

NEW RULES FOR THE RUSSIAN RULING CLASS

. . . page 6

The Convention of the SDA

... page 5

. . . page 2

Stop Dixiecrats, Said Labor, But . . .

AFTER STRADDLING ON McCARTHYISM-

has made up to the present. fully and permanently with Com-The same should be true

observed, including the implicit apology for being in politics-an obeisance to the popular and wellfounded mistrust of capitalist politics-and then the political

The primary idea that Eisenhower put forward was that of the liberation of the Iron Curtain peoples-in the Republican manner, of course. He called the roll of the once independent people now suffering under Stalinist domination, including, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, East Germany, East Austria, Czechoslovakia, Albania and Bulgaria, Indonesia, Indo-China, and the rest of Asia under Stalinist tyranny.

"We can never rest and we must so inform the world including the Kremlin," Eisenhower said, "That until the enslaved nations of the world have in the fullness of freedom the right to choose their own paths, that then, and then only, can we say there is a possible way of living peacemunism in the world.

"We must tell the Kremlin that never shall we desist in our aid to every man and woman of those shackled lands who seeks refuge with us, any man who keeps burning among his own people the flame of freedom or who is dedicated to the liberation of his fel-

The general goes beyond the policy of "containment" and calls



"Japan's industrialists fear peace more than anything else. The estimated \$1,000,000 a day in war orders from United Nations command has given Jap industry a shot in the arm-and every mention of peace starts a frantic wave of stock-market selling. In two years the U.S. army has purchased \$744,297,000 worth of Japanese goods."-News item in the Los Angeles Mirror, Aug. 18.

for an aggressive policy against Russia, and he seems to call for a kind of revolution against the Stalinist dictatorship. In view of the fact that Eisenhower was appealing in his address to the American Legionnaires, scarcely the vanguard of revolution, and was prompted by the Old Guard of the Republican Party, the kind of campaign against Stalinism which he would wage and the kind of allies he would seek in that campaign are all too obvious. It is an American crusade that would base itself on the Chiang Kai-sheks, Syngman Rhees, Francos and their similars: in short, a restoration of old capitalist regimes and semi-feudal rewhose rottenness fur nished the subsoil for Stalinist growth initially. But it is couched in the primitive, ambiguous terms of Eisenhower: ". . . the truly revolutionary values of man's dignity, man's freedom, man's brotherhood under the fatherhood of God. . . . Each of us must live with his neighbors in a spirit that is wholly American.'

EUROPE ALARMED

In orienting his Legion talk toward increasing armaments, uniting with friendly countries and liberating the satellite nations, Eisenhower sounded the most aggressive note in the campaign so far, aside from those traditionally made by the GOP dinosaurs, its Chinese and Formosan congressmen and Senator Taft when he tried to score on the administra-(Continued on page 2)

What's Behind the Russian Party Congress?

is undoubtedly of secondary interest, there is another article in this issue devoted to this subject. Though the interest is secondary compared with the possible significance of the congress, the analysis will provide some interesting sidelights on the structure of the political system of

The other three items of information are: (1) As described in the press, "The last of the directives for the fifth Five Year Plan-a plan that has been in operation since January 1, 1951-setting ambitious production goals for heavy industry and agriculture." That the Russian economy is oriented toward the building up of its war economy, at the expense of the living



Page Two

Ike's Russian Crusade ---

(Continued from page 1) tion after the outbreak of the

Korean war. The reaction abroad to this rattling of the American sword has generally been far short of enthusiastic. Le Monde (Paris) is reported as labeling the general's speech "violent"; Ce Soir calls it a crusade against the Soviet Union and China: the British Manchester Guardian feels that the forcefulness of the address makes it appear that the U.S. is preparing an aggressive war and also that Eisenhower is paying tribute to General MacArthur.

PUSH AND PULL

Eisenhower also praised the Legion for having "helped cleanse the American government and American community of subversive influence and traitorous conspiracy. . . . And you have done your work without recklessly injuring the reputations of innocent people

Eisenhower's praise came just before the Legion demanded an investigation into the American Civil Liberties Union as a "subversive" organization!

While Eisenhower has made the New York Times "unhappy" in his failure to come out against "McCarthyism"-which it correctly deems not a "proper" name but "a symbol of something frightening on the American scene," the Legion speech roused its sinking spirits. The Times had confidently predicted the non-endorsement of Senator Joseph Mc-Carthy by both Nixon and Eisenhower; it erred and expressed "disappointment" and both "shame" over this omission and pleaded for a denunciation of "McCarthyism" at least.

Whereas the criticisms of Mc-Carthyism by Eisenhower have been anonymous and ambiguous, his pledge of assistance to, the candidate has been flatfooted. He said: "I am not going to support anything that smacks to me of un-Americanism . . . if a man has been properly nominated by the Republicans in his state I am going to state clearly that I want to see the Republican organization elected." However, when General Marshall (who was called a "traitor" by McCarthy whose Marshall Plan was described by McCarthy as being cut to the "Communist blueprint") was mentioned. Eisenhower sprang to his defense and said. "George Marshall is one of the patriots of this country." Marshall was, after all, his mentor and the man most responsible for his prominence today.

Thus Eisenhower straddles with difficulty the "two Republican Parties" that Stevenson described as "case of political schizophrenia" (which describes the Democratic Party equally well). There have been other repercussions of lke's

"middle-of-the-road" efforts. The N. Y. Daily News and the Scripps-Howard chain are on Eisenhower's neck for his failure to be militant enough in the Taft direction. The N. Y. World Telegram described him as "running like a dry creek." The Scripps papers want him to name names -but Truman's, not McCarthy's. Colonel McCormick's Chicago Tribune has bolted the Republicans completely.

Eisenhower, as reported, has been taking some weak jibes, without naming names, at Mc-Carthy. His prepared text for the Legion speech contained the sentence, "The assassins of character and the promoters of witchhunts are dangerous to our freedom at me and to our world position of leadership." But this sentence was omitted from the speech to the legionnaires. The N. Y. Herald Tribune blamed departures from the text on a defective "prompter," not the general's backers and ghosts but a mechanical text-enlarging device used on the lectern.

NIXON-HIM TOO

The general's running mate, Senator Nixon, was of no help in dispelling the fears of the Eastern and "liberal" Eisenhower supporters. His solution : "The way to get rid of so-called 'McCarthvism is to elect a new administration. Also: "I think 'McCarthyism' has been created by Truman. I believe it is the creature of Truman." In an interview with U.S. News & World Report, Nixon said "to the extent that" Mc-Carthyism means smears, unfair charges not based on facts, etc., McCarthy is liable. On whether people had been injured by Mc-Carthy, Nixon fenced: "It is difficult to say that any person has been damaged or injured until you have had a chance to study all of the facts in the case. As far as McCarthy's charges are concerned, I haven't had that opportunity for study."

The Times, whose candidate Eisenhower still remains, points out that Eisenhower has taken the Taft "me-too" bull by the horns. While castigating the blunders that led up to the Korean war, Eisenhower stated in his Boise and Kansas City speeches: "Now some people have advocated -well, let's go and fight China. No one yet, no one that I know of, has presented any feasible militarv plan for attacking China." Ike is also for all of the "socia laws" and "social gains" which have been accepted by all Americans, and will only "administer honestly and efficiently." He also now recognizes the necessity for farm support.

His old-fashioned equation for security was a "mule's sort of heaven—a tight roof overhead. plenty of food, a minimum of work, and no worries and responsibility." He has revised or re-explained his concept that security can be equated with being in jail.

that in his Boise speech, Eisen- states' rights-including the right hower suggested that the government accept the responsibility for a worker's ill-health. When asked if he was advocating something like the New York Disability Insurance Law, Eisenhower replied no, and that he had never heard. of it

RESTON'S LINE

Governor Stevenson is having his own problems with the Democratic "split personality." He conceded in his exchange with a Western editor that there was a 'mess' - meaning scandals and corruption-in the Democratic Party, and his vice presidential candidate, Senator Sparkman, said the steel strike was handled badly. These, criticisms led to President Truman, who retorted to the press that he could not be the "target" of criticism by his party's candidates because they were running on the record of the Roosevelt-Truman administration.

Stevenson may have lost the Texas electoral votes because of his stand that the tidelands underwater oil deposits should be controlled by the federal government, and what Governor Shivers called his "too liberal" stand on civil rights, including what the Texas governor indicated was a stand against "unlimited debate." that is, filibustering, Stevenson too, has wavered all around the civil-rights issue in response to the contradictory influences within the Democratic Party. He has the McCarrans in his party, too.

In an article "Memo on the Two Presidential Candidates," in the N. Y. Times Magazine of August 24 by James Reston, the Times presents a view of interest r its "line." Reston tries to but prove the political identity of the two candidates-both resembling "border-state Jeffersonian Democrats such as Woodrow Wilson and John W. Davies" or the "liberal New England Republicans. such as Senators Henry Cabot Lodge and Leverett Saltonstall.

Reston rejects what he calls the "popular" conception that Eisenhower is a conservative and Stevenson a liberal, and places Eisenhower to the left of the Republicans and Stevenson to the right of New Deal—"further to the right than most people realize." He stresses that Harry Truman wanted Eisenhower to seek the presidency in 1948 and attempts to belittle the obvious intellectual advantages that Stevenson has in relation to Eisenhower by describing him as "not an intellectual in any thing but the Alexander Woollcott-Dorothy Parker sense."

Reston can imagine "Eisenhower defending the foreign policy of this administration and arguing for a continuation of New Deal domestic policies directed by a benevolent but strong until the labor movement gives up central government." He can en- its idea that political office for it-

. The New York Post reports is time for a change, defending of filibuster in the Senate-and lecturing the CIO and AFL on the responsibilities of labor."

