. His term of service expired Sept. 1863 and he was mustered out. He wrote for German American newspapers in St. Louis with the purpose of fostering general emancipation immediately, in contradiction to many conservatives who wanted emancipation to be delayed.

Weydemeyer's position was sustained by Karl Marx's address to the International Workingmen's Association (First International) which was sent to Abraham Lincoln congratulating him on his re-election in 1864.

Weydemeyer, as early as June 1864, called for support of all radical candidates on the state ticket who favored emancipation immediately. Before the election Weydemeyer again entered the Union Army because of Confederate guerrilla activity and a possible new rebel invasion. After victory, he rose to the rank of general, due to his distinguished military service, and was appointed commander of the military district of St. Louis. His regiment was mustered out at the war's end - July 11, 1865.

ELECTED TO OFFICE ■ The state elections in Missouri broke the power of the conservatives, and Missouri became one of the most progressive states on the side of the Union. The German Americans who had taken a vital part in safeguarding democracy in Missouri now took a leading role in developing a democratic state administration.

Weydemeyer, who had resumed his activity as

an editor of the *Neue Ziet (New Times)*, was elected county auditor in St. Louis. He took office on January 1, 1866.

On August 20, 1866, in St. Louis, Joseph Weydemeyer died at the age of 48, a victim of a cholera epidemic. An obituary by F.A. Sorge, leader of the First International in New York, asserted that "the successful activity of the Workers' Societies in New York, Chicago, St. Louis and Milwaukee was the fruit of many years of labor by Weydemeyer in these cities." The Illinois newspaper *Staatzeitung* paid tribute to, as they put it, this "pioneer of Marxism in the United States," as follows: "Weydemeyer's deeds assure him for all time an honorable place among the champions of freedom for all peo-

ple."

During World War II, one of the liberty ships was named in honor of Joseph Weydemeyer.

Through his work, Weydemeyer helped develop Marxist thought during most of the 19th century, and is the forerunner of the modern Communist Party USA of the 20th century. □

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx - The Story of His Life*, New York, 1935.
2. John R. Commons, *History of Labor in the United States*, Vol. I, pp. 617-18; Vol II, p. 204.

Tyner, continued from page 9

Thus, all around the country the question is: what can be initiated among various independent forces on a local level to use the elections to advance the fightback? What can be done to strengthen the fight for the Martinez bill *vis-a-vis* the coming elections? This must be a period where hundreds of labor, African American, Latino, youth, women and senior progressive independents are challenging for public office. The real independents must come to the fore.

COMMUNIST CANDIDATES ■ As I said, we must be prepared to launch Communist candidates for public office in the 1996 elections in as many states and districts as possible. At this point, a goal should be for at least one candidate in every Party district. I think the time is ripe for running Young Communist League members for office as well. Youth candidates have a special appeal, particularly when voter alienation is so high.

We also must not rule out running for president. In fact we must examine all the technical requirements for running a presidential slate. The Jackson forces say that it is fairly easy in 27 states. What should we do? For one thing, we could at least go for a number of key states in order to have a voice in the very important national debate.

In the course of these electoral activities, the opportunities are very great to build our party and press, and broaden the Party's contact with

independent forces, elected officials and especially rank-and-file activists. Electoral activities have always been an excellent way to build the Party. This could accelerate our mass recruitment in the streets.

The situation calls for a higher level of unity of the independent forces and a more coordinated relationship between them. With such unity it will be much more possible to defeat the right and build towards a mass national people's party. While we favor political independence all the way up to the presidential race, if there is not a mass united independent candidate for president we will still be building pressure from the grassroots.

We should keep in mind that while an independent progressive presidential challenge may be difficult to realize in 1996, by the year 2000 - after electing a lot of independents on the local and Congressional levels especially - it would be a natural.

The objective possibility is that by that time, we could be in a position to build a strong coalition people's party, greatly democratize the electoral process in America and launch a formidable challenge to the old parties of big business - not only at the point of production, on the street and on campus, but at the ballot box as well. So let us take today's challenge very seriously, and take it to others, and help make the breakthroughs that are so possible in this period a reality. □

Racism & the Origins of Science

John Pappedemous

Editor's Note: In a New York Times Magazine article on The Bell Curve (October 9th, 1994) Charles Murray made the false claim that Africa had produced no written language, another "proof" of racial inferiority. In another New York Times op ed piece attacking multicultural education the idea that Africa had made a significant contribution to science was subject to violent ridicule. The essay below concerns some of these issues.

Since ancient times, "divide and rule" has been a favorite tactic of those who profit by exploiting others. Thus the never-ending series of attempts by the ruling class and its ideologists over the years to convince white people that the source of their problems is to be found in, among other things, the supposed inherent lack of intellectual ability of Black people.

Book after book, research paper after research paper, have appeared over the years to "prove" the genetic inferiority of Black people - the latest notorious example being the book entitled *The Bell Curve*.¹ And this is not surprising - capitalism has a big economic stake in racism, including the \$90 billion raked in by the big corporations in the form of super-profits.

The thesis of *The Bell Curve* permeates the thinking of many of those in decision-making offices; witness the recent statements by the president of Rutgers University who remarked that African Americans were genetically unable to profit by higher education. And since racist thinking has always been linked to racist action, as it guides the actions of those in power, this mode of thought has a way of being a self-fulfilling prophecy: after all, the numbers of Black PhDs, is declining as a result of lack of educational opportunity.

The racist theory of the inferiority of Africans and those of African descent has produced particularly severe effects in the sciences. For example in 1993, the most recent year for which federal data are available at this writing, there were only nine PhD's

granted to African Americans in physics in the U.S. (out of 799 total). African Americans actually experienced a 17 percent drop in numbers of PhDs awarded (all scientific fields) from 1975 to 1990.² Despite all the racist barriers in their path, some African Americans have managed to make outstanding contributions to modern science and technology.³ The fact of the severe lack of Black participation in science certainly tends to reinforce the conscious or unconscious belief of the intellectual inferiority of Africans and African Americans.

But it hasn't always been this way. Two thousand years ago, Africa's Nile Valley was the seat of the world's most advanced science and technology. Black Africans were in power. Indeed, the ancient Egyptian civilization has always been a major source of embarrassment for the racist theoreticians. After all, its enduring legacy and priority in the story of human civilization has been impossible to ignore, and as a result much archeological research has been carried out in Egypt over many years. Much less archeological work has been done in sub-Saharan Africa, which is why we have so little to go on when writing about the development of science south of the Sahara.

Egypt's being situated on the African continent and its unquestioned African roots⁴ has led to a long-standing attempt by Western opinion-makers to disassociate Egypt from the rest of Africa - this was first clearly pointed out by W.E.B. Du Bois in 1946.⁵ And if that weren't enough, some influential writers on the history of science have often denigrated Egyptian achievements in science and described the ancient Greeks as the first true scientists.⁶ Textbook writers on physics have universally omitted Africa from any role in the history of the subject.

