

political affairs

NOVEMBER 1957 • 35 CENTS



Oct.
CHARLOTTE SAXE

[10]

The Youth Festival
in Moscow

JOHN and S. KAHENITZER

[28]

New Forms of Industrial
Management in the USSR

SOVIET ECONOMISTS

[40]

A Discussion of the
"Political Economy
Textbook"

[46]

Hungarian Intellectuals
on the UN Report

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[49]

People's Capitalism—
and Djilas

[60]

Letters from Readers

SPUTNIK, THE USA AND THE USSR
by Eugene Dennis

[1-9]

THE EDITOR

[14]

"Ideas in Our Time"

*A brilliant pioneering novel
in the field of science-fiction—*

The gates of ivory, The gates of horn

by THOMAS McGRATH

IN HIS KEENLY PERCEPTIVE foreword to Tom McGrath's new science-fiction thriller, *The gates of ivory, The gates of horn*, off the press this month, Charles Humboldt writes: "You must look carefully at what first appears to be the familiar furniture of 'new world' fantasy. . . . It is apparent that McGrath's devices are not imagined delights or desolation to come. They are metaphors in a critique of our society. . . . More important, however, than McGrath's moral criticism are his perceptions of the self-destructive character of contemporary society. His story is a brake on those naive enthusiasts of capitalism to whom every advance in productivity is an unmixed blessing and who see the system as within arm's reach of unravelling its hitherto unsolved contradictions. . . . McGrath's story is a true prophecy. It is not an assurance of what will happen, but a warning of what may, unless . . . The answer is in our hands only."

Read this fascinating story set in a hypothetical push-button society of the future, completely automatized and fascisized, and what happens when seemingly dehumanized and robotized men find forms in which to unleash struggle for a return to human values.

Popular \$1.00; *cloth* \$2.25

At Most Bookstores

MAINSTREAM PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

Vol. XX

A

By EU

EVERY
people

The

popul

conver

and m

organiz

entific

Amer

all wa

satelli

for the

ments

The

storm

of cza

ism. I

society

ing c

guard

based

pressic

cial o

and v

ership

cial li

Eve

Social

* Thi

the Res

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

Sputnik, The USA and the USSR*

By **EUGENE DENNIS**

EVERYWHERE IN THE United States people are talking about Sputnik. The Soviet "moon" has fired the popular imagination. It dominates conversation in the shops, schools and neighborhoods, in the mass organizations, as well as in diverse scientific, religious, and business circles. Americans of all opinions and from all walks of life marvel at the earth satellite and exhibit a new respect for the USSR and its socialist achievements.

The great October Revolution stormed and conquered the ramparts of czarism, landlordism, and capitalism. It ushered in a new system of society—Socialism—led by the working class and its Communist vanguard. It created a new social order based upon ending exploitation, oppression, and war. It established social ownership, planned production, and working class power and leadership of the state, economy, and social life.

Ever since 1917 the first Land of Socialism has demonstrated, time and

again, the superiority of its social system. It embarked on a bold and successful program of socialist construction during the period of worldwide economic crisis in the 1930's when even the richest and oldest capitalist nations were ravaged by mass unemployment and industrial decline. Unlike nearly a score of capitalist nations that succumbed to the Nazi onslaught, the USSR survived the unprecedented tests of the anti-Axis war. It bore the brunt of the anti-fascist struggle and mounted a victorious counter-offensive, in cooperation with its allies. It emerged from the ordeals of this global conflict solidified and with renewed achievements and capacity for socialist growth and advance. It met the challenge of the so-called atomic age with flying colors in every sphere of scientific, industrial, cultural and social endeavor.

Today, forty years after the October Revolution, the greatest event in human history, the Soviet Union has succeeded, literally, in storming the heavens. Its historic launching of the first earth satellite on Octo-

* This article is also scheduled to appear in the *Rude Pravo* (Prague), Nov. 7, 1957.

ber 4, 1957, constitutes a long step toward surmounting cosmic space. It is an epic landmark in mankind's struggle to effect basic social progress and master nature.

As the *AFL-CIO News* noted, Sputnik opens "a breathtaking new era in the history of civilization." The Executive Committee of the Federation of American Scientists stated on October 9th:

. . . Scientists of all countries salute the scientific and technological achievement of the USSR in successfully launching a satellite into space. The world's imagination is stirred by the promise implicit in this historic event of new knowledge and exciting frontiers. . . .

Even that rabid opponent of labor and socialism, the *Chicago Tribune*, had to acknowledge that:

. . . The measuring and recording and reporting instruments carried in the Soviet satellite should increase man's knowledge of many things affecting the earth and its environment. Among these are ultra violet and cosmic rays, factors affecting changes in climate, density and composition of the outer atmosphere, cloud cover influencing weather, air drag, and the intense waves of solar radiation. . . . It is with justifiable pride that Russia can claim the Columbus of this expedition into space. . . .

* * *

It is widely recognized that Sputnik—unlike the atomic bomb which

was manufactured in the U.S.A. and first tested over Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the cost of hundreds of thousands of lives and with untold harmful effects on unborn generations to come—was designed for peaceful purposes, as part of the Soviets' contribution to the peaceful, scientific program of the International Geophysical Year.

At the same time many Americans have noted that the successful launching of the Soviet satellite confirms the fact that the USSR has mastered the technique and production of long-range, high-powered rockets, inclusive of Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles. As a consequence, certain American military experts point out that the nature and strategy of modern military science—including those concepts based on strategic airpower and a global network of military bases—is undergoing a transformation, and one in which the relationship of military, scientific and technological forces, as well as political relations, are changing further in favor of the anti-imperialist camp.

Regardless of how this viewpoint may be debated, increasing numbers of knowledgeable Americans admit that the Dulles-Wall Street-Pentagon "positions of strength" and "massive retaliation" policies with their aggressive NATO, SEATO, and METO military alliances, bases and war plans, have been dealt another **shattering blow**. Moreover, the advent of the Soviet earth satellite, as

wel
the
tou
re
ator
the
tary
the
wou
ator
nati
O
top
taris
clus
be a
a qu
sult
enti
and
So
crats
ing
and
—ha
noth
like
tions
total
peac
ism.
acted
inter
race.
turo
gress
beha
and
grav
press
per".

well as the ICBM, underscore that the U.S.A. has ceased to be an untouchable and impregnable fortress; and that in the event of an atomic holocaust, and irrespective of the inevitable ebb and flow of military-scientific development between the West and the East, the U.S.A. would be no less vulnerable to atomic annihilation than any other nation.

Of course, a number of America's top financiers, politicians, and militarists have come to different conclusions. They consider Sputnik to be a scientific and social "accident," a quirk of history; a momentary result of "totalitarian" advance in scientific research and experimentation and planned industrial production.

Some of these gentlemen—Democrats and Republicans alike, including most leaders of the Pentagon and the Eisenhower Administration,—have learned nothing and forget nothing. They pursue an ostrich-like policy in face of the new relationship of world forces which in its totality favors the cause of world peace, national freedom and socialism. And therefore they have reacted to Sputnik by calling for an intensification of the atomic arms race. They are pursuing an adventurous brink-of-war policy, and aggressive imperialist interference in behalf of the oil monopolies in Syria and the Middle East—a policy that gravely threatens world peace. They press for a "crash program" of "super"-nuclear weapons and interme-

diat and inter-continental ballistic missiles experiments and production. Other monopoly spokesmen, including some who share these military fixations but are less sanguine regarding Dulles brinkmanship, also emphasize the need of overhauling our nation's educational, research, and scientific systems which, admittedly, and even from the viewpoint of basic science and technology, now lag behind those of the socialist countries.

* * *

Many American scientists and educators differ concerning the unprecedented scope and rate of progress, as well as the inherent values of and potentiality of socialist scientific research, education, invention and industrial production. But many of them presently recognize that a decade of witch-hunting McCarthyism and Truman-Dulles cold war policies have severely disoriented and set back scientific inquiry and progress in the U.S.A.

Moreover, certain conservative Big Business circles, as well as millions of ordinary Americans, have come to the conclusion that the apparent military stalemate between the Great Powers, plus the fateful potential consequence of global atomic warfare, and America's national interests, now require a re-appraisal of U.S. foreign policy. They propose that serious and resolute efforts be undertaken to ensure a ban on nuclear weapons *and* the

ICBM, to promote universal disarmament and peaceful co-existence.

