

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 2

January 10, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2°

THE CANADIAN NUCLEAR THREAT

Editorial writers in the capitalist press of the USA sounded a sober and almost repentant note in summing up the events of 1963. The unusual modification of the usual end-of-the-year boasting was out of deference apparently to lingering emotions among the public over the assassination of President Kennedy and the blinding light it cast on the growth of irrationality and violence in the American Way of Life.

The mood was not shared in the Pentagon and the White House. No weak-sister stuff there. In fact New Year's Eve was selected for a move of grimmest implications. As a way of demonstratively ringing out the old year and ringing in the new, U.S. armed forces made their first delivery of nuclear warheads to Canada.

Twenty-eight missile tips -- fourteen times the number of atomic devices used to wipe out Hiroshima and Nagasaki -- were delivered to the Bomarc base seven miles from North Bay, Ontario.

This was only the first delivery. An undisclosed number of nuclear warheads are also to be installed at La Macaza, Quebec, eighty miles north of Canada's capital city Ottawa.

These nuclear warheads are designed for antiaircraft missiles, according to press reports. They do not complete the nuclear arsenal to be installed on Canadian soil.

The Canadian government has given the Pentagon permission to store nuclear warheads for U.S. jet interceptors at Harmon Field, Newfoundland, and Goose Bay, Labrador.

Finally, it should be noted that "Canada" is a rather loose designation in the thinking of the White House and Pentagon. The Canadian Army has "Honest John" rocket units stationed in West Germany. These units, too, in accordance with the agreement with the U.S. which was approved by Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, are to be equipped with nuclear warheads.

No comparative figures were issued on Canada's relative standing as the latest member of the "nuclear club." It seems clear, however, that it took Canada only a single evening to achieve a larger "force de frappe" than the one possessed by de Gaulle's France or probably Great Britain. Canada may shortly have a bigger nuclear stockpile than these two powers combined, becoming the third nuclear power in the world.

Moreover, Canada's unusual geography, extending into West Germany, gives its armed forces strategic advantages, hitherto little appreciated, in the deadly game of building up "deterrence."

However, lest anyone become overly alarmed at capitalist Canada's extraordinarily swift emergence as a nuclear threat, the North American press stressed the reassuring limitation of this new development: "The United States will control use of the warheads."

ANGOLANS SEEK AID FROM CHINA, USSR, CUBA

An announcement by Holden Roberto, head of the Angolan government-in-exile, in Leopoldville January 3 was considered by the New York Times of such importance as to rate page one treatment the next day. The capitalist press in Western Europe picked up the dispatch from this source and likewise gave it prominent handling.

"Mr. Roberto is considered a political moderate with essentially pro-Western sympathies," said the special dispatch to America's most authoritative bourgeois newspaper, but he has "decided to accept the help of Communist China and 'other Communist countries' in the fight to free Angola from Portuguese rule."

The New York Times learned through "African diplomatic sources" that within a month "an Angolan delegation is expected to visit Peking at the invitation of the Chinese Communist Government." The trip to China "will probably be followed by visits to Moscow and possibly Cuba."

According to the New York Times, Holden Roberto met Chinese Foreign Minister Chen Yi at Kenya's independence celebrations in Nairobi. Later he met Soviet and Cuban representatives at the United Nations in New York.

In an interview with the special correspondent of the New York Times, Holden Roberto was reported to have said, "The Communists assured me that we can have whatever we need in arms and money. We are firmly decided to accept."

Explaining further why the Angolan government-in-exile had decided to shift its orientation in foreign policy, Holden Roberto declared: "Until now we have kept out of the cold war and within the

framework of African politics. We are now at a point where a radical change of policy is imperative for us to make headway in our struggle."

He has given up hope that the United States or its allies will put pressure on Portugal to negotiate with the freedom fighters.

"I came to the conclusion that the Western countries are hypocritical. They help our enemies. While paying lip service to self-determination, the United States supplies its North Atlantic treaty's ally, Portugal, with arms that are used to kill us."

He gave another example of American hypocrisy. G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, tried to convince Congolese Premier Cyrille Adoula not to recognize the Angolan government-in-exile. But the Congo granted recognition last June and several other African countries followed suit.

"With our present support we could go on fighting for another 20 years," Roberto continued. "In the end there would be no one left to liberate."

"Only the Communists can give us what we need. None of the African countries produce arms; they have to buy them themselves. It would be a betrayal of the suffering Angolan people not to turn to those who can help."

The correspondent of the New York Times expressed doubt that the "new Angolan policy" will be acceptable to the Congo. Adoula "is known to be suspicious of Communists." In November he expelled the staff of the Soviet Embassy on charges that they had aided Congolese insurgents.

However, Holden Roberto said in response that "Mr. Adoula will understand that we need help. Besides, the Congolese shouldn't interfere in our internal affairs."

CHOU EN-LAI'S REMARKS ON THE ALGERIAN REVOLUTION

In our last issue [January 3], we called attention to Chinese Premier Chou En-lai's speech at a meeting of cadres of the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale] in Algiers December 25. Here are some additional extracts of special interest from this speech as translated from El Moudjahid [December 28], official weekly organ of the FLN:

* * *

"Correct revolutionary leadership, a broad united front and a revolutionary army -- these are the elements that are important, not only for the victory of the national democratic revolution, but also for the continued development of the revolution.

"The Algerian people, long tested in the revolutionary struggle,

understand well that the winning of independence is not the end of the revolution but the beginning of a new struggle. Independent Algeria finds herself still facing arduous tasks, such as safeguarding and consolidating political independence, liquidating the colonialist forces, applying the agrarian reform and other social reforms, and developing the economy and the national culture.

