

WORLD OUTLOOK

PERSPECTIVE MONDIALE

Un service de presse ouvrier

Vol. 2, No. 4

January 24, 1964

21, rue d'Aboukir - PARIS-2°

In this issue:

	<u>Page</u>
Revolution in Zanzibar	1
Thousands of Peasants Take Over Land in North of Peru	4
Ben Bella Pledges Revolution Will Continue to the End	4
Panama's President Denounces Washington	6
What Happened in Panama	7
French Imperialists Recall Suez	10
France Tells U.S., "We're Going to Recognize China"	10
Memo on China for the State Department	11
Italy's New Party, the PSIUP -- By Sirio Di Giuliomaria	12
The Italian CP Tries to Hook onto the Algerian Revolution By Livio Maitan	15
The French Left Unveils "Mr. X" -- By Pierre Frank	17
The CIA Gives Figures	20
"Minggwan Pekerdja" -- An Indonesian Marxist Magazine	22
The End of "Sotsialisticheski Viestnik"	23
Can Canada's Unemployed Survive?	24
Label for Atomic Bomb Demanded	25
Dennis Brutus Sentenced	26
Discrimination in New York Schools Challenged -- By Evelyn Sell	27

REVOLUTION IN ZANZIBAR

On December 10, to the accompaniment of a volley of rifle fire and the boom of guns over the harbor, Britain's Prince Philip formally handed over independence to Zanzibar, ending its 73-year-old status as a British protectorate. The British Union Jack was hauled down and the new flag went up, red with two golden cloves in a green circle. Zanzibar, the small island that provides most of the world's supply of cloves, had become the youngest and smallest member of the British Commonwealth.

On January 12 the government which had played host to Prince Philip was toppled by an uprising. Sultan Seyyid Jamshid bin Abdulla and Prime Minister Sheik Hamadi fled the island aboard the Sultan's yacht.

Caught by surprise at the sudden overturn, the chancellories of the West could only mutter insinuations about "Castroism" and "Maoism."

More solid information about what happened has been provided by Jacques Vergès, editor of the monthly magazine Révolution. In the January 16 issue of the Paris weekly France Observateur, he proudly calls attention to the fact that one of the leaders of the revolt, now a top figure in the new government of Zanzibar, is Mohamed Babu, a member of the editorial board of Révolution.

Babu, the chairman of the Umma party, was in the Paris office of Révolution, "barely three months ago. . . to discuss the development of the review with us. . ." Today he "has assumed the duties of Minister of the Interior and of Defense in the revolutionary government."

"In this island of around 400,000 inhabitants," continues Vergès, "which now appears as a hope for all of eastern Africa, are concentrated the grave problems for which the African peoples impatiently await solution. The conquest of independence, of national dignity opens the struggle against undernourishment, against unemployment, the privileges held by a minority, against monopoly of the land. In all these former colonies, no durable solution of these problems is conceivable without overturning from top to bottom the economic and social structures.

"After independence was granted last month, the island of Zanzibar was saddled with the regime of a constitutional monarchy which rested on a minority of landlords and the protection of British imperialism. This landholding aristocracy in power undertook to repress the opposition parties. The Umma [people] party was declared illegal. Its leader, Comrade Mohamed Babu, was actively sought for 'subversive activities.'

"Why was the Umma party the major target of the old feudal power? Because, of all the parties on the island, it possessed the clearest and most precise program, demanding, among other things, an agrarian reform and struggle against the land owners. Born from a split in the Zanzibar Nationalist party, which had a base in certain sectors of the peasantry, in the Arab intelligentsia, in important sectors of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie of the towns, it became a political force whose influence was preponderant in the powerful trade unions of the island. While the Zanzibar Nationalist party became, after the split, a party of feudalists and was deserted by the masses, the Umma party reinforced its positions, concluding alliances with the Afro-Shirazi party, which was based on the African majority of the population, and which plunged into the struggle for an independence that would not be nominal nor confiscated by a few privileged layers. . . .

"Under the leadership of Mohamed Babu, the most militant and popular cadres of the Zanzibar Nationalist party left it to form the Umma party on the basis of a resolutely antifeudal and anti-imperialist program. The Umma party was the first to advocate amid a population of Muslim tradition, the equality of men and women, the abolition of

the veil, and founded the first popular associations of women. If it is able today to share the fruits of victory with the Afro-Shirazi party, it is because it was able to root itself in the masses as an independent political organization struggling for its own democratic and anti-imperialist program. It is also the revolutionary party capable of understanding the importance of the democratic revolution in Zanzibar and of integrating that revolution in the context of the class struggle on an African and world scale. . . .

"In Zanzibar, the 'constitutional' road was tried many times by all the parties including the Umma party. But the elections were organized in such a way that the Afro-Shirazi party and the Umma party were fraudulently defeated each time to the benefit of the Zanzibar Nationalist party and the Zanzibar and Pemba People's party, both of which are dominated by the land owners, masters of the big clove plantations (80% of the world's production), and submissive to the interests of imperialism. It could be said, from this point of view, that the people of Zanzibar, even before independence was granted, had suffered the experience of neocolonialism. The possibilities of peaceful development of the revolution being exhausted, it was necessary to prepare the people for 'criticism by arms'; namely, the conquest of power along the road of armed insurrection. How can one not compare the example of Zanzibar with that, for example, of Venezuela where American imperialism authorizes elections only to place its agents in power and thus be able to continue to rule through intermediaries?

"A revolution cannot occur, on the other hand, without the support of the masses, without rallying the population as a whole, above all the poor peasantry, around democratic objectives. One of the secrets of the strength and influence of the Umma party resides in its capacity to overcome opposition between races, between Arabs and Africans, and to pose the national-democratic problem on the level of the class struggle. . . .

"The popular revolution in Zanzibar is a hope for all those who still live under the yoke of colonial domination. The conquest of real national independence is a possibility that is transformed into reality by the uninterrupted mobilization of the masses, by the existence and the action of a strong revolutionary party that has assimilated to the bottom the relations that dialectically unite the democratic stage and the socialist stage, and that is able to conclude alliances without making concessions in principles and consolidating its authority within the national movement.

"The foreign press has stressed the fact that the island of Zanzibar is only a few dozen kilometers from the coast of east Africa. But it is not by distance that one measures the repercussions of the popular revolution of Zanzibar on the other countries of Africa. Zanzibar can, by its radiance and the depth of its social transformations, become an example for the peoples of Africa. It is because of this that it is threatened and that pressure is already being placed on it. Solidarity with the popular revolution of Zanzibar! This must be the slogan of all the democrats the world over."

THOUSANDS OF PEASANTS TAKE OVER LAND IN NORTH OF PERU

A meager report appeared in some European newspapers that on "Tuesday" [January 14] between 12,000 and 30,000 peasants "invaded" some 15,000 hectares [a hectare = 2.47 acres] planted to cotton in the Piura valley in the north of Peru.

"They marched in closed ranks onto the lands which they consider to be their property," said the dispatch. "According to certain reports, they were led by Castro-Communist leaders."

"Up until now," continued the news item, "the government at Lima has not intervened in the conflict, but has sent troops into the area. It is assumed that operations to dislodge the peasants will begin at any moment.

"It involves the biggest invasion of land that has occurred in recent years." The value of the land was put at \$10,000,000.

The January 17 issue of the Algiers daily Le Peuple printed the following report from Lima:

"The police of Peru, with the help of tear-gas bombs, guns and small planes, attacked some 15,000 peasants who invaded several cotton farms in the North of the country last Monday [January 13].