Illustrative of this trend is the initial position expressed on the launching of Sputnik by the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, an influential publication closely identified with financial interests supporting Harold Stassen:

. . . Greatest challenge of all in this new age, ushered in by a baby "moon," is the challenge to a new approach, in both West and East, to the problem of world peace. There is not much point in scientifically reaching for the moon if a race for more devastating missiles is to annihilate civilization down here. . . . The "beep-beep" of that Soviet satellite is being heard around the world. It will be folly indeed to pretend either that we in America do not hear it, or do not grasp its message.

There is also the viewpoint of Cyrus E. Eaton, an industrial tycoon who heads a two billion dollar iron and coal empire and is associated with George Humphrey, former Secretary of the Treasury in the Eisenhower Administration. Eaton, who represents those sections of Big Business who favor a military "positions of strength" policy coupled with negotiations for peaceful settlements, stresses that the U.S.A. should recognize the People's Republic of China, establish cordial relations with the USSR, and help effect a universal agreement prohibiting the testing and use of thermo-nuclear weapons.

Popular American public senti-

ment is growing in favor of a radical change in U.S. foreign policy, looking towards a new and friendly *modus vivendi* with the USSR. The concept of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Grand Design, the cornerstone of which was American-Soviet amity and peaceful cooperation—a concept which was "verboten" during the height of the cold war years—is being resurrected in diverse ways, by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and others.

A recent Gallup Poll indicates that over 61 per cent of all Americans favor a ban on nuclear weapons tests. Among the proponents of quarantining nuclear weapons are thousands of atomic scientists, outstanding churchmen, leading spokesmen of the Negro people, as well as various farm and labor leaders. Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers Union, Patrick Gorman of the AFL Meatcutters Union, James Carey of the CIO Electrical Workers Union, and Frank Rosenblum of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, are among the growing roster of trade union officials who, in one way or another, and regardless of their motivations, have reflected the sentiments of labor's rank and file for outlawing nuclear warfare and who on occasion proclaim that the alternative now facing the US. is "peaceful coexistence—or no existence."

Yet it must be admitted that many of the decisive mass organizations of labor—currently engaged in preparing for a new round of wage

stru
for
epic
lab
feet
are
effe
over
men
of la
—th
mos
influ
line.
Co
Am
flects
inclu
had
state
tober

Scien
that
"first
of nu
nenta
fully
appea
tests
long-r
ing a
Agen
Beacu
range
of ins
monit
same
to un
sis, re
long-r
for pe

struggles, for the 30-hour week and for combatting an N.A.M.-inspired epidemic of federal and state anti-labor legislation—are dragging their feet in the struggle for peace. They are deeply concerned regarding the effects of a military cutback on over-all production and employment. As for the reaction of most of labor's top officialdom to Sputnik—this has been, thus far and for the most part, muddled and not a little influenced by Meany's pro-Dulles' line.

Contrariwise the Federation of American Scientists, which often reflects a measure of popular sentiment, including certain peace attitudes, had this to say in its first official statement on Sputnik, issued on October 9, 1957:

. . . The Federation of American Scientists renews its appeal of last year that all possibilities for even limited "first-step" agreements for the control of nuclear weapons and of intercontinental ballistic missiles be most carefully explored. In particular, it would appear feasible at once to ban further tests of large nuclear weapons and of long-range rocket weapons, empowering an appropriately constituted UN Agency to monitor such an agreement. Because of recent advances in long-range detection systems, the number of inspection sites necessary for such monitoring need not be great. This same UN Agency could be authorized to undertake, on an international basis, research on and development of long-range rockets and earth satellites for peaceful purposes. Limited agree-

ments along these lines might prove invaluable by providing a breakthrough in the prolonged disarmament negotiations which have to date been so disappointing. Concessions will be necessary on both sides, but they must be made. The time is short. . . .

• • •

Among the millions of Americans who have hailed and appreciated the significance of Sputnik, not all of them view the magnificent achievement of the earth satellite solely as a qualitative leap forward by Soviet scientists, technicians and industry in the fields of mathematics, physics, chemistry, astro-physics, aeronautics, and engineering.

More and more Americans are beginning to ask what *is* socialism and what makes it "tick"? What is the nature of the new social system which made possible this epic scientific advance? What clarity, insight, and perspective accrue to those who master and creatively apply, in all fields of human endeavor, this advanced and generalized science and methodology of the working class—Marxism-Leninism?

What are the new world factors and class relationships which enabled the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to boldly and realistically conclude that "world war is no longer inevitable"? And why has the emergence of socialism as a world system and the disintegration of the old colonial empires enhanced the possibilities

of a peaceful transition to socialism in various countries?

* * *

It is true that the inveterate enemies of peace and socialism, the spokesmen and lieutenants of monopoly, had a veritable anti-Soviet and anti-Communist field-day in our country following the disclosures of gross distortions of Party and Soviet norms and legality and the harmful violations of the Leninist policy on the national question made in the Soviet Union during the latter years of Stalin's leadership. As a result, not a few progressives and Communists became disoriented.

But facts are stubborn things. And the process of socialist self-criticism and self-correction initiated at the 20th Congress, coupled with the new advances in Marxist-Leninist theory based on the new world developments and perspectives, and the renewed and great strides forward subsequently made in industry and agriculture, science, culture and socialist democracy—as well as the bold and flexible moves and notable achievements registered in unfolding the resolute peace policy of the USSR and the People's Republic of China, and all the socialist countries—all these have compelled many Americans to take a "second look" and to see the woods despite the trees. Undoubtedly now the Soviet "moon" will enable many more to get their bearings and see things in historical perspective.

Undoubtedly, too, the course of recent events, no less than the fundamental working class and socialist experiences of the past four decades, will serve to underscore the universal validity of the social laws of Marxism-Leninism. This is so especially regarding the necessity and inevitability of establishing the political power and rule of the working class and the leading role of its vanguard, the Communist Party. And this will shed additional light on the new and diverse ways and forms to effect, under new national and international conditions, the transition to socialism in various countries, including by the peaceful and constitutional path of mass struggle advocated for our country by the Communist Party of the USA.

* * *

As Sputnik races around the earth's orbit, millions of Americans are grievously aware of the Dixiecrat satellite launched by Gov. Faubus and the White Citizens Council in Little Rock, Arkansas. But not enough Americans recognize that Little Rock highlights a major constitutional crisis in our country. That it undermines the limited Civil Rights law recently passed by Congress, and places new obstacles in the way of labor's organizing the unorganized in the South and in the nation. That it subverts and challenges the Courts, the laws of

the
Neg
W
in
tain
relat
thro
feren
crisis
Th
illum
ism f
State
whol
has b
sized
lion
who
termi
dema
before
whose
by an
Amer

Des
and t
tile to
fact is
impre
of lib
among
with
achiev
memb
the his
viet U
tional
ress of
and el
Clear
among

the land, and the Constitution—for Negroes and whites alike.

While this situation is reminiscent in certain aspects of 1860, it contains new features and new class relationships which make possible, through democratic struggle, a different resolution of the impending crisis.

The new Soviet star has sharply illuminated the impossible anachronism for mid-twentieth century United States of its jim-crow system and its whole pervasive vicious racism. This has been seen at once and emphasized most decisively by the 17 million Negro people in this country, who are better organized, more determined and more militant in their demand for full freedom than ever before in their stirring history—and whose struggles are being joined in by an ever greater number of white Americans.

Despite all the anti-Soviet slanders and the waves of propaganda hostile to the first socialist state, the fact is that the Negro masses are impressed with the USSR's policy of liberty, equality and fraternity among nations. They are impressed with the national and socialist achievements of its many diverse member republics, as well as with the historic contributions of the Soviet Union in championing the national liberation and social progress of the peoples in Asia, Africa, and elsewhere.

Clearly indicative of this attitude among the millions of American Ne-

groes is the viewpoint expressed on October 12 by the leading and conservative New York Negro newspaper, *The Amsterdam News*. Among other pertinent remarks, occurred these sentences:

Whenever officials of our government can find time to look up from the problem of Little Rock they glance at the sky and say, "Wonder how those Russians were able to get ahead of us to the horizon of a new world?" . . .

To begin with, the Russian government apparently does not have the albatross of racial segregation and discrimination hanging around its neck as our government does. . . .

It is costing our government \$100,000 a day to maintain troops to escort nine Negro children of Little Rock into a school where they have every right in the world to be admitted without incident. Little Rock is only one example. Multiply the millions of extra school houses, extra teachers, extra waiting rooms, extra drinking fountains, extra everything, which the poor South has set up and marked "Colored" since 1860 and the total in time would be more than the Russians spent on their new moon and the total in money would probably pay for their whole missile program.