"We are happy to see that under the leadership of President Ben Bella and the FLN, the Algerian people, solidly united, are conducting an inflexible struggle against the various plots of sabotage hatched by the colonialists, triumphantly carrying forward the revolution, and have decided to take the road of socialism in order to carry out the glorious historic tasks I have mentioned."

* * *

"The victory of the Algerian revolution and its continuous development today exercise constantly increasing influence on the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of all the oppressed peoples and nations and, in particular, on the national liberation movement in Africa. Just as the flag of the Cuban revolution floats over Latin America, so that of the Algerian revolution has been planted on the African continent.

"Since the Algerian people unleashed the armed insurrection in 1954, enormous changes have occurred in Africa and the flames of the national liberation struggle embrace the whole continent. Among the fifty odd countries and regions of Africa, there are already more than thirty independent countries, including more than eighty percent of the African population and more than eighty percent of the area of Africa. And in the countries and regions still under colonial domination, the struggle for national independence is increasing in impetus. The African people have decided to make the revolution, to become master of Africa and to finish with imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. Africa, it is absolutely sure, will become an independent and free Africa. This is a great historical current which no reactionary force can dam.

"The rise of three hundred million Africans and the inevitable disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism in Africa, these are events of great historic import in our epoch. The revolutionary peoples of Africa, together with the revolutionary peoples of Asia and Latin America are playing a more and more important role in the evolution of the international situation and are becoming a powerful force in the struggle against imperialism and for the defense of world peace.

"While giving full consideration to the importance of the big victories won by the national liberation movement, one must also understand that imperialism always remains imperialism and that it will never retire of its own volition from the historical scene. The old colonialists are still struggling in their death agony. They turn from armed repression, in trying to maintain their colonial domination, to trickery in order to try to transform the independence of the new-born countries into an independence more of name than of fact, even

into an independence void of meaning. And the neocolonialists, while supporting the old colonialists in their repression of the national independence movement, disguise themselves as 'friends' of the oppressed nations in order to intensify their infiltration and expansion in the newly independent countries. The struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism therefore remains the task of imperious primary importance confronting the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

"The peoples of Asia and Africa have learned through revolutionary practice that to conquer, safeguard and consolidate national independence, they must count above all on their own struggle. All the evidence shows that the popular revolution of each country can be undertaken only by the people of each country and no one can replace them. Any foreign interference is intolerable. Aid from abroad is important, but it is up to only the peoples themselves to make the decisive contribution to the victory of the revolution in their respective countries.

"Imperialism is the common enemy of the peoples of the entire world. To win their common cause, the peoples support each other and give mutual aid. In particular, the countries where the revolution has already triumphed have the sacred duty of supporting and aiding their brother peoples who are struggling heroically for independence and liberation. President Ahmed Ben Bella has said: 'No Algerian can feel completely free while in Angola, Mozambique, South Africa, our brothers, the African patriots, face colonial repression. . . ' These words of President Ben Bella express the firm will of the revolutionary peoples to unite in struggle against the common enemy."

NEW WAY TO END NERVOUS TENSION

If you feel that your nerves are about to give way, perhaps the thing you need is a winter vacation in England. Like nowhere else you can drop out of today's difficult world and turn the clock back centuries.

The miracle is easy. From a weekly list published in Horse and Hound you pick out a traditional foxhunt. Some of them are arranged conveniently close to London. About £7 [\$20] hires a horse that knows his business. The fee also covers "participation," which includes expenses for the fox.

Most foxhunters prefer proper dress. This consists of a bowler hat, yellow gloves, fawn breeches, black jacket and black boots. If you do not wish to add these to your permanent wardrobe, you can rent them for a day at a little more than £5 [\$15]. The gay traditional outfit is not obligatory, however. The arbiters of foxhunting have extended their approval to "more casual riding clothes." Thus if the black boots prove troublesome, hang them on the stirrups and ride barefoot. This is one of the more bracing ways of following the

hounds at this season in England.

It's an ideal time, say London tourist agencies, to take the cure in England. Why not make a reservation on the next jet flight and come back feeling a lot different than when you went?

SEVENTH FLEET BECOMES ISSUE IN INDIA

A new issue has been injected suddenly into the political scene in India -- the American Seventh Fleet.

Washington's recent suggestion to the Nehru government that it would be well to accept extension of the patrol work of the Seventh Fleet from the Straits of Taiwan to the Indian Ocean, which the Pentagon now pictures as the soft underbelly of Asia, created commotion in the subcontinent where it was interpreted as an aggressive bid to take advantage of India's weakness.

In the Communist party of India, the issue may help to bring together the Left Wing and Center into a bloc against the Right Wing headed by S.A.Dange.

At a meeting held late in December at Delhi, Left Wing leaders were of the opinion that recent developments, among which the Seventh Fleet proposal figured prominently, exposed the "true character of the Indian bourgeoisie and the Right deviationism of the Communist party's Right Wing leadership."

Harekrishna Konar, a Left Wing member of the Central Committee, told the Calcutta Statesman [December 28] that the political situation was changing so fast that it was not unlikely that the whole Communist party of India would be able to stand united on certain fundamental issues.

"The imperialist threat is becoming so patent," he said, "that no particular ideological group will be able to ignore it."

RIGHTIST INDIAN CP LEADER TARGET OF "UNITY" BLOC

After his recent release from one of Nehru's jails, Jyoti Basu was asked at a conference of West Bengal Communist party legislators December 26 to resume his position as Leader of the Communist Group in the Assembly and also Leader of the Opposition. The decision, reported by the Calcutta daily Statesman [December 27] to have been unanimous, ended the temporary arrangement under which Somnath Lahiri functioned as Leader while the regular party leaders served time in prison because of their opposition to the Indian government during the Sino-Indian border dispute.