"During the skirmishing, more than a dozen peasants were gravely wounded by the police.

"The officers of the police said that the peasants faced the attack with stones and clubs.

"The peasants who were dislodged Wednesday from their lands from which they had been dispossessed, again invaded the farms after night had fallen.

"In the recent period the occupation of lands by the peasants has redoubled throughout the country in face of the refusal of the government to carry out its promise for an agrarian reform and improvement in the standard of living."

BEN BELLA PLEDGES REVOLUTION WILL CONTINUE TO THE END

The ugly disturbances in Oran on January 7, in which counterrevolutionary forces sought to capitalize on unemployment and other grave problems which revolutionary Algeria has not yet had time to solve, were answered the following day in the same city by huge crowds who shouted approval of the Ben Bella government and its socialist orientation. [See World Outlook January 17.]

A further resounding reply was given in Algiers January 11. A

vast throng assembled in the Place des Martyrs, carrying such banners as "The Reaction Shall Not Pass!" "Hang the Speculators!" "Hang the Reactionaries!" "Vigilance Committees!" "A Party of the Vanguard!"

A number of speakers explained the development of the socialist revolution and attacked the reaction. A resolution condemning the incidents at Oran was introduced by the student organization and passed with applause and the "youyous" of the women.

Ben Bella began his speech by explaining what had happened at Oran. He wanted to counteract "tendentious rumors" spread "by scattered politicians lacking a program" who were sowing division in the country to the injury of the Revolution, exploiting unemployment and distress. He then issued a firm warning:

"The people are witness to the fact that we have never wanted to spill blood. For a year and a half no Algerian has been condemned to death. But we are aware that there are people who do not hesitate at using force. I have signed a decree instituting revolutionary criminal courts. These courts are going to meet in session today and if there are people who deserve to be shot, they will be shot. All those who steal will be condemned, no matter what positions they hold."

Referring to the events at Oran, Ben Bella said, "It is bizarre to observe that the demonstrations which began with cries of 'We want work; we want bread' ended with cries of 'Long live France' and the waving of the French flag."

Ben Bella appealed for patience. "If we have struggled and suffered for 132 years against colonialism, if we have struggled for seven and a half years for our liberation, we can still accept some sacrifices for five or six years in order to assure a better life for all, social justice, prosperity for all the Algerians."

He did not blame the unemployed for what happened in Oran. "Our unemployed were victims of politicians who did nothing when they were in power to solve their problems. They had beautiful villas and ate their fill while their brothers were homeless in the street."

"Whoever says he is able to regulate all the problems, including unemployment and hunger is a demagogue like the false miracle men, the liars, the counterrevolutionaries."

Ben Bella denounced evidences of corruption. He cited the case of an employee who had offered to restore the holdings of a European in return for three million francs [\$6,000]. "He will be judged by the criminal court and I hope he gets twenty years in prison."

Affirming the determination of the Algerian people to carry their socialist revolution through to the very end, Ben Bella declared: "We repeat once and for all, that no force in the world can ever make us turn back from the objectives which we have set."

PANAMA'S PRESIDENT DENOUNCES WASHINGTON

While the Johnson administration made full haste to set up double flag poles in the Canal Zone so that the Panamanian colors can be flown side by side with the Stars and Stripes, thus eliminating what the brain trust of Kennedy's successor considers to be Panama's main grievance, the capitalist press in the United States was in full cry over what it holds to be the real reason for the disturbances in the isthmus; namely Castroism. They found "agents of Havana" at the bottom of everything although Castro himself is not at present canoeing in the Panama Canal but far away, trying out the winter sport of throwing snowballs in Moscow.

In Panama on January 15 a thousand university students demonstrated in front of the Presidential Palace demanding abolition of the 1903 treaty, imposed on the country by Theodore Roosevelt, and maintenance of the break in diplomatic relations with the United States until a satisfactory new treaty is negotiated. The State Department sought to maintain the fiction that the Panamanian government had not broken diplomatic relations but had only "suspended" them. This posture was intended to provide President Roberto Chiari with a convenient bridge for retreating from his first angry response to the shooting and wounding of Panamanians by U.S. troops.

Chiari, however, responded to the student demonstration by pledging that Panama would not resume diplomatic relations until Washington had agreed to "negotiate" and not just "discuss" a new treaty. On January 17, the Panamanian government told the U.S. diplomats to get out of the country. They packed their bags and moved into the Canal Zone.

The U.S. State Department sought to inveigle President Chiari into throwing the blame for the situation on "Castroism." The President, however, although he is a conservative, could not brush away facts that are only too well known to every citizen of Panama. He indicated the true situation in an interview which he granted Léo Sauvage on January 15 and which appeared in next day's edition of the Paris daily Le Figaro.

"Not Much That's Perpetual"

"Do you believe, Mr. Journalist," Chiari asked Sauvage, "that anything perpetual exists in international affairs in our epoch?" Answering his own rhetorical question, Chiari said: "Certainly not; there's not much that's perpetual in our time, except what's done in Heaven. But the United States continues imperturbably to oppose all our complaints and admonitions, because a treaty dating from 1903 contains the word 'perpetual.' I am sure of expressing the will of my people in taking the decision not to resume diplomatic relations with the Washington government as long as they have not accepted the idea that we are an adult nation that desires to be considered as such. . . ."

On the State Department attitude that it will not negotiate "under pressure" and that a break in diplomatic relations constitutes completely unacceptable pressure, Chiari said:

"What an astonishing attitude. Here is the biggest nation of the world, the most powerful militarily, talking about pressure from a small country like mine. How could we react otherwise, and with greater dignity, than by refusing to maintain relations with a government which, each time it invokes the treaty to which it reserves the right of interpretation, it offends our national honor? We are ready to resume relations with Washington at any moment, but we place one condition on it. One sole, unique condition, which is this: it is necessary that the United States recognize that the world has changed since 1903."

The current events are not without a background, Chiari pointed out:

"Long ago, in 1959, there were bloody incidents which you will recall. For us, the Zone is part of the national territory which was merely rented for the construction of the canal. There could be no question of alienating our sovereignty and renouncing putting up our flag. The incidents of 1959 began with a civic parade led by members of the National Assembly, among them the former Minister of Foreign Affairs Aquilino Boyd who is today in charge of the Panamanian delegation [at the United Nations]. But the authorities of the Zone found it impermissible to let the Panamanian flag float in their streets. Blood was spilled. Mr. Eisenhower sent Mr. Merchant here as Mr. Johnson has now just sent Mr. Mann here. Then blood was spilled again, last week, more abundantly than ever. Also more uselessly than ever, because today there do exist other means for stopping an unarmed crowd -- tear gas, fire hoses and who knows what else -- rather than firing bullets."

Chiaria ended the interview by saying: "Friendship and co-operation, that's all the Panamanian people ask for. Friendship and co-operation, however, are no longer possible today within the framework of the existing treaty."

WHAT HAPPENED IN PANAMA

The January 14 edition of the Mexico City daily El Dia carried a vivid report from Panama, date-lined January 12, on the violent incidents that broke out between the American armed forces and the people of Panama. From the dispatch, written by Leopoldo Aragon, we have translated the following:

"The Panamanian nation today buried twelve of its twenty-seven dead, who fell under North American bullets. Panama today is caught up with indignation and with pride over its dead and its three hundred wounded. Since last Thursday Panama waged an unequal struggle with the might of the United States in the long anti-imperialist struggle. . .