Could this be one reason why we lag behind in the world that's a-coming? We think it is. . . .

* * *

On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the USSR many of America's working people are endeavoring to draw a balance sheet between the two social systems.

Many socialist-minded workers and intellectuals, including some who are far from being Marxist-Leninist in their outlook, now agree with Lincoln Steffens that socialism in the USSR "works." Many concur with John Reed who boldly declared, forty years ago, that the promise of America's future is inseparably intertwined with the progress of socialist development in the Soviet Union as well as elsewhere.

No matter how Americans may be divided over ultimate social objectives, we American Communists share in common with all militant working-class, democratic, and progressive individuals and organizations the burning desire and determination to achieve a better America in a world at peace.

Now, more than ever before, we Communists favor a crash program for universal disarmament—not a crash program for ballistic missiles and atomic destruction.

We favor a welfare, not a warfare, budget. We favor a government program of economic security—not of monopoly profiteering. We favor an all-inclusive program of governmental policy, irrespective of whether it is inspired by the GOP, the Democrats, Labor, or Independents, for enforcing, not subverting, the Bill of Rights, and the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments.

In short, we American Communists are confident in the ultimate verdict of history, in the eventual socialist reorganization of society—

we favor and will support any government or movement that will advance democracy, peace, and progress.

No matter how Americans presently may be rent asunder over the values and potentialities of socialism versus capitalism; no matter how America's masses may differ as to how to solve all the mounting and acute problems of inflation and automation, to enforce desegregation and civil liberties, and effect disarmament—ever larger numbers of democratic Americans, especially working people, agree that it is high time to find the ways and means for East and West to negotiate, to co-exist as Good Neighbors, and to engage in peaceful and constructive competition.

In order to further this great, democratic and national objective, America's progressives, particularly the Communists, are resolved to do all in their power to promote American-Soviet-Sino friendship and cooperation. There is a growing political awareness in our land—among Communists and many Socialists and militant trade unionists—that international unity of action of America's toilers with their fellow-workers in the USSR and China, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, Syria and Egypt, India and Indonesia, Ghana and Argentina—is more essential than ever to safeguard the national interests of the American people and to advance peace and progress.

Th
tion
—wh
tarian
signe
ible t
demo
powe
stren
Marx
pare
ing th
a pe
of ba
ist tr
In

no
we
for

The main decisions and orientation of our 16th national convention—which repudiated dogmatism, sectarianism and revisionism—were designed to unfold a militant and flexible united front policy of labor and democratic mass action to curb the powers of monopoly, to build and strengthen our Party and enhance its Marxist vanguard role, and to prepare a basic Party program charting the way of mass struggle towards a peaceful and constitutional path of basic social change, of the socialist transformation of society.

In striving to realize these objec-

tives, we are sure that we will revitalize our Communist Party and augment its mass ties and influence, promote the class consciousness and independent role of labor, and help forge a broad democratic front of struggle of the working people in our own country—Communist and non-Communist, labor and non-labor, Negro and white—so as to more effectively champion civil rights and liberties, economic and social welfare, the cause of proletarian internationalism and world peace, national liberation and social progress.

"I was greatly impressed by the fact that the Soviet government does not stint in organizing scientific work. It might be well if the whole world would follow the Soviet Union's example in creating favorable conditions for the activities of scientists and other professionals."

—*Dr. Eugene Ziskind, Professor of Psychiatry,
University of Southern California, visiting the
Soviet Union, October, 1957.*

The Youth Festival in Moscow

By CHARLOTTE SAXE

Among the Americans who this summer attended the World Youth Festival in Moscow, was our author, here represented by her first published article. Miss Saxe is a 19-year old resident of Cincinnati; we know our readers will be interested in her reactions to a memorable experience.—Ed.

THE SIXTH WORLD Youth Festival, held in Moscow this summer, certainly realized its aim of promoting peace and friendship among peoples. Over 32,000 delegates, representing every country in the world, were present and the warmest kind of relationship was established; this, alone, could only serve to advance the cause of peace.

American representation was small; we numbered about 160 young men and women. That more of American youth did not attend was due largely to the efforts of the State Department, which branded the Festival as a "Communist propaganda stunt." Actually, the International Preparatory Committee, which planned and organized the Festival, made perfectly clear that no particular political or religious ideas were to be allowed to dominate it. And as it worked out, none did. The Festival afforded a wonderful and unforgettable opportunity for the free interchange of ideas, and for making real the ideal of brotherhood among all peoples.

Excluding transportation costs

from New York to Moscow, the expenses of the Festival for each participant came to only \$30. For this quite nominal fee we were served excellent meals, had good sleeping accommodations, and free travel and entry to every event that went on in Moscow. And in that city, while we were there, something like 350 or 400 major cultural events went on daily throughout the city. So numerous were the things I wanted to see and do, that I felt if I had 100 years I could not have accomplished it all. Still, among numerous events and places that I did experience, I remember especially the great carnival outside Moscow University, a Kremlin ball, the magnificent circus, and the fascinating Writers' Congress.

Besides the sixteen days we spent in Moscow, we were invited to spend two days in Leningrad, a city which truly deserves the name of "Venice of the North."

"MIR Y DRUSHBA"

"Mir y Drushba" (Peace and Friendship) were the keynote words of the Festival. Everywhere we

Americans went, in the Soviet Union, on our way by train to Moscow, crowds gathered with flowers and gifts and smiles, and shouts of "Mir y Drushba." Everywhere we saw radiant smiles and shining eyes; sincere friendship and real happiness and pride. Never in my life have I encountered such warmth and kindness and friendliness. The reception we received everywhere from the Russian people touched the hearts of all in the American delegation, and most of us were far from being Left-wingers. And everywhere—from remote villages to Moscow itself, were the signs and shouts, "Mir y Drushba."

This slogan came to life in the performance of gymnasts who spelled out the words, and the banners drawn through the skies by blimps and planes. It seemed to me to be personified, too, in the projects and buildings that were going up everywhere the eye turned in Moscow and in Leningrad. But above all, the slogan came to life in the Russian people themselves, and the way they crowded around us by the thousands (often stopping all traffic), shaking our hands and crying out "No More War," "Peace and Friendship."

MYTH AND REALITY

Before I went to Moscow I had believed much of what the press in my city had said, but what my eyes

saw and what that press tells its readers are like day and night. I thought Moscow would be drab, that the Russian people would be cowed and sullen and that their dress would be quite shabby. In all respects the opposite is the truth. Moscow is a beautiful, clean and quite prosperous city; the people are dressed quite adequately; and if any people are not cowed and not sullen it is the thousands of people I saw in Russia. And all this but a decade after the tremendous destruction and human loss of World War III!

In Moscow we went anywhere and everywhere we wanted, at any time. We talked informally with scores of people, in the streets, parks and in their homes. From countless talks with the Russians, it was clear to me that they were devoted to their own system, took pride in their government, and were especially proud of what had been accomplished since the defeat of Hitler.

The Russian people know that with Socialism, and despite wars, the Soviet Union is now one of the two greatest states in the world and they know of the great social achievements that have transformed their own standards and needs and abilities. For me, coming from mid-America, I could well understand their pride when I looked upon such great works of man as Moscow University, Gorky Park (one of the most beautiful in the world), the Lenin Library (the largest in the

world), the tremendous Lenin Stadium, seating over 120,000 people, the amazing pavilions in the Agricultural Exhibition, the inspiring Palaces of Culture visited every day by hundreds of working men and women and their children.

No one who comes to Moscow can fail to be impressed by its magnificent subway system—especially one who had been in New York's subway. Each station in the spotless Moscow Metro, designed by a leading Soviet architect, has its own beautiful paintings, mosaics, sculptures. This must make the ordinary, daily habit of riding to and from work an experience something other than nerve-wracking and painful.

A NEW CULTURAL LEVEL

The cultural level of the Soviet people, as one may see it in Moscow and Leningrad, is so high as to be breathtaking. Everywhere people are reading, and they are reading the classics of the entire world's literature. People are reading while riding the escalators in the Metros—everywhere. I never saw anything like it. And the enthusiasm for music and the ballet is enormous; and I found that everybody, those I met most casually who were working in the Metro, or ordinary citizens walking on the streets, could discuss music and art and literature with fluency and real interest. I found, too, a very great familiarity with the artistic and cultural achievements of the Western world.