ROOTS OF SCIENCE ■ A number of authors have shown the fallacy in this viewpoint, by delineating irrefutable Egyptian achievements in science, but the battle continues to rage. The recent appearance of *Black Athena*⁷ by Martin Bernal, a Cornell University scholar, has received much publicity and has had a small but noticeable effect in causing defec-

John Pappedemous is a contributor to *Political Affairs*.

tions from the ranks of the Eurocentrists in the history of science.

The thesis of *Black Athena*, that the older and far more advanced Nile Valley civilization exerted a very strong influence over the emerging ancient Greek culture, is supported in the writings of ancient Greek philosophers and historians.⁸ It is also backed up by Bernal's linguistic research showing that Egypt played a strong role in the formation of the Greek language, much as Norman French had an enormous effect on the English language that we speak today, given the fact that Norman rule of England lasted 400 years.

With a similar type of relationship between the two cultures, it is only natural to suppose that a number of Greek intellectuals in less advanced Greece would undertake the difficult and enormously time-consuming journey to Egypt, learn the Egyptian language (as they must have had to do), and spend considerable time in Africa in their studies of science. And this is exactly what happened, according to the testimony of most ancient historians.⁹ Those who maintain that Egyptian science was of such a low level as not to be considered science at all would have us believe that the great mathematician Pythagoras, for example, who studied in Africa for as long as 22 years, was too stupid to realize he was wasting his time.

How far did science progress in Africa in the first tens and hundreds of thousands of years of humankind's existence? Today we have as yet very little archeological evidence from that earliest period. But about six or seven thousand years ago a great civilization arose in the valley of the Nile which left us some written records of its achievements. It was there that the ancient Nubians and Egyptians gave the world what is their greatest contribution to science – the invention of writing. With that, science took a great leap forward, for it became possible to keep written records and thus communicate results of measurement and experiment. It was then that human beings began to record the results of observations of natural phenomena.

In making records, perhaps the most fundamental quantity in physics is time. The calendar can be thought of as a clock that uses large time intervals: days, weeks, months and years. In ancient times, Babylonians and Greeks adopted complicated forms of lunar calendars. The 365-day Egyptian year is far superior for scientific work, and since its adoption it has been the basis of all scientific astronomy

throughout the world. Otto Neugebauer, a well-known scholar in the ancient history of science, has termed the Egyptian calendar "the only intelligent calendar which ever existed in human history."¹⁰ Ancient Egypt gave humanity the first fixed date in human history, estimated at about 4229 B.C.¹¹

There were actually two years, both well known to the ancient Egyptian priest-scientists.¹² One was the Sothic, or tropical year, which began with the heliacal rising of star Sirius (known as Sothis to the Egyptians – the term "heliacal" refers to the rising of a star at sunrise; in Egypt this must have become noticed because it heralded the annual flooding of the Nile.) The Sothic year was about 365 and one-quarter days long. The other Egyptian year, known as the "civil year," was exactly 365 days long. The reform of the civil calendar to add an extra day every four years (leap year) was not done until about 30 B.C. under the reign of Roman emperor Julius Caesar, who relied on the scientific advice of the famous Egyptian scientist Sosigenes¹³ in carrying this out.

INSTRUMENTS OF MEASUREMENT ■ For measuring smaller intervals of time the Egyptians invented sundials,¹⁴ the earliest known dating back to about 2000 B.C. And to accomplish the same purpose, water clocks¹⁵ were invented in Egypt, as early as 1500 B.C. To place the latter date in better perspective, we should point out that this was nine centuries before the person customarily identified as the first European scientist, a Greek, Thales (first half of the sixth century B.C.) arrived on the scene! Later, the accuracy of the water clock was improved by Egyptians through the addition of an inflow arrangement to make the water level constant, thus maintaining a constant flow rate.¹⁶

The use of water clocks in measuring short time intervals continued for many centuries. Herophilos of Alexandria used one in measuring the rate of the human pulse in the last third of the fourth century B.C. Ptolemy of Alexandria (second century A.D. – not to be confused with the pharaohs of the Ptolemaic Dynasty discussed below) used one in measuring the angular diameters of the sun and moon, although he complained about the accuracy of the method, preferring a different technique which did not involve the measurement of time.¹⁷ Although early forms of weight-driven mechanical clocks had become known in Europe by the latter half of the tenth century A.D.,¹⁸ the seventeenth century A.D. Italian scientist Galileo used a water clock in his

studies of accelerated motion.¹⁹

Europe is indebted to Africa for standards used in measuring other basic physical quantities such as length and weight. The Egyptian standard of length was the cubit (the length of the forearm). It continued in use as an internationally accepted standard of length for thousands of years – in fact was used by Galileo in his studies of motion. To measure weights, the Egyptians used pan balances of basically the same type as those used today in college physics classes; the instrument is an application of the principle of the lever. Frequently Archimedes, a Greek who died in 212 B.C., is credited with the invention of the lever. He is supposed to have said, "Give me a place to stand and I can move the earth." But pan balances and foot-powered potter's wheels – which must have used a pedal arrangement involving the lever principle – are both depicted in Egyptian temple paintings²⁰ going back as far as 2400 B.C., about 26 centuries before Archimedes. Archimedes fully deserves his reputation as a great scientist, but it is not necessary to rob Africa of its proud history by crediting Archimedes with something he did not do.

It was these and many other achievements in science and technology that led ancient Greeks to view Egypt as their teacher in science and to make the "long and painful journey" (as Homer put it) to Egypt to study. For example, the ancient Greek historian Strabo²¹ tells us that when he visited Heliopolis, Egypt (first century A.D.):

The houses of the priests [who studied philosophy and astronomy – J.P.] and schools of Plato and Eudoxus were pointed out to us; for Eudoxus went up to that place with Plato, and they both passed 13 years with the priests, as is stated by some writers;²² for since these priests excelled in their knowledge of the heavenly bodies, albeit secretive and slow to impart it, Plato and Eudoxus prevailed upon them in time and by courting their favor to let them learn some of the principles of their doctrines; but the barbarians concealed most things. However, these men did teach them the fractions of the day and the night which, running over and above the 365 days, fill out the time of the true year. But at that time the true year was unknown among the Greeks, as also many other things, until the later astrologers learned them from the men who had translated into Greek the records of the priests; and even to this day they learn their teachings, and likewise those of the Chaldeans.

Note that the "true year" referred to here is clearly the astronomical year, and the passage confirms that the need for "leap year" was recognized in Egypt centuries before the time of Julius Caesar.

THE PTOLEMAIC DYNASTY ■ We have seen that for thousands of years, the level of scientific advancement in Africa was far above that to be found in Europe. This was also true in regard to military power, as is attested to by the rather recent discovery of the Mit Rahina inscription providing evidence of an Egyptian empire in Asia during the Middle Kingdom (early 12th Dynasty, between 1959 and 1882 B.C.).²³

The level of science in a given country, however, does not guarantee its military power, nor does military and political dominance, once gained, continue indefinitely. We can find other examples in history in which a country not especially advanced in science came to exercise hegemony by virtue of military conquests. Ancient Rome was a good example. Or more recently consider the USA. After World War I, aspiring U.S. physicists would travel to Europe to study – for example J. Robert Oppenheimer, Linus Pauling, etc. French or German was obligatory for all advanced physics students. But today, neither France nor Germany is the world's strongest military power, the international language of science is today English, not French nor German, and many U.S. universities have dropped the foreign language requirement for graduate students in the sciences.