"The terrible events that occurred here have great importance for Latin America and countries whose sovereignty is compromised by strong nations. A literally unarmed people has said, 'Enough of our blood!' and has declared its intention of rebelling as it deems necessary to

finish with a totally anachronistic situation going back to 1903. . . .

"In the afternoon of Thursday, January 9, some two hundred students of the National Institute entered the Canal Zone to protest the fact that a secondary school had raised only the North American flag, violating the agreement to raise it together with the Panamanian. They brought their own flag so that it could be raised.

"The North American police of the Canal Zone intercepted them and the boys agreed that a delegation of five of them should go up to the flag pole of the school to sing their national anthem and display their ensign. While they were singing, the North American students poked fun at them and began singing their anthem. The Panamanian students were then invited by the police to get going. They had a discussion with the police, as can be seen in newsreels, and the North American students then surrounded the delegation of five.

"The newsreel shows how the police proceeded to push the Panamanian youths and the menacing gestures of the Yankee students. The two hundred ran to join their comrades and then the police attacked the whole group, throwing tear gas. Their feelings aroused, the boys broke lamps and threw chunks of garbage, spreading out in various directions, trying to plant small Panamanian flags. Then the police began shooting, wounding several.

Group Becomes a Crowd

"The shots and the wounds transformed the group into an angry crowd chased by the police of the Zone, who succeeded in driving them out, but since the Zone is separated from Panama by a painted line in Fourth of July Avenue, rebaptized Kennedy Avenue, the youths ran along it shouting, attracting people who had heard the shots. They joined up, forming a group of some three thousand persons who entered or tried to enter the Zone carrying flags, along the sector of the avenue passing in front of the Legislative Palace.

"The police opened fire indiscriminately, causing deaths and wounds. The army then showed up, shooting and throwing tear gas and a still more irritating product. The population of Panama seethed with indignation and joined the crowd by the thousands. The struggle went on throughout the night and Friday morning. The people charged, literally with shirts unbuttoned, baring their breasts to the North American bullets. Waves of them advanced and fell back before the gunfire. Armored caterpillar trucks carrying heavy machine guns, resembling tanks, appeared at the three principal points of entry. At the street openings where there were considerable open areas, the troops threw up barriers of barbed wire, and posted sharpshooters in various tall buildings, mainly in the old Tivoli hotel and a convent from which a deadly crossfire could be set up.

"The list of wounded and dead continued to grow and the radio and television reported the facts. The people poured into the streets to destroy any North American vehicles they could find (North American

automobiles carry Canal Zone plates which are quite different from the Panamanian and thus easily identifiable) and to burn and destroy anything that might be North American.

"The building of the USIS, the United States propaganda agency, was reduced to a heap of ashes; the Chase National Bank was left without a single unbroken window; the glass blocks of the front of the Electric Company were destroyed, broken with hammers and picks; the futuristic building of the Panamerican Airways and two more buildings located between the Tivoli and the convent on the side of the Panamanian sidewalk of Fourth of July Avenue, and dozens of other North American properties, were also set on fire.

"The crowds were on point of capturing the North American embassy, the numerous windows of which were shattered. The National Guard was readied to prevent it from being taken by assault. The armored trucks made sallies into Panamanian territory, crossing the line, in order to push back the Panamanian throngs, the armed forces of the United States thus violating sovereign Panamanian territory. The soldiers did not confine themselves to firing on the nearest people, but splashed bullets over the entire plaza of the Legislative Palace and beyond, since wounded and dead were found three thousand meters beyond the dividing line. . . .

On Friday morning, "North American planes soon appeared with powerful loudspeakers demanding that the Panamanians get behind the dividing line. This order produced an effect totally the opposite of the one expected. 'They're not going to tell us that. . . where we can or cannot be in our own home,' was the reply, and all along Fourth of July Avenue a sea of people congregated. In the plaza of the Legislative Palace there were as many as twenty thousand people, I have been told.

"And it was extraordinary to see twenty thousand people throw themselves to the ground when there were bursts of machine-gun fire and get up and advance as soon as they ceased. 'They were stopping those that fell but the rest of us moved forward yelling at the Gringos what we thought of them.'

Jet Planes Buzz Homes

"At noon and throughout the afternoon jet planes buzzed the roofs of houses, breaking the sound barrier, and then giving the penetrating roar of their motors. They sought intimidation, but once again the effect was the reverse. With greater passion people charged the points of invasion.

"The Legislative Palace was a heap of glass smashed by thousands of machine-gun bullets. We want to dislodge the sharpshooters, explained General Andrew O'Meara, absolute dictator of the Canal Zone, where martial law had been declared the night before. The North American army also barred all traffic on the highway crossing the isthmus and linking Panama on the Pacific with the City of Colon on the Atlantic, and they barred passage from one side of the national territory to the other across the so-called Bridge of the Americas."

FRENCH IMPERIALISTS RECALL SUEZ

The attitude of the U.S. government toward Panama has been the subject of ironic remarks in French imperialist circles who recall the way their adventure with the British and Israeli governments in Suez in 1956 was reproved by Washington. Here is Robert Escarpit's comment on the front page of the Paris daily Le Monde [January 12-13]:

"It would without doubt be in the worst taste to point to Suez in relation to Panama, and it would certainly be taken in the United States as proof of Castroism or, at the very least, an antidemocratic spirit.

"Moreover the two affairs have nothing in common. In Suez it was a question of colonialism. Two old nations of prey, weak and badly armed, had the audacity to oppose the expansion of the young Arab nationalism, all the more respectable because it held a good part of the world's oil. In Panama, on the contrary, a great liberal and democratic power is efficiently protecting a small country against the temptations born of poverty. This is so much in the order of things that there is no need to even pay attention to it.

"Ignorant Panamanians who want to quench their thirst in the briny waters of the Canal! They're due for trouble, the innocents!"

FRANCE TELLS U.S., "WE'RE GOING TO RECOGNIZE CHINA"

A big leak in the pipe lines between Paris and Washington gave virtually official standing to what has been intimated by developments for some months -- de Gaulle intends to grant recognition in the immediate future to the People's Republic of China. [See World Outlook January 10 and 17.]

In accordance with protocol, the French government sent official notice to the State Department through normal channels on January 15. Within two days inquiries from the press in both Washington and Paris brought an admission from "authoritative sources" in both capitals that the report was accurate. In Washington, however, the White House wriggled miserably over the news. First a statement was issued denying that the U.S. government had been officially informed of the French intention. An hour later Assistant Press Secretary Andrew Hatcher rectified this statement by saying that the government "has received no official notification that France has recognized Communist China."

French recognition of China can have big repercussions. Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, visiting de Gaulle in Paris, said January 17 that his government has already given China a "form or recognition" through extensive trade relations and that a "great deal of consideration" was being given to extending these relations. This was a cautious way of intimating that full recognition of China may be forthcoming from Canada. Tunisia recognized China on January 10. [See World Outlook January 17.] The pressure in Japan for recognition will

now undoubtedly increase in intensity. And many countries in Africa, where Premier Chou En-lai is now on tour may likewise extend early recognition.

It is thus possible that the majority in the United Nations, which the United States has successfully prevented up to now from recognizing China, may be reversed before long. This would constitute a major setback for U.S. foreign policy.