When I used to have discussions with artistic and intellectual friends who assured me that the masses are stupid and incapable of appreciating culture, I wondered; now I could only smile at such arrogant ignorance. Now, I can think of the altogether "ordinary" Russians that I saw and met and talked with who were highly cultured people and who loved and understood literature and music and art.

The Americans, without exception, were amazed at the high level of artistry of all performances we witnessed in Moscow. The singing and dancing were superb; and the performances in the theatre—for instance, we saw Mayakovsky's famous satire, "The Bed-Bug"—were magnificent.

The Soviet people displayed a great curiosity about everything; they were not dull or what we sometimes call "sophisticated." Maybe this is because the USSR itself is still so very young. The Russians seemed almost fanatical about knowledge, about learning; they seemed unable to get their fill of culture. It was thrilling to see working men and women flocking to the theatre, ballet, music halls, art museums, libraries, the jammed bookstores. Culture seemed as necessary and as important as food.

* * *

At the various delegation meetings, there were friendly speeches and much good will. And then, af-

ways,
tural
espec
Amer
Amer
"take
seem
mon,
Russi
Th
asked
That
States
with
To t
thing
Amer
Sovie
in C
and I
how
times
count
or eve
ing it
I re
to thi
bases.
bases
gover
plann
"Othe
would
bases

ways, singing and dancing, and cultural "contests." The fraternization, especially between the Russians and Americans, was wonderful. We Americans and Russians seemed to "take to each other" naturally; we seemed to share many traits in common, and then the warmth of the Russians could not be resisted.

There was one question that I was asked over and over again in Russia. That was: "Why does the United States encircle us with air bases, and with airplanes having atom bombs?" To the Russians this is a terrible thing, and they would ask me how Americans would feel if there were Soviet air bases and atomic bombs in Canada and Mexico and Cuba and Iceland. And they would explain how Russia had been invaded many times in the past, and was an open country, without an Atlantic Ocean, or even an English Channel bordering it.

I really did not know how to reply to this question about encircling air bases. The Russians think that these bases mean some in the American government would like to and are planning to destroy their country. "Otherwise," they asked me, "why would the United States establish bases so far from its own borders

and so close to the borders of our own country?"

The Russian friends asked only that we work for peace wherever our homes were. Surely all of us want peace; cannot the armament race come to an end, cannot troops everywhere come home, and cannot war-making bases of all nations that are outside their own borders be closed down?

Most of the American delegates, as I have said, were far from radicals; yet I think most of us did feel that we had not been told the truth about Russia by the American press or government. And I think most of us, if not all, were impressed with what benefits Socialism has brought the Russians. I do not think most of the delegates would go so far as one Nigerian young man did; but the thinking of the delegates was in the direction he indicated when he said to me:

I will never say bad things against the Soviet people. For me, there are no other people so good. I tried to find out if it was propaganda, but the more I looked, the more I became convinced that it was not propaganda at all. I was against Socialism before I came to Moscow. Now I know that Socialism is the hope of the world.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

LENIN, ON THE threshold of his superb revolutionary career, turned his attention at once to the particular features of the Russian society he wanted transformed. In 1894 Lenin wrote:

In Russia the relics of medieval, semi-feudal institutions are still so immeasurably strong, compared with Western Europe. . . . The workers need to be shown in all details what a terrible reactionary force these institutions represent, how they strengthen the yoke of capital over labor, how degradingly they press down on the working people, how they hold back capital in its medieval forms—no less exploiting of labor than the modern industrial forms, but adding to this exploitation frightful difficulties in the struggle for emancipation.

With incredible courage and inspiring leadership, the workers and peasants of Russia overcame these "frightful difficulties," destroyed Czarism, and undertook the most momentous task in human history—the creation of a socialist society.

Marx, in his *Critique of the Gotha Program* (1875), foresaw that a socialist society, "just as it emerges from capitalist society" would be "in every respect, economically, morally, and intellectually, still stamped

with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it emerges."

Five years after the success of the Revolution, October 30, 1922, Lenin noted some of those "birthmarks" when he said that, compared with the great capitalist powers, Soviet Russia was "the least cultured, our productive forces are developed the least, our ability to work is worse than anyone else's." Two weeks later, celebrating the Fifth Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, Lenin paid particular attention to existing weaknesses and errors in practice and in policy. Why were there so many errors and failures, Lenin asked. He replied that it was because it was necessary to depend upon the old civil service, many of whose members hated the Communists and therefore sabotaged their efforts, while many others did not understand them and so performed their tasks badly. But the first three reasons offered by Lenin for the serious failings that marked the efforts at building a socialist society from 1917 to the end of 1922 were:

First of all, we are a backward country, secondly education in our country is at a minimum, thirdly we get no help, not a single civilized state helps us; on the contrary they all work against us.

Therefore, the Communists of the USSR, ardently supported by the vast majority of the peoples of that vast land, turned their efforts to eliminating sabotage, curbing hostile acts, and making secure working-class power; to transforming their backward economy into one that would challenge the most advanced nations for primacy; to making their minimum educational system into a maximum one; and to the consistent pursuit of international peace.

Then, the exploiters and oppressors sneered at such dreams. The philosophical root of those dreams—Marxism-Leninism—they damned incessantly and banned repeatedly; *but they did not refute it*. Against the implementation of those dreams they hurled their fiercest weapons, and all the legions of Fascism—fitting embodiment of their own ultimate values—but they did not succeed. If they did not succeed in the first forty years, they will never succeed. They are, in fact, outmoded; still dangerous, but outmoded. Still powerful and ruthless, but outmoded—hence, doomed and distraught.



Not so long ago, the friendliest of non-Communist commentators habitually referred to the Soviet Union in terms of some kind of "experiment," carried on by more or less well-meaning, absurdly naive devotees—"moon-struck theorists" was a

common description. Always implicit in this approach, and often explicit, was the transient nature of this "experiment"—perhaps noble, as Herbert Hoover said of another experiment, but like Prohibition, shortly to be undone.

Not so long ago, to think of this "experiment" as offering any kind of challenge to Western Civilization (by which, of course, was meant, then, as now, capitalism), except possibly some kind of partial and temporary ideological challenge, was simply absurd. Thus, Stuart Chase, writing in *The Progressive* (July, 1956) recalls the USSR when he was there last, in 1927, as "a country desperately poor" and says that to conceive of this country as offering capitalism "any material challenge was ridiculous."

But now that the moon-struck theorists have created a moon riding through the heavens, the transient nature of what they have built on earth is no longer so confidently asserted; on the contrary now American eyes and ears are confronted continuously not with the Soviet experiment, but with the Soviet challenge. The urgency with which the entire American bourgeoisie is responding to this "challenge"—and different elements in that bourgeoisie respond quite differently—is, in a sense, the greatest possible tribute to the Russian Socialist Revolution on this, its Fortieth Anniversary.

Generally, American public opinion responds to the reality of a

"challenge" from the Soviet Union in terms of amazement. Thus, the *New York Post's* inquiring reporter, conducting the "Sidewalks of New York" column, on October 7, asks five men: "What was your first reaction to the news that the Russians had launched an earth satellite?" All, in different words, express the same sense of astonishment: "I couldn't believe it"; "speechless and extremely surprised"; "utter disbelief"; "complete amazement"; "how in the world could they have done it?"

But the astonishment, arising from misinformation, is perfectly natural for the American man-on-the-street; yet it is by no means confined to the ordinary citizen. Thus, for example, in the summer of 1956, leading officers of the United States Air Force were invited to visit the Soviet Union. Upon their return one of them, General Donald L. Putt, research chief for the Air Force, was questioned by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.* The General testified that while he had tried to keep abreast of scientific and technological developments in the Soviet Union, as one would expect from a man holding his position, "I was still astounded at the scope of their training program and at the quantity and quality of their facilities which are apparently available to all parts of their scientific training effort." Not unnaturally, one of the Senators picked up this apparently immoderate re-

mark and asked the General: "You were astounded?" And the General came back:

That is correct. . . . I was astounded at the foundation that they are laying in science and technology and the training of people in those fields.

Surely one of the most knowledgeable of American newspapermen is James Reston, the Washington correspondent of the *New York Times*. Yet, his writing from the USSR also conveys this sense of amazement and disbelief. He notes, for example, "an obvious paradox in Western eyes," in that, "We regard the Communists as a ruthless people willing to indulge in any trickery or depravity to serve their ends," yet the symbols of the society he himself saw in the USSR "all depict wholesome, noble characters who clearly could not dream of doing an unworthy act" (*N. Y. Times Sunday Magazine*, Oct. 20, 1957).