Likewise it came to pass that Egypt and many other parts of the world came under the rule of Alexander of Macedon. After Alexander's death in 323 B.C., one of his generals became ruler of Egypt. He is known as Ptolemy I, the first of a dynasty of Ptolemys that ended about three centuries later with Ptolemy XIV (almost certainly the son of Julius Caesar and Cleopatra).²⁴ Alexander, before his death, had encouraged his generals to intermarry with the local population. This was done in Africa; the Egyptian religion was adopted by the Pharaohs of the Ptolemaic Dynasty, and evidence of intermarriage, although fragmentary, is indicated by one ancient historian, Diogenes Laertios, who describes a Black Ptolemy as an Epicurian philosopher.²⁵

Early in this dynasty the Egyptian city of Alexandria became the world center of scientific research, attracting scholars not only from the rest of Egypt but from all over the Middle East.²⁶ Great

libraries and a university flourished there, with the language of the Greek conquerors as the medium of academic discourse and writing among the international community of scholars in residence. The standard versions of the history of science would have us accept the implausible notion that Greece was the most advanced nation in the world in science at the time and yet established their scientific research center in supposedly backward Africa. The founding of the museum and library in Alexandria makes sense only if third century B.C. Egypt was more advanced in science than Greece at that time.

Were the scientists of Alexandria Greek? In the official Eurocentric version of science almost universally taught in the United States and Europe today, they are always referred to as Greeks (and absolutely never as Africans). The fact that the scientists of Alexandria wrote in Greek and in some cases even had Greek names means nothing – foreigners frequently adopted Greek names in those times.²⁷

HERON AND PTOLEMY ■ Let us turn our attention to two of the greatest scientists of Alexandria: Heron and Ptolemy.

About Heron (often spelled Hero), the British historian of science Gow writes, "It is now commonly believed that Heron was an Egyptian. His name, if it is Greek at all, is found only in a late era and belongs to persons of Egyptian or Oriental birth." Gow goes on to give other reasons for supposing that Heron was Egyptian, involving the style of his writing and language.²⁸

It is worthwhile to consider the work of Heron in more detail. Heron was a combination of mathematician, experimental physicist and engineer. In addition to inventing the world's first steam engine or steam turbine, involving the principle of jet propulsion,²⁹ various types of siphons, the hypodermic syringe, and other mechanical devices, he wrote a number of treatises on various fields of physics and mathematics. One of his works describes a method for using observation of eclipses to determine the distance between two cities, and also outlines the construction of what is perhaps the world's first odometer (instrument for measuring the distance traveled by a vehicle).³⁰ Another treatise includes basic theorems of mechanics, such as static equilibrium under the action of several forces, determination of the center

of gravity, etc.³¹

One pioneering result of Heron's work in optics was to establish the principle of least time: namely that during the process of reflection, a light ray always follows the path of least time. Fourteen centuries later, this work was extended to the case of refraction by the French physicist Fermat, and today is taught to physics students as Fermat's principle, with no credit to the African Heron. The importance of this principle in modern physics is hard to overemphasize; in 1965, Richard Feynman received the Nobel Prize in physics for his quantum theory of light (quantum electrodynamics), which is based on an elaboration of the principle of least time in optics first discovered by Heron.

Ptolemy (Claudius Ptolemaios) spent his life in Alexandria, Egypt. As noted above, he is not to be confused with the Ptolemys who ruled Egypt. The scientist Ptolemy lived in the second century A.D., two centuries after the end of the Ptolemaic dynasty. One of the greatest scientists who ever lived, he was an astronomer, geographer, mathematician and physicist. In all probability he is the author of an epigram³² to be found in manuscripts of *The Almagest*, his most famous work:

Well do I know that I am mortal, a creature of one day.
But if my mind follows the winding paths of the stars
Them my feet no longer rest on earth, but standing by
Zeus himself I take my fill of ambrosia, the divine dish.

Although no evidence exists to indicate that Ptolemy was anything other than African, he is commonly considered Greek in texts of physics and astronomy and even in most texts on the history of science. Although little is known of his life other than that he flourished in Alexandria, what evidence there is indicates that he was Egyptian.³³ He is said to have been born in Ptolemais Hemeiou³⁴ – upper Egypt, near present-day Akhmim, around 400 miles from Alexandria. That Greek science was a component of the intellectual hothouse that was Alexandria is doubtless true, but that does not mean that Ptolemy was European.

Before discussing Ptolemy's major work, the 13-volume work known as *The Almagest*, let us note that he wrote several lesser works, any one of which would have earned him an honored place in science's history. His book on geography marked a turning point in the history of science. In this

work³⁵ Ptolemy devised and improved several systems of map-making or cartography; thus it became possible to put maps of the world and of countries onto a scientific basis. He greatly improved a system of map projection, later to be called the Mercator projection, which is still used today in our maps. He introduced the concepts of latitude and longitude.

Other lesser works include: *Tetrabiblos*,³⁶ devoted mainly to a study of astrology, the *Harmonics*,³⁷ containing his studies of musical theory, the *Handy Tables*, a collection of astronomical data enabling the prediction of eclipses, a work on mathematics (mainly trigonometry and descriptive geometry), and several other books and fragments.

THE ALMAGEST ■ Ptolemy's most celebrated work, *The Almagest*,³⁷ played such a great role in the history of science that it deserves more discussion, in fact much more discussion than we can give here within the confines of this article. This work is in 13 volumes. Not only is it a summary of all the world's astronomical work, it contains much that is Ptolemy's own theoretical work and astronomical observations.

He is responsible for the invention of an improved astrolabe, an instrument for determining the exact positions of stars and planets. He lists a catalog of 1,300 stars with their positions and magnitudes. We still use his system of magnitudes for classifying the brightness of stars – for example we speak of sixth magnitude stars (referring to stars that are barely visible to the naked eye). *The Almagest* is quite mathematical and starts off with trigonometric tables and theorems of geometry and spherical trigonometry. The mathematical theory was necessary in order that Ptolemy could accomplish his major purpose, which was to give a theory of the motions of all of the heavenly bodies: the sun, moon, planets known at that time, and the stars.

Over the years, much has been made of the fact that Ptolemy's work was based on a false hypothesis, namely that the earth is fixed at the center of the universe, and that the sun, moon, planets and stars all move about the earth at the center (the so-called geocentric theory). Using Ptolemy's methods, one could predict with some degree of precision, for example, the dates of eclipses or where, say, the planet Jupiter would be in the sky on a certain date of any given year in

the past or future.