> Reston concludes by saying the "idea that I can't get out of my head is that both political parties chose excellent candidates but maybe each of them should have nominated the other man."

All of which is also an excellent summation of the Times' dilemma, which supports Eisennower but wants to push and prefers to read into his program that of the New York Times. The Reston article is also an excellent illustration of the limitations of the argument from personalities, which finds both men "good," both "pragmatists" in the American tradition, both "suspicious of extremes or ideological solutions,' etc. It is designed for its public, that is, to influence the heavily Democratic New York vote, when Reston says that both candidates appeal to noble qualities of character and speak of matters of the spirit. "though neither really seems to be sustained in his present trials by profound religious conviction.'

SOCIAL PRESSURES

Reston's social analysis is limited to stating that Eisenhower is being pulled to the right by the Republicans. What is omitted in this approach, and must be omitted by the nature of the Times, s that whatever the personality of the candidates, they are the representatives of two parties, both coalitions of various social forces, but with an identity, how-"schizoid" in each case, based upon the various social strata that compose them. Each presidential candidate veers and tacks, backs and files, in accordance with the varying social pressures exerted. One is more reactionary than the other, based upon more reactionary social groupings; they are like each other in that each is wedded to the preservation of capitalism. From the standpoint of the labor movement, pledged to and active in the Democratic Party, and whose greater participation is a sign of its primitive political awakening, neither should be regarded as progressive.

Walter Reuther of the UAW can parrot the Stevenson theme, "not a candidate of labor, not a candidate of industry, and not a candidate of the political bosses.' And he can express the absurdly unpolitical description of Eisen hower, "a good general but he's out of his job classification."

Imagine the labor leader saying with pride that his choice is "not a candidate of labor" nor of anything else! . . . Just a nice man, who stumbled into politics. We will hear more of the same until a real candidate of labor arises who stands for a real change, and visage "Stevenson arguing that it self is out of its job classification.

LOS ANGELES, Aug. 18-Almost 1000 members of the CIO United Rubber Workers went on strike today against the production plants of the B. F. Goodrich in this area in connection with the Akron walkout last night where 13,000 are on strike. Only the Goodrich plants which

LABOR ACTION

On the

Labor Front

Los Angeles

By LES WRIGHT

process rubber are invloved. The company offered a 10-cent hourly pay increase such as was granted other rubber firms earlier, The demands include fringe benefits: holiday pay, grievance machinery, reporting for work, vacations and other items. A union publication said the company offered the 10-cent wage increase only "if we agree to the impossible contract terms dictated by the company."

James S. Martin, international field representative of the union here, said the main cause of the dispute is a financial-liability clause which Goodrich is determined to write into the contract.

"This clause," stated Martin 'would make the union liable in case of work stoppages or slowdowns. Inasmuch as we do not have a union-shop contract, how could the union be responsible for the action of an individual who might be dogging it?"

Late reports say that the pickets are not detaining entry of management or office help but are turning back trucks trying to enter the plant.

IAM VERSUS UAW

As the United Auto Workers (CIO) are trying to make the best of the "patriotic appeal" deal meted out by the government to prevent a UAW work stoppage North American Aviation plants here and in Ohio, members of the International Association Machinists (AFL), Locals 1578 and 720, voted strike powers to their negotiators who are meeting with representatives of Douglas Aircraft plants in El Segundo and Santa Monica. The union negotiators represent about 30.000 IAM workers.

Present IAM contracts with Douglas expire within three days The workers are demanding a 101/2 per cent wage increase as well as other benefits. Meanwhile. IAM workers at Lockheed in Burbank are awaiting result of negotiations with that company, strengthened by a recent strike vote. Lockheed offered a wage boost of two cents an hour and an increase in vacations from one to two weeks after one year's service. But this proposal also would require reduction of paid sick leave from six to five days annually. The IAM local, representing the Lockheed has requested the intervention of the U.S. Mediation and Concili-

ation Service. UAW workers may well think over the difference between the policy of their own leaders in the North American dispute in contrast with the burst of militancy shown in this area by the IAM in the aircraft field. And the UAW leaders may do well to ask themselves why the IAM has made recent strides in organizing workers where the UAW failed and, in addition, has won certain elections in contest with the UAW.

The old reputation of the UAW as an aggressive union seems to be on the wane in this area. And it is in aircraft where the UAW should have the most to offer in this region. Aircraft is a major industry here and one that falls behind the auto industry generally in wage scales. IAM victories outside aircraft where the UAW is involved and the IAM-militancy in aircraft should spur the UAW. te greater action.

Stop the Dixiecrats, Said Labor, But

By BEN HALL

erats.

In four Southern states since the Democratic national convention, reactionary right-wing, state Democratic machines have brought themselves to endorse the candidacies of Stevenson and Sparkman. This in Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi and Louisiana where party leaders head an extremist anti-New Deal, anti-Fair Deal bloc. Officials, wardheelers and professional votegatherers of the national party have every right to be jubilant, for anything that promises to keep a few more electoral votes in the proper columns is good enough for them.

But the labor movement has a somewhat different concern with the diffics of the Southern Demo-

Since 1948, a majority in Con-

gress has been held by "a coalition of reactionary Republicans and Dixiecrats"-to use the standard terminology of official union political analysts. And, according to the continuing lament, this coalition has thwarted every effort of the fighting friends of labor to put through progressive legislation. Needless to say, in order to bolster this somewhat onesided version of the political facts of life the unions have to whitewash the actions or inaction of their so-called friends and seeonly what they want to see. But the fact remains: the

Southern Democrats in alliance with the Republicans have held a majority and this majority has been used against labor. And so, the unions make their main political objective the destruction and defeat of this coalition. To the ex-

are able to wield influence in the Democratic Party and press it to give them concessions, to that extent the labor movement has been shunted aside and to that extent the unions fail to achieve their primary political goal.

LOADED PISTOL

The Democratic Party organizations in these four Southern states are not just giving away votes for free. While they endorse Stevenson, they hold a loaded pistol to his head.

James F. Byrnes, governor of South Carolina, and Fielding Wright of Mississippi, Dixiecrat leader, will vote for Stevenson, so they say, but they also reserve the right to change their minds if he irritates them by his campaign. Furthermore, say the tent that the Southern Democrats Southern Democratic tops, they

will hold no grudge against any Democrat who decides to support

This is their way of demanding pressure is bringing results.

In order to conciliate them, says a New York Times Southern correspondent, "several prominent Democrats, somewhat obliquely, have been making the point that Governor Stevenson is a scholarly conservative with much compassion for Southern problems and (Continued on page 3)

September 1, 1952 LONDON LETTER

By ALLAN VAUGHAN the contrary.

What has, in fact, happened is this: that the whole ground beneath Attlee and Bevan has itself shifted noticeably to the left. More important still, the Attlee wing has conceded many of the points Bevan himself has raised, particularly on the level of rearmament, and also on charges for the Health Service. This apart from the Labor Party vote against the government on the timing of the ratification of the Bonn treaty. The greatest cause for sat- trial advantage, and also enable us to build up a fairsized and isfaction as far as the left is well-balanced force if, to begin concerned is the crystallizawith, the period of service was tion of a small right-wing reduced to twelve months." group inside the Labor Party The recent general strike in

parliamentary fraction. This

right wing-or, to be more accurate, extreme right winghas arisen as a result of the pressure on the Attlee-Morrison leadership by the Bevan group. Consisting of about 18 MPs (those who abstained or were absent during the vote on the Bonn treaty ratification), such as R. T. Paget, Phillips Price, Jack Jones and Captain Fred Bellenger, they are bent on keeping the Labor Party's foreign policy in line with the abstraction which they call a "national" foreign policy.

SHINWELL PROPOSAL

The recent outbursts in the London News Chronicle and the heavy correspondence resulting, on the subject of Aneurin Bevan and his "party within a party' (to quote Richard Stokes, MP) has provoked fresh feuds within the party. Two former junior ministers, George Brown and A. Crawley, have also entered the fray. Again, what is most significant is the fact that the Attlee-Morrison leadership is not behind the right-wing "ginger group." Attlee and Morrison are fully aware that their position in the Labor movement depends on the extent to which they can represent the broad center, rather than its increasingly . isolated right wing.

Stop the Dixiecrats — —

(Continued from page 2) from the party."

FOR A SOCIALIST EDUCATION Get it EVERY week! A subscription to LABOR ACTION is only \$2.00 for a year

the Republican national ticket.

that Stevenson go soft on the civil-rights question and not injure their white-supremacy sensibilities and their method of pressing him to play down the New Deal-Fair Deal party platform and tradition. They stand ever ready to bolt the national ticket unless Stevenson follows a conservative course. And their Page Three

化施力剂 化结合的 人名克拉什 Labor Party Conference Will Show All-Around Shift to Left

LONDON, Aug. 19-Preparations for the Labor Party Conference at Morecombe are now nearing their completion. The close of the parliamentary session has shifted the center of interest from Westminster to Transport House, the headquarters of the Labor Party. Both the right wing and the Bevan wing are making elaborate plans for the important gathering at Morecombe.

It would be erroneous, however, to assume that the issues dividing Bevan and the right wing have increased. Quite

Meanwhile, another issue has been taken up by none other than Emanuel Shinwell, the former minister of defense in the Labor cabinet. Writing in the Daily Mirror and in Reynolds News, he has put a strong case for reducing the period of military service from two

Belgium organized by the Confederation of Labor and the Belgian Labor Party, to reduce the period of military service, seems, at least by implication, to have Shinwell's backing. I have it on the authority of a friend who was at Liège during the International Labor Festival that Attlee and Morgan Phillips, secretary of the BLP, were both involved in the demonstrations organized by the Belgian labor movement, much to their own annovance.

Be that as it may, it is certain that Shinwell will mobilize a strong segment of opinion on this vital issue at the Labor Party conference. His demand for a reduction of the period of military service parallels or complements Bevan's demand for a further review of the arms program.