Gregory Grossman, for several years associated with the Russian Research Center of Harvard, and now a professor of economics at the University of California (Berkeley), very recently has emphasized the "past erroneous appraisals of the USSR." He finds the errors to have minimized, at times, failures in the Soviet Union, but it is his enumeration of the errors concerning accomplishments that is most impressive.

* Much of the testimony is reprinted in *The New Republic*, Oct. 21, 1957.

Many serious American students of the Soviet scene underrated the ability of the USSR to resist the German attack, the speed with which it would reconstruct its heavy industry, the pace at which it would progress in the development of nuclear weapons and modern means of their delivery, the achievements of some branches of Soviet science, and perhaps most recently its ability to conduct a large program of "foreign aid."*

Now, with the sensational accomplishment of Soviet scientists embodied in the newly-universalized word, "Sputnik," one finds second looks being offered by such major purveyors of mis-information as Harry Schwartz of the *New York Times*. Writing under the sub-head, "A Review of Apparent Shortcomings in Official Estimates of Soviet Power" (Oct. 7, 1957), Mr. Schwartz reports that as of July, United States Intelligence Services (with whom his relations seem to be quite close) had mis-read entirely Soviet developments in the area of ballistic missiles, and that Sputnik caught it quite unawares. Schwartz adds, that these errors seem "to be only the latest in a major series of errors in estimating Soviet scientific and military capabilities during the last decade."

Mr. Schwartz was modest in limiting himself to just the past decade; Dr. Grossman was more frank in

calling to mind the expectation of so-called Western experts that the Nazi war machine would destroy the Soviet Union in, at most, eight weeks. Understandably, the *Times* prefers not to remind its readers of that little miscalculation, since its military expert, Hanson Baldwin, then announced: "It seems probable that Hitler will be able to achieve his main military objectives within a few weeks."

Of course, that misreading of the Soviet Union led to catastrophe for the peoples of Europe; it was basic to the whole tragic policy of the Western capitalist democracies which made possible—better, inevitable—the scourge of fascism and the awful calamity of Hitlerism.

In World War II, also, as now with Sputnik, the response of the average American to Soviet accomplishments was one of amazement. Typical was the editorial entitled "The Russian Revelation" in the *Boston Herald*, September 7, 1941:

How strange it seems! A nation which was thought to be the most backward, careless, least efficient and least patriotic in the world has checked a mighty host from the nation which was assumed to be the most advanced in organization, morale, leadership and efficiency. . . . Americans are forced to revise their beliefs as to the physical prowess of the Soviets, the skill of the leaders, the morale of the civilian populace, the willingness of all, women as well as men, to make tre-

* "Soviet Economy and Soviet World Power," a paper delivered May, 1957 at the Eleventh American Assembly, held under the auspices of Columbia University; published in *International Stability and Progress* (Columbia University Press, 1957).

mendous sacrifices in order to turn back the invaders.

But with all the "revelations" that were partially brought to the American people for a few years during World War II, the central source of the strength of the Red Army was never brought to them: *the Red Army, of all those opposing Hitler, was not afraid of Socialism!* The Red Army, alone of all the armies opposing Hitler, was a socialist one backed by a socialist state and society. It gave battle without inhibition, with careful planning, with collective skill, with high political consciousness, with a new sense of fundamental patriotism, and with an already highly developed socialist productive base.

* * *

Similarly now, the sputtering experts are apologizing for Sputnik; and similarly today one is getting some breakthrough to the American public of the accomplishments of the Soviet Union. But once again this is very partial; it will probably be very transient. The policy of deliberate falsification in the past cost humanity very much. It was a policy of reaction and therefore of treason and calamity; it remains today a policy of reaction and it threatens even greater calamity.

What are some of the reports that have amazed a poisoned public opinion? Let us gather together some of these observations and facts that

have appeared in unlikely places in the past few months and see what they add up to.

The great violinist, Isaac Stern, returns from a tour of the USSR, and reports there were 22,000 applications for tickets to his final concert. He, too, reports amazement: "What amazed me were the number of orchestras everywhere." He is disappointed only that their instruments are not up to the best available in the West, but otherwise he has never experienced a society wherein music means so much, is so widely understood and played and heard and enjoyed. "There are conservatories almost everywhere . . . the audiences invariably respond to musical values with extraordinary sensitivity." Gifted children are sought out, their education is paid for by the state, they are developed with consummate care and skill. (*N. Y. Times*, July 8, 1956). This from a society whose leadership Mr. Reston regards as ruthless, tricky and depraved!

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, at home after an extensive trip through the USSR, in a remarkable series of articles in the *New York Post* (through most of October, 1957) also reports the existence of values and practices quite astonishing for the slavish, backward country conventionally presented to the American people. She finds "a hunger among men and women alike for education" and "everywhere, young and old" are studying furiously. All have free

m
cia
m
me
"a
th
wo
he
bin
57
pa
17
vic
vie
tw
per
ha
P
lar
In
is
titu
dre
chi
ann
nov
low
the
and
clu
yea
ecy
a l
Sta
ere
ject
—
*
carr
15.
vice
legal
if L
vice

medical care—and this means physician, drugs, dentist, hospital, and it means preventive as well as curative medicine. She finds that the doctors "are not supposed to work more than a six-hour day"; that a pregnant woman is given ample time off from her work, with pay, prior to the birth of her child and then is given 57 days more, after the birth, with pay. Thereafter, until the child is 17, regularized health care is provided to every youngster in the Soviet Union; each child is assured two months a year in camp, all expenses paid, and: "Every worker has a month's holiday."

Mrs. Roosevelt studies a particular district in Leningrad with care. In that district, she writes, "there is no venereal disease and no prostitution."* It contained 19,000 children; in the previous year only four children had died. No wonder the annual death rate in the USSR is now below 8.4 per thousand—the lowest in the world. In this respect, the first socialist land has overtaken and surpassed the entire world, including the United States. If forty years ago, someone had dared prophecy that Russia would one day have a lower death rate than the United States, this would have been considered as more outlandish than projecting a man-made moon.

* The same newspaper in which this appears, carried a Reuters dispatch, dated London, Oct. 15, whose first paragraph read: "A citizens' anti-vice committee declared today some form of legal prostitution should be considered quickly if London was to 'remove the chaotic menace the vice presents today.'"

Quite naturally, not all of Mrs. Roosevelt's findings impressed her positively. Most indicative of her objections is this paragraph from her final article on her Russian experiences:

I can well understand why the Soviet people accept the good that has come to them. I cannot understand or believe, however, that anything which has to be preserved by fear will permanently stand against something which offers love and trust among the people themselves and their leaders—something that asks the understanding and the cooperation of the people and that permits personal initiative and removes fear from free thought and the expression of ideas.

Here Mrs. Roosevelt is touching, somewhat obliquely, upon the existence of bureaucratic practices, illegalities, and violations of national rights which have marred the phenomenal advance of the USSR. To a degree they reflect the persistence of "birthmarks"; the failings of legitimate resistance to surrounding hostility; the results of provocateurs and enemy agents; the necessity for "forced marches" in the face of life-and-death emergencies and tasks. To a degree they are the result of tackling unprecedented problems; "the penalty of being first," as Veblen warned, is very high. They stem, too, from problems of psychology and organization which still require collective study. And not unrelated, was the fundamental task of build-

ing a productive base, in the first place, that would assure the survival of a socialist society, and make possible the erection of a superstructure that would be worthy of that base in all particulars.

We think that the economic and personnel and international developments, given the decisively progressive nature of socialism and the purposes of a Marxist-Leninist Party, assure continual advances* in the areas broached by Mrs. Roosevelt. We think, too, that the remarkable advances already made in these aspects of life justify such assurance and are themselves cause for greeting with especial warmth the fortieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution.

Mrs. Roosevelt herself, also in her final article, declared that the majority of the peoples of the world—in Asia, Africa and Latin America—were close to the conditions which existed in Czarist Russia before the 1917 Revolution. Now, she says:

The Soviets can say to them: "We know your conditions. Our people were hungry, too, not only for food but for health and education and the possibilities lying before us in order to have hope in the future. Look at what we have done in 40 years. Take heart. We can help you."