With the data available in Ptolemy's time, the geocentric hypothesis, together with Ptolemy's theory of planetary motion based on "epicycles," gave the most accurate predictions of the positions of the planets. Ptolemy was well aware of the heliocentric theory (the earth and planets revolve about the sun), said by some authorities to have been Egyptian in origin,³⁹ but rejected it because the assumption that the earth and planets revolved in circles about the sun simply would not fit the observational data. (It remained for Kepler, 14 centuries later, to discover that the orbits are actually elliptical).

Some 14 centuries after Ptolemy's time as well, a Pole named Copernicus wrote *The Latini of the Heavenly Spheres*,⁴⁰ which was based on the heliocentric theory. This book was modeled closely on *The Almagest*, the latter still being the world's bible of astronomy. It starts off looking almost like a copy of *The Almagest*, with geometrical theorems and a table of chords (really trigonometrical tables). Like Ptolemy, Copernicus gives a catalogue of stars and their positions, using the same measuring instrument that Ptolemy used – the astrolabe. But Copernicus could make corrections using results of later astronomers. Then Copernicus bases the rest on the heliocentric idea that planets rotate around the sun in circles.

Copernicus had the advantage over Ptolemy of having the results of centuries of careful observations by Muslim astronomers like Al-Battani to draw upon. Thus he could see the problems with the predictions of the Ptolemaic theory. But even Copernicus' ideas were not immediately accepted. He continued to assume that the planets moved in circles – a wrong assumption – which caused his results to be not much better than Ptolemy's, and Copernicus still had to use Ptolemaic epicycles to explain the planets' observed motions.

Three years after Copernicus died (1543 A.D.), a rich Danish nobleman named Tycho Brahe who had a great interest in astronomy used his financial resources to build an astronomical observatory where he spent much of his life taking the most accurate data possible for the motions of the planets. He also took on an assistant, a German named Johannes Kepler. After Tycho died in 1601, Kepler made use of Tycho's data, trying to explain the paths followed by the planets. For most of his life he worked on this project and finally succeeded, publishing three laws of planetary motion.

The first law states that the planets do not move

in circles but rather in ellipses, with the sun at one focus. The second law is the statement that a line drawn from the sun to any planet must sweep out equal areas in equal times as the planet moves around the sun in its elliptical orbit. Putting it in other words, the second law says that the closer a planet is to the sun, the faster it moves.

After he worked out the first two laws, it took Kepler ten more years to discover his third law, of which he was most proud. It relates the periods (time for one revolution) of the planets with their distances from the sun. Kepler published this law in a work entitled *The Harmonies of the World*.⁴¹ In it, Kepler writes of reading Ptolemy's book on musical theory and acoustics, *The Harmonics*. Kepler writes that a reading of this book inspired him to reconsider an hypothesis which he had considered and then abandoned 22 years earlier, namely, that the five regular geometrical solid shapes are found between the celestial spheres. In writing about how he came to discover the third law, Kepler acknowledges his debt to Egypt. He says, "I frankly confess that I am stealing the golden vessels of the Egyptians in order to build from them a temple for my God, far from the territory of Egypt."⁴² Note that Kepler did not refer to Ptolemy as a Greek but rather an Egyptian.

CONCLUSION ■ The story of African contributions to science and technology is a lengthy one and certainly cannot be covered here in more than a cursory way. Our hope is that enough has been presented to give an appreciation of the fundamental importance of the African role.

Also, we hope to have helped expose in some measure the Eurocentric idiocy that is still being foisted upon unsuspecting students. For example, a recent book⁴³ declaims:

Although Greek science may have been a continuation of ideas and practices developed by the Egyptians and Babylonians, the Greeks were the first to look for general principles beyond observations. Science before the Greeks, as practiced in Babylonia and in Egypt, consisted mainly of the collection of observations and recipes for practical applications ... Speculative philosophy was the new element in Greek thinking.

Now, it is undeniable that Greek scientists made important contributions to the history of science and many other areas of human culture. But remarks

like the one quoted seem to go beyond simply recognizing and praising Greek science – there is the implication that the earlier, non-white civilizations were incapable of thinking scientifically and in abstract terms. This is racist thinking, and should be recognized as such.

Genius resides in peoples of every race and nationality – whether African, Latino, Jewish, Arab, Indian, Chinese, European or any other. This statement is not based on some idealistic theory but on historical fact. Knowing and understanding the true history of how science developed will equip us better to debunk the racist ideologues of today, like *The Bell Curve's* Murray and Herrnstein, who try to give a scientific basis for the theory that certain races are intellectually inferior. Here we have tried to indicate how false this thinking is by showing that African scientific thinking was far in advance of European for a much longer period – many thousands of years – compared to the five or so centuries (since the time of Copernicus) that Europe and the U.S.A. have been the leading centers of scientific research.

The rape of Africa by European imperialism, centuries of the African slave trade, and the continuing racist oppression of African Americans in the United States have caused the pendulum to swing the other way, and today the number of African American physics professors is tiny and maybe even decreasing. It is important to discuss further the reasons which have caused this to happen, but that is beyond the scope of this article. Works by Du Bois and Walter Rodney⁴⁴ provide important treatments of this topic.

It is also important to note that Murray and Herrnstein go further, and allege the intellectual inferiority of all workers in the "lower-skilled" occupations. It is clear that their racist theories are part of a thinly disguised, more general attack on the working class, particularly its organized sector. *The Bell Curve* forms part of the ideology of the same forces of oppression that are today tightening the squeeze on the whole working class; its purpose is to divide the working class not only along racial lines, but to create divisions between "intellectual" and "blue collar" workers. The best way to counter such theories is by linking the fight against racism with the struggle against class oppression, since such theories ultimately stem from the nature of capitalism itself in its final stage. □

