

to trust to reason as a restraint on the use of ready-made, ready-to-fire bombs," asks General Omar N. Bradley, why not seek an accord on the basis of a compromise which would banish nuclear warfare? How can massive retaliation deter aggression if the Russians are incapable of assessing "world realities" correctly? Whether we like it or not, the only alternative to trusting the Russians is to fight them. Recently Lester Pearson (at the University of Minnesota), Aneurin Bevan (at Harvard Law School) and Cyrus Eaton (in

a statement published in the New York *Herald Tribune* based on Mr. Eaton's observations at the Pugwash Conference), have taken much the same position as General Bradley. These men are not "appeasers"; they are not naive. "There are situations in the world today," to quote Mr. Pearson, "which do not admit of any permanent solution which will bring stability, without Russian participation in, and at least acceptance of, that solution. We might as well admit that hard fact." So might Mr. X.

by **FIDEL CASTRO**

WHAT CUBA'S REBELS WANT

Fidel Castro leads the revolutionary 26th of July Movement against the Batista government from his stronghold in the Sierra Maestra, rugged mountain country of the province of Oriente. So far as The Nation's editors are aware, this is the first clarification by Castro of his program to appear in the U.S. press. The original version appeared in Spanish in Cuba Libre, a Costa Rican publication of the 26th of July Movement, and was translated for The Nation by P. W. Murphy, a graduate student of Princeton University.

Oriente Province, Cuba
CUBA'S LAND situation, the problems of industrialization, living standards, unemployment, education and public health: these are the problems—along with the attainment of civil liberty and political democracy—to the solution of which the revolutionary 26th of July Movement directs its efforts.

This presentation may seem cold and theoretical to the reader, unless he is familiar with the fearful tragedy which our country is living through.

At least 85 per cent of Cuba's small-scale farmers rent their land, and face the constant threat of eviction. More than half of our best arable land is in foreign hands; in Oriente, the broadest province of Cuba, the lands of the United Fruit Company and of the West Indies Fruit Company unite our northern



Drawing by Berger

and southern shores. Throughout the country, 200,000 rural families are without a square foot of land on which they can support themselves; yet almost *ten million acres* of untouched arable land remain in the hands of powerful interests. Cuba is primarily an agricultural country. The rural areas were the cradle of our independence; the prosperity and greatness of our nation depend on a healthy and vigorous rural population, willing and able to till the soil, and on a state which protects and guides that population. If this is so, how can the present situation be allowed to continue?

Except for a few food-producing industries and some woodworking

and textile plants, Cuba is essentially a producer of raw materials. She exports sugar and imports candy; she exports leather and imports shoes; she exports iron and imports plows. Everyone agrees that there is a great need to industrialize: that we lack metal, paper and chemical industries; that the techniques of agriculture and animal husbandry must be improved; that our food-producing industries must be expanded to meet the ruinous competition of European cheese, condensed milk, liquors and cooking oil, and of American canned foods; that we need a merchant fleet; that the tourist trade is a potential source of great income. But the possessors of capital keep the people bowed under ox-yokes, the state folds its arms, and industrialization will wait for kingdom come.

As bad, or worse, is the tragedy of our housing situation. There are about 200,000 huts and shacks in Cuba; 400,000 rural and urban families live crowded in slums without the barest necessities of sanitation. Some 2,200,000 Cubans pay rents which absorb from one-fifth to one-third of their incomes, and 2,800,000 of our rural and suburban population are without electricity. In this matter we are blocked in the same way: if the state proposes a reduction in rents, the proprietors threaten to paralyze construction; if the state does nothing, the owners build only so long as they can fore-

see high rents. The electric-power monopoly, acts the same way: it extends its lines only so far as it can visualize a good profit; beyond that point, what matters if the people live in the dark? The state folds its arms and the public remains without adequate housing or light.

Our educational system is a perfect complement to the situations just described. In a country in which the farmer is not master of his land, who wants agricultural schools? In our non-industrialized cities, who needs technical and industrial schools? All this follows the same absurd logic: since we have none of one thing, there is no need for the other. Any typical small European country boasts more than 200 technical and industrial-arts schools; in Cuba there are only six—and graduates go forth with their degrees only to find that there is no work for them. Less than half of our rural children of school age can attend school; and they go barefoot, ill-clothed and ill-fed. Often the teacher must buy the necessary school supplies out of his own salary.