Remembering the "frightful diffi-

* In one of the most critical areas—that of civil rights and law enforcement—a particularly illuminating study of recent decisive progress will be found in the British publication, *Stories Studied*, July, 1957, edited by the faculty of Glasgow University.

culties" mentioned by Lenin in 1894 and the sources of the serious failings Lenin referred to in 1922, one may fairly say, I think, that the accomplishments noted in Mrs. Roosevelt's summation are something to inspire all partisans of socialism and to fill all friends of the Soviet Union with pride.

* * *

There has been particular pre-occupation with advances made by the Soviet Union in the areas of education, science, and economic productivity. What has been admitted in non-Communist and anti-Communist sources recently, amounts to conclusive evidence of such strides forward in each of these basic social areas as to be without precedent in history. Harry Schwartz now tells his readers (Oct. 13) that Soviet schools graduate each year more than twice the number of engineers, physicists, chemists, mathematicians than does the United States. He states that the prestige and social standing of teachers and scientists are immense in the Soviet Union, quite unlike the situation in our own country. He refers to the universal free educational system and declares:

There is not the phenomenon in the Soviet Union that exists in this country in which able youngsters are unable to get higher education because their parents cannot pay for it.

Education-wise, Stuart Chase, in the article already cited, sums up

the
"Th
see
hill
goin
and
ers."

Sci
that
mate
plish
but t
really
Sovie
tiona
ing it
realiz

In
simpl
passes
tant
entists

In
Union
talist
the U
growt
surpas
capital
the de
World
to say
Bank
1956)
Pace
ment,"
though
States,
presen

by abo
Whi

the content of the recent literature: "The American educational plant seems to be going steadily downhill . . . the Russian plant is steadily going uphill with better equipment and better opportunities for teachers."

Schwartz now writes (October 6) that the potential in terms of human material for high scientific accomplishment always existed in Russia, but that this potential at present has really come into its own, because the Soviet system "provided the educational and other conditions encouraging its maximum and widest possible realization."

In scientific development the simple fact is that no country surpasses the USSR, and that in important areas the work of Soviet scientists is without peer in the world.

In overall production, the Soviet Union has surpassed the entire capitalist world, with the exception of the United States; in the rate of growth of its productive plant it has surpassed anything achieved by any capitalist country in history—despite the devastations of Civil War and World War. Perhaps it is sufficient to say, on this point, that *Lloyd's Bank Review* (London, April, 1956) in an article entitled, "The Pace of Soviet Economic Development," concluded that "the USSR, though still well behind the United States, may have reached America's present (i.e., 1956) industrial output by about 1963."

While this is total and not per

capita output, in that regard also, the advance of the Soviet Union has been extraordinary. Gregory Grossman, in the paper referred to earlier, states that while per capita production in the USSR still lags behind that of the United States, "it compares very well with the West European level, and has been rising faster than either."

The quality of the phenomenal advances in science and in productivity achieved within the lifetime of the Soviet Union may be summed up by a sentence appearing in Harold Callender's round-up of West European reaction to Sputnik (N. Y. *Times*, Oct. 9). The sentence is put negatively and with marked restraint, but the restraint and the source give it added weight:

Judging by progress already made, many Europeans reject the assumption that the Soviet Union must always remain far behind the capitalist democracies of the West in either scientific or industrial achievements.

* * *

While, then, with the sensational Sputnik development—as earlier with the successful Soviet resistance to Hitler Germany—some of the facts demonstrating the enormous advances made in the USSR have pierced the iron curtain of capitalist hostility, the basic sources of these advances have this time, as in the past, been obscured or misrepresented. No satisfactory answer has been given the American people generally

as to why the advances of science in the USSR have been so great, why the educational system there has been so magnificent to sustain and promote these scientific leaps, and why the entire production system has developed with such speed and scope to make possible such educational and scientific strides.

Most certainly, the source for this transformation and progress does not lie in wealth, as compared to the wealth available to great capitalist powers, notably the United States. Especially when one remembers the colossal losses sustained by the Soviet Union in human and material terms due to World War II, it is an "answer" that will not hold up at all.

Just as surely, the progress does not come from the so-called "totalitarianism" of the Soviet Union. This term, if it has any meaning at all, relates to a system of rigid tyranny, springing from and bulwarking an exploitative ruling class. Such a term has meaning when applied to fascist states, though the term fascism does very well, and little help is forthcoming from the semantic invention of Mussolini's foreign minister.

The fact is that fascism murdered the splendid sciences of Italy and Germany. This was particularly striking in Germany, where before Hitler no nation had a more outstanding scientific record and cadre. The obscurantism, anti-humanism, conformism, chauvinism, and basic

imperialist essences of fascism militated against the maintenance of the pre-Hitler level of German science, let alone any advance. Further, devotion to the advancement of humanity was a central motive force in the creation of science, and humanist values are organic to the nature of science. Hence fascism vitiates science; but socialism propels it forward.

Peter Kapitza, the renowned Soviet physicist, said the epoch-making breakthrough of Sputnik was due to the work of "a large and talented group of scientists and engineers"; and that:

Life has shown that it is possible to organize, inspire and manage the work of such a group in our country, in a socialist system, more effectively than in countries without a socialist system.

It was socialism that made the Red Army withstand and then hurl back the massed assault of the Hitler juggernaut, and then exterminate it; it was socialism that lifted Russia from the bottom of the list of productive countries in Europe to the top of that list; that transformed Russia from a land of pestilence and death to a land of the most advanced medical system and the lowest death rate in the world; that transformed Russia from a land where 76% of the people could neither read nor write to a land without illiteracy; that transformed the educational system of Russia from abysmal back-

wa
wh
nes
aiw
sci
app
a p
coll
cial
firs
and
per
hith
S
it h
and
no
ideo
ter.
the
man
all.
socia
the
socia
orde
A so
ously
on th
mate
as th
advan
forty
stup
geom

Th
as M
believ

wardness to world pre-eminence; which made the despised and neglected scientist of Czarist Russia, always suspected for his interest in science, into the most esteemed and appreciated and honored man, with a position higher than that of his colleagues anywhere else. It was socialism that led the USSR to be the first to conquer interplanetary space and to open to man vistas into properties and problems hardly suspected hitherto.

Socialism eliminates exploitation, it heightens the role of consciousness and heightens its level. It contains no built-in limitations, either of an ideological or an economic character. It knows no gods other than the reason and the aspirations of mankind; it fears nothing and dares all. Socialism is collective, planned, socially-oriented. So is science; and the identity stems from the fact that socialism is the first scientific social order ever brought into existence. A socialist society is a society consciously reared in Marxism-Leninism, on the scientific outlook of dialectical materialism. Science is to socialism as the fingers are to the hand. The advances in this area in the first forty years of the USSR have been stupendous; they will increase in geometrical proportions.

* * *

The leaders of the Soviet Union, as Mrs. Roosevelt states, "not only believe in education but they have a

real enthusiasm for research and a respect for the scientific mind and the processes which bring advances in the present-day world. . . ."

We may well compare this with Charles E. Wilson's response to Sputnik—"a nice scientific trick" he called it, thus nearly equalling the classic remark of the Admiral in charge of naval research (!) who thought it absurd to get excited because the Russians had thrown a piece of iron into the sky and made it stay up there for a while and travel about a bit. This Mr. Wilson, of course, has been Secretary for Defense; and it is he who remarked: "Basic research is when you don't know what you're doing."

In that remark is not only the egregious ignorance of a Cabinet member and one of our leading "industrial statesmen"; in it is focused the purely pragmatic, anti-cultural philistinism of the American monopoly bourgeoisie. Therein is characteristic contempt for scholarship and for teaching ("When you don't know how to do something, you teach it to someone else"—goes the saying). There is the explanation for the average yearly salary of \$3,700 for instructors in large state universities. There is the attitude that makes possible and urges on the hounding of scientists by a McCarthy and the firing or intimidating of the most original minds in the country.

There is the root of the unspeakable ignorance of a former federal

prosecutor like Myles Lane or a United States Senator like James Eastland, who explain epoch-making scientific advances in terms of "stolen secrets"; explanations worthy of comic-horror pulps—and the thinking of such savants as the distinguished attorney and the honorable legislator.

• • •

As so many of the analyses of the sources of Soviet scientific advance are faulty, so are many of the suggested conclusions from the event.