REFERENCE NOTES

1. R.J. Hernstein and C. Murray, *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*, New York: The Free Press, 1994.
2. *Survey of Earned Doctorates*, Office of Scientific and Engineering Personnel, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences Press, Wash., D.C., 1991.
3. Ivan Van Sertima, ed., *Blacks in Science: Ancient and Modern*, New Brunswick: N.J., Transaction Books, 1983.
4. Cheikh Anta Diop, *The African Origin of Civilization*, New York: Lawrence Hill & Co., Transl. by Mercer Cook, 1974.
5. W.E.B. Du Bois, *The World and Africa*, New York: International Publishers, 1946, new enlarged edition, 1965, p. 99.
6. O. Neugebauer, *A History of Ancient Mathematical Astronomy*, Part II, Berlin: Springer Verlag, 1975, p. 559. It is ironic that this work (in three volumes), which is devoted in large part to the work of an Egyptian, Ptolemy, is filled throughout with denigrations of Egyptian science. However, the book is a valuable source of references to work by and about Ptolemy and Egyptian astronomy.
7. Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*, Vol. I. *The fabrication of ancient Greece 1785-1985*, New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1987; Vol. II. *The archaeological and documentary evidence*, 1991.
8. Herodotos, *Histories*, Vol. 55, Transl. by A. de Selincourt, 1954, p. 406.
9. George Sarton, *A History of Science*, Vol. I, New York, W.W. Norton, 1952, pp. 170, 200, 441.
10. O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, New York: Harper, 1962, p. 81.
11. Sarton, op. cit., p. 30.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 29; *The Geography of Strabo*, with an English translation by Horace Leonard Jones, Vol. 8, Book XVII, part 29, p. 85 (Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass., Howard University Press, 1932).
13. George Sarton, *A History of Science: Hellenistic Science and Culture in the Last Three Centuries B.C.*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959, p. 322.
14. R. J. Roh, *Sundials: History, Theory and Practice*, University of Toronto Press, 1965, p. 5.
15. Alexander Pogo, "Egyptian Water Clocks," *Isis*, 25, 403-425, 1936.
16. Rene Taton, ed., *History of Science: Ancient and Medieval Science from the Beginnings to 1450*, Transl. by A. J. Pomerans, New York Basic Books, 1963, p. 41; G. Sarton, Ref. 13, pp. 343-346. Sarton describes a water clock design ascribed to Ktesebios of Alexandria (third century B. C.), citing as source A. G. Drachmann, Ktesebios, Philon and Heron, Copenhagen, 1948, *Isis* 42, 63, 1951. The Alexandrian physicist Ktesebios wrote in Greek, like all the other Alexandrians; there is no evidence, however, that he was of Greek nationality.
17. Taton, op. cit., p. 312; Ptolemy, *The Almagest* (translated and annotated by G. J. Toomer), New York: Springer-Verlag, 1984, Vol. 14, p. 252. In this passage, Ptolemy criticizes the accuracy of waterclocks as follows: "... we have rejected those (methods - J.P.) claiming to measure the luminaries (sun or moon - J.P.) by measuring (the flow of - J.P.) water or by the time (the bodies - J.P.) take to rise at the equinox, since such methods cannot provide an accurate result..."
18. William H. Harris and Judith S. Levey, eds, *The New Columbia Encyclopedia*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1975, p. 581.
19. Silvio Bedini, "The Instruments of Galileo Galilei," in *Galileo: Man of Science*, E.A. McMullin, ed., New York: Basic Books, 1968.
20. C.G. Fraser, *Half-Hours with Great Scientists: The Story of Physics*, New York: Reinhold Publishing Corp., 1948, p. 11.
21. Strabo, (Ref. 12), p. 83.
22. See Strabo (Ref. 12), footnote 3, p. 83. A stay of only three years is cited elsewhere, and Diogenes Laertios quoted a period of only 16 months. The latter figure seems very dubious; however, it would take the two visitors more time than that just to learn the Egyptian language.
23. Bernal, *Black Athena*, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 188, 189.
24. *The New Columbia Encyclopedia*, Ref. 18, pp. 2237-2238.
25. Diogenes Laertios, X, 25, p. 555, transl. by R.D. Hicks, Loeb Classical Library, 1925.
26. G. Sarton, "The Unity and Diversity of the Mediterranean World," *Osiris*, Vol. II, p. 429.
27. M. Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1959, p. 35.
28. James Gow, *A Short History of Greek Mathematics*, New York: G.E. Stechert & Co., 1923, p. 285.
29. *The Pneumatics of Hero of Alexandria*, A facsimile of the 1851 Woodcroft Edition, introduced by Marie Boas Hall, New York: American Elsevier, 1971, p. 72.
30. Neugebauer, (Ref. 6), p. 846.
31. Sir Thomas L. Heath, *A Manual of Greek Mathematics*, New York: Dover Publications, 1963, p. 432.
32. Quoted by Neugebauer, (Ref. 6), p. 835.
33. The astronomer Ptolemy was known in early Arabic writings as As Said, the "Upper Egyptian" (J. F. Weidler, *Historia Astronomiae*) Wittenberg, Gottlieb, 1741, p. 177. Cited by M. Bernal in "Animadversions on the Origins of Western Science" *Isis*, 1992, 83. Also see Sarton, Ref. 26.
34. Franz Boll, *Kleine Schriften zur Sternkunde des Altertums*, Leipzig, 1950, p. 143, n.l. Cited by Neugebauer, Ref. 6, p. 834.
35. Ptolemy, *Geography*, transl. by Edward L. Stevenson, 1932; Taton, op. cit., pp 327-329.
36. Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos*, ed. and transl. by F. E. Robbins, Loeb Classical Library, 1940.
37. Cited by Neugebauer in *A History of Ancient Mathematical Astronomy*, Part III. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1975, p. 1175.
38. Ptolemy, *The Almagest*, Transl. by R. C. Taliaferro, Vol. 16 of Great Books of the Western World, Chicago, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1938. The main works of Ptolemy, Copernicus and Kepler are all in this volume. The translations of Kepler's works and that of Copernicus are by Charles Glenn Wallis.
39. Neugebauer, Ref. 6, pp. 695-696. Discusses the famous passage in Macrobius (4th Cent. AD) in which he asserts that Egyptians had a heliocentric theory. Neugebauer cites Macrobius, *Comm. I*, 19, Ed. Willis II, p. 73f. transl. Stahl, p. 162-164; Heath Aristarchus, p. 258f, summary in Dreyer, *Plan. Syst.*, p. 129.
40. Copernicus, Ref. 38.
41. Kepler, Ref. 38.
42. Kepler, Ref. 38, p. 1010.
43. Hellemans and Bunch, *The Timetables of Science*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968, p. 21.
44. For Du Bois, see Ref. 5; Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, Bogle L'Ouverture Publications, 141 Colder-shaw Road, London W. 13, 1972. Also published by Tanzania Publishing House, P. O. Box 2138, Dar es Salaam, 1972.

The Illegality of Nuclear War

Editor's note: this document is excerpted from a longer brief which was submitted to the World Court on behalf of the World Peace Council by its attorney, Stanley Faulkner. The World Court rejected the brief.

Violators of laws, including international law, are normally subject to judicial review and punishment. This will not and cannot happen with regard to the use of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons can be found in every part of the world. The mere thought of a nuclear war is to envision a world completely destroyed as we now know it. It is a sick aberration to think that there should be any survivors. To be sure, some would outlive the war but only to suffer its aftermath. Those who survived would hope that they had not. A lingering, suffering death for several hours or days would be the limited life span for most; the radiation of the earth's surface would be the inheritance of any whose lives continued longer. Food supplies, water and shelter would be destroyed. Medical care would become impossible and the structure of society would be virtually destroyed.

The bombs dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki were "old-fashioned" – the equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT. Today, we have modernized A and H bombs which yield up to many megatons with correspondingly greater effects. There is a mistaken assumption that differences between nations can be solved by military means. The military means available – nuclear war – will not only fail to solve differences but destroy all avenues for resolving them.

In the aftermath of one of the most devastating wars in which the most sophisticated weapons available at the time were used – World War II – the "peoples of the United Nations determined" that succeeding generations should be saved from the scourge of war.