Only death frees people from such poverty, and in this solution the state cooperates. More than 90 per cent of the children in our rural areas are infested with parasites which enter the body through bare feet. Society is greatly moved by the kidnapping or murder of a single child, but it remains criminally indifferent to the mass murder of our children through lack of proper care.

And when a father works only four months a year, as do some 500,000 sugar-workers, how can he afford medicine and proper clothing for his children? They will grow up with rickets; at thirty, will not have a sound tooth in their mouths; and having heard a million speeches, will die in poverty and disillusionment. Access to our always-crowded state hospitals is almost impossible without the recommendation of some politician, whose price is the vote of the sufferer and his family—a vote that insures the continuation of this evil.

In such conditions, is it surprising that from May to December we have more than a million unemployed, and that Cuba, with a population of

Program of the 26th of July Movement

(as stated by Cuba Libre, bulletin published in Costa Rica by the Costa Rican Committee of Exiles and Sympathizers of the 26th of July Movement)

1. Ownership of their land to be granted to all tenant farmers occupying parcels of fewer than 170 acres. The state will indemnify the former owners on the basis of the rents which the lands would draw in ten years.

2. Laborers and employees will be granted 30 per cent of the profits of all industrial, mercantile and mining enterprises, including sugar refineries. Enterprises which are exclusively agricultural would be exempted in consideration of the laws to be enacted dealing specifically with agriculture.

3. Sugar farmers to be granted the right to 55 per cent of the price of their cane ground in sugar mills, and a minimum quota of 500 tons will be awarded to all sugar farmers established more than three years. [This means that 500 tons of the sugar quota assigned Cuba by the International Sugar Council would have to come from the crops of small farmers, who usually depend on being able to help fill a quota only after the large plantations have sold their crops. Sugar mills normally prefer to deal with large-scale operators only. Typical recent crops have been of the order of five million tons.—*Translator.*]

4. Confiscation of the fortunes of the grafters and embezzlers in all previous governments, and from their assigns and heirs by means of special tribunals with full access to all sources of investigation; and the audit, for these purposes, of the books of all stock companies registered in the country or operating in it, and the soliciting from foreign governments the extradition of persons and the impounding of funds. Half of all funds recovered would be applied to social security, the other half to hospitals, asylums and settlement houses.

5. In international affairs, the establishment of close solidarity with the democratic nations of the American continents. Persons persecuted for political reasons by the tyrannies which oppress sister nations will find in Cuba generous asylum, brotherhood and bread.

6. The enactment of fundamental laws and measures necessary for agricultural and educational reform; the nationalization of the electric and telephone trusts, coupled with a return to the public treasury of all taxes owed by the companies now operating these services, as well as of all illegally excessive income they have garnered through their rates.

5,500,000, has more people unemployed than either France or Italy, whose populations exceed 40,000,000?

THE FUTURE of the country and the solution of its problems cannot continue to depend on the selfish desires of a dozen financiers, on the cold profit-and-loss calculations of a few magnates in air-conditioned offices. The country cannot continue to beg, on bended knee, for miracles from a few "golden calves." Cuba's problems will only be solved if we Cubans dedicate ourselves to fight for their solution with the same energy, integrity and patriotism our liberators invested in the country's foundation. They will not be solved by politicians who jabber unceasingly of "absolute freedom of enterprise," the sacred "law of supply and demand" and "guarantees of investment capital."

A revolutionary government, with the endorsement of the nation, would rid our institutions of corrupt and mercenary bureaucrats, and proceed immediately to the industrialization of the country—mobilizing all our idle capital, which amounts to more than 1.5 billion pesos, through the National Bank and the Bank for the Promotion of Agriculture and Industry. This great task of planning and administration must be put in the hands of men of absolute competence, who are completely outside the sphere of politics.