One of these is the insistence—akin to the idiocy of "theft-of-secrets"—that what is needed is a tightening of security and an enhancing of the governmental policy of administrative secrecy. Actually both these related practices have dealt devastating blows to American scientific progress, and are seriously eroding well-established and elementary practices of democratic government. Thus, Harold L. Cross, counsel to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, reports:

In widespread areas having nothing whatever to do with national security or any other public necessity, the people, the Congress, and the press are being denied information essential to the formation of public opinion, to the formulation of legislation, and to the functioning of their information media. Public officers and employees suppress information. They deny access to public records. . . .

The jaws of secrecy are clenched against participation by the people in

the basic processes of democracy: the management of government, the formulation of its policies, the executive and administrative action taken. (*The Atlantic*, Dec., 1956.)

Specifically in terms of science, the same authority reported that in March, 1956 a Special Subcommittee of the House, "heard some of the nation's leading scientists and technical experts"; here is his summary of their testimony:

They challenged official secrecy beyond military necessity as a threat to national survival rather than as a means of national security. This cloak of secrecy, they almost unanimously reported, has made free exchange of scientific thought difficult, or, in some cases, impossible, has impeded basic research, and has delayed or prevented altogether the actual application of results of research. The Subcommittee was told that some leading universities, including Harvard, Syracuse, and Oregon, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, had refused certain government research contracts because of the red tape of unnecessary security classification.

James Russell Wiggins, executive editor of *The Washington Post and Times Herald* has produced a very useful volume—*Freedom or Secrecy* (Oxford Univ. Press, N. Y., \$4)—further documenting to the hilt the points made by Mr. Cross.

Yet the response of the Administration to these protests and warnings is indicated by the headline in the *New York Times*, April 5,

1956
Ho
low
bur
han
por
10

T
gres
of v
not
requ
even
pers
grou
deal

So
ism
tion
of t
fici
what
seen,
very
dam

was
when
and
to fo
(N.

A
entifi
positi
the p
ness;
deter
ducti
and
ready
spirit

1957: "Secrecy Upheld by White House." Further, as a natural follow-up to this kind of support to bureaucratic bungling and high-handedness, the same newspaper reports from Washington on October 10 that:

The Defense Department told Congress today that adequate protection of vital security communications could not be had under existing law. It requested new authority to bar from even non-secret posts in defense plants persons whose records gave "reasonable grounds" for concern that they might deal in espionage or sabotage.

So, apparently, what McCarthyism did to undermine the educational, intellectual and scientific life of the country is felt to be insufficient. Walter Lippmann writes, what any one with eyes must have seen, that the damage this did "was very great." And he adds that the damage,

was done in the kind of thinking where the difference between creation and routine lies in the special courage to follow the truth wherever it leads. (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, Oct. 10, 1957.)

A conclusion from the Soviet scientific advances favoring the re-imposition of McCarthyite terror upon the professional community is madness; it can spell nothing but further deterioration in the morale and productivity of the American scientist and intensified damage to the already severely shaken democratic spirit of our country.

One finds, also, some tendency to draw sweeping anti-democratic lessons from the Soviet accomplishments. This deeply erroneous conclusion stems from the equally wrong analysis of the sources of Soviet progress, which we have already discussed. Such anti-democratic biases are especially pronounced in recent literature relative to the educational crisis in the United States.

Typical is the statement by Dr. B. R. Stanerson, assistant secretary of the American Chemical Society:

Problems of major proportion are being created by the great expansion in number of students, the tendency to provide high school education for all with the unavoidable trend toward mediocrity. (*Chemical and Engineering News*, March 21, 1955).

Ominous is the first recommendation made by the very influential Council for Technological Advancement* in its recent study, *Trends in Education and Utilization of Technical Manpower* (Washington, 1957): "Quality of education must receive more emphasis, not necessarily at the expense of the democratic principle of quantity."

That word "necessarily" is exceedingly worrisome. And definitions of democratic education which are confined to quantity, will not do; the highest quality of educa-

* Among the trustees of this Council are executive officers of such corporations as: Otis Elevator, American Machine & Foundry, Worthington Corporation, etc.

tion is also a democratic demand.

The trend in recent literature here is toward an education for the elite, selected and defined by the present elite—which is to say, by the “industrial statesmen.” But at the same time, the concern expressed by Dr. Stanerson and by the corporation executives in charge of the Council for Technological Advancement is evoked, quite explicitly, by the advances in Soviet education and science. Yet they themselves admit—as in the above-cited publication of the Council—that both the quality and the quantity of education in the USSR have made phenomenal advances.

If one wanted an elitist education, he had it in Czarist Russia; education there was so selective that only 24 per cent of the population could read and write! No, the advances in the USSR have come because of socialist education—really free, non-racist, universal, scientific, rigorous and fully equal for women. What is needed here is the democratization of our educational system, in quantity and quality; an end to racism, to conditions favoring the rich, to an atmosphere choking the conscientious teacher, to male supremacy, to budgetary stinginess when it comes to the mental development of our youth. That is the lesson for the American educational system from the thrilling advances made in this regard during 40 years of Socialism in the USSR.

Most dangerous, in my view, of all the mistaken conclusions drawn for the American public on the basis of Sputnik and related developments, is that which seeks to intensify the cold war, expand and prolong a weapons race, and discard any possibility of peaceful co-existence. This is summed up briefly and conveniently in the last words of a recent editorial in the *New York Times* (Oct. 7, 1957): “We prepare for war in order to make war impossible.”

There are no more tragic “last words” than those, and they have been drummed into generation after generation of humanity. Each time, they were the prelude to awful calamity; but in this era of thermonuclear weapons they can be the prelude to human extermination.

The fact is that Dulles’ foreign policy of “strength,” containment, roll-back, liberation, brinkmanship, is intensely immoral, though it has a modicum of logic to it if the government promulgating it has the power to substantiate it. But where the government pursuing such a policy manifestly does not have the power to implement it, and would be abandoned by its allies the moment it tried to do so—as is most certainly the case with the United States at the present time—where that is true, then a policy of brinkmanship becomes not only immoral, it becomes positively insane.

When so ardent, and keen, a friend of monopoly capitalism as

Wal
colu
ter
how
have
Asia
are
keen
as J
(N.
1957
syste
and
vanc
that
is at
wher
gent
don
mans
Af
wher
Elear
with
effort
event
Mrs.
ently
econ
elem
her.
dedic
she

th
ou
fa
kn
de

Walter Lippmann declares (in his column of Oct. 15, 1957) as a "bitter truth" that the present Eisenhower Administration "does not have negotiable policies" so far as Asia, the Middle East and Germany are concerned; when so ardent, and keen a friend of the same system as Joseph Alsop writes from Paris (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, Oct. 14, 1957) that the Western Alliance system, propped up by Dulles and American dollars, is in so advanced a "process of deterioration" that "the rottenness of the structure is at last unmistakably revealed"—when such advisers write such urgent messages is it not time to abandon the cold war, aggressive, brinkmanship policy?

After seeing the Soviet Union when it is forty years young, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt returns pleading with America: "We can join in the effort to use all knowledge for the eventual good of all human beings." Mrs. Roosevelt maintains, apparently, her preference for a capitalist economic order, and she has seen elements in Soviet life that displeased her. But above all, she has seen there dedication to human betterment and she has returned with the funda-

mental message for mankind today—we must have peaceful co-existence, and competition in bringing a fuller and more creative life to the world's population.

Norman Cousins, too, in an editorial in *The Saturday Review* (Oct. 19, 1957), puts the common sense of the matter in his characteristically eloquent manner:

The need today is the same as it was in 1945, only it is infinitely more urgent now. The principal need is not to conjure up more effective ways of destroying the world. The principal need is to tap our intelligence and moral imagination to the fullest in creating a working design for a better tomorrow in which all the world's people can share.

To me the supreme quality of the historic meaning of the Great Russian Socialist Revolution, as its fortieth birthday is celebrated, is shown in the fact that, as a consequence, the people of the world stand on the threshold of securing for all liberty, equality, fraternity, abundance and peace. As man makes of earth a heaven, he turns his eyes heavenward to conquer new worlds.

"Some things I have said of which I am not altogether confident. But that we shall be better and braver and less helpless if we think that we ought to inquire, than we should have been if we indulged in the idle fancy that there was no knowing and no use in searching after what we know not—that is the theme upon which I am ready to fight, in word and deed, to the utmost of my power."