This introduction to the Charter of the United Nations directs governments to establish "an international organization to be known as the United Nations." Throughout the Charter, there are calls for the removal of threats to the peace, fundamental human rights and suppression of acts of aggression.

Taken together, these mean that the greatest of

human rights is to allow the person to live out a normal life in peace without the threat of war – especially nuclear war.¹ The Charter of the United Nations was conceived as a treaty² on the conduct of peace, as distinguished from all the treaties on the conduct of wars.

The United Nations at its very early stages became deeply concerned about the use of nuclear weapons. The General Assembly adopted a resolution on January 24, 1946 and set as its goal the insurance that atomic energy would be used only for peaceful purposes.

There is ample evidence, however, that wars of mass destruction have been illegal for some time under international law. These laws lay the basis for making nuclear war illegal. The earliest convention regarding the conduct of war is the Declaration of St. Petersburg of 1898, which declared that the objective of war was limited "to weaken the military forces of the enemy." It condemns and prohibits the "employment of arms which uselessly aggravate sufferings of disabled men or render their death inevitable." This prohibition of "aggravated suffering" by war was restated in United Nations Resolution 1653 (XVI) of 1961.

We can also find in Articles 22 and 23 of the Annex to the Hague Convention No. IV, Oct. 18, 1907, that the right of belligerents to adopt means of injuring the enemy is limited, and that "it is especially forbidden ... to employ arms, projectiles, or material calculated to cause unnecessary suffering." While it must be conceded that in 1907 there was no thought of nuclear weapons, it must also be agreed that its use would cause "unnecessary suffering" far worse than any that could then be conceived.

An important consideration in this regard is the uncontrollable winds that would carry radioactive fallout across frontiers and into neutral countries.

This "invasion" would violate Article I of the Hague Convention of 1907 which states, "The territory of neutral Powers is inviolable." Article 23(g) forbids the destruction of an enemy's property "unless such destruction ... be imperatively demanded by the necessities of war." Would this not include the indiscriminate bombing by nuclear weapons of vast

areas? And, further, such indiscriminate destruction would violate Article 25, which provides that "the attack or bombardment, by whatever means, of towns, villages, dwellings or buildings which are undefended, is prohibited." Would "hospitals, and where sick and wounded are collected" be protected as provided in Article 27? This same protection was carried in the 1949 Geneva Convention for the Protection of Civilians in Time of War.

On December 9, 1948, the United Nations enacted the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes of Genocide. This convention was approved by the General Assembly, having considered their declarations in its resolution 96(1) dated December 11, 1946 "that genocide is a crime under international law, contrary to the spirit and aims of the United Nations by the civilized world." Acts which would destroy an entire people, as a nuclear war would, are encompassed within this Convention.³ For those who do survive, there would be none of the protections and treatments provided by the Geneva Convention of 1949. With this prevailing situation, the planning and threat of a nuclear war in and of itself violates international law.

On November 24, 1961, a majority of the states adopted a Declaration at the UN on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear and Thermonuclear Weapons. It held that the use of these weapons ran counter to both the spirit and letter of the UN Charter and international law and was a crime against humanity.

On December 5, 1966, the General Assembly of the United Nations reiterated what was said in the declaration of 1961, and concluded that a convention on the prohibition of nuclear weapons "would greatly facilitate negotiations on general and complete disarmament under effective international control and give further impetus to the search for a solution of the urgent problems of nuclear disarmament."

In 1972, the 27th Session of the General Assembly adopted a resolution declaring that member states "prohibit the use of nuclear weapons for all time." At the 30th Session of the General Assembly in 1975, the Soviet Union submitted a draft agreement banning the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of wholesale extermination.

One of the most important agreements pointing in the direction of world peace was the Declaration of Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States. Adopted by the UN on October 24, 1970, it stressed the principles of abstention from the use of force in relations

between states. It pointedly says that a war of aggression constitutes "a crime against peace for which there is responsibility under international law." It further states, "In accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, states have the duty to refrain from propaganda for wars of aggression."

Article I, subparagraph I of the Charter holds that in order to maintain international peace, there must be

effective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace

No considerations of whatever nature, whether political, economic, military or otherwise, may serve as justification for aggression. "Threats to the peace" and the first use of armed force in contravention to the United Nations Charter would constitute *prima facie* evidence of aggression. The bombardment against territory of another state would be an act of aggression. Such acts of aggression would be a violation of the Charter.

SPECIAL SESSION OF DISARMAMENT ■ These considerations and worldwide pressure for peace prompted the UN General Assembly to hold a special session on disarmament. After much deliberation, it adopted a resolution on July 1, 1978, which recorded the concern of the nations regarding the present status of the world and the reasons for disarmament and arms limitation, particularly in the nuclear field. It recognized that the arms race, including nuclear weapons, is incompatible with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

That resolution stated: "Further international action should be taken to prohibit or restrict for humanitarian reasons the use of specific conventional weapons, including those which may be excessively injurious, cause unnecessary suffering or have indiscriminate effects." It further called for the "cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapons systems."

Priority to this principle of non-use of force was made firm by 33 European states in the final act of the Helsinki 1975 Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.⁴

NO FIRST USE ■ The political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty in November 1976 stated directly to the participants of the Helsinki Conference that they be bound to a pledge "not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against one another on land, at sea, in the air and in outer space." Had this been accepted, it would have led to a reduction of the threat of a nuclear war and a gradual liquidation of nuclear arms and their destruction.

In the autumn of 1981, the USSR submitted a proposal to the 36th Session of the United Nations declaring that the first use of nuclear weapons would be committing the greatest crime against humanity. Although the majority of nations came out in favor of such a declaration, the U.S. government raised objections. It was also renounced by the United States and NATO when the Warsaw Treaty states presented the idea of an agreement between all signatory states to the Helsinki Final Act in 1975.

In June of 1982, the Soviet Union again pledged before the Second United Nations Special Session on Disarmament that it would "not be the first to use nuclear weapons." This was an historic act for peace in the struggle for the prevention of nuclear war, the barring of nuclear weapons, the halting of their production and the gradual reduction of nuclear arsenals extending to complete nuclear disarmament.. According to the late Prime Minister Olof Palme of Sweden, if the United States were to make a similar pledge to renounce the first use of nuclear weapons, "... then, without a doubt, a sigh of relief would go up throughout Europe."⁵ Yet the Reagan Administration dismissed the idea altogether.⁶

Other agreements and treaties regarding peace and nuclear weapons are:

- Antarctic Treaty (1959). Prohibits all military activities in this area.

- Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies (1967). This treaty also bans launching spacecraft carrying nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction into the earth's orbit.

- Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (1968). It prohibits passing nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosives to non-nuclear states. For their part, the non-nuclear states renounce all forms of acquiring such weapons.. Supervision of the observation of these obligations was given to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The importance of this treaty is its

aim of preventing the spread of such weapons of mass destruction.

- Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof (1971).

Of the nuclear powers, the USSR and the United States and Great Britain acceded to all these agreements. France has only signed the Antarctic Treaty and the treaty banning military activities in outer space. China has not signed any of these agreements.