TIMID PAMPHLET

Three policy statements by the Labor Party have now been published: on its approach to foreign policy ("Labor's Foreign Pol icy"), on the economic problems of the underdeveloped countries ("Toward World Plenty"), and home policy ("Facing the Facts"). The last-named statement of policy has been ruthlessly torn to shreds in the Reynolds News column written by Maurice Webb, former Labor minister of food. He writes that a more accurate description of the statement would be the title "Dodging the Issue."

The third Policy Discussion Pamphlet, Problems of Public Ownership by Ernest Davies, MP, has also been published. It discusses many of the criticisms of vegrs to twelve months. In the nationalization, such as the un-Reynolds News of August 3, he disputed fact that there is too wrote: "It would be to our indus- much centralization of the admin-

that at the Chicago convention his was the principal voice in formulating a middle-of-the-road decision to beat off an attempt by left-wingers to drive the South

Stevenson's coy efforts to disentangle himself from full responsibility for the Truman administration, his failure to take a firm hard-hitting stand for the New Deal-Fair Deal traditions of the party (Truman's ill-concealed dissatisfaction with the nature of

Stevenson's campaign stems from this) show that the pressures from the South have had their effect.

The labor movement which hopes to defeat the reactionary Repubican-Dixiecrat coalition finds that its own candidate for president displays an alarming solicitude for the comfort of Southern Democracy. Before it can break up the **Republican-Dixiecrat** coalition in Congress, it will have to break up the conservative-Dixiecrat coalition in its "own" Democratic Party.

istrative apparatus governing the given industries. Again, there is widespread dissatisfaction with the type of people appointed to the nationalized boards, some of whom are opposed to nationalization. Also, "a further cause for criticism has been the high salaries paid to board members.' he writes. But he justifies this by saying that "to attract the best men remuneration must · bear some relationship to that in private industry." (Page 11.) These and many other related questions are dealt with in this cautious. rather timid pamphlet.

DUAL LOYALTY

From the worker's point of view, the question uppermost is the question of "workers' control," a phrase that I fear is used too often as-a slogan without relating it to any existing form of private or nationalized industry. According to Davies, "there are two ways in which workers in nationalized industry have been brought into more direct participation: by the appointment of trade-union officials to the boards and through joint consultation.' And he writes, moreover, that "Direct representation on the boards by workers in the industry has been rejected by most unions, largely because it was considered that it would involve dual loyalty. In practice, however, trade-union officials have been appointed to the boards, but have been compelled to divorce themselves from the unions with which they had been associated. No single important corporation [public corporation in a nationalized industry s without a member experienced in the trade-union movement, but all are free from control by any outside organization."

This surely is the crux of the matter. The dual loyalty of tradeunion members on nationalized boards is very much in question. As long as these trade-union representatives are not subject to recall or re-election by their union (say, once a year), so long will the loyalty be toward the board rather than the mass of tradeunion supporters.

The problem of dual loyalty would, of course, arise even if these trade-union representatives were elected. This, by the way, Lenin clearly realized, when he emphasized the necessity for the independence of the trade unions from the state, even if it is a workers' state.

FROM THE FLOOR

It is not sufficient to deal abstractly with the question of workers' control. It has too often been the custom to sloganize a truly serious problem. The key to an understanding of the force of such demand lies in the connection between it and the problem of training a managerial and technical stratum from the "floor" (as t were) of industry. Once the technical and managerial grades become open, or more open, to the men directly involved in given industries and firms, the social barriers between the "workers by hand" and the "workers by brain" break down.

Certainly, something has been done in the mines to provide for training and promotion of workers both in the pits and on the surface. However, a great distance has yet to be covered before the whole managerial setup in nationalized industries is transformed into a truly representative layer of administrators.

The last point worth mentioning is the subject of the Consumers Council attached to the boards of nationalized industries. Davies admits that these have not been functioning properly. However, at least, the framework for a democratic consumers' participation in industry exists. To make use of it, there's the rub, there's the problem.

Kurt Schumacher ----

(Continued from page 1)

centration camps or who, as refugees, had to sever all ties with what was once their most meaningful existence-they could not be replaced by Schumacher or anyone else.

Schumacher re-created the German Social-Democratic Party (SDP). That is an accomplishment which cannot be denied him by the assertion that the reappearance of this party was inevitable in any case.

Above All, He Was a Fighter

That it was a Schumacher and not a Benedikt Kautsky who undertook this task spells the difference between the national independence and national character which this party today possesses and the sterile appendix to the Western powers it might well have become otherwise. The difference between the two men, both of whom suffered long years in concentration camps, is the difference between the popular leader, the stubborn, proud and, by character and temperament, uncompromising fighter, and the theoreticianfunctionary, the bureaucratic intellectual, the representative of the machine of a socialist party grown to respectability

The re-creation of the SDP needed the fighter if the SDP was to become a viable political instrument.

Schumacher inflicted a decisive defeat upon the Stalinists. Some may say, in the light of the deterioration of the relations between the great powers and the experiences of the East Germans, that Stalinism in Western Germany could never have made great strides anyway. But in 1945-46 such a deterioration was not easily forseeable, least of all by the Germans. And the break between the SDP and the Communist Party, for which Schumacher was responsible, was made over the potent opposition of the occupying

The Socialist Unity Party (SED) of the Eastern zone. which the Stalinists formed in what they claimed was a merger of both parties, has never been able to make the slightest claim to being nationally representative. The SDP, by its clean break with the Stalinists, was enabled to strengthen itself as a national political movment; and it contributed decisively to the maintenance of the freedom of the city of Berlin, the courage of whose working-class population in the face of overwhelming adversity must never be forgotten:

Courage for the Times

The struggles of the post-war period have all tended to associate the SDP with national ends. Schumacher has been 'accused" of nationalism, but there has not been a more progressive and a more necessary nationalism than Schumacher's. That the democratic movement in Germany should be closely linked with the national interests of the country is a task still far from accomplishment; it was Schumacher who saw the necessity of this association, if the social and political developments in Germany were to have any decent potentialities. It was he who tackled this task in the face of powerful opposition by the occupying powers, sabotage by the Adenauer government, and a growing inertia inside the party body of functionaries.

The succession to Schumacher is, at this writing, doubtful. The problem is not at all simple. The German workers are confronted with the basic issue of co-determination, spelling the survival of their organizations as free bodies. Germany remains the focus of the world power struggle. and what leverage the German people have may affect the issues of war and peace to a very important extent. The 1953 elections, finally, cannot leave the SDP indifferent as to who is to head it-if it preserves the will to power which was so manifest in the personality of Schumacher.

Schumacher's death is doubly tragic at this juncture because of the lack of leaders comparable to him in stature. This is in part related to his own rather autocratic methods. his failure to train leaders. But it is also due to the decline of the socialist movement, involving, as it did, the physical or psychological destruction of its best cadres.

Schumacher was anything but a man to be idealized or idolized; he was an austere disciplinarian, rather harsh and somewhat forbidding. But like Karl Liebknecht, he was a man of action, who gave courage to a time in dire need of it.

Get ALL your books from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

We specialize in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement and Marxism.

Write for our free book list: all the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky; labor history; socialist fundamentals; economics of capitalism; Stalinism and Stalinist Russia, etc.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York Page Four

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. If must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without offective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long at the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

• The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

STATE TEL
CITY ZONE
ADDRESS
NAME
□ I want to join the ISL.
□ I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
New York 11, New York
Independent Socialist League 114 West 14 Street
Get Acquainted —
INTERESTED?

LABOR ACTION 114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York Please enter my subscription: □ Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00 D One year (52 issues) at \$2.00 D NEW D RENEWAL 🗆 Bill me. 🔲 Payment enclosed. NAME ADDRESS CITY

STATE

ZONE

SWP & PCI CANNON SUPPORTS PRO-ENTRY LINE FOR FRENCH TROTSKYISTS

The press of the Socialist Workers Party (Cannonite official-Trotskyist) has finally taken cognizance of, and taken a stand on, the split in the French section of the Fourth International on the question of entry into the Communist Party. Its reaction is presented in the columns of the lilitant (Aug. 18) in as typically Stalinist a form as the decision which it approves.

Although the SWP is not affiliated with the Fourth International because of the Voorhis Law in the U. S., its press devotes itself to presenting news and activities of the international movement. On this question, however, it has been silent up to the current issue. It now breaks its silence not to present the issue which has divided the French party nor even adequately to report the decision of the F. I. leadership, but to reprint the decree of expulsion issued by the latter against the majority group opposed to its line, introducing this with an evasive and falsified picture of the background. EXCOMMUNICATED

In February - publicly announced a couple of months agothe F. I. leadership decided that its groups must disband their essential forces into the Communist Party in those countries where the Stalinist movement is the majority force in the working class (see LABOR ACTION for June 2 for details). This applied particularly to France and Italy. In France a majority of the Trotskyist group, the PCI (Parti Communiste Internationaliste), after much discussion and skirmishing, broke with this policy (see LABOR ACTION for August 4).

. It appears from the F. I. statement that this dissident group is still using the name PCI and controls the group's newspaper La Vérité. The F. I. statement itself is reprinted from La Vérité de Travailleur, a new organ set up by the Pierre Frank group which is going along with the pro-entry policy.

The F. I. ukase reads the dissidents, led by Pierre Boussel-Lambert and Favre-Bleibtreu, out of the movement "automatically." It says: "By breaking discipline, this faction has automatically placed itself outside of the Fourth International . . . and of its French section, the PCI." They might be hard put, however, to find such an "automatic" provision in the statutes of their International

STALINIST REFLEX

leadership denounces the group for "desertion" and in so many words ascribes this "desertion" to the

"pressure of forces of the class enemies of the revolutionary proletariat which is sharpening with the approach of the Third World War." The Lambert group is thus getting a taste of this movement's penchant for denouncing affyone who disagrees with it (or even with the leadership) as capitulators to imperialism, class enemies of the proletariat and with other slanderous associations. It got this habit, of course, from the Kremlin.