Instead of at once taking a clear stand in the internal struggle

which has been deepening in the Communist party of India, Basu sought to avoid commitment by raising the banner of "party unity." He "disappointed all major groups in the party in West Bengal," reports the Statesman, "when he refused to commit himself at private meetings with leading members of the different factions."

Basu, however, may have done this as a tactical move. On being let out of prison, he got in touch, it is reported, with Centrist leader E.M.S.Namboodiripad "and proposed that the latter should gather a third force which might help the building of party unity."

This could be interpreted as part of a factional plan that aims at securing the position of strategic balance between the Left Wing and Right Wing. If successful, the plan could lead to the displacement of Rightist leader S.A.Dange, who at present holds a majority in the leadership but only a minority in the rank and file.

Namboodiripad "immediately flew to Delhi and sounded all the Left-wing leaders for an informal conference to try for an unified stand against the Rightists in the party now in control of the party leadership."

The results of this move were so encouraging that Namboodiripad sent an emissary by air December 23 to Calcutta to take Basu and Harekrishna Konar, a Left Wing leader, to Delhi for the conference. They left the next day. One of the purposes of the conference "was to iron out whatever differences were there between the Leftists and the so-called Centrists in the party."

The conference participants appear to have decided to ask the Central Executive Committee of the party to postpone a scheduled January 6 meeting to January 12. It was hoped that by then another Left Wing leader of West Bengal, Promode Dasgupta, would be released from prison. Apparently the bloc of Leftist and Centrist leaders is counting noses in the 31-member body in hope of racking up a majority there against Dange.

Among the issues on which the Left Wing seeks support from the Center is restoration of the West Bengal party leadership as it existed in September 1962 and withdrawal of all disciplinary measures against those members who opposed the Dange leadership. Some fifty leading Communists were either suspended or expelled.

The Left Wing has recently felt some wind in its sails. A considerable electoral success was chalked up at Burdwan, which is its stronghold. This was done without any support either from the national leadership or the official leadership in the state.

When the National Council sent Z.A.Ahmed to address party election rallies there, the local organization kept him "confined under guard at the party commune." When he finally agreed not to try to "sell" the line of the national leadership and to confine himself to merely introducing party candidate Benoy Chowdhury, Left Wing leader P. Rammurthi let Ahmed speak as sixth on the list.

FRANCE LOOSENS BLOCKADE ON CHINA

The political skirmishing within the opposing sides of the "cold war" involves changes in international trade. Thus China is seeking better trade relations with capitalist countries and has encountered a more favorable attitude on the part of the French government.

De Gaulle, of course, is not a shining example in his understanding of economic questions, but, hoping to bring some substance to his illusory dream of a "Europe" independent, under French leadership, of the United States, he has encouraged the desire of French businessmen to strengthen economic relations with the Chinese market.

Within recent weeks, a series of moves have been made in this direction. First of all, there was a trip to Peking taken by Edgar Faure, all-round politician, who was president of the Council and member of a good many ministries of the right and the left in the Fourth Republic, and who is at present serving as an unofficial ambassador for de Gaulle. Edgar Faure received a cordial welcome in Peking.

He was followed by an agent of de Villiers, president of the National Council of French Employers, the most eminent representative of the industrial world.

Quite recently, four new delegates, the names of whom mean nothing to the general public, but who are experts in various branches of the economy, went there. Among other things, an exposition of French products is being prepared in Peking for 1964.

In addition the question was raised at the time of Chou En-lai's visit to Algeria, of triangular trade combinations between China, Algeria and France -- but nothing certain is known about this for the time being.

The workers movement can only favor these developments, since neither the economy of the workers states nor the antibureaucratic tendencies in these states can gain from anything savoring of autarchy or economic blockade.

But the extent of these shifts must not be overestimated. The restrictions due to the "cold war" are still quite considerable. France is afflicted beyond doubt by a vicious circle, as can be seen from the following facts:

The government decided some weeks ago to subsidize the Sud-Aviation company in building twenty-five new Caravelles. Since then the decision seems to have been held up. The explanation appears to be the following: A good part of the planes were for China, representatives of Sud-Aviation having made a trip to Peking at the same time as Edgar Faure. The U.S. government, having learned through indiscrete talk what was up, let the French government know that if the Caravelles were built for the Chinese then it would not deliver the Boeing KC 135's which France needs for refueling projected Mirage IV's,

an element in de Gaulle's "striking force." And, without these Boeings, the Mirage IV's could not reach the Soviet border. . .

NEW GAINS MADE BY BELGIAN LABOR MOVEMENT

By Henri Vallin

BRUSSELS -- The year 1964 opened auspiciously for the Belgian working class with two important gains. A few weeks before New Year's Day, after brief negotiations between the trade unions and employers' associations, legal vacations with pay were increased for all Belgian manual workers and white-collar employees to three weeks with five weeks pay. This is the most advanced legal system of paid vacations enjoyed by workers anywhere.

On January 1 a new law went into effect on sickness and injury compensation. This extends free sickness compensation (free medical service, pharmaceutical products and hospitalization) to all old-age pensioners, widows, orphans and invalid workers.

Both conquests, achieved through negotiations rather than direct struggle, have of course been hedged with many reservations which are correctly criticized by left-wing militants of the Belgian labor movement. The extension of the paid vacation system from two to three weeks is to be introduced in two stages (three more days in 1964, the full three weeks to begin only in 1965). The employers have the right, in some industries, to stagger the extra vacation days throughout the year (into the slack season, for instance), which would prevent the workers in these instances from actually lengthening their vacation trips. Also, in exchange for the concession, the unions have agreed not to press demands for a 40-hour week before the end of 1964.