Revolutionary-minded workers everywhere and oppressed peoples seeking freedom will hail the recognition of China by the French government. It is fresh evidence that the mighty revolution which toppled the rotted Chiang regime has had an irreversible effect on the world's power structure.

The sooner this is understood the better. It is high time that Washington reconsidered its ostrich-like policy and admitted like France that after all six to seven hundred million Chinese people do exist.

MEMO ON CHINA FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The following "Chinese Memorandum" by André Frossard appeared on the front page of the conservative Paris daily Le Figaro [January 13]:

Q. -- Why is the State Department opposed to the recognition of China?

A. -- Because China is Communist. To recognize it would favor its aims of general subversion.

Q. -- Why is China Communist?

A. -- Because the State Department let it be conquered fifteen years ago by the armies of Mao Tse-tung.

Q. -- For what reasons?

A. -- To create insurmountable difficulties for international Communism by inflicting it with charge of 600 million Chinese.

Q. -- The Communization of China is therefore a success for American policy?

A. -- Yes. For a long time it was the only one.

Q. -- Consequently the State Department must feel satisfied?

A. -- No. It is discontented.

Q. -- Why?

A. -- Because it expected to fail.

ITALY'S NEW PARTY, THE PSIUP

By Sirio Di Giuliomaria

ROME -- A congress of the left wing of the Italian Socialist party [PSI], held here January 11-12 and attended by some 850 delegates, each representing approximately 250 members, decided to split and form the Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity [PSIUP].

Tullio Vecchietti, leader of the Socialist left wing, made the main report and at the end of the congress was elected national secretary of the new party of some 212,000 members. A national committee of 120 members was elected which in turn elected a political bureau of nineteen. The party will have a weekly paper. This may be Mondo Nuovo, at present the weekly organ of the Socialist left wing. A decision was made to hold a national congress. Some delegates demanded that this be scheduled in the immediate future but the leaders of the new party decided to convene it "in one year's time."

Lelio Basso, one of the most popular leaders of the Socialist left wing, said during a speech to the delegates that he will retire from political activities for at least two years due to ill health.

With this congress the long-drawn-out struggle between Nenni's rightist tendency and the left wing came to a close. This fight began after the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union when the PSI started to loosen its ties with the Italian Communist party [PCI] to which it was linked through a united front pact.

Nenni began his shift toward the right by declaring the "autonomy" of the PSI with respect to the PCI. In accordance with this, he labeled his tendency "autonomist." His ultimate aim was to accommodate his forces to the Social Democratic turn that was to culminate in the government coalition with the Christian Democratic party [DC], the majority party of the bourgeoisie.

Didn't Plan to Split

The decision of the Socialist left wing to abandon the PSI and form a new party was preceded by considerable turning and twisting. At the last national congress of the party there is no doubt that the left wing had no intention of carrying things so far as to end in a split. Instead of decisively pressing the fight against Nenni's aim of joining the government and clearly denouncing the dangers of such a policy to the rank and file, the left wing tried to influence Nenni by seeking a bloc with the moderate wing of his tendency.

Before the national congress, when the PSI decided to abstain in parliament in a vote of confidence at the time the first "center-left" government was formed, the left wing did not vote against the party leadership's policy even in the central committee.

After the national congress, when the majority of the PSI decided

in a shameful capitulation to join the government, the leadership of the left wing was faced with the following alternative: It could seek to stay in the party, while lodging a protest, or it could begin actions against the decision of the party leadership which would lead to violations of discipline and set the stage for the split. To have followed the policy of seeking to remain in the party would have led to gradual loss of support as the left-wing ranks walked out either individually or in small groups. To avoid suicide, the left wing had to follow the second course.

PCI Against It

This was done, but not without hesitation. A big obstacle lay in the road. The PCI, out of opportunism [see World Outlook November 8], and tactical considerations, opposed a split in the PSI. The main reason was that an opposite attitude would have embarrassed relations with the PSI leaders. For instance in the CGIL [General Confederation of Italian Labor; i.e., the main trade-union organization in Italy], to keep Socialist left-wing unionists in the leading posts they hold, after a split, would sharpen things with the PSI. On the other hand, the PCI could not refuse to defend Socialist unionists who stand closer to them than do the right-wing leaders of the PSI.

Another worry was that a new Socialist party could outflank the PCI to the left.

These views influenced the leaders of the Socialist left wing, most of whom are closely linked to the PCI.

After long discussions and meetings with rank-and-file supporters, the Socialist left-wing leadership decided to abstain from voting when the confidence vote for the government came up. They did this by simply leaving the chamber and making their position known through a declaration. They thought this would leave the door open for future reconciliation or at least a compromise.

Nenni Cracks the Whip

They left out of consideration one fact -- Nenni. Under various pressures (the need to get rid of an uncomfortable opposition, to meet demands from the Social Democratic party and perhaps the government as a whole), Nenni cut off the possibility for the left wing to retreat. Heavy disciplinary measures were taken against the twenty-five left-wing members of parliament and against seven of the thirteen senators who broke discipline. They were suspended from party activity for one year. This was too much for even as hesitant a leadership as that in the Socialist left wing. The split could not be avoided.

As for the new party, it was a gain for the working class that a considerable part of the PSI refused to follow Nenni in his capitulation to the bourgeois government. Nenni's base among the workers and peasants has been narrowed. However, it should be pointed out that the PSIUP most likely could have been launched with a larger membership had

not the indecisiveness of the Socialist left-wing leadership given Nenni time to undertake measures to soften the blow. It should also be observed that the parliamentary strength of the new party is probably out of proportion to its actual influence in the country.

However, the PSIUP has an important channel for making its voice heard among the masses; its strength in the trade unions is considerable (even though it can be expected that it will lose some of its posts in the CGIL). This is cause for worry not only to Nenni but even to Togliatti, the head of the PCI. However limited it may be, a new pole of attraction now exists. Further differentiation now faces Italy's working-class movement. This will at least complicate life for the bureaucratic leaderships.

Two Main Possibilities

With regard to prospects, two main possibilities, with obvious secondary variations, face the new party. It could continue developing its criticism of the "center-left" and of reformism. Eventually this would mean criticizing the policy of the Italian Communist party from a class point of view.

The other possibility was indicated by one of the leaders at the congress, who held that the PSIUP should fill the vacuum left by the PSI. This would doom the PSIUP to playing the role of mere mediator or liason between the PSI and the PCI. In this case, aside from a formal split, the objective role of the PSIUP would remain substantially the same as that of the Socialist left wing during the past few years.

Elements favoring the first possibility are the antagonism felt by the rank and file toward the PSI in the light of their experience; the existence of differences among the leaders of the new party; the possibility of new trade-union struggles affecting the political arena.

A big factor pointing toward the less favorable outcome is the pro-Khrushchev orientation of most of the new party's leaders. Their outlook is quite similar to that of the Communist party leadership.

In estimating the immediate repercussions in Italian politics of the formation of the PSIUP, two symptomatic reactions are worth noting. The Social Democratic party hailed the split as a helpful factor in bringing the PSI closer. The PCI displayed embarrassment.

On the day of the split, l'Unità, the official Communist party daily paper, gave the news secondary treatment. Both the main headline and editorial were devoted to the events in Panama.

On January 14 l'Unità finally published an editorial. It explained away its three-day silence by saying that the PCI did not want "to interfere, in one way or the other, in the internal affairs of another working-class party" (!). After placing blame for the split on Nenni, and conceding that the split is a positive development, the editors wrote: "It remains a painful fact, and must be so judged, because it also poses

not a few far from easy problems for the working-class movement as a whole."