Can international law stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the interminable threat of war? Treaties, conventions, statutes, charters, being the codification of customary international law, are only as strong as participating nations make them.. The General Treaty for the Renunciation of War of August 27, 1928 – more generally known as the Pact of Paris or the Kellogg-Briand Pact – although binding on 63 nations, including Germany, Italy and Japan, did not stop the Axis powers in 1939. In the preamble, the signatories declared that they "renounced war as an instrument of national policy."⁷

This solemn renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy necessarily involves the proposition that such a war or any war is illegal in international law, and that those who plan and wage such a war with its inevitable and terrible consequences are committing a crime in so doing.

Part IV of Protocol II of the 1949 Geneva Convention, General Protection Against Effects of Hostilities, reaffirmed the ban on weapons, materials and methods of warfare that cause excessive suffering. It has thus provided a barrier in international law to the use of the more inhumane mass destruction weapons such as the neutron bomb and modern thermonuclear warfare. On the neutron bomb, Linus Pauling, said it

has a smaller blast fire and local fallout than an ordinary hydrogen bomb, but produces larger numbers of fast neutrons. It would accordingly kill more people but do less damage to property than an ordinary hydrogen bomb. Some of the people killed by the neutrons would die quickly, but many of them would linger for several hours or even days before an end is brought to their suffering.

The production of this anti-personnel bomb has not been the focus of attention lately and is mostly forgotten by the American people. However it has now been revealed that the neutron bomb has been

in production since August of 1981, when President Reagan gave it the go-ahead. European nations have refused to allow it on their territory. On May 2, 1983, news reporters wrote that the United States had deployed nuclear weapons in South Korea, including the neutron bomb.⁸

As early as June 20, 1975, former U.S. Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger told a Japanese news agency: "I think you know well that we have deployed tactical nuclear weapons in South Korea." It was also reported on South Korean radio on October 17, 1981, that former U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig told the Hapdong News Agency that to preserve United States interests on the Korean peninsula, U.S. troops must have a capacity for executing not only conventional war but also a nuclear war. No consideration was given that the introduction of nuclear weapons in South Korea is in violation of Article II, Section 13 (d) of the 1953 Armistice agreement that ended the three-year war in Korea.

The crimes against humanity of which some of the Nazis were found guilty would pale in comparison to the aftermath of a nuclear war. Those who first used the nuclear bomb would clearly come within the framework of Article 6 of the Nuremberg Charter which defines "crimes against humanity" as "other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, before or during the war ..."

The "total war" as conceived and carried out by the Nazis differs very little from a nuclear war:

For in this conception of 'total war' the moral ideas underlying the conventions which seek to make war more humane are no longer regarded as having force or validity. Everything is made subordinate to the overmastering dictates of war. Rules, regulations, assurances and treaties, all alike, are of no moment; and so, freed from the restraining influence of international law ...⁹

The first use of nuclear weapons would constitute a "crime against peace," as defined by Article 6 (a) of the Nuremberg Charter,¹⁰ namely the "planning, preparation, initiation, or waging of a war of aggression or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing."

'LIMITED' NUCLEAR WAR? ■ Consonant with this kind of thinking are the plans for a "limited nuclear war" developed and adopted by the United States

and NATO in recent years – including Presidential Directive No. 59 (PD-59), signed by President Carter in July, 1980 and retained by the Reagan Administration.

The Pentagon has made no secret of the fact that it is planning three types of "limited" nuclear war. These are "strategic limited war," "theater nuclear war," and "tactical nuclear war" which is to be waged in the peripheral battlefield theaters. Obviously, these "limited" nuclear wars would be waged in areas far from the United States. However, even the best of authorities must concede that such limited wars would extend to an all-out nuclear war, making no area in the world immune from attack.¹¹

The essence of PD-59 is aimed at intensifying the preparations for making selective and powerful strikes – though below the level of all-out nuclear war – against targets which are systems of political and military control, nuclear and non-nuclear military arsenals and industrial centers of military nature. All this presupposes the preposterous idea that those attacked would not retaliate.

Treaties, conventions and the unwritten customary international laws of nations are only as strong as the leadership of states have a desire to observe them. As we know from history, the violators have on occasion been punished. We thought that the Nuremberg Judgment would discourage aggressors.

The late Justice Jackson, the chief U.S. prosecutor in the Nuremberg Trials said, "This law is the first applied against German aggressors. The law includes, and if it is to serve a useful purpose, it must condemn aggression by any other nation, including those which sit here now in judgment."

The development and deployment of MX missiles and other nuclear weapons capable of totally destroying the world must be recognized not only as being illegal but immoral. Our generations, especially young people, are feeling the psychological effects of the threat of nuclear war. Proclaiming that MX missiles as "Peace Keepers" and that stockpiling nuclear weapons is a "deterrence" to war are hollow words. At the same time, plans are on the drawing boards.

There is no avenue of escape in a nuclear war. It behooves all nations and people of same reasoning to realize that the prevention of nuclear war is the most urgent and topical task to be solved in our time. The conclusions reached by the UN General Assembly on July 10, 1982 at a Special Session on Disarmament was for "... the elimination of the danger of nuclear war and implementation of mea-

asures to help to reverse the arms race."

Someone once said that treaties are made to be broken. Unfortunately we find this to be a truism with respect to the arsenals of nuclear weapons both in existence and in the making. Has the Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB) been observed? Have the signators to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) performed?

A nuclear war would make all laws ineffective. A nuclear war would be illegal but for the law to have any effectiveness it must be prevented before it begins. There must be a halt to this madness of developing more and more weapons of nuclear capability. This must begin with a freeze on the manufacture and deployment of those weapons, clearing the war for further disarmament measures.

And last but not least, every nation should pledge not to be the first to use a nuclear weapon. The UN should be the forum to resolve differences, not battlefields.

Under international law, proportionate retaliation in time of war is acceptable. It follows, therefore, that should a nation use nuclear weapons, the attacked state could retaliate with similar weapons.. However, under international law the first use of a nuclear weapon would be an act of aggression and be prohibited. Unfortunately, the Western powers have taken an adamant position on the employment of nuclear weapons, and therefore its non-use has not yet, in so many words, been incorporated into any international convention.

In 1982 four prominent Americans – former United States Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, former leader of the United States delegation at the SALT talks Gerald Smith, former special presidential advisor on national security questions McGeorge Bundy, and the former ambassador to the USSR George F. Kennan, wrote in a joint article that the sensible thing to do would be to renounce a first strike.¹²

Who are the violators of the Charter of the United Nations and contemporary law? They are those who, despite the end of the Cold War, maintain arsenals of nuclear weapons and the means to produce them.

A reliable report names the nations who openly maintain nuclear weapons: U.S. (9,200), Russia (13,855), Ukraine (1,804), Kazakhstan (1,370), Belarus (72), France (525), China (435) and Britain (200). The undeclared nations are: Israel (55-95), India (0-20) and Pakistan (0-10).¹³

The International Atomic Energy Agency can perform a useful service by exposing those nations that possess the weapons to destroy the world, and

then promote a program for dismantling the weapons and discarding their remains.