A revolutionary government, after installing as owners of their plots the 100,000 small farmers who now rent their land, would proceed to a final settlement of the land problem. First, it would establish—as the constitution requires—a maximum size for each type of agricultural holding, expropriating the

excess acreage. Thus public lands stolen from the state would be recovered, marshes and swamplands drained, areas set aside for reforestation. Second, the revolutionary government would distribute the remainder of the expropriated lands to our rural families (giving preference to the largest), sponsor the formation of agricultural cooperatives for the joint use of expensive farm machinery and refrigerated storage facilities, and provide guidance, technical knowledge and equipment for the farmer.

A revolutionary government would resolve the housing problem by resolutely lowering rents by 50 per cent, exempting from taxation all houses occupied by their owners, tripling taxes on rented buildings,

demolishing slums to make way for modern, many-storied buildings, and financing construction of dwellings throughout the island on an unprecedented scale. If the ideal in the country is that every family should own its parcel, the ideal in the city must be that every family lives in its own house or apartment.

WE HAVE sufficient stones and more than enough hands to create a decent residence for every family in Cuba. But if we continue to wait for miracles from the golden calves, a thousand years will pass and nothing will change.

Finally, a revolutionary government would proceed to the integral reform of our educational system.

Cuba can easily support a popula-

tion three times what it is now. There is no reason, then, why misery should exist among its present inhabitants. The markets should be full of produce; the pantries of our homes should be well-stocked; every hand should be industriously at work. No, this is not inconceivable. What is inconceivable is that there should be men who will accept hunger while there is a square foot of land not sowed; what is inconceivable is that 30 per cent of our rural folk cannot sign their names and that 90 per cent know nothing of Cuban history; what is inconceivable is that the majority of our rural families live in conditions worse than those of the Indians whom Columbus found when he discovered "the most beautiful land that human eyes have seen."

THE AIRPOWER LOBBY

SALESMEN IN UNIFORM . . . by Al Toffler

(FIRST OF TWO ARTICLES)

Washington, D.C.

ON A HOT DAY in mid-July this year, a man named Joseph F. Quilter climbed up the stone steps outside the Washington office of the Friends Committee on National Legislation. Quilter had come all the way from Sunnyvale, California, to this small house around the corner from the Senate Office Building to discuss prospects for disarmament. Quilter went elsewhere, too. He was collecting, from all sources, the best possible estimates of the degree of disarmament, if any, which could be anticipated in the next ten to fifteen years.

Quilter is with the Product Planning Section, Missiles Division, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., and Lockheed has a right to be worried about disarmament. Since 1951, no year has passed in which less than 69 per cent of Lockheed's sales have been military. In some years the propor-

tion has been as high as 92 per cent.

Quilter's trip here, in itself unimportant, symbolizes the understandable anxiety with which the aircraft industry — the nation's biggest employer — views any relaxation in international tensions.

Other evidences of this anxiety abound. Said the San Francisco *Chronicle* on June 30: "Aircraft stocks have been in a nosedive. . . Villains of the piece are the trend toward disarmament and the increasing competition from missiles."

By August, disarmament talks in London had cracked wide open. On Aug. 30, *The New York Times* reported "a spurt in demand for aircraft issues. . . The renewed interest was attributed by some observers to Russia's flat rejection of the West's disarmament program. . ."

Few (and the author is not among them) would urge that the United States disarm unilaterally as long as the Soviets remain strong and antagonistic. On the other hand, as the recently formed National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy has pointed out eloquently:

The test of a nation's right to sur-

vive today is measured not by the size of its bombs or the range of its missiles, but by the size and range of its concern for the human community as a whole. . . . The earth is too small for intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear bombs, and . . . the first order of business for the world is to bring both under control.

This is a large order of business and the Russians do not always make it easier of accomplishment. But under the Dulles regime we have deliberately by-passed several opportunities for at least partial disarmament. Disarmament need not depend on the good faith of Moscow. Negotiated properly, it can be made to depend on Moscow's self-interest as well as our own.

However, a climate has existed in Washington which made it almost inevitable that we would pass up the limited opportunities. If we are ever to move on to "the first order of business," this climate must be altered; and to be altered it must be understood. It is within this context that the amazingly frank remarks of former Secretary of De-

AL TOFFLER, former labor reporter, is a newspaperman specializing in the Washington scene.

November 30, 1957

Copyright of Nation is the property of Nation Company, L. P. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.