THE ITALIAN CP TRIES TO HOOK ONTO THE ALGERIAN REVOLUTION

By Livio Maitan

ROME -- A feeling of relief was evident in the way the press of the Italian Communist party [PCI] handled its report of a trip which an official delegation of the organization, headed by Assistant General Secretary Luigi Longo, just made to Algeria. The turn which the Togliatti leadership outlined three or four months ago is now explicit -- the PCI holds that Algeria has started the process of socialist construction and warmly greets certain major accomplishments of the Revolution, self-management in the first place. This is clear in the official press release published after discussions between the Italian delegation and an Algerian delegation as well as in a whole series of commentaries in the press which have appeared recently.

Of course, the leaders of the PCI, not wishing to give the impression that what is involved is a turn, recite in a completely tendentious way their list of honor points on the subject of the Algerian Revolution. It is true that the attitude of the PCI for some years was noticeably different from that of the French Communist party [PCF]. But it should not be forgotten that it is always easier to be "revolutionary" against the bourgeoisie of other countries than at home. In addition the criticisms made of the PCF were always timorous and never expressed publicly. Again, the top layer of the PCI, including Longo, always rejected in the sharpest way the criticisms directed by the left wing at the PCF when it voted for granting "special powers" to the French imperialist government.

Fishy Eye on Ben Bella

Moreover, the attitude of the PCI up until very recently was quite cold and reserved with regard to the course taken by the Ben Bella leadership. This led the PCI not only to maintain a waiting posture at the time of the crisis of August 1962 but even to ignore almost completely in its press the historic decrees of March 1963. It is true that a delegation of the PCI, including members of the Central Committee, participated in the European conference at Algiers in June 1963. But at the conference itself the delegation did its best to block any declaration specifying the socialist orientation of the Algerian Revolution and on its return to Italy it "forgot" to publish the appeal the conference made for aid to Algeria, l'Unita [the official daily newspaper of the PCI] mentioning it only in passing in a completely different context.

On July 13, Rinascita [official weekly publication of the PCI] published an article by Rossana Rossanda, a member of the delegation, which, while admitting some things, went so far as to stress "the element of insufficiency and the negative character of the policy of the current

president who already in the crisis that followed the cease-fire divided the leadership of the revolution" and brought about "the concentration of powers and the singling out of the person of the president." The article pointed an accusing finger at "the personal responsibility of Ahmed Ben Bella because of his intolerance with regard to tendencies, not only rightist but also leftist as expressed by his own comrades themselves whom he has successively destroyed since Tlemcen up to now."

Signal for the Somersault

In reality, the PCI changed its attitude the instant the USSR reached an economic agreement with Algeria and Khrushchev himself indicated a turn in this field. It is evident, precisely as in Cuba, that the bureaucracy has little hope of capturing or controlling the leadership of the revolution by means of the skeleton-like, discredited national Communist parties. That is why they seek to exploit economic aid -- a necessary vital contribution emanating not from the bureaucracy as such but from the workers states as a whole -- in order to exercise indirect influence to an increasing degree. Some of the big Communist parties can help in this and in the concrete case it is clear that the PCI is in an excellent position.

It should be noted in addition that the Togliatti leadership is utilizing the turn also to take a weapon away from its critics of the left both within and outside the party, showing that it is ready to recognize conquests of the revolution anywhere, while forgetting rather conspicuously that it is one thing to help a revolutionary struggle in the decisive hours and something else again to run to the help of a victory in order to exploit it.

Finally, it is piquant that the enthusiastic commentaries on the Algerian Revolution, including self-management, emanate in the first place from Luigi Longo, a Stalinist of many chevrons, who -- until the turn of 1955, of course -- covered Yugoslavia and its workers councils with mud, who has sung praises to the plurality of parties in Ulbricht's "democracy," and who was one of the main partisans of the theses in the 1960 Moscow Declaration that ignored the socialist character of the Cuban Revolution and whose formulas could not but block any understanding of the Algerian revolutionary developments.

Change Greeted by Left Wing

It goes without saying that the Italian Communist left greets the fact that the PCI is ready to organize practical aid for Algeria. In this the Algerian leaders are completely correct in extending a fraternal welcome to the delegations of the workers movement from all countries and of all orientations. It is in the interests of the Revolution to do this.

But the aims of certain turns should not be forgotten nor should it be overlooked that Longo & Co. are also seeking a certain surety from the Algerian Revolution for their own politics. That is why they wanted to include in the final press release of the meetings passages like

these: "The activists of the FLN [Front de Libération Nationale] have expressed to their Italian brothers all their sympathy and esteem not only for the decisive role played by the PCI during the resistance and the armed struggle against fascism, but for the contribution of the PCI to the big labor and democratic struggles of the Italian people from 1945 up to now. These struggles have permitted the democratic conquests to be widened and consolidated, as well as the standard of living of the workers and the middle classes to be improved against the exploitation of the monopolies. These conquests today permit us to envisage the possibility of a thrust toward socialism in Italy on the same basis of wide popular unity."

This is an estimate which the Italian Communist left disputes and which will be exploited by Togliatti against that revolutionary orientation which alone can help the Italian labor movement to get out of the rut and by this to give the most powerful aid to the Algerian Revolution.

This is an aspect of things which must not be minimized.

THE FRENCH LEFT UNVEILS "MR. X"

By Pierre Frank

PARIS, Jan. 15 -- Since the arrival of de Gaulle to power, political life in France has been almost nonexistent. The few referendums and elections have left the masses largely indifferent, preoccupied as they are with the daily struggle. (The figure for strike days during 1963 was the highest in ten years.) The workers parties receive big votes in the elections but mobilize nobody.

However, the so-called opposition of the left; that is, under the circumstances, the clubs of politicians, top functionaries, etc., feels that a means has been found to revive political life. This is around the election of the President of the Republic.

It is more than 110 years since a President of the Republic was elected by universal suffrage. The experience of the Second Republic with the election of the man who was to become the second Bonaparte (see Karl Marx, The 18 Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte), following a coup d'état, created among republicans a tradition hostile to the election of the head of the state by means of universal suffrage. The fear was that a man thus backed by a plebiscite would go beyond the parliament. The republican tradition was even opposed to political leadership by the President. On de Gaulle's gaining power through the coup d'état of May 13, 1958, the bonapartist tradition replaced the republican tradition, and the President of the Republic is to be elected through universal suffrage.

Legally the election must take place by 1965, but de Gaulle can precipitate matters at any time. During a recent tour in the provinces, he let it be understood in his usual equivocal way, that he might seek a new mandate. It is likewise not impossible that he will seek re-election not through an electoral campaign but through a referendum.

Democratic Pond Stirred Up

For all these reasons, the democratic frogs have been stirring for some time in their little clubs, seeking to settle on a candidate for the presidency from here on out in opposition to the candidacy of de Gaulle.

It should be noted that among these frogs are to be found quite a number of neocapitalists who seek a "modern state"; that is, a "strong" bourgeois state, with a vigorous President of the Republic, in which parliament in the final analysis would play a permissive role. In brief, these gentlemen are not too displeased with the present regime. What they want in place of the arbitrary de Gaulle, who is hostile to the elected intermediary bodies, is a personage who acts in a more regular way with the traditional political circles.