As for the free sickness compensation for old-age pensioners, this is limited to those with an annual income of less than \$1,500 [£530], which excludes many white-collar pensioners as well as government office workers. The contribution exacted from the workers to the general sickness and injury compensation system has been increased to the special disadvantage of the better-paid metal and steel workers and the white-collar employees. The government has made many concessions to the reactionary medical associations which in Belgium, as in most other countries, strenuously oppose any progressive medical care provisions.

Nevertheless, taking into account all the shortcomings, these reforms undoubtedly represent a significant step forward for the Belgian working class. The striking fact about them is the relatively easy way in which they were obtained. The demand for three weeks' vacation was first advanced by the leader of the left wing of the socialist trade-union federation FGTB [Fédération Général des Travailleurs de Belgique] in a radio speech at the end of August 1963. Immediately after this speech, the demand was supported by the whole FGTB as well as by the Catholic trade-union federation CSC [Confédéra-

tion des Syndicats Chrétiens]. Representatives of the employers first opposed the claim. But as soon as negotiations opened at the beginning of December 1963 it became clear that they would give in.

The free medical care provisions for old-age pensioners and other low-income workers were included in the election platforms of all the major political parties in the spring of 1961, following the big general strike of December 1960-January 1961. When the medical associations started their big opposition campaign against this "free medicine," it was generally assumed that the Christian Social party, which is the main bourgeois party, governing Belgium in coalition with the Socialist party, would drop the plank in order to appease bourgeois public opinion. This didn't happen, however. The pressure of the Catholic trade unions and Catholic workers mutual aid societies was sufficiently strong to compel the government to keep its campaign promise.

What is the explanation for the relative ease with which these new concessions were won from the Belgian bourgeoisie?

First of all, the "boom" should be noted. This is really rolling. It was only in 1963 that Belgium experienced something like full employment. Belgian exports expanded by more than ten percent and industrial production by 6.5 percent. The boom resulted from reserves of productive capacity and manpower contrasting to the shortage of workers and equipment in most other West European countries. Another contributing factor was that Belgian wages have risen much more slowly than those in neighboring countries in previous years. Under these conditions the employers can evidently make considerable concessions in order to avoid strikes and to be able to exploit the favorable conjuncture to the hilt.

The main reason, however, is political. Although general conditions of "boom" and rising wages do not favor the radical left, and although the left wing has lost some positions in the Socialist party, the existence of a seasoned left tendency with mass support outside the control of the traditional reformist and clerical trade-union bureaucrats represents a major potential threat to the capitalist state and economy.

When the Walloon Popular Movement, against the open opposition of all the big political parties (with the exception of the Communist party), gathered not less than 650,000 signatures in a short period, the potential strength of this left wing was strikingly confirmed. (The petition opposed a constitutional reform, already underway, that keeps the unitary state structure against the wish of the Walloon Popular Movement for a federal structure.)

At the head of a mass movement favoring immediate social or economic demands, on which the government refused to yield, this left wing could grow with enormous speed, threatening the grip of the established trade-union leadership. Because they are very conscious of this possibility, the employers -- and their government -- are prepared to make considerable concessions in hope of blocking it.

This is part of the reason why wage increases in 1963 amounted to nearly ten percent, a great contrast to the situation during the past five years.

There is, however, a limit to the concessions. The Belgian "boom" depends strictly upon what happens in Western Germany, Holland, France and Italy. (Nearly sixty percent of Belgian exports today go to Common Market countries.) The Belgian employers can grant concessions to the workers only as long as trends in the Common Market are not reversed, and as long as the concessions do not seriously threaten their rate of profit and their competitive strength compared to foreign capitalists.

When these conditions change, they will again harden their attitude, and this might very well be the signal for a new stage of intensified class struggle in Belgium.

KHRUSHCHEV'S ADVICE TO THE ALGERIANS

On the eve of Chou En-lai's arrival in Algiers, two daily papers of that city, Alger Républicain and Le Peuple, published an interview with Khrushchev which took an entire page in fine print in these publications. This was part of the ideological battle around the Sino-Soviet dispute, since it is not in the columns of a newspaper that you demonstrate the material advantages at your disposal.

In Khrushchev's remarks are to be found a series of truths about the importance of the emancipation movement of formerly colonized people, truths that scarcely require discussion -- since they are now forced even on bourgeois politicians. Doesn't the U.S. State Department pay lip service to the Latin-American revolution?

Khrushchev also stresses the danger of neocolonialism in terms that are scarcely sensational to the Algerians. Along with these now fundamental truths, he adds some small distortions of history, particularly "the support without reservations" which he alleges his government granted the Algerians at the time of their struggle against French imperialism.

But the major interest of the interview lies in Khrushchev's conception of the stages of development in the underdeveloped countries.

He continually insists on the struggle for "the national, anti-feudal and democratic liberation" of these countries. This is the theme to which he returns the most frequently, embellishing it with variations.

The "socialist revolution" as seen by Khrushchev is simply an internal affair for each people. But their first problem is a "democratic program," and in this "the national bourgeoisie which is not linked with the foreign monopolies can likewise take part in carrying it out."

Thus he remains fixed in the position held by Stalin. Never does he advance, as do the Chinese, the leading role of the proletariat in the struggle for this program. We should also note that he displays rare discretion about guerrilla fighters, peasant struggles, etc.

At the same time, in developing his main theme, Khrushchev appears aware that this will not satisfy the colonial masses, above all the Algerian masses who are mobilized for the construction of socialism. That is why he says:

"The revolutionary democratic leaders of certain liberated countries are looking for methods and forms of passage on to the noncapitalist road of development. In the opinion of Marxist-Leninists, a national democratic state could well serve as the form for such a passage."

One should savor this text of the "Marxist-Leninist" Khrushchev: a "national democratic state could well serve. . ." To what concrete state of today "could" this well be applied? And if this is a transitional state in the stage between capitalism and socialism, how is this form different (aside from degrees of development) from a workers state, the dictatorship of the proletariat taken in the sociological sense which Marxists give it? Really, Khrushchev should not be asked to get involved in theoretical problems.