In 1795, the German philosopher Immanuel Kant prophetically stated "war for extermination, in which both sides can be annihilated and together with them every right, would lead to peace only on a graveyard of mankind." □

Reference Notes

1. Article 1 (1) expresses the purpose "to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace." Article 2 (4) "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations."
2. Arthur J. Goldberg, the *New York Times*, February 6, 1966: "Sometimes, just because the United Nations is such a great concept, we forget that the Charter is also a legal document, a treaty, and we're bound by it – we have treaty obligations."
3. Ratified by the United States, February 23, 1989.
4. August 1, 1975 .
5. *Berliner Zeitung*, July 20, 1982.
6. Unilateral action by any member without the sanction of the United Nations has been condemned. The Sinai Peninsula incident in 1956.
7. "Being permanent in its nature and purpose and representing a fundamental change in the legal structure of international society, the Pact of Paris must be regarded as continuing in being and as one of the cornerstones of the international legal systems." L. Oppenheim and B. Lauterpacht, p. 187
8. John Anderson in *Washington Post*, May 2, 1983.
9. International Military Tribunal: VI. War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity (p. 56), Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression: Opinion and Judgment, U.S. Printing Office, 1947
10. On December 11, 1946 the General Assembly of the United Nations, on the motion of the United States, adopted Resolution (2) (95) reaffirming the principles of the Nuremberg Judgment and the provisions of the Charter of the International Military Tribunal.
11. "It is conceivable to "limit a nuclear exchange between the U.S. and the Soviet Union geographically to Europe," President Ronald Reagan was quoted. *Frankfurter Rundschau*.
12. *Foreign Affairs*, April 1982.
13. *To Win the Peace*, a publication of Committee for National Security, Washington, D.C., 1992-1993 Report.

Addendum

*The issue is now before the International Court of Justice, at the Hague. In May 1993 the World Health Organization voted to request the Court to render an Advisory Opinion that "In view of the health and environmental effects, would the use of nuclear weapons by a State in war or other armed conflict be a breach of its obligations under international law including the WHO Constitution." 73 voted in favor. The U.S. challenged the action of the WHO.

On December 15, 1994, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted Resolution 49/75K, "Request for an Advisory Opinion from the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons." The United States was one of the leading nations that had voted against resolution 49/75.

BRINGING BACK MEMORIES

Terrie Albano's excellent article on the Young Communist League's recent National Conference was a superb example of clear, concise and highly readable writing that should be studied by all who write for our Party press. The YCL and the Party are fortunate to have developed such an outstanding leader. After reading her article I was stimulated to write a letter about my own experiences.

I joined the YCL in 1934 in the Bronx, N.Y., in the depths of the Depression, and after getting a dead-end job with a relative at a small shop, I answered the call of the YCL to go into industry and wound up shipping out in the merchant marine in 1936.

I made one trip to Beaumont, Texas on a Standard Oil tanker when the East Coast seamen's rank-and-file strike broke out in October, and I spent the next three cold winter months on the picket line and other strike activities.

Our YCL Seaman's club tried to relate to the fact that many young seamen were stranded far from home and with few resources, and so, we organized parties, cultural events with folk singers like Woody Guthrie, Burl Ives, Pete Seeger and Will Geer, and discussions on political topics.

The whole YCL and Party in New York rallied to the support of the seamen, and the YCL grew on the waterfront, earning the respect of old timers, and raising morale.

When the strike was won and the new democratic union, the National Maritime Union was formed shortly after, great efforts were made by the shipowners to destabilize the NMU using the "red" issue as its main weapon. Physical attacks were made on Communist and other progressive forces at union meetings and on the waterfront by goon squads organized by a shipowner-sponsored group called "The Mariners Club."

The Party decided to organize "Defense Squads," to protect its leaders and members and to maintain its presence on the waterfront. Our YCL Seamen's Club formed two such squads, and we walked into waterfront bars and cafes surrounding Waterfront Organizer Al Lannon, and others, talking to seamen about the issues of the struggle. The

fact that we were organized and ready to hold our ground deterred the goons from trying anything.

At the same time, our club felt that it was important for the seamen who were out at sea and cut off from information about what was happening in the union to be made aware of events. So we put out a little two page mimeographed newsletter that we called *The Foc'sle Forum Newsletter*, and mailed it out all over the world.

During and after the 1936-37 strike, many hundreds of seamen, including a number of members of our YCL club, joined the Lincoln Battalion of the International Brigades on the side of Republican Spain against the fascist armies of Franco, Mussolini and Hitler. Some came back wounded, and some are buried in the Spanish earth.

The Seamen's Club of the YCL played an important role on the waterfront right up to World War II, when the YCL was dissolved under the policies of Earl Browder. However, the friendships that were formed in those dramatic struggles of the '30s, were maintained to a large degree in later years, and we look back on that period as the most intense and significant of our lives.

Herb Kaye

BUILD PA CIRCULATION

In response to your Note to Readers (June, 1995), I would like to suggest an additional way - in addition to subscriptions - that readers can help build the circulation and finances. This can be done by circulating *PA* by the bundle regularly each month, at bundle rates.

In doing so, clubs enhance their ideological and political roles. In addition, the membership, new and old, benefitting from political discussion based on *PA* can help build mass struggle.

By spreading perspectives of class struggle, class unity, and equality, clubs can help build multiracial working-class leadership.

Applause also for your full confidence in the readers to build *PA* and also to communicate with the editor and write articles. This is confidence in the working class and our science of socialism.

George Fishman

FOOD FOR THOUGHT



Political Affairs keeps you in mental health with a steady diet of Marxist-Leninist thought and incisive comment, reflecting the views of the Communist Party, USA. Get it straight from the source all year 'round, get it now!

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

Be fully informed on world and national events, economic issues, political, class, race, gender, and cultural questions. Stay healthy by subscribing to Political Affairs — for an enriched regimen of ideas and writing. Spread the health with a gift subscription for a friend.

ORDER YOUR SUBSCRIPTION NOW



To: Political Affairs, 235 West 23rd St., New York, NY 10011

Enclosed please find \$ _____ in payment for the subscription indicated below.*

\$18 for 1 year \$32 for 2 years \$46 for 3 years

Name _____

Address _____

City / State / Zip _____

* All funds payable in U.S. currency, drawn on U.S. bank.
Foreign subs add \$2.50 per year for sea/land shipment.

GIVE A GIFT TO A FRIEND



To: Political Affairs, 235 West 23rd St., New York, NY 10011

Enclosed please find \$ _____ in payment for the gift subscription indicated below.*

\$18 for 1 year \$32 for 2 years \$46 for 3 years

Name _____

Address _____

City / State / Zip _____

Donor's name _____

* All funds payable in U.S. currency, drawn on U.S. bank.
Foreign subs add \$2.50 per year for sea/land shipment.