Since the Lambert group refuses to liquidate its essential forces into the Stalinist party, says the statement with as cavadisregard for logic as the Stalinist experts' at mudslinging themselves, "They have renounced as a task patient activity among masses now influenced by the mmunist Party of France as set forth by the Fourth International as the tactic for France. As a consequence they have in practice renounced aiding these masses to liberate themselves from the counter-revolutionary influence of the Soviet bureaucracy and of struggling in the same class camp as these masses for the triumph of the French socialist' revolution."

The fact is that the ideology of the Fourth International now virtually identifies the victory of the Stalinist movement with the victory of the socialist revolution.

MUTED CLAIM

The Militant's statement, which precedes this excommunication, likewise presents the split as "desertion" by the dissidents, and speaks of them as refusing to honor the "overwhelming majority vote" of the movement. A careful reading of the weaselworded statement reveals that the "majority vote" which is referred to is one which took place at the "Third World Congress of the F. I." While this congress confirmed and extended the general pro-Stalinist politics of the movement, it did not decide on the entry. This decision was taken by the February plenum of the "International Executive Committee" of the F. I.

It is significant that neither in the F. I. nor Militant statement is even the claim made that a majority of the PCI supports the "official" line. (The fact is that the dissidents are in the large major-

As LABOR ACTION has previousreported, the Lambert group appealed for moral support of their position to James P. Cannon, the leader of the SWP, without getting any response. The Militant article would present seem to constitute a definitive In line with their Stalinist-type reply, lining the American group. of reflex, the statement of the F. I. up in approval of the pro-entry policy, and thus with the extreme pro-Stalinist tendency of the F. I. leadership as led by Pablo.



LABOR ACTION

Jews and South African Racism

In the oppressive atmosphere of racist oppression in South Africa, the feeling of unrest and insecurity among the Jewish population s growing. While the government is attempting to implement its program against the dark-skinned population with all its might, one also hears the echo of anti-Semitic propaganda.

The government itself is not carrying out any anti-Semitic policies, although the parties that compose the coalition were anti-Semitic during all the years they were in the opposition and have not repudiated their anti-Semitic statements now that they are in power. But no restrictions against Jews were enacted and the government plans no restrictions. At least that is what government. spokesmen - including Premier Malan-have said on a number of occasions officially.

It is of course unnecessary to add that a racist regime places the Jewish population in a peculiar position despite the fact that no discriminatory action against Jews has taken place. A year ago the representative body of Jews in South Africa, the "Board of Deputies," declared in favor of a policy "neutrality" in the race quesof tion. Jews as such, the declaration said, have no special need to fight against all race discrimination. The government press received that declaration with a certain amount of reserve, and with a threatening tone implied that Jews should "keep their place."

A point of view in oppos to the Board of Deputies was expressed by G. Saran in the African Jewish Newspaper. He wrote: "We Jews who are a minority in all countries (except Israel) can protect and preserve our rights only when the country is based on justice, progress and democracy Otherwise our position, as a group or as individuals, becomes shaky and the end is always a sad one for us, as our bitter generations-long experience proves."

Lately a few anti-Semitic oragainst ment party engage in inflammatory speech-making against Jews.

Even Premier Malan; while at-

ganizations have increased their tivity. They propagandize shechits (ritual-slaughterers). Deputies of the govern

tically.



INDIAN SOCIALISTS PRESS TITO ON ONE-PARTY SYSTEM

LOGIC

This is why, he says:

The bulletin of the Socialist International, Socialist International Information for August 2, reports on the visit of a delegation of the Socialist Party of India, led by Faridul Hag Ansari, to Yugoslavia. There they had an interview with Tito and other officials including Boris Kidric, who steers economic policies for the regime. The bulletin reproduces questions and answers in the interviews.

It is noteworthy that the Indian comrades' questions to both Tito and Kidric centered around the nature of the political regime in Yugoslavia, and kept coming back to it as the two doubletalked. Tito here shows his ability, as he has in other direct interviews, to answer a question with irrelevancies and then, when the question is repeated, inform his interviewer that he has already answered the question.

DOUBLETALK

For example, the Indians asked specifically: "Do you believe in the theory of 'one class, one party'?" That is, does he believe that there can be a working class parother than his own CP?ty Tito's answer in full follows, however unenlightening, though composed of scraps of "Marxism":

"There will be no need for a party in the classless society. What forms of organization will then develop remains to be seen. But they will grow out of the cooperation of various groups of producers. Political conflicts are caused by class conflicts and will disappear with the changes in the economy.

"Let us consider, for example, the struggle of the working class for its rights in a capitalist society where there are, besides workers' parties, other parties with programs aimed at a modification instead of a radical trans- SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE formation of the existing system. In such countries the revolutionary working class has its own program. It aims at taking power away from the capitalist class. You have Socialists, Communists and Cominformists, which shows that there are conflicts within the classes as well as between the classes."

His listing of "Socialists, Communists" with "Cominformists" negates any possibility, from his own point of view, of reading an answer into his verbiage, since the Titoist view is that the Cominform parties represent "statecapitalism" (their theory of Stalinism).

Therefore the Indians asked again: "Do you hold the view that in the conditions of today each class should have only one party?" Tito: "I have already answered that question. [!] But I should like to explain why the accusations leveled against the so-called one-party system are unfounded . . . "

"First of all, what we have is

not a one-party system, but a

revolutionary party leading the

country and giving guidance on

tions, and besides the People's

Front which united the citizens

of our country on the basis of the

Communist Party's ultimate aim

and program. The members of

the People's Front are not Com-

munists. They are men and wom-

en who desire a social change,

who want the socialist society.

There cannot, therefore, be any

Having with this sterling logic

denied that there is a one-party

system, he then proceeds to scout

the very idea of a multi-party

absurd to speak of a multi-party

system with various programs.

Here in our country there can be

only one program: the construc-

overwhelming majority of the citi-

zens of our country stand united

behind that program, and those

who are opposed to it cannot be

No one-party system-no multi-

party system-what then? Tito

went on to talk of other things.

The Indian comrades had the

allowed to obstruct it."

114 W. 14th St.

'In a revolutionary period it is

st soci

talk of a one-party system."

system:

theoretical and practical ques

against them as well."

CONTRADICTION

The Titoists, by the way, have been developing a theory about the "withering away of the par-Some of them started talking about the party "withering away" even before the state, but in this interview Tito reveals that "the state will wither away faster than the party." It will be a race to watch.

with the m

same difficulty with Kidric, nat- blies. . . ."

lew	York	11,	N. 1	Y.			4		
si _3									
- , ii		ant	more	information	abost i	the	Socialist	Youth	Longue.

🔲 I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

	1 63	1.4.5	5 J.	
NAME.		100		
	• 1	£		-
	1 3			
ADDRESS		·····	••••••	
	2.2	100		
яту			ONE	STAT
and an and a start of the			· 2 - 4	
CHOOL (IF STUDENT).				
	1 1986	Sur Sura	er, courses	in march
and the second second				
The second se		201 V	1.1 2.12	1997



September 1, 1952



tacking the millionaire Harry Openheimer, took the opportunity to take digs at the Jews in general. No one can foretell what future developments will take place in South Africa, but one thing is certain: that no good for Jews can come from the racist insanity that has engulfed South Africa. Nor can the policy of the majority of the Board of Deputies be condoned by Jews in the United States and elsewhere. It can easily be understood, naturally, that the South African Jewish leaders do not wish to "stick their necks out" in the inflamed racist atmosphere of South Africa and that they view their stand as a matter of discretion and self-protection. If and when, however, the racist knife descends on their own necks, it is not likely that these Jewish leaders will take a sweetly understanding view of other groups which may seek to wash their hands of this injustice. The minority point of view in the board is the only one which can be justified morally, so cially and (in the longer run) prac-

urally. His reply is interesting also because the main multi-party danger that he envisages is obviously not from the Stalinists, which comes as an afterthought:

"What would happen if we were to introduce a multi-party system now? We would be giving our enemies socialist freedom and they would use it to fight socialism. Once the danger of the internal restoration of capitalism ceases altogether, there will no longer be the need for a party in the present form. Moreover, we still have Cominform agents and we must fight

Coming back to Kidric, the Indian Socialists pushed him redhanded in a contradiction. At one point he claimed: "In our economy, the party holds no positions. The workers themselves run the factories. Not only is the party no longer identified with the government apparatus, but together apparatus." Later in answer to another question, he said: "all important government posts are actually in the hands of the Central Committee and the Politburo [of the CP]. But under the new system the members of these two bodies will transfer their activities more to the National Assem-



Socialist Touth League Socialist Touth League

The Convention of Students for Democratic Action

By ARTHUR HART

Students for Democratic Action, the campus affiliate of Americans for Democratic Action, is scheduled to hold its annual convention next week at Brandeis University in Waltham, Massachusetts. Like its parent organization, SDA combines a program of social reforms together with animated defense of America's foreign policy in the cold war. With such a program it undoubtedly represents the views of a predominant section of liberal campus opinion, even if it does not command the active support of more than a small minority of students. This makes SDA somewhat more important than its small size would otherwise indicate.

Unfortunately, the undemocratic procedure to be followed by the SDA convention does not permit any estimate of the strength of the different views within SDA, or even what these may be exactly. Rather than discuss prepared resolutions drawn up in advance and voted on by chapters as the basis for electing delegates, the designated chairmen of different committees entrusted with drawing up resolutions are to prepare drafts which will guide the committees in their deliberations.