In disguised form his interview contains a certain criticism of the policy now being followed by the government in Algeria:

"Socialism cannot be built by decree, one cannot jump over the stage of democratic transformations. . . "

Against this he stands for "involving the wide masses in creative revolutionary activity. . . "

That socialism is not the product of one or a good many decrees, but of a process, and even of a rather long process, no one can doubt. But why oppose "the activity of the masses" to passing decrees or laws by a revolutionary power? The decrees issued by the Algerian government in March 1963 contributed precisely to inspiring gigantic creative activity by the masses. What then should be the role of a revolutionary power if not, especially through appropriate decisions, to give impulses to the creative power of the masses?

Khrushchev perhaps does not recall very well the history of the October Revolution -- he lent himself so thoroughly to the contortions of Stalin's time -- but it is sufficient to recall that in October 1917, when the Bolsheviks took power, Lenin began his speech at the Congress of Soviets with the words, "We are going to begin the construction of socialism. . ." He likewise had this assembly adopt a decree on the question of peace and one on the question of the land.

It should also be noted that in this interview Khrushchev sought to convince those who might read it that "peaceful coexistence," as he means it, does not signify giving up the class struggle in any country whatsoever. But he stuck to generalities and carefully refrained from saying anything for example on the subject of India and the way in which the wing of the Indian Communist party which is associated politically with him views the implications of "peaceful coexistence" in domestic politics.

LEGISLATIVE RUN-AROUND ON CIVIL RIGHTS

By Evelyn Sell

The civil-rights bill, on which hearings are supposed to start January 9 in Washington, is part of a calculated maneuver by the capitalist white power structure in the United States to head off and contain the civil-rights struggle that rose to new heights in 1963.

Last April the whole world was shocked at the police brutality against Negroes in Birmingham, Alabama. Police dogs, fire hoses, beatings, bombings and mass arrests were used against the picket lines, marches and sit-ins of the Negro community protesting racial inequalities. The chief organizers of this naked show of racist violence were the officials charged with upholding law and order and the Constitution of the United States.

Sympathy demonstrations with the Birmingham Negroes were held throughout the country. Mass rallies protested the police terror and demanded federal protection for the Freedom Fighters of the South. These rallies were the largest since the protests over the lynching of Emmett Till in 1955.

A new wave of mass demonstrations against Jim Crow swept the South. Negro leaders and others begged President Kennedy to send federal troops to Birmingham. They were told that this was impossible because no federal court orders had been violated. The NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] pointed out that under U.S. Code 242, title 18, it is a punishable federal offense for anyone "under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation or custom" to willfully deprive any citizen of any rights protected by the U.S. Constitution. Still Kennedy did not act.

When the Negro community, in desperation, struck back at the police and the racists, Kennedy ordered federal troops to the area but kept them inactive forty miles from Birmingham.

Ever sharper criticism was voiced across the country both against the Kennedy administration and against the philosophy of nonviolence preached by such leaders as Martin Luther King, Jr. More and more voices cried out for self-defense measures by the Negro community.

At the end of May a new battle front erupted in the North. Pick-

ets appeared at construction jobs in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in protest against discriminatory policies in the building-trades union. The traditional Negro leaders who had depended on winning over "white" friends, who had settled for token gains, were being swept aside by the growing mass initiative. New young militant fighters were moving into leadership of the struggle.

Kennedy Goes into Action

Kennedy, who had been silent on the terrible events in Birmingham, made a TV broadcast in which he pleaded that the issue of civil rights be taken "out of the streets and into the courts." (Nine years after the Supreme Court outlawed school segregation, less than eight percent of Southern Negro children attend the same school as whites.)

Kennedy also proposed civil-rights legislation covering voting rights, public accommodations, school desegregation, extension of the Civil Rights Commission, establishment of a community relations service and the withholding of federal funds in cases where racial discrimination occurs in federal-aid projects. The proposed provisions were weak and inadequate (for example, no deadline on school desegregation), but the gesture enabled Kennedy to parade as a great protagonist of civil rights and it gave the more conservative Negro leaders a plausible argument for reducing the mass struggle to mere petitions for enactment of this pitiful package.

After almost six months of labor, a subcommittee presented the House Judiciary Committee with a draft that was much stronger than the original Kennedy proposals. The horrified administration pressed for a weaker version. Attorney-General Robert Kennedy was very active in this and the President himself intervened. Their argument: only a weak bill could get through Congress and half a loaf, after all, is better than none. The administration succeeded in getting the committee to knock out a provision against police brutality, claiming the Republicans would never vote for it.

Roy Wilkins, head of the NAACP, answered this October 25 by pointing out that in 1956 the House voted 279 to 126 for a civil-rights bill that included the very same provision. Of those in favor, 168 were Republicans; 111, Democrats.

After some jockeying between the Democrats and Republicans, the House Judiciary Committee finally approved the weaker version demanded by the administration and, in accordance with the legislative procedure, sent the bill to the House Rules Committee.

The function of this committee is to decide when a bill shall be brought to the floor for discussion and vote. The chairman is a Southern Democrat, Howard W. Smith of Virginia, and the majority of the members are Democrats. Smith, a long-time opponent of civil rights, stated publicly, "I don't think this bill ought to be passed."

He kept the bill in his committee and refused to hold the hearings that are part of the process of bringing a measure to the floor for

definitive action. That's where the bill was when President Kennedy was assassinated.

Johnson Continues Kennedy Course

In his first major address as President, Johnson called for speedy passage of the civil-rights bill. He personally met with congressional leaders following his speech. The chairman of the House, John McCormack, announced that the Democrats would try to force the bill out of the Rules Committee by using a discharge petition, a device requiring a majority of signatures of members of the House; that is, 218.