Under present conditions, a candidate running in opposition to de Gaulle does not appear to have any chance of coming out ahead. But our frogs are busy with intricate calculations. There will likely be a candidate of the right who could take about five percent of the votes. If the candidate of the left obtained a little more than forty percent of the votes, then taking into account the abstentions, de Gaulle would risk being elected by only a minority instead of an absolute majority, and he would be quite capable of rejecting these results. Even if he doesn't pull out in a huff, our augurs add, de Gaulle is close to 75; he is not immortal; and it is good to run a candidate to get him known and prepare his triumph over a candidate of the right who will not have much weight once de Gaulle is no longer here.

To all these considerations, there must be added the fact that two big workers parties exist, the French Communist party [PCF] and the Socialist party [PS], without whose support a candidate cannot hope to win a massive vote.

The astuteness of these strategists is limitless. It is necessary to find in the Socialist party an adequate personality, one who adheres unquestionably to "socialism," but who, at the same time, is able to maintain his "independence" in relation to the party. To have him nominated as a candidate by his own party would, under present conditions, tend to force the hand of the leadership of the Communist party. This party, not wanting to bear responsibility for splitting the votes of the left, must likewise hesitate at presenting a Communist candidate who would not be able, given the character of the electoral rules, to register under his name all the votes won by the Communist candidates in the legislative elections.

What We Want Is Mr. X

We have not yet come to the end. To have a candidate meeting such qualifications is not sufficient. It is still necessary to find the means of making him acceptable without too much trouble. Looking across the Atlantic, something might be learned, it seems, concerning presidential elections. It is necessary to operate the way advertising campaigns

are launched: create the demand, publicize the features of the product in demand, and do this in such a way that the consumers will conclude: the only product I want is the Such and Such brand.

The first part of the operation was launched without a hitch. An opening press campaign raised the disturbing thought: the left runs the greatest risk if it doesn't have a candidate right now for the Presidency of the Republic. Came the second round: we're not concerned about the name of the candidate; let's call him "Mr. X" for the time being; but let's reach agreement on the features he needs!

With the appearance of the very first article, there were plenty of explanations as to what was going on behind the scenes, but that didn't stop things from proceeding in their course. Those in on the game began to say during the speech-making wind up at some of the truly republican banquets: "For me, 'X' can't be anyone but Defferre."

On being interviewed, Gaston Defferre, the mayor of Marseilles, candidly replied, "I don't know if I was made for that. I'll have to think it over."

The timing required a major move, otherwise the campaign could lose momentum and end in something the very opposite of what was wanted. The leadership of the Socialist party was summoned to take a stand. The movement was strong enough among the party chieftains to bring this about and they decided to call a special congress of the Socialist party on February 1 with only one point on the agenda, the candidacy of Defferre.

Mr. X Unfurls His Banner

Some fifteen days before the congress, the Marseilles mayor, during a congress of his federation, announced his views. The press, radio, television gave him top billing. All his speech was concerned about was to make clear that he stood on a neocapitalist platform. Socialism is not involved, neither now nor later. Defferre stands for the firm application of the Gaullist Constitution, against the poor record of de Gaulle in this.

In other words, he stands with both feet firmly planted in the present bonapartist regime. For him, his candidacy is thus not a challenge against the regime but a proposal for trimmings. He does not intend to talk about any "program" which he promises to carry out in one way or another; he will attempt to solve problems as they arise.

Finally, while affirming his loyalty to the Socialist party, he wants to be the candidate of the whole "left." There is no question of drawing any line to the right. On the other hand, he took a categorical position against any negotiations over his candidacy with the Communist party. The Communist party, he said, must vote for me or assure the reelection of de Gaulle.

This is the way things stand on the eve of the special congress of

the Socialist party. Guy Mollet and the official Socialist party newspaper Le Populaire are silent. It is known that Defferre's candidacy does not exactly enjoy Mollet's blessing, but it seems that he will not be able to block it at the congress. The congress may see shrewd maneuvering to deny Defferre the free field he demands; but how this will turn out cannot be predicted.

An Indignant Cry from the CP

The Communist party reacted strongly to Defferre's speech, particularly his haughty attitude in their direction and insisted on the necessity of agreement on a program -- bourgeois democratic, it should be noted in passing -- letting it be known that a Communist candidacy is always possible for the first round of balloting in the absence of an agreement.

We have summarized the circumstances surrounding the preparations of the left, a very respectable left, for the presidential election to be held in the still undetermined future. As of now the maneuvers of narrow circles, of small-time Machiavellian hopefuls, seem to be succeeding. But the real problem is not touched by these combinations.

The only force that can bring an end to the Gaullist regime is the working class; and, at the present time, its activity -- including its interest in a candidate for President of the Republic -- hinges first of all in the relations between the Communist and Socialist parties. Minimum agreement between these parties would give completely different meaning to a candidacy. The relations between the Communist and Socialist parties are no longer war to the knife as they were for the past fifteen years; they are undergoing a change although it cannot yet be discerned where the discussion now underway between these two formations will end.

We will examine this problem in another article.

THE CIA GIVES FIGURES

There is an old saying that figures don't lie but liars can give figures. The Central Intelligence Agency appears to have gone out of its way to prove the aptness of the saw.

According to the New York Times [January 9] the CIA cited an "exhaustive analysis" which it had made, proving that "the Soviet Union's economic growth in the last two years has been less than 2.5% annually, well under the rate of the United States."

The CIA, of course, is in the spy business, and while it has many triumphs to boast, such as toppling the legally elected government of Guatemala, it does not yet seem to have recruited the world's outstanding economists. The report should be taken with a side dish of salt.

It is true that the rate of growth of the economy in the United States has averaged 5% during the past three years. This is due to the fact that 1960, being a recession year, had no growth at all. Once the figures are taken for four years instead of the selected three, the average declines to less than 4%. And since the previous years were marked by near stagnation, three successive years of stimulated growth brought the average rate for the past fifteen years barely over 3%.

The annual rate of growth of the Soviet economy, in contrast, has been oscillating between 7% and 10% (not 6% and 10% as the CIA report incorrectly states).

Official Soviet statistics do not give anything equivalent to American "national income" or "gross national product" calculations, if only because they do not include services. American statisticians therefore have to make a series of guesses to calculate what the Soviet equivalent of the U.S. "gross national product" might be. The calculation of the "value" of services in the Soviet economy, as well as the calculation of the relative weight of Soviet agriculture in the Soviet national income (calculated on Western patterns) is extremely difficult.

It is from these difficulties that much of the uncertain if not highly dubious character of the CIA spy-service calculations stems.

The figures provided by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, which are generally considered very accurate, indicate only a slight slowdown of industrial growth in the Soviet Union during the past three years -- from 10% in 1961 to 9% in 1962 and 8% in 1963.

It is true that agriculture not only showed no growth during this period, in 1963 the results dropped below the 1961 and 1962 figures. However, official Soviet sources estimate that the over-all net output of agriculture contributes only 16% to the Soviet national income (calculated by Soviet standards).

Under these conditions, an 8% increase in industry and transport, together with 5% decrease in agriculture, give an annual average rate of growth of 6%.

If allowance is made for the services not included in the Soviet statistical category "industry and transport," it is doubtful that this percentage falls below 6% -- and it is quite ridiculous to assume that it would drop as low as 2.5%, the assertions of Washington's spy department to the contrary.

DON'T FORGET THIS

Out of 41 Polaris submarines authorized or under construction, the United States has 15 now prowling the seas. Each captain of the pig boats controls 16 nuclear rockets, giving him a destructive power greater than all the bombs exploded in World War II.