Naturally such a procedure gives maximum weight to the views of committee chairmen, who tend to be national officers and thus most directly under the influence of the more conservative elements close to the ADA. Indeed, only the "implementation and action suggested by [each] commission will be reported to a Convention Plenary Session for final consideration."

Organized Liberalism in Decline

Under such conditions it will doubtless prove difficult for the delegates to have a fruitful discussion of the basic policy questions which confront the organization. There is even some reason to believe that the main purpose of this convention is not so much to provide a basis for discussion and democratic decision on policy differences as it is to lay the basis for organizational participation in the coming election campaign along lines already laid down by ADA.

In a mail vote of its national board, ADA has decided by an overwhelming majority to immediately endorse the candidacies of Stevenson and Sparkman, and SDA is presumably expected to go along with this decision. Under other circumstances it would be possible to expect a considerable amount of opposition on this, as well as on more basic and fundamental policy questions. Whether the differences which do exist within SDA will now find expression at the convention, however, is difficult to predict. It is, however, possible to discuss the nature of these differences and their significance from a socialist standpoint.

Perhaps one of the outstanding features of the coming convention will be its demonstration of the decline of organized liberalism on the campus. In terms of membership alone, the convention is expected to represent less than a thousand SDA members, of whom even fewer may be considered as active.

It is true that SDA includes among its members a large number of cal, and even national, student leaders. On the one hand this would tend to signify that its influence extends beyond its numbers, but on the other hand it emphasizes the fact that even with prominent campus spokesmen it is unable to build chapters with large and active memberships. Rather than indicating its popular support, this fact tends to confirm reports that SDA is frequently a small, tightly-knit electoral machine or power caucus for student government elections.

Parallel with its dwindling size is the fact of SDA's frequent failure to take an active part in those very activities which should be a vital part of its existence. Aside from its abortive campaign against "Mc-Carthyism" last term little has been heard of SDA during the last two years on such issues as academic freedom, civil liberties, etc. Naturally, there have been exceptions to this, notably in the case of Brooklyn College (where SDA led the fight against the suspension of Vanguard) and the University of California, where before its virtual demise SDA took a leading part in the fight against the loyalty oath.

Basic Ambivalence

Yet the important fact to note is that compared with the total number of students in more or less general agreement with its program, SDA remains small and uninfluential. What is the reason for this?

The weakness of SDA cannot be attributed solely to the same political conditions which have reduced student socialist movements. For unlike (say) the Socialist Youth League, which must operate in a general atmosphere of isolation and hostility, SDA can find a considerable amount of broad sympathy for its general aims. If, as Time magazine reports, the average student holds as a political philosophy some kind of "pale and lifeless liberalism," that more or less fits the description of the current platform of SDA. Indeed, this is precisely where its fault lies.

The campus liberal, to the extent that he actually considers current problems, tends to face these with somewhat of "a mind divided." This is only another way of saying that his political ideas tend to be ambiguous and self-contradictory. SDA shares his basic ambivalence to such an extent that it cripples its own ability for vigorous and militant action.

Primarily the contradiction of SDA is the conflict between its ad-

herence to support of the Fair Deal, or more specifically, the foreign policy of the Fair Deal and the anti-democratic policies which the Fai Deal administration practises. Insofar as liberalism has ever meant any particular set of ideas it has been associated with the defense of democratic rights at home and the support of the democratic aspirations of foreign nations. Today, however, liberals have adopted as their basic policy the support of democratic American capitalism against Stalinist fotalitarianism, subordinated to all other considerations. They have come to judge any question of foreign policy in terms not of democratic context, but on the basis of whether it is necessary for the defeat of Stalinism by the United States.

Page Five

Now Independent Socialists are also in favor of struggling for the defeat of Stalinism, but they see in the capitalist character of American society an insuperable barrier to such a struggle on a progressive basis. They see in the inability of the United States to win allies among the working classes and backward nations of the world a iving demonstration of the barrier which capitalism erects against genuine democratic forces. The validity of such a viewpoint aside for the moment, it does permit the socialist to criticize U.S. foreign policy from a democratic standpoint.

In contrast, an organization like SDA, representing liberals who support the general aims of American foreign policy as it is now applied, tends to defend all of the particular means which are employed, however illiberal and undemocratic they become. Thus, in every conflict between the interests of American imperialism and the anti-imperialist countries of Asia and the Middle East, liberals tend to criticize or belittle the anti-imperialist forces while supporting the United States. Unfortunately, it has been apparent for some timenow that American policy has served mainly to alienate peoples engaged in struggles on their own behalf, while unsuccessful in building strong points of support in the form of reliable military allies.

Driven to the Right

On the home scene, SDA liberals are faced with an even worse dilemma with regard to a problem like civil liberties. In the first placethey are confronted with an administration which they support, and which they help to elect at periodic intervals, leading the assault against civil liberties in America. In the face of government-initiated oyalty oaths, security checks and trials for political opinions, all of which run directly counter to the most basic of all liberal principles, liberals are pushed to resort to various subterfuge as a bridge for capitulation to the witchhunt. They have tried to foist onto a secondary figure in the minority party (McCarthy) the responsibility for the witchhunt atmosphere which the government originally stimulated. In the long run, however, this has proved to be impossible; support of the party in power led to support of its policies—and to one degree or another, nost liberals today go along with the various procedures of the government's persecution of "subversives."

Thus in both foreign and domestic policy the effects of the cold war have been to drive SDA to the right. In place of being able to vigorously espouse a program of civil liberties and support of the democratic struggles of colonial peoples, SDA now limits itself to attacking McCarthyism and proposing expanded Point Four programs.

SDA's contradiction is most sharply symbolized by the projected support of the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket: for in addition to the general endorsement of Democratic Party policies which such support signifies the addition of the anti-civil-rights figure Sparkman means a retreat on the one remaining issue on which ADAers boasted about having a "principled" position. Since the convention, ADA's efforts have been to play down Sparkman's record on civil rights, while proclaiming its own influence in the framing of the party platform.

Among those who oppose SDA's drift to the right are many who have come to realize the inadequacies of a simple liberalism in a period of cold-war economy. These elements have come to recognize the necessity for a political realignment which will bring the forces of the labor movement into a leading position. They agree on the necessity of building a labor party as the alternative to supporting the Fair Deal-Dixiecrat machines.

Yet they continue to argue that SDA represents the instrument for working toward this end. Unfortunately it has always proved difficult to argue the necessity of a new party while still supporting an old one. In actuality a far more effective job of education for a labor party among students is being done by student socialists today despite their smaller numbers. It is to be hoped that they will soon be joined in this far more fruitful work by those who today remain within the confines of SDA's program.

J. EDGAR DEMANDS FREE SPEECH

"J. Edgar Hoover was forgetting the cares of the Federal Bureau of Investigation watching the ponies run. With him was his assistant, / Clyde Tolson. They were betting on the entry of Blue Reading, Stormy Cloud and Stranglehold in the San Diego Handicap, but when Moonrush came in Hoover never batted an eye. He sure has a poker face.

"He is getting his annual checkup at the La Jolla Clinic as he does every summer. In commenting on the long trial here of the recently convicted Communists, he said he was surprised their attorneys kicked up such a ruckus about the releasing of his report during the trial.

"'They make an issue of free speech for themselves but they don't want me to have free speech,' he said."

-Florabel Muir's column in the Los Angeles Mirror, Aug. 18.



New Rules for Russia's Ruling Class:

By HAL DRAPER

Together with the announcement last Wednesday by Pravda that the 19th party congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union would convene in October, after a lapse of 13 years, one political document to be adopted by the congress was published. As stated elsewhere in this issue, it is doubtless of secondary importance, but deserves scrutiny from one point of view. This is a set of new party statutes to supplant the ones which have been in force since March 1939 when the 18th party congress met.

The text of the new statutes, which was published in full in the N.Y. Times for August 21 (though with some obvious poor translations and many typographical errors) doesn't mean very much until it is set side by side with the 1939 text and the changes noted.

Let it be said right away that the differences are not startling. There was no reason to expect they would be. The new Stalinist structure of the party was adequately established, from the point of view of the new bureaucracy, as far back as 1927, at the culmination of the struggle against the Left Opposition led by Trotsky. That struggle indeed, was Stalin's struggle to crush and destroy the Bolshevik party and his victory was formalized most extensively precisely through the new structure for the new party apparatus which he had built.

As was true then, and as was true again in 1939, the rewriting of the statutes did not signify so much that changes were going to takeplace as it was a codification of new practices and procedures which had already been found useful and were already in force de-facto. The new 1952 statutes are also a matter of catching up and codifying.

The first thing to be understood is that we are not dealing here with a document which can be primarily viewed on the same plane as the constitution or by-laws of any other organization. What we are examining is the internal mechanism for the operation and interrelations of the new ruling class of Russia, the totalitarian bureaucracy.

The Inherent Contradiction

This is a subject which is one of the darkest in a dark land. Here is a key to it:

It is only from the outside that the main internal problem of the top bureaucracy is thought to be how to suppress democracy and opposition. That is not the problem of the new statutes at all. The basic problem of the bureaucracy is how to function, at all, as a class without any genuine democratic institutions whatsoever.

Some people, including pro-democrats, may sigh in an off-moment for the complete "efficiency" which is supposed to result from the totalitarian concentration of power. It is an illusion which the Stalinist bureaucracy does not labor under. A complex modern industrial society cannot be directed, planned and run efficiently completely from the top down. There must be ways by which thousands of mistakes and abuses hurtful to the regime itself can be corrected from below. And yet there can be no freedom for correction from below. It must be done, and in the last analysis it cannot be d a central contradiction of the Stalinist social system. It would be a basic contribution to the analysis of that social system to examine the various ways in which the regime has tried and still tries to overcome this contradiction, to gain the positive and indispensable results of democratic give-and-take without any concessions in the absolute authority of the tops.