This maneuver was calculated solely to gain prestige for Johnson and the liberal Democrats. To bring the total to 218, a large number of Republicans would have to sign and their leaders oppose discharge petitions, arguing that they disrupt orderly legislative procedure.

The petition was doomed from the start but on December 9 it was begun and within an hour 115 members, mostly Democrats seeking Negro votes, had signed. Conspicuously absent were the names of two top Democrats: Majority Leader Carl Albert of Oklahoma and Majority Whip Hale Boggs of Louisiana. As of December 18, only 167 signatures had been obtained.

The impasse would seem to doom any hope of passing this measure. And this in turn would seem to increase the attractiveness of utilizing other means in the civil-rights struggle. Smith, however, is part of a smooth-working team. He came to the rescue. First, he announced that hearings will be held "in January." That offers a ray of hope -- and also enabled Johnson supporters to claim a "victory." Next, Smith collaborated in trying to keep up interest in the legislative game by saying on a radio and TV broadcast, when asked if he thought the bill would pass, "I'm very much afraid that it will."

It is indeed possible that the bill will eventually be passed. What then? The answer to that question was given back in 1957 at a Leadership Conference on Civil Rights held in Washington to put pressure on Congress for passage of civil-rights legislation.

One of the delegates went right to the heart of the matter when he burst out: "We have enough laws already! We don't need any new laws; all we need is for them to enforce the laws we already have!"

New laws, more laws, do-nothing courts and do-little politicians and do-evil police -- the only way to win the civil-rights struggle is through the mass action of the Negro people themselves.

CHOICE BETWEEN TOTALS

"Thus, for the first time in the history of humanity, the choice is no longer between peace or war, but between the end of wars or the probable end of man. Total war or total peace. . . ." -- Dominique Halévy

BEHIND THE AGRICULTURAL CRISIS IN THE SOVIET UNION

In his report at the recent Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev tried to excuse his policies and to explain away the current agricultural crisis in the USSR by referring to the situation in 1953 when, as he admitted long ago, there were less agricultural products for consumers per capita than in Czarist times.

In contrast to this hemming and hawing, Voprossi Ekonomiki [Economic Questions], No. 4, 1963, has published an interesting article by M. Vassiliev, entitled "State of Development and Specialization of Agricultural Production," which offers background material of genuine relevancy to a rational explanation of the agricultural crisis in the Soviet Union.

Figures made public in the article completely confirm some of the basic criticisms lodged by the Fourth International against Khrushchev's agricultural policy during the past ten years. Here are key items [our emphasis throughout]:

"Compared to 1913, gross output of industry has risen 44 times; in 1961, gross output of agriculture had risen only 2.3 times. In all major economic regions of the country, the increase in industrial output is rather regular and high, whereas the increase in agricultural output is very irregular from one year to another, and presents great variations from one region to another.

"In numerous regions, the gap between the development of industry and the development of agriculture not only is not reduced, but is growing wider and wider. In 1961, in four great economic regions of the country, gross output of agriculture was from 3% to 6% lower than in 1959 and 1960. In two other great regions, it stagnated at the 1960 level. In five other economic regions, it grew only by 1% to 3% compared with 1959 and 1960. Only in eight economic regions did gross agricultural output grow by more than 4%.

"From 1957 to 1959, grain output actually fell by 0.6% to 1.7% in three Soviet republics and in the great economic region of the Northwest, as compared with the annual average of the 1954-57 period. In five economic regions (Central Asia, Ural, Central Siberia, East Siberia, and Transcaucasia) the increase in agricultural output was very low (between 0.2% and 2% annually) during that period. During the same period, the potato crop fell in four important economic regions and the vegetable crop in two major economic regions. From 1960 to 1962, the grain output likewise fell in several economic regions. . . . "

"During the period 1959-61, among 26 economic regions and Republics of the USSR, the plan for per capita output of agricultural products was realized in 3 regions for wheat, in 7 for potatoes, in 2 for milk, in 5 for sunflowers, in 6 for sugar beets and in 4 for wool. Not a single economic region fulfilled its plan figures for meat, vegetables and eggs per capita. . . . "

"Between 1928 and 1961, productive fixed funds [i.e., productive investments] rose 41.2 times in industry and construction, 9.7 times in transportation and telecommunication, and only 2.9 times in agriculture (including cattle raising). Investments in agriculture between 1928 and 1961 amounted to only 14.5% of total investments made by the state and co-operative societies in the Soviet Union during that period. . . . In 1960, only 3.4% of all electrical energy produced in the country was utilized by agriculture, whereas industry, building construction and transportation utilized 86.1%; i.e., 25 times more than agriculture. Per person employed, agriculture in 1960 used 1/18 the amount of electricity of other sectors of the economy, and 1/15 the amount of coal, oil and gas used by industry, building construction, transportation and telecommunications.

"The relatively small amount of fixed funds received by agriculture explains to a great extent the lower level and the lower rate of growth of labor productivity in that sector of the economy as compared with industry. From 1913 to 1961, productivity of labor rose 11.9 times in industry and only 4 times in agriculture (sovkhozes and kolkhozes combined). As a result of this, agriculture, which occupies 38.8% of the active population of the USSR, produces only 16.1% of the national income. . . . According to the program of the CPSU, the increase in productivity of labor from now to 1980 must be higher in agriculture than in industry; it must rise 5 to 6 times in agriculture, against 4 to 4.5 times in industry. . . . In order to realize the objectives which the Twenty-second Congress put before the Party, visualizing an abundance of agricultural products, industry will have to deliver 7 to 8 times more chemical fertilizers to agriculture. . . . But in 1960, five out of 19 major economic regions produced no chemical fertilizers, and in 6 regions the consumption of these fertilizers was 2 to 4 times higher than the local output. . . . In only 8 major economic regions was the output of chemical fertilizers greater than local consumption."