"MINGGUAN PEKERDJA" -- AN INDONESIAN MARXIST MAGAZINE

The staff of World Outlook finds the incoming mail from all over the world a source of never-ending interest. A real highlight was the receipt of the six latest issues of Mingguan Pekerdja, an Indonesian Marxist magazine published in Djakarta. A 32-page magazine, it appears twice a month and has a press run of 10,000. The editor is Ibnu Parna, leader of the Partai Acoma (Indonesian section of the Fourth International) and a member of parliament.

Among the many items that caught our attention, we cite the following:

-- An article by Comrade Ibnu Parna on the Moscow-Peking conflict. The subtitle of the article is "Tito and Khrushchev: progressive internally and conservative internationally; Mao Tse-tung: progressive internally and internationally."

-- A memorial article dedicated to Tan Malakka, the well-known Indonesian revolutionary fighter, who adopted Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution and was the first to work out the idea of an international proletarian republic of the peoples of Malaya, Indonesia and the Philippines, an idea that has been revived around the proposal for "Maphilindo."

-- A report about a recent trip made by Comrade Ibnu Parna to the People's Republic of North Korea.

-- An extensive study of Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution.

-- Several excerpts from the works of Leon Trotsky.

-- Numerous appeals for solidarity with Hugo Blanco. Among these is a poem dedicated to the imprisoned Peruvian peasant leader. This was written by S. Hary, of Surabaya. It is dated November 30, 1963, and appears in issue number five.

Mingguan Pekerdja uses considerable material from World Outlook with full credit to its source. Among the items we noted were Joseph Hansen's article on the assassination of President Kennedy and the Fourth International's appeal for support of revolutionary Algeria against Morocco during the frontier fighting last November.

THINGS WE DON'T FIND IT HARD TO BELIEVE

"They won't admit it and the United States government has never come right out and confronted them with it, but the hard, sad fact is that most of the United States citizens in the Canal Zone are colonials in the true sense of the word, with a colonial mentality that may never be changed." -- Barnard L. Collier. [European edition N.Y. Herald Tribune, Jan. 18-19.]

THE END OF "SOTSIALISTICHESKI VIESTNIK"

The Russian-language magazine Sotsialisticheski Viestnik [Socialist Messenger] has ceased publication after forty-two years of existence. It was founded in Berlin in 1921 by the left Menshevik Julius Martov, who had just left the Soviet Union. After Martov died in 1923, the left Bundist (Jewish Social Democrat) R. Abramovitch became editor. He continued to put out the publication in Berlin until Hitler came to power in 1933. It was then transferred to New York.

The founders of the magazine, especially Martov himself, displayed an ambivalent attitude toward the October Revolution. They were not against the transfer of power to the Soviets, but were very much opposed to what they considered to be "one party rule" by the Bolsheviki. They favored a "Soviet government composed of representatives from all working class parties," including Kerensky's "trudoviks."

They overlooked the fact that at the very moment they were seeking an "ideal solution," Kerensky, together with not a few right-wing Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries, was conspiring in a counterrevolutionary move against Petrograd. Had the Cossack echelons under Kerensky and General Krasnov succeeded in taking Petrograd, the revolutionary capital, Lenin and Trotsky would no doubt have suffered the same fate as Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg in January 1919 in Berlin when another right-wing group of Social Democrats succeeded in suppressing a workers' uprising with the help of counterrevolutionary officers.

The tragedy of Martov, a man who had collaborated closely with Lenin during the Iskra period (1900-02) and for whom both Lenin and Trotsky had deep respect, was that he wavered constantly between theoretical acceptance of the idea of the conquest of power by the proletariat and disinclination to take the practical steps necessary to bring about this conquest in an atmosphere of harsh class struggle that spilled into open civil war.

This wavering continued throughout the civil-war period. Martov, for example, shifted at one point from hostility to the Soviet power to critical support of Lenin's government against the counterrevolution headed by Admiral Kolchak.

The Bolsheviki, characteristically, far from promulgating the one-party idea, alternatively closed down or permitted publication of the Menshevik press in Moscow and Petrograd, depending on whether it opposed or supported (be it with many harsh criticisms) the Soviet power.

It was only in the desperate year of 1920 that the decision was made to definitively outlaw the Menshevik press. At the same time, Lenin saw to it that Martov, who was already a sick man, was granted a passport so that he could leave the country.

During the NEP, when the Soviet government relaxed regulations for the peasants, Sotsialsticheski Viestnik took a rather favorable attitude towards official Soviet economic policy. During the 1924-27 period

particularly, it supported the Bukharin-Stalin course against the criticism of Trotsky and the Left Opposition which he led. The magazine was sharply critical of the intensified industrialization after 1927 and especially Stalin's forced collectivization of agriculture.

During the tragic period when Stalin's man Yezhov headed the secret political police and conducted the mass slaughter of the old Bolsheviks, the Menshevik paper made important revelations about the crimes and their background. The most sensational document the editors published was the "Letter of an Old Bolshevik." A few years ago, Abramovitch revealed that the anonymous author of this indictment of Stalin was Bukharin.

The magazine's collapse is due not so much to lack of means as to lack of contributors. Those who remain are in their eighties. They plan to publish an occasional issue when sufficient material is on hand. . .

CAN CANADA'S UNEMPLOYED SURVIVE?

TORONTO -- In his New Year's message, Prime Minister Lester Pearson admitted that unemployment remains one of the most pressing problems facing Canada in 1964. The figure for the regularly unemployed is 500,000 out of a population of some 18,000,000. Pearson had no concrete suggestions to offer on how to solve the problem.

In Toronto the welfare budget has been overspent. Officials are hinting that one way out is to send people not born in this city back to where they came from. But then if that were applied elsewhere, Toronto might end up with even more unemployed than it has now.

The estimated minimum income required for an average family in Canada is \$5,000 a year. The 1961 figures, made public at the end of 1963, reveal that 33.7% of the taxpayers made less than \$3,000; 21.7% were in the \$3,000-\$4,000 bracket; and 18.5% fell in the \$4,000 to \$5,000 level. Some two million wage earners did not make enough to pay taxes. Thus more than three-fourths of Canada's workers don't earn enough to support a family adequately.

The low level of incomes is reflected in another way. According to the same source (Dominion Bureau of Statistics), in 1961, out of 4,554,493 dwellings, 496,180 had no running water and 955,025 had no flush toilets.

Leaving aside the mortgage on their home, the average Canadian family owes \$913, the equivalent of eight weeks' salary.

The Minister of Immigration stated recently that Canada wants "young skilled workers and entrepreneurs with the capital and experience to operate their own enterprises in Canada."

That's not really as hard-hearted as it sounds. True, there are

people all over the world who would like to come to Canada but who can't meet those specifications. However, judging from the statistics, you have to be well-equipped to survive in this country and apparently even those responsible for the deplorable conditions realize it.

LABEL FOR ATOMIC BOMB DEMANDED

The satirical Paris weekly newspaper Le Canard Enchaîné found its own ingenious way of increasing sales through the big stir created by the U.S. government report on the evils of cigarettes. It ran a big sensational headline clear across the front page:

New Cry of Alarm from the Experts:
The Atomic Bomb (Also) Causes Cancer

"The emotion aroused throughout the entire world -- and particularly among the manufacturers of American cigarettes -- by the report from the experts on the cancerous effects of tobacco has hardly subsided," said its lead story. "Now another paving block has been dropped in the sea by other eminent cancerologists.