The democracy that is here involved is not necessarily even democracy for the masses. It is, in the very first place, democratic leeway for the ranks of the bureaucracy itself.

There have been other authoritarian societies in which there have been no democratic institutions for the masses of people; but a close examination of these societies (absolute monarchies, military dictatorships, etc.) will show that there have been provisions and channels whereby at least the ruling class itself can exercise guiding and restraining influence on the heads of their own state. The ancient Athenian city-state was even formally organized as a democracy for the ruling class only, even though the mass of workers (the slaves) had no human rights at all. The councils of state of the absolute monarchies of the later feudal period were likewise channels of expression for the ruling nobility vis-à-vis the monarch.

But one thing that characterizes, even defines, modern totalitarianism is the complete destruction not only of the independent organizations of the people but, progressively and by compelling logic, of every other possible rallying point for political opposition to the summit of the state.

And yet the uncontrolled and uncontrollable bureaucratic apex realizes that, even though its exercise of

power must go from the top down, there must also be a reverse current to tell it where it is going wrong, what is happening, to check on results objectively, to correct abuses by lower and lower echelons of the bureaucracy, etc.

This is the main angle from which we must understand what they are trying to do with the party statutes. What we have stated is the big problem, and it is no doubt true that the party statutes are only one (and not the most important) field on which the big contradiction is faced. But it is at any rate the basic legal document governing the internal relations of the new ruling class of Russia.

Introducing the Ruling Class

The very first change in the statutes, in fact, is to formally introduce that ruling class by name.

The name is a pseudonym, a "party name": Paragraph 1: "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is . . . formed of people of the working class, the toiling peasantry, and the toiling intelligentsia."

Even the 1939 statutes still hung on to the following class definition of the CP: "the organized vanguard of the working class of the USSR." To be sure, it elsewhere referred to the trinity which we have quoted, but not yet in defining the nature of the party itself.

Thus, for the first time the CPSU ceases to define itself even formally as a working-class party. The real ruling class is presented under the sobriquet of "intelligentsia," i.e., the bureaucrats.

That it is the bureaucracy which is being baptised the "intelligentsia" was made perfectly clear, it must be admitted, at the 1939 congress. (It is not a change we are discussing but the retarded codification of a change.) At that congress Zhdanov made the report on the new statutes and the resolution adopted sanctified it. The latter document said:

"The Soviet intelligentsia consists of yesterday's workers and peasants, and sons of workers and peasants. WHO HAVE BEEN PROMOTED TO COMMANDING POSTS. The Soviet intelligentsia . . . is an equal member of socialist society."

In fact, to paraphrase Orwell's classic, it is "more equal" than any other.

It was at this 1939 congress that the four social categories set up for regulating admission of candidates into the party were abolished. The bureaucracy was freed from the disadvantages of "bad" social origin.

The new statutes introduce a howling contradiction into the document exactly with reference to this question of classes in Russia. Paragr. 2 declares eligible for party membership "any worker who is a Soviet citizen not exploiting anyone else's labor . . ." This exclusion of "exploiters" is new. Now compare it with the declaration flatly made by the 1939 resolution on the statutes:

"All exploiting elements-capitalists, merchants, kulaks and profiteers-have been eliminated," it proclaimed then.

Who then are these people who, for the first time, are declared ineligible? In a society which claims to have eliminated "all exploiting elements," isn't it an oversight to introduce a new provision in the statutes making these non-existent elements ineligible for the ruling party? There

is clearly some Titoist-Trotskyite-fascist-wrecker, at work

LABOR ACTION

. The same 1939 resolution also declared, after heralding the emergence of the "Soviet intelligentsia" as an equal "member" (class) in society, that "Thus the class boundaries dividing the working people of the USSR are being obliterated: the economic and political contradictions between workers, peasants and intellectuals are disappearing-becoming obliterated."

And therefore, since these distinctions were already "disappearing" in 1939, the new statutes of 1952 go out of their way to introduce these same class distinctins into the primary class definition of the party!

Paragraph 1 is the formal coronation of the new ruling class in power-quite delayed.

From the Top Down

As we have pointed out, the detailed provisions of the statutes are not mere meaningless obeisances to formality. Louis Fischer's new book The Life and Death of Stalin says that "Stalin is the only free man in Russia." That was the level of thinking by this hack when he was, a stooge for the Kremlin and it remains his level now that he has transferred his literary services. As we have pointed out, Stalin is the supreme arbiter of a ruling class, which, precisely because it is an entrenched bureaucracy, is forced continually to try to fight against the inevitable consequences of bureaucracy. Now note: its only way of fighting against bureaucratic "excesses" and abuses below-is by bureaucratic methods from on top.

Thus the new statutes show an interesting movement in two contrary directions. See how it is reflected in the statutory provisions for the frequency of meeting for leading bodies. The more often a body meets, the better it can act as a check. Therefore:

On top-

(a) We have seen that even the formal requirement for the convocation of party congresses is made less frequent, from every three to every four years. Its job is to check on the very top leadership.

(b) The Central Committee, which was required to meet once every four months, is now required to meet only every six months. The Central Committee's job is to check on the very top leadership (now combined in the Presidium). It is to meet less frequently.

(c) There was another body which existed in the 1939 statutes whose job was to check on the very top leadership. This was the provision for the calling of a party conference (as distinct from a congress) every year between congresses. Its very assemblage, of course, would be a check on the tops, but in addition it was given an extraordinary power: to replace up to one-fifth of the Central Committee with new members. This was its only power, in fact, which was not subject to reversal by the Central Committee. This body is abolished root and branch from the new statutes. (Naturally, we knew these party conferences did not meet anyway. That's not the present point.)

This is the tendency of the changes in the new statutes as far as concerns channels for checking the SUMMIT of the bureaucracy. But below-

of them

bodies.

Going still lower in the hierarchy, there are the area (okrug) CPs. The present statutes make no requirement for frequency of meeting of the leading committee. The new statutes require meetings at least once in 11/2 months. Go still lower, to the city and district (rayon) CPs: the present statutes require that the leading committee meet every six weeks; the new statutes lower this to "not less than once a month."

The changes in this respect are uniform and consistent throughout the new document. In the case of EVERY body which was supposed to check on the top bureaucrats, the structure is loosened or eliminated. In the case of EVERY body which checks on the organs below the top, the requirements are tightened up, in order to check the evils of bureaucratic irresponsibility. Thus bureaucracy reproduces its contradictions in the very act of fighting them.

Vain Hope

(a) There is an interesting change in Par. 58. This deals with the right of the party fraction in an enterprise "to control the activities of the administration of the enterprise." (The word control in this usage, by the way, means supervise and check on; it does not necessarily mean decisive control.) How does this apply to the party fraction in a government ministry? Here, in both the old and new statutes, the party fraction does not have the right of control, but must "notify shortcomings in work of the establishment, report the deficiencies in the work of the ministry and its individual workers. . . ."

And the new statutes add: "and of the directors of the ministries.

We will see this theme also in another added section. Outside of the promulgators of the statutes themselves, cutside of the tops, no one is too big to be reported on from below—so say the statutes. It is a vain (but sincere!) hope. The way it actually works can be traced in the Russian press from time to time. Every now and then a to-do is made (for example, by Pravda) of a guilty high local functionary who is "exposed" by a "workers' correspondent." The ones who don't make the grade are not heard of in Pravda.

(b) Another addition. to Par. 35, extends the powers of the Central Control Commission. According to the 1939 rules, each of the lower echelons sets up its own local Control Commission. The central body now takes over completely. Now the Central Control Commission "has cits representatives, independent of local party bodies, in the regions and territories." And all "appeals and decisions of the Central Committees of Communist Parties of union republics, regions and territories concerning

expulsions from the party and party censures" are passed on by the top Control Commission directly. Thus all Control Commission work (a terrain inter-

mediate between regular party supervision and that of the secret police) is centralized at the top.

d'

In addition, quite a large proportion of the new language added to the statutes comes under this head, but it is purely hortatory. The exhortations point to what the it to add peculiar little essays in the midst of formal statutory language. It is like a heart-felt plea breaking out in the midst of a legal document.

This sticks out most obviously in a long passage added to Par. 3 on the duties of party members. Do not read it cynically. They mean every word of it-in their sense!

"(f) To observe party and state discipline, equally obligatory for all members of the party. [This much was enough for the old statutes; here the addition begins.] There can be no two disciplines in the party-one for the leaders and another for the workers. The party has only one discipline, one law for all Communists, irrespective of merit or office. Violation of party and state discipline is a great evil damaging the party and therefore incompatible with the state of membership.

"(g) To develop self-criticism and criticism from below, expose shortcomings in work and work for their elimination, fight against a parading of well-being and the flush of success. Suppression of criticism is a great evil. He who silences criticism, parades his work, and indulges in eulogy cannot remain in the ranks of the party:

"(h) To report to leading party bodies, up to the Central Committee of the party, shortcomings in work, irrespective of the persons involved. A party member has no right to conceal an unsatisfactory state of affairs, or by-pass wrong-doings, thus damaging the interests of the party and state. He who interferes with a party member



The Changes in the CPSU Statutes

There are more provisions than we can quote which Fare changed to provide for more effective channels to check the lower echelons of the bureaucracy, in particular_through more frequent meetings of supervisory

Take the provisions for the leading committees of the subdivisions of the all-Union party, the CP organizations of the constituent republics, regions (oblast), and territories (krai). The present statutes require that these committees hold plenary meetings every three months. The new statutes say every two months, for all

But these provisions on frequency of meeting for lower bodies are not the only changes in the statutes designed to further elimination of bureaucratic abuses. There are two others which point in the same direction.

Honesty by Decree

carrying out such duties must be severely punished as violating the will of the party.