"At present, the effective use of mineral fertilizers per 100 ha. [hectares] of cultivated land still varies greatly from region to region: from 7.6 m.q. [metric quintals] in East Siberia to 37.6 m.q. in Central Asia. For nitrogenous fertilizers the variation is between 3.8 m.q. in Kazakhstan and 90.7 m.q. in Transcaucasia; for phosphates, between 2.5 m.q. in East Siberia and 158 m.q. in Central Asia; for potash fertilizers, between 0.27 m.q. in Kazakhstan and 73.9 m.q. in the West.

"Our country is far behind many advanced capitalist countries in the use of mineral fertilizers. The USA uses 4 times more chemical fertilizers than the USSR (in kilogram units), Britain 14 times more and the Federal Republic of Germany 20 times more. . . . As a result, during the last five years, average yield (per hectare of cultivated land) of grain and beets is twice as high in the USA, and three times as high in Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany; wheat yields were 3 to 3.5 times higher in Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany, corn yields were nearly twice as high in the USA; oats, twice as high in the USA and 3 to 4 times higher in Western Germany and Belgium. Potato yields are 2 to 2.5 times higher in the USA, Britain and the

German Federal Republic, flax yields 5 times higher in Belgium, soya beans 3.5 to 4 times higher in the USA and Canada, etc., etc. "

"On 100 ha. of agricultural land, there are 3.5 more cattle in Britain than in the USSR, and 4.5 times more in the German Democratic Republic. This implies in turn a much lower input in the USSR in natural fertilizers. . . . "

"At present, the equipment of our agriculture in tractors, agricultural machinery and other labor instruments is much worse than in many advanced capitalist countries. For 100 ha. of cultivated land, the USA has 7 times more tractors in physical units, and, converted into 15 horsepower tractors, nearly 4 times more; the number of combines for wheat is 5 times more in the USA (per physical units) or 3 times more (converted into 15 horsepower units), and the number of corn harvesters is 5 times greater in the USA. American agriculture has 3.7 more trucks. . . . "

* * *

These figures clearly show that the main reason for the backwardness of Soviet agriculture is chronic underinvestment in equipment, sheds, buildings, spare parts, fertilizer, etc. So long as this underinvestment is not radically overcome, agriculture will remain the Achille's heel of the Soviet economy.

It is characteristic of Khrushchev that while he invites experts to sit in at decision-making meetings (of the Plenum of the Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, ect.), he is nevertheless little interested in their opinion. Criticisms voiced in the Academy of Agronomy over his "virgin lands" experiment was ruthlessly suppressed at the time, although it later proved to be accurate.

Recently, just before the Plenum of the Central Committee, he again invited the Academy of Agronomy to voice "frank criticism" of the current agricultural policies of the government.

When this criticism proved to be very sharp indeed, he avenged himself by banning the Academy from Moscow to the provincial town of Kursk.

WORLD OF CAPITALIST ABUNDANCE

"Man is in position today to raze the surface of his planet ten times over, to annihilate his species ten times over. A good many thousand Hiroshimas are technically possible on command. When nothing else remains, bombs will still be left over. There is 'nuclear abundance.'"

-- Dominique Halévy

NAZIM HIKMET

The French literary review Les Lettres Nouvelles offers a deeply moving article entitled "Nazim Hikmet, a Nonconformist Revolutionary" in the current issue [December 1963-January 1964].

The author of the article, Joseph Berger, was the representative of the Palestinian Communist party in the Communist International during the twenties. It was at that epoch in Moscow that he met Nazim Hikmet who had just come to study at the "Stalin University for Workers of the Orient" [KUTV]. The two were not to see each other again until 1957 in Warsaw. Nazim Hikmet had spent almost twenty years in Turkish prisons. Joseph Berger had spent twenty-two years in Stalinist prisons and concentration camps.

"In a few minutes," he writes, "we resumed fraternal enthusiastic contact; we talked like friends who had separated the evening before"

"We discussed many hours, exchanging memories, mentioning mutual friends, figures and events of the past: a whole life since our first meeting; we had a lot to cover and decide on."

In homage to his poet comrade who died recently, Berger felt it necessary to say who he really was:

"The men of the Apparatus sought to present him as being 'on the line,' but I am sure that in the Soviet Union many are aware of this true revolutionary's nonconformist principles. The day will come when the entire world will know it. Meanwhile these few lines constitute the contribution of a friend to the immortalization of his memory."

From this noteworthy article we cite some paragraphs of considerable interest:

* * *

"I saw from his first words that the poet understood what had been happening in the world during these decades; the significance of this epoch had not escaped him. He still believed in the great ideal to which he had adhered in his youth; he had remained faithful to the principles of social justice, of truth, liberty, to the memory of Lenin (too young to have known him personally, he had followed his burial in 1924). Nevertheless, or more accurately just because of that, he showed fierce hatred of the deviations of the Soviet power during the Stalinist epoch; he confessed that he was convinced that only his absence from Soviet territory between nineteen-thirty and forty had enabled him to escape the bitter destiny of 'all the most faithful friends of Lenin, who fell victim to the fury of a mad tyrant.'"

* * *

"I had learned from the newspapers the story of his life, the details of the battle conducted throughout the world for his freedom, his hunger strike just before freedom, his escape to the Soviet Union at the beginning of the fifties. Nazim Hikmet told me about the other side of the coin. He described with irony the festivities with which he was received after having left Turkey: 'Yes, it sure was a royal reception; they placed at my disposition all the resources of the country; they gave me a magnificent apartment and a 'datcha' for the summer; they invited me to sumptuous feasts; I had a special cook, an auto; the papers never stopped writing about me, my books were circulated in Russian in very satisfying editions. . . but (and his handsome face puckered) they were badly mistaken; they didn't succeed in 'buying me' and they never will.'"