"According to them, THE ATOMIC BOMB ALSO CAUSES CANCER.

"The report, which ended in this alarming conclusion, is based on a whole series of observations made at Hiroshima, on the Japanese fishermen after the tests at Bikini, after the latest tests conducted by the Americans, Soviets, English and French (in the Sahara). Warnings to the public have not ceased to be made, moreover, by the most eminent scientists. . . ."

Le Canard Enchaîné continued its own startling exposé: "Thus the atomic bomb is not at all the completely inoffensive object which some make it out to be. Its immoderate use could create a real danger for all of humanity."

The editors do not direct what they have to say solely to other peoples but bring it home to France: "Here is what is particularly interesting for us French, who are being bled white to pay for an atomic bomb for our own great Charles! What will be our guilt if the experts are right and our own bomb finally causes cancer among some unfortunate innocents, even General de Gaulle himself?"

A "delicate question" has been posed by de Gaulle. "He recently declared he favored the creation of an international institute for struggle against cancer." Is this consistent with his determination to have a bomb that provokes the fatal disease?

Taking a leaf out of the American notebook, Le Canard Enchaîné proposes: "While waiting for more radical measures, perhaps it would be well to make it mandatory to place this warning label on each bomb: 'CAUTION! INJURIOUS PRODUCT.'"

DENNIS BRUTUS SENTENCED

Dennis Brutus, president of the South African Nonracial Olympic Games Committee, was sentenced in Johannesburg January 9 to a total of eighteen months in jail. The internationally known 39-year-old colored school teacher was found guilty of attending a meeting of the South African Olympic Games Association and of seeking the expulsion of South Africa from the Olympic Games because of the country's racist policies.

The meeting had been banned under South Africa's fascist-like "Suppression of Communism" Act. It is likewise a crime in South Africa to advocate a change in the government's "apartheid" laws.

In August, while awaiting trial, Dennis Brutus fled to the British protectorate of Swaziland and applied there for political asylum. A decision on this was still pending when he set out for Europe on his British passport. The trip took him through Mozambique. There PIDE, the Portuguese secret political police, kidnapped him and beat up his traveling companion Dr. George Msibi, a prominent Swaziland political figure.

Without so much as a pretense at a hearing, the Portuguese secret political police took Dennis Brutus across the border and delivered him to the South African police. They in turn delivered him to a hospital. They had shot him twice in the stomach from close range, in front, the two bullets passing completely through his body.

Their story was that he had broken away as they were bringing him to the police station and that they shouted at him. When he refused to obey the command to halt, a single shot was fired at the back of the fleeing man. This was the police story and they stuck with it.

In sentencing the victim, the judge said that he was exercising clemency and giving only an eighteen-months sentence because the wound Brutus had suffered was in itself a "punishment."

It is quite in accord with the operation of the law in South Africa for the police to thus participate with the judge in meting out justice. The police hand out justice before the trial and the judge hands it out at its close. The guilt of the victim is determined by the simple procedure of ascertaining the color of his skin.

NO PANIC IN TOBACCO INDUSTRY

Representatives of the \$8,000,000,000 United States tobacco industry refused to panic over the government report condemning their product as cancer-producing. They expect the 70,000,000 consumers to worry a little and then smoke more than ever like their "English brothers" after a similar report. As long as they're free to spend \$200,000,000 a year in advertising they see no profits going up in smoke.

"Do Away with Ghetto Schools!"

DISCRIMINATION IN NEW YORK SCHOOLS CHALLENGED

By Evelyn Sell

A boycott of the New York City school-system, to begin February 3, was announced by the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People]. It is being organized by the City-wide Committee for Integrated Schools which includes local chapters of the NAACP, CORE [Congress for Racial Equality], Harlem Parents Committee and the Parents Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools. "Freedom schools" will be operated to continue the children's education during the boycott.

Second-class education for minority groups has been a sore spot in New York for a long time. School boards tend to set up school districts which conform to housing patterns. Children normally attend the school in their neighborhood; and so segregated housing leads to segregated schools.

A boycott was threatened last September but was called off after an agreement was reached that the Board of Education would present a plan for integration of the city's schools by December 1.

A half-hearted plan was finally presented on December 9. This called for such measures as the establishment of 233 after-school study centers, recruitment of more Negro and Puerto Rican teachers and a free-choice plan of school enrollment allowing students to attend any school on a list drawn up by the Board of Education.

Civil-rights groups refused to approve the plan. "The progress report of December 9 fails at every point to meet the criteria set for it by the September agreement," said Frederick Jones, education chairman of the State Conference of NAACP branches. "It represents a piecemeal approach consisting of nothing more than proposals which the NAACP rejected as inadequate at the time of the September agreement."

The Urban League charged in a 108-page report that segregation in city schools was worse than ever.

On December 16 the City-wide Committee sponsored a sit-in and march to protest school conditions in Brooklyn, one of New York's five boroughs. Twenty-five persons were arrested for staging a sit-in in the Board of Education offices in Brooklyn while 100 Negro and white pickets marched outside, chanting and singing.

The next day the Brooklyn chapter of CORE called for immediate removal of the city superintendent of schools and election of a new Board of Education. The present nine-member Board, appointed by the mayor from a list drawn up by civil-rights groups, includes only one Negro.

Other Northern cities have engaged in boycotts and protests over school districting, teacher placement and hiring, textbooks which present an unfair picture of Negroes, inadequate and out-dated school facilities.

A one-day boycott staged in Chicago October 22 was the largest civil-rights action of this kind in the history of the country. Almost 200,000 elementary and high-school students stayed away from schools that day. Percentage-wise the figures are quite revealing: About 51% of the city's elementary students are Negroes. On "Freedom Day" 51.4% of the total enrollment were absent. About 33% of the high-school students are Negro. Here 38.4% were absent.

Some of the boycotting students attended special "Freedom Schools" held in 144 churches, union halls and community centers. Their teachers were 300 teen-age volunteers from the "Student Advocates of Negro History." The classes dealt mainly with the history of the Negro in the United States. These students and their teachers were adding a proud chapter to that history.

In the afternoon, between ten and twenty thousand children, youths and adults marched around Chicago city hall and the Board of Education building carrying such placards as: "Do Away with Ghetto Schools," "History Is Not All-White. Teach Us About the Black Man!" The day's activities were organized by the Co-ordinating Council of Community Organizations which represents sixteen major civil-rights groups.

Similar, though less spectacular, protests were organized in Detroit by GOAL [Group on Advanced Leadership]. During the past two years they have picketed and partially boycotted one of the city's all-Negro high schools to protest extremely overcrowded conditions. They have waged a successful campaign to make the Board of Education throw out a biased history textbook. They have supported a court case instituted by the Sherrill School Parents group against the Detroit Board of Education to force that body to desegregate the city's public school system.

The contrast between school fights in the South and in the North was vividly presented in the December 5 New York Times. One article described how a single Negro was registering at Auburn University in Alabama for the first time in that school's history. A different article reported the call for a city-wide boycott of New York schools.

In the South, school integration has centered around court cases, army bayonets and the heroism of individual Negroes walking into classrooms amid the jeers and threats of racists. In the North, the tendency has been to involve the masses of the Negro urban communities. This has been the pattern up to now.

Imprimerie: 21 rue d'Aboukir, Paris 2 (imprimé par les soins de l'éditeur).

Directeur-Gérant: Pierre FRANK.