cables are as you surely know actually sponsored by great monopolies and are partial to their own selfish interest. Yet I assure you that in spite of the U. S. government economic aggression, blockade, etc., Cuba is working toward the social justice this hungry and naked world needs so badly. (And you Americans I am afraid do not have a direct understanding of how hungry and naked great masses can be.) Imperialism and monopoly interests are gone forever in Cuba.

Life, my dear friend Morrison, is a brief thing and unless the Fidel Castros arise in the world to worry about the common people they'll never have decent clothes to wear, clean food to eat and a warm house to live in. Under the former regimes in Cuba our people suffered from a feudal system of exploitation that drove the vast majority into the most sordid conditions of existence imaginable. The revolution with its land reform and industrialization program, school planning and urban distribution of property among tenants is the most generous thing that state power can do for the great many. Especially in underdeveloped countries like ours.

I personally do not agree with all the methods of our revolution which is basically "state minded." If I did not tell you in my first letter I am a Communist Anarchist and my ideal society is based on decentralization and self sufficient units, such as cooperatives, collective farms, community centers etc. On this line I have written several books (unpublished as yet) with the intention of creating public consciousness in regard to Freudian Marxism and Pacifist Anarchism by means of voluntary association.

Yet I am aware that my ideal is rather exotic and it is only useful as a symbol of a final goal to work toward. In a practical way I cannot see how immediate justice and freedom with bread can be had unless practical men like Fidel do something about it. Fidel is both a dreamer and a schemer, the perfect combination which was the envy of G. B. Shaw. Only men like Fidel can therefore actualize what otherwise must remain mere literature and wishful thinking at the mercy of monopolistic and imperialistic power...

MARIO J. GONZALEZ

ANSWER

There is certainly a world of difference between the concepts inherent in our Object and the policies of nationalization, be it the Cuban variety or any other. One does not understand the nature of a society by contemplating the slogans of political "messiahs." Castro's slogan: "to insure that people do not have bread without freedom or freedom without bread" is certainly as idealistic as Lenin's "Peace, Land and Bread" but it is equally as unattainable in a society organized on the basis of production for sale on the market. The slogan, "Bread and freedom," merely reflects the grinding poverty of the masses in Cuba and the resentment against the domination of American imperialism.

The partial nationalization and expropriation program of Castro can mean no more to the Cuban masses than has the virtually total nationalization by the Bolsheviks in Russia or the "Communist" government of China meant to the workers in those countries. To whatever extent peasants become farmers and own land they become entrepreneurs. On the other hand, under a land nationalization program, the erstwhile peasants and farmers are all converted into exploited farm workers. Along with Marx we maintain that "so long as the worker remains a wage worker, his lot in life is dependent upon capital." We are not "Freudian Marxists," whatever that means. We are Marxists or scientific socialists who realize that nationalization is an inescapable phase of capitalism.

Nor does the personal character of Castro or of any other political leader enter into the matter. Whether the "fuehrer becomes a power-hungry, corrupt dictator with no pity for the plight of the workers or is inspired by lofty motives overflowing with deep concern for the plight of "his people" is of little consequence. In the operation of capitalism, be it the so-called

"laissez faire" type, which is all but extinct even in the United States, or the state-capitalist variety, be it in an avowedly imperialist or professedly peaceful nation, the political bosses cannot do what they necessarily desire to do.

Castro is a product of the times. Similar historic conditions are giving rise to similar social developments in other Latin American countries. None of the "leaders" in these countries are the creators of revolutionary changes. These "leaders" must do, in one way or another, what the conditions call for and these conditions call for exploitation of labor.

We of the World Socialist Party and our Companion Parties in other lands advocate a society in which each man, woman and child in the world will have the right of access to all that can be produced. Buying and selling — be it of food, clothing, shelter, "luxuries" or of the commodity "labor-power" that is required to produce these articles of sale — will vanish. There will be no longer the problem of "good leaders" or "bad leaders" because there will be no reason for leaders to exist. People will no longer hold out an entreating hand to someone to "give" because nobody will have the power to "give" the things that all of mankind needs. These things, together with the means and instruments for producing them, will be the common property of all mankind. This is by no means a society, such as our correspondent envisages as an ideal. "Self sufficient" colonies and cooperatives are typical of a low degree of industrial development. Under socialism, the problem of production of an abundance for all will be solved and mankind will at last enjoy the leisure time to do what it wants — to live a worthwhile life.

Is this an idle, utopian, dream? Or, at best, something to be thought of for the future but impossible of achievement now? We deny this most emphatically. There is more than enough raw material, machinery and brains in the world to make such a system possible today. All that is needed is the understanding and the desire of the majority of the working class. This will not be brought about by elevating individuals, be they "good" or "bad" to a position of leadership. Leaders are, in the final analysis followers themselves. They can never go beyond the general desire of those who place them in the position of power, even if they so wish. Their followers would soon depose them, in such an event, for "better" leaders.

What is it that the Castros, the Franklin D. Roosevelts, the Lenins, Maos, Khrushchevs, Hitlers and all the rest of them do for the workers in their countries? A better question might be, what do the workers do for their leaders? Certainly without the support of vast numbers of working people there could be no leaders. Were all of the world's leaders to suddenly drop dead there would still remain the workers with their muscles and brains together with raw materials and machinery to carry on production and distribution. The reverse is certainly not true!

But what about the reforms introduced by Castro? They are in the main, drastic agrarian reforms. Furthermore, the illusion of the Castro program of converting tenants into "home owners" can be seen by observing the United States legend of "home-ownership" enjoyed (?) by a large percentage of workers in this country. This mirage serves to curb working-class militancy. The same can be said for pension plans, sickness insurance plans and so forth. Anything that helps make the worker imagine a stake in "his" job and in "his" country is excellent for the exploiters. The Castro reforms may be long overdue but they are merely steps in Cuba's capitalist revolution.

No, friend Gonzales, we are not influenced by A.P. and U.P. cables, as you must have realized by now. Nor are we ready to assume that the fact of United States aggression against Cuba — something which we in no way defend — signifies that the Cuban regime is worth defending and fighting for. Cuba is one of the danger spots that could trigger World War III. The issue would not be Cuban "communism" but the explosion