* * *

"On his arrival in the Soviet Union, Nazim Hikmet was handed over to the solicitous care of celebrated writers. They fastened on to him, tried to guide and watch over him. He gave me his opinion of Surkov, Simonov, Ehrenburg. He knew them well, meeting them daily.

"I will mention only the most gifted and I know how their talents were degraded by the political conjuncture. I associated with Ehrenburg; we talked a lot about art, painting, sculpture and Soviet architecture. I was sure I had found in him a faithful ally in my criticism, in the profound disgust that filled me at the byzantinism and lack of audacity in the Soviet art of that epoch; I was sure of it up to the day we visited, in 1951 or 1952, the exposition of artists of the USSR in Moscow. We formed an important group of artists; at my side from room to room walked Ilya Ehrenburg. I could not hold back my critical comments, which I made half aloud to my friend. To my great surprise, Ehrenburg did not join in with me at all, and even let out some praise in a loud voice; I was ready to argue with him but he pushed me into a neighboring room and whispered, looking anxiously around: "Are you crazy? I'm sixty and I want to live another ten years. . . ." and we continued to visit the exposition side by side, in silence."

"Nazim Hikmet's opinion of Surkov was clear and explicit: "A functionary, in charge of Soviet poetry who received inspiration not from his conscience but from his superiors."

"As for Simonov (many of whose recitations and poems are popular with the Soviet public and whose talent I myself appreciate), Nazim Hikmet said: 'I, too, respected him and there was great warmth between us, up to the time, just recently, when something happened; it was in 1956, when I published in "Novy Mir" (of which the editor in chief was then Constantin Simonov) my piece Ivan Ivanovitch, Does He Exist? No doubt you have read it or seen it?' (I had read it and had likewise witnessed the enthusiasm which this vigorous and biting criticism of the bureaucracy and the hypocrisy had aroused among the Soviet youth and all those who inspired the spirit of the Twentieth Congress.)

"Here is what Nazim Hikmet told about the history of this piece:

'You found the piece biting and vigorous? But if you could have read what I wrote in the first version! It was necessary to correct it, and it was my friend Simonov who devoted himself to it; he conscientiously did his work; he tried to transform it into a little self-criticism, limited, perfectly safe. He tried to weaken the satire, suppressing the most violent passages, the clearest allusions. "I'm doing it for you," Simonov told me, "I want to help you understand our reality." Simonov's remarks, his paternalistic tone, irritated and disturbed me, because in fact, I was fighting for communism when he was still being carried under his mother's skirts; in brief, I am not at all satisfied with the definitive version of my piece, despite the great success it won on the stages of the Soviet Union and the popular democracies.'"

* * *

"Profound nostalgia was visible in his expression; he longed for his homeland, his country which he loved so much; we began talking about his youth and soon he was describing the magnificent Anatolian countryside, the beauty of Constantinople, the Golden Horn, the small islands of the Sea of Marmara. He had faith in the final victory of the Turkish working class but knew that he himself would not have the pleasure of being there. 'My fate is to die in a foreign land, in emigration, far from my beloved Turkey.' For him, this fate was the most tragic.

"These regrets were linked to another sorrow, the value he had placed on the close ties which he had associated with internationalist ideas, such as those expressed by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and those that had begun to be concretized in the October Revolution, in the first Soviet Constitution. He returned in imagination to that epoch, when the brotherhood of peoples was not simply a propaganda theme or a May Day slogan; when it was freely expressed on Soviet territory. 'Me, for example, exiled from my country, I arrived in Soviet Russia at the beginning of the twenties. I immediately had all the rights and all the duties of a Soviet citizen. I participated in elections of the Soviets, like my Russian comrades. I could run as a candidate for any official post, I could even be elected president of the whole Republic. Limitations, administrative differences were for us, forty years ago, notions of the past, bourgeois prejudices. How things have changed! When I returned to the Soviet Union at the beginning of the fifties, not only could I not receive Soviet citizenship, but they told me that my application for membership in the Soviet Communist party could not be accepted, "on account of the rules," that was after decades of struggle in the service of communism, after eighteen years in prison for my communist faithfulness.' (Nazim Hikmet told me that he went to the Polish government for naturalization, one of the ancestors of his mother having been a Pole living in Turkey.)

"The rise of nationalist sentiment in the world was a great disappointment for Nazim Hikmet: 'Our hopes of forty years ago were wrong then.' (He reminded me of the conference I had held at the KUTV university at the beginning of the twenties, at the time we first met.) "More accurately, we were born at least a half century too soon. It seems that the world must still go through a phase of national awakening before the internationalist ideal penetrates the masses.

Six months ago I visited the Soviet East: Azerbaidjan, Armenia, Uzbekistan; what enormous pressure of national sentiments! What hatred for the Russians! I was able to see how much the prophecies of Lenin came true about how Great Russian chauvinism could inflame the nationalism of all the oppressed peoples of the Czarist epoch. This chauvinist Great Russian domination was carried out, by trickery and cruelty, during the long period of the Stalinist dictatorship!"

CORRECTION

In our last issue [January 3] we published the second part of E. Germain's article, "The Law of Value in Relation to Self-Management and Investment in the Economy of the Workers." On page 32, the second paragraph contains an error which changes the meaning. The paragraph should read:

"The more backward a country is, the more conditions of almost universal scarcity rule not only in the means of production sector but also for much of the industrial means of consumption (at least for the great majority of the population); and the more detrimental the practice of self-investment is, the more detrimental is it to permit the self-management collectives to determine for themselves the projects for priority of productive investments."