"(i) To be truthful and honest before the party and never admit any concealment or distortion of truth. Untruthfulness of a Communist toward the party and deceit of the party are severe misdeeds incompatible with the state of party membership.

"(j) To keep party and state secrets and to display political vigilance, keping in mind that the vigilance of Communists is paramount in every section and in all circumstances. Giving away of party or state secrets is a crime before the party and incompatible with party membership. [I admit that I don't get the point of this whole paragraph. It is rather peculiar to make a special point of the admissibility of revealing state secrets for party members when the act itself is one of high treason to the state. One is entitled to suspect that there is some problem behind this which is not spoken of .-- H. D.]

"(k) At any post entrusted by the party, to carry out without fail the party injunctions on a correct choice of cadres with regard to political and professional [occupational] qualifications. An infringement of these injunctions, that is, selection of workers on the basis of friendship, personal devotion, local ties, or relationship is incompatible with party membership."

There is the whole exhortation, and it is worth quoting because from it one can make up a list of some of the ineradicable bureaucratic evils which bedevil the operation of the system. In fact, it is this list. That is why i would be superficial merely to jibe at the glaring hypocrisy and two-facedness of the moral pleas for truth and honesty, etc., in the mouths of the despotic leaders of these slavedriving cutthroats. It has to be read as Newspeak, every word redefined in terms of the real and thoroughly sincere meaning which it bears in the context of the bureaucracy's social needs.

Byzantine Portrait

The authors of the statutes, the law-givers on high, genuinely wish and direly need that there be "one discipline, one law for all Communists; irrespective of merit or office." The unspoken qualification is: this applies to all, except to us who do the applying. As a matter of fact, this attitude and this need hold true for every bureaucrat at every level right down the ladder-one discipline and one law for all (who are below us).

Stalinist "self-criticism and criticism from below" is not a demagogic phrase, as some seem to think who merely sneer at these apparently democratic words in the mouths of the Stalinists. It only has to be interpreted with a slight reservation, as Newspeak, and again it becomes a genuine and fervent wish and need of the bureaucracy. It means that every bureaucrat, from his own, height on the ladder, looks down below and decrees that all below him shall revel in self-criticism and encourage criticism from below. It is necessary to keep his subordinates up to the mark. Woe to anyone who tries it out on him, of course!

Since the same is true all up and down the ladder, the resulting picture of the Stalinist bureaucrátic system is one that is a little alien to Western eyes, which are accustomed only to the equally fantastic, and even sometimes equally Byzantine, contradictions of inter-capitalist rela-

The reader has already no doubt noted the emphasis on reporting "shortcomings in work," wrong-doings, etc., on nepotism and favoritism, promotion by clique ties, etc. The cry is: Do not conceal these things; we have to know in order to straighten out the messes! Do not cover up! Tell the truth !- Yes, the injunctions for "truth" and "honesty" are also sincere, within the whole framework. The framework is, however, not that of a frame of mind, or "corruption" in the bourgeois sense; the Framework is that of a type of bureaucratic exploitive system different from the one we know as capitalism.

We add, parenthetically and for its symbolic value, that though the new statutes greatly expand the section on the duties of party members, the next paragraph (4) on the rights of party members remains at the same terse sentences. That hasn't grown any!

We can further show the consuming concern of the bureaucracy with this question by noting that wherever the statutes come to the question of the duties of the lower committees, the corresponding paragraphs are disproportionately expanded with the same kind of hortatory language. Like a ritual the same phrases are repeated. There is Par. 43 on the duties of the leading committee of the republic, oblast and krai: "developing criticism and self-criticism . . . irreconcilable attitude toward shortcomings . . .," etc. It comes again in Par. 48 on the okrug committee: again in Par. 51 on the town and rayon committee; again in Par. 57 (g) on the primary party unit; again in Par. 63 on the Komsoniol (Young Communist League).

This type of change and addition is by far the biggest single change in the language of the statutes, with the possible exception of the change involving the new Presidium. .

Presidium and Penalties

a Parks set a set of a

According to Par. 34, the present Political Bureau and Organization Bureau, which have been formally subcommittees of the Central Committee but actually the day-to-day centers of real power, are merged into one under the name of the Presidium. Journalistically speaking, this "abolition of the Politburo" has made the greatest impression on the press, perhaps because columnists will no longer be able to denounce the Polithuro and will have to accustom readers to language about the Presidium (which somehow doesn't sound so sinister, perhaps because it is new).

In any case, it is harder to see what this might mean outside of a technical change. It may well be that the division of labor between the two bodies is obsolete from the point of view of simple functioning. Another speculation, however, can be justified: The existence of two toprung centers of power is a division of the power which can be dangerous to a totalitarian leadership. The leader of the Politburo must also, it goes without saying, hold the reins on the other horse, lest they start in different directions. But why ride two horses? At this point, to continue the metaphor, one has to combine horses; it is easier to combine committees.

This is especially a consideration for a new constellation of powers at the top, not yet completely entrenched

There are a few other miscellaneous points to be covered. The 1939 statutes had more than one passage with dire threats against factionalism and any infraction of its monolithic "unity." There were especially three whole paragraphs (72-74) constituting Section XII of the 1939 statutes under the title of "Penalties for Violation of Party Discipline," which implemented the monolithic principles enunciated in Par. 1 of the same statutes. Both no longer appear, along with some other odds and ends of references to factionalism, expulsions, etc.

The reason is quite clear. These are no longer party matters (not for a long time), and their retention in the party statutes would be really meaningless. It is not the party organizations nor its Control Commissions which are concerned with such crimes; it is the MVD-GPU.

In this regard there is a symbolic difference between one provision in the 1939 rules and another in the new document. Par. 73 of 1939 listed various disciplinary penalties, from various kinds of censure up to expulsion, and then added the ultimate penalty: "expulsion from the party with notification of the offense to the administrative . and judicial authorities."

Compare this with a new provision in the 1952 version, constituting Par. 13: "In cases where a party member has committed an offense punishable by the courts, he is expelled from the party on receipt of the reports on his misdeeds from the administrative or udicial authorities."

The "notification," you see, now goes just the other way: not from the party to the GPU but from the GPU to the party. In any case, the new Par. 13 is quite sufficient to replace the party procedures thrown out of the old document.

The "Happy Life"

Finally, a sidelight on one aspect of the economic status of the new ruling class is provided by the last paragraph prescribing the level of dues. Here are the old and new dues schedules, the salary figures referring to monthly paychecks:

OLD DUES SCHEDULE (1939)

Up to 100 rubles	
rul-100 rubles	60 koneke
151-200 rubles	1 00 mbles
201-250 rubles	1.50 shubles
251-300 rubles	2 00 rubles
501-500 rubles	2% of earning
Over 500 rubles	

New DUES SCHEDULE (Dues given in percent of commings)

todes given in percent of	earnings /
Below 500 rubles	1/0 0/0
500-1000 rubles	1 64
1000-1500 rubles	11/-0/
1500-2000 rubles	2 0
Over 2000 rubles	3 0/2

There has obviously been an increase in the standard of living for some people! The new dues schedule begins at the level where the old dues schedule ended.

Stalinist dupes, no doubt, can tell themselves that this reflects the happy and prosperous life which the Russian peoples now live, even before achieving "complete communism" under the benevolent rule of that Genial Leader and Coryphee of the People . . . Malenkov. But this is not a dues system to be paid by the masses; t is a dues system set up for the pockets of the selfcrowned ruling class of Stalinist society, the "intelligentsia" which (as Zhdanov put it) holds the "commanding posts," the ruling bureaucracy of a bureaucraticollectivist system.

As this issue is being made up, the press reports (Aug. 27) that official "discussion" articles on the statutes in Pravda emphasize the injunctions in the new sections that encourage "truthful" reports from below on "shortcomings" in the work of all functionaries, including superiors, against nepotism, etc., as discussed in this article. The disease they are trying to combat is endemic to the regime, and in any case to meet bureaucratic abuses by bureaucratic decrees is to put Typhoid Mary in charge of a health campaign-H. D.



September 1, 1952

The Russian Party Congress — —

(Continued from page 1)

standards of the people, is, however, not very

(2) The naming of Georgi M. Malenkov as the main reporter at the forthcoming congress,

(3) The fact that a congress is being held at

That last point is more suggestive than it may seem. As in the case of virtually everything else this article discusses, only informed speculations (educated guesses) are possible, but it may be pertinent to ask why the congress-has been

The New York Times calls attention to the "timing" as being "two days after the arrival in Moscow of a mission of Chinese officials for the first high-level Sino-Russian talks since Mao Tse-tung's visit to Moscow in 1950." It is cautious enough to venture no reason why this timing has any significance, from the point of view of motivating the convocation of a party congress, and it is indeed hard to see what the connection would be. There probably isn't any. For one thing, the decision to call this congress, whenever it was made, was undoubtedly the outcome of a whole preceding series of developments within the Russian ruling structure, and to link the decision with conjunctural events is super-

For a similar reason, it is not likely that the congress has been called merely to act as sounding board for some new drive or slogan which the Kremlin wishes to launch, as has also been

Let us review the formalities, first. In the revolutionary period, party congresses convened yearly. The statute adopted in 1927 at the 15th party congress, which saw the consolidation of Stalin's power in the party, provided for holding a party congress not less than every two years. In March 1939, at the 18th party congress, the present statutes were adopted and these called for a congress every three years. (Note in passing that in the 12-year period after the twoyear provision was adopted only two party congresses met!) We may add at this point that in the proposed statutes to be adopted in October, the period for party

Thus there has been a steady arithmetical progression -one, two, three, four—even as far as the formal re-

Schedule for SYL Institute

Following is the time schedule for the three days of the Socialist Youth League's National Educational Institute, classes and other events. All will take place at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, New York, with the exception of the Saturday evening affair (place to be announced). Note that the time schedule for Friday is different from that for Thursday and Saturday. The three classes are: The Marxian Theory of the

State (Max Shachtman); The Structure of American Capitalism (Albert Gates); and What Was Bolshevism? A Critical Survey (Hal Draper).

THURSDAY, Sept. 4

Shachtman-I (The Capitalist State and Its Transformations).

Gates-I (The Expansion of American Capitalism).

Draper-I (Bolshevism as a Russian tendency).

Open House at Labor Action Hall.

FRIDAY, Sept. 5

Shachtman-II (Marxian theory of the state and the socialist program). Gates-II (Economic crisis and inter-

national conflict). Draper-II (Bolshevism as an international tendency).

(Note: New York SYL unit will not meet this evening.)

SATURDAY, Sept. 6

Shachtman-III (Marxian Theory of the State Reconsidered).

Gates-III (War and the Permanent War Economy).

Draper-III (Bolshevism and Stalinism). Final Reunion and Chinese Banquet. (Place to be announced.)

quirement is concerned, but even this has not kept pace with the reality, which has been the atrophy of the party congress as an institution. This part of it is no mystery: since the real power resides at the apex of the bureaucratic structure, with no control over it from the ranks below whatsoever, the existence of the party congress becomes meaningless, for the bureaucratic rulers as well as for the ranks.

The party congress is meaningless and functionless as an institution of control over the bureaucracy. Its remaining role-and one that accounts for the decreasing frequency that this role has had to be played-is something else.

It comes into play only after serious conflict within the top bureaucracy, when the Politburo no longer functions as a monolithic and essentially united bloc. Not to settle that conflict, but to register its outcome, after the event.

Rallying the Apparatus

For the monolithic state also has its group and clique struggles. These take place not in the party as a wholethat is a capital offense—and still less in the society as a whole, but, by the nature of this totalitarianism, are confined to and centered in the top circles. The tug-of-war of the bureaucratic groups and cliques has its own forms, its own weapons, but it is there. We suggest that the convocation of this party congress signifies that the victorious clique is now calling on the party apparatus to rally around it.

Such a role for the Stalinist-type party congress we saw also, with much less clouded view, in Tito-Yugoslavia when the Tito leadership called its first party congresss in 20 years only as a result of the fact that the bureaucracy had been shaken by the crisis brought on by the Cominform assault. For it too, the convocation of the congress was not to provide an opportunity for the ranks to assess policies but to rally the apparatus, to confirm the adherence of the party machinery.

Naturally, in the case of the Russian Politburo, there is no such threat facing it, nor is it a question of the bureaucracy as a whole being shaken, as it was in Yugoslavia. It is here a question of one section of the bureaucracy which now steps forward to claim the whole

If the congress could not be called sooner, it is because the clique struggle had not been settled. For six years following the last Russian party congress, the war was on, and party congresses were out of the question for the Kremlin. (Lenin's Bolshevik party held, congresses even in the midst of civil war, attacked by interventionist troops from all sides, but we are speaking of a different political species here.) With the end of the war, a whole new world perspective and new possibilities and problems opened up for the rulers. Differences, disputes, opposing orientations and tendencies (even though all within the framework of the Stalinist system and its interests) cannot openly exist; yet they must be settled. It is an oversimplification to believe that Stalin settles, or can settle, deep-going pulls from powerful sections of the bureaucracy merely by a nod.

Power and Policy

This is to say, then, that the group conflicts which take place within the bureaucracy can by no means be viewed simply as maneuvers in a struggle for personal power by one leading claimant or another. We need not emphasize how much this is doubtlessly involved. But even conflicts over personal power, taking place at the leadership of a state, inevitably become fused with the equally real conflicts over problems of policy and orientation.

Thus, the last party congress in 1939 marked a big turn by the regime. It was at this congress, in March, that Stalin offered the olive branch to Hitler, an offer that the latter took up later in the year in the Nazi-Stalin pact. We would suggest that the congress was not used as "sounding board" for this new international crientation of the regime-as a matter of fact, it was not until months later that most people understood that the change had even taken place, so little of a "sounding board" was there involved-but that the decision was the result of a conflict, the results of which the congress was called to witness in terms of group power apparatus. It was then that Molotov's star rose in the ascendant.

The coming congress may also be used as the sounding board for a new turn in policy, but it is not being called as sounding board for a policy but to rally the apparatus behind the victors in a bureaucratic struggle, victors who may also stand for a new orientation or line.

There is another element involved in the internecine post-war struggles of the bureaucratic cliques, which may have played an even greater role than policy questions and which also involved other policy questions itself. It must not be forgotten in this connection that this bureaucracy which rules Russia has, since 1945, come into possession of a new empire, of new satellite lands-and therefore of overlordship with respect to new and subordinate bureaucratic apparatuses in those lands.

The Winner

With the expansion of the Stalinist empire, the arena on which rival bureaucratic factions had to maneuver became not only the machinery of the CPSU itself, though that is still primary, but also the gauleiter CPs of the satellites. In the dog-eat-dog struggle for power, prestige and position that goes on at the top of the Stalinist apparatus, the new subfuehrers in Eastern Europe had to choose up sides.

Here we have a sidelight also on one factor in the purges that have gone on continually in Eastern Europe. Is Zapotocky of Czechoslovakia a "Malenkov man"? Was Slansky, who tumbled into the abyss, a "Beria man"-?

Was Ana Pauker of Rumania a protégé of Molotov? The specific connections for these individuals may be otherwise; that is not the point. The victorious clique in the leadership of the CPSU also had to consolidate its posttion in the satellite Stalinist machines, get their men into the driver's seat, rally the apparatus there.

The victor, of course, would appear to be Malenkov. There is a reservation to be made but it is not that which has been brought forward, for example, by the New York Times experts.

The latter duly noted that the selection of Malenkov as congress reporter put him in the forefront, but they noted in qualification there have also been contrary indications recently: a photo in Pravda last July showed Beria closest to Stalin: the list of Politburo members present led off with Molotov's name, etc., etc. This is relatively small potatoes. Compared with the choice of Malenkov as main reporter to the party congress, the significance of such evidence is so far behind it as to be out of sight. As a matter of fact, the approach which these experts are using is of much value only when a name disappears entirely from the scene.

Question Mark over Beria

The reservation which is to be made concerns, I think, primarily Beria, the head of the secret-police apparatus (GPU-NKVD-MVD). Assuming for a moment that it s he who is the strongest power among the aspirants to the mantle, as some have conjectured, it is very very doubtful that in any case he would put himself forward for the official spot which Malenkov now occupies. Beria like all those who have preceded him in his post, is the public bloodhound of the regime. It should not be supposed that this means he is especially hated only by the mass of the people; he is the bloodhound not only for the masses but also for the ranks of the apparatus all the way down the hierarchy.

And even as far as the masses are concerned, Stalin, as No. 1 man, has always sought to foster the illusion that he is not directly responsible for the horrors perpetrated in his name; it is useful for the No. 1 man to appear to be above the immediate execution of his policies in blood, so that he can always step forward as the deus ex machina to relieve the pressure here or there, when the "excesses" become too dangerous. Beria, as heir to Stalin's mantle, could not easily assume this air.

The naming of Malenkov, then, does not entirely exclude the possibility that behind him is Beria-the same reasoning does not apply in the case of Molotov-and there is equally the possibility of a Malenkov-Beria partnership. This will be subject to check when the congress meets, unlike other aspects of these speculations.

But even with such reservations, the emergence of Malenkov as top dog is certainly the outcome which fits in most neatly with the view of the nature of the Stalinist bureaucracy which we have held. For behind the Politburg, and all cliques and groups within it, is not merely a mass of featureless robots jumping to its orders but a classa class which holds the power in the Stalinist social system in a real sense. This class is the extensive bureaucracy.

This is not the place to discuss the relations between such a ruling class in a totalitarian system and the seemingly all-powerful prerogatives of the small group of men at the top, that is, to discuss how the class as such limits and conditions the will of the top dictators; but this much has been clear to us: this class is based on its possession of the political power in the broadest sense of the term-not merely on its control of the armed forces, which it constantly seeks to subordinate to its political power; not merely on its control of the secret police, in whose case it also always has the problem of subordinating it to its political power. It is a vulgarized interpretation of the Stalinist system which looks on the GPU as the "real ruler" of Russia.

Malenkov's Lever

And the political power of the bureaucracy as a whole is wielded through the fusion of the Stalinist party with every organ, organization, nook, cranny and thread of the state and all state institutions. The executive committee of the ruling bureaucratic class is the party. The central lever of power is not in the army, not in the PU, not in the managarial staffs of the lies at the apex of the party apparatus.

It is this lever that Malenkov has possessed, as general secretary and Orgburo head, for several years under Stalin. It should be understood not merely as a tactical advantage nor as an "organizational" question, but in social terms.

In any case, all of the above still leaves unanswered, as it must, the \$64 question: What does the "Malenkov group" want? Which way do they want to go? What trends, what line, what tactic for Russian policy is it associated with, if any?

Was there a conflict of "hards" and "softs" within the Russian bureaucracy with respect to policy toward Titoism, and where did Malenkov stand? Is he oriented toward beating the Chinese Stalinists under Mao Tse-tung into complete subordination to Moscow, or toward forming a co-partnership with this other colossus of the Stalinist world? Is he oriented toward toughening or temporarily softening the cold war with the West, in the present period? As a man who grew to maturity with the development of the Stalinist totalitarianism, whose adult life never knew the revolutionary past of the country, will his ascendancy speedup the process whereby, albeit gradually, the regime has one by one dropped its pretenses of conforming even in formality with the tradition of revolutionary Russia?

This is where even speculation founders. The answers are not likely to be seen, or seen entirely, even at the congress (or rather, in the congress material which is released) which will only inaugurate the new period, at the most