—Socrates

Forms of Industrial Management in the USSR*

By L. ITIN and S. KAMENITSER

In the Soviet Union, economic and technological progress, especially since World War II, has been going forward at an extraordinary rate. In these areas one has the consolidation of the socialist base and, simultaneously, the groundwork for the transition to communism. These enormous advances produce problems that are new, and place old problems in a new light; they require a constant refreshing of ideas and re-examination of reality. This process is going on every minute within the socialist world, and particularly in the Soviet Union. In an effort to bring our readers some indication of this development, we publish in the following pages an examination of the "New Forms of Industrial Management" now being introduced in the USSR, and extracts from a collective discussion of the second edition of the Political Economy Textbook published in Moscow.—Ed.

PROBLEMS RELATING to technical progress in industry, and to the continuous improvement of forms and methods of production have always been a central concern of our Party and government. An organic connection exists between the resolutions on these major questions which were adopted at Plenary Sessions of the Central Committee of the CPSU held respectively in July 1955, December 1956 and February 1957. These resolutions include a series of measures necessary for improving the economic aspects of production, which approach the question from a number of different angles.

* Translated by Amy Schechter from *Problems of Economics* (Moscow), No. 5, 1957. Because of space considerations, some omission has been necessary.—Ed.

The organizational forms employed in the management of Soviet industry are in a process of change which corresponds to the changes taking place in the economic structure of industry itself. The determining factor in this process is the complex of political and economic tasks our industry faces at various stages in its development; the forms and methods of management exert, in turn, a tremendous influence on the development of our economy in the interest of society as a whole.

The principles on which management is based are constant in our economy; they are the expression of the Leninist style of leadership. What changes are only the forms and methods of management, in accordance with the specific characteristics of the period, and the goals

shaping the development of our economy within a given segment of time.

The criterion for evaluating the form and the system of administration of our economic structure is the degree to which these correspond to the level of development attained by the productive forces as well as to the principles of our socialist economy; and their advantageousness under given political and economic conditions. If the forms of management in use are incapable of effecting the successful solution of economic problems related to production, if they act as a brake on economic growth, they must be changed and new forms substituted better adapted to prevailing conditions—forms which are the expression of the principles of socialist economy.

* * *

The hardships and losses inevitably accompanying the break-up of outdated forms of management are compensated for a hundred-fold by the vast economy benefits resulting from the improved quality of production.

The basic principle of the structure of the forms and methods of management in a socialist economy, and especially of the management of industry is the principle of democratic centralism.

Democratic centralism requires the operation of the principle of individual responsibility in management throughout the entire indus-

trial network. Given the contemporary scale of socialist industry and enterprises, and given the complexity of the problems which industrial management must solve on a day-to-day basis for the entire network, individual responsibility assumed an exceptional importance as a condition for successful leadership.

As economic leader, the individually responsible director is the servant of the people: to him is entrusted a specific sector of production—in its economic phase—for which he bears full responsibility before state and nation.

The system of individual responsibility ensures a strengthening of the sense of responsibility and an end to depersonalization in management; it ensures, too, concrete, direct, plant leadership, and systematic, meticulous control of the execution of decisions. Individual responsibility is based on a precise demarcation of both rights and duties of all leading personnel, and the establishment of a sound relationship between administration, Party and social organizations.

Full responsibility accorded the economic chief, the right to issue orders and control the operations of the enterprise, demands the unflinching mass participation of its workers in management. Under the conditions of socialist economic organization such broad mass participation in management is an absolute precondition for individual responsibility of management in an enter-

prise. The administrator who functions in isolation from the community and fails to reckon with collective opinion, perverts the principle of individually responsible leadership; such a leader is unfit to handle the duties entrusted him.

The new forms of management require considerable expansion in the role Soviets, Communist Party, and trade unions play in the economic apparatus, along with the broad involvement of labor in managing production. As the workers' organization with the broadest mass character, the trade unions have an especially large role in working out and putting into action the plans for the enterprise, in deciding questions relating to fixing quotas, organizing labor processes and wage payments, providing for plant safety measures, and, especially, in deciding questions connected with construction of housing and general improvement of living conditions for workers and employees.

* * *

The new tasks which industry has to meet demand a more flexible form of leadership and a closer approach of management to actual production. The law passed by the Seventh Session of the Supreme Soviet envisages a transition from the management of industry and construction through various ramifications of Ministries and departments to new forms for administering in-

dustrial enterprises along territorial lines, based on the economic regions, which have been constituted, the specialization of enterprise according to branch of industry being retained. The basic organizational form of management for industry and construction has become the Economic Council set up according to economic administrative regions.

By far the greatest part of the further growth in volume of industrial output will come from the most effective utilization of existing plant capacity. In addition, a significant portion of industrial output will be the result of the creation of new capacity in those localities and regions of the country where this will be most expedient from the economic viewpoint. The powerful production apparatus created in past years in every branch of industry demands fuller utilization with the accompanying improvement in production.

The following measures will aid in achieving this:

a) The continuous perfecting of the technical bases of production, with special emphasis on complex mechanization and automation, introducing use of high-productivity equipment and advanced technological processes.

b) The development of specialization and cooperation in every branch of industry—the most efficient distribution of products—classification among the various enterprises; the creation of specialized enterprises for the manufacture of mass-pro-

duced parts, dies, tools, reserve stocks, reinforcement materials, etc.; the interbranch and inner-regional cooperation of contiguous branches of production.

c) The complex development of our economic regions, and the more rational location of individual branches of production on a territorial basis; the utilization of local raw materials and fuel and power resources in every possible way.

d) Perfecting the organization of the productive processes in the enterprises—motion studies, the efficient organization of material-technical procurement, inner-plant planning, etc.

* * *

The organizational forms of industrial management in use up to now were not sufficiently geared to carrying out these tasks.

A narrow bureaucratic departmentalism has acted as a brake on preparing and introducing important measures in the field of new technique. Departmental barriers which obstructed the implementation of specialization and cooperative production have led to serious deficiencies in plant specialization, to a non-rational type of cooperation among enterprises located at considerable distance from one another. Departmental barriers broke the normal links existing between enterprises in different branches of industry located in the same economic region, thereby intensifying the difficulties involved in the complex de-

velopment of industry in the economic regions of our country, and in many instances leading to the non-rational location of new construction. In this way departmentalism has made it more difficult to achieve those conditions on which the further successful development of industrial production depends.

An extremely grave weakness in the leadership given industry has been the gulf which separated the Ministries and their chief production administration from the country's enterprises. The vast scale of present-day industry, plus the fact that the majority of our enterprises are scattered over a number of different regions has made it impossible for one Ministry to give these enterprises concrete and operative leadership. What actually happened was that serious miscalculations in planning as well as in material-technical procurement developed in the activities of many enterprises, adversely effecting their operation.

Under the new forms of management of industry and construction, departmentalism of this kind will be a thing of the past. The organs of industrial management are moving towards direct contact with production; more favorable conditions for the development of inner-regional cooperation among enterprises are being created. It is true that under the new setup a danger exists of the development of a certain amount of parallelism, as well as of breaking existing ties, in the work of the in-

dividual Economic Councils and enterprises, and the project-making and research organizations connected with them. Not to permit such parallelism to develop, and to guarantee the effective coordination of the above activities within the economic region is one of the paramount tasks to be handled by GOSPLAN (the State Planning Commission) and the Scientific-Technical Committees.

* * *

The most important condition on which depends the high-efficiency operation of an enterprise is the quality of planning employed by top-level management bodies. For planning the work of an enterprise carried on by a branch administration, the following are the main requirements: a) Timeliness in establishing production quotas; correlation of the quotas planned in respect to nomenclature, designs, and capacity. b) Stability of production quotas over a given planning period. c) Careful linking of the production plan to the plan for material-technical procurement, according to time schedule and materials classification; establishment of continuous production ties between contiguous enterprises within an economic region, in order to ensure transportation along the shortest routes and to create the conditions necessary for direct technical-economic connection between supplies and consumer enterprises. d) The coordination of

the indices of the separate components of the Plan (production, labor, costs) with production goals, by volume and value of output.

Inadequacies in the organization of material-technical procurement as well as in the planned activity of the enterprise, can be eliminated by transferring the center of gravity of management to the locality, within the economic administrative region, closer to the enterprise.

However, the reorganization of industrial management cannot be limited to changes in the structure of the leading bodies alone: the reorganization of leadership in the economic structure must be supplemented by reorganization of the managerial system within the enterprise as well. This applies, in the first place, to industrial enterprises and their administrative personnel.

Let us look at the way projects for a new line of products are confirmed. For assuring the high quality of new products a routine was established for confirming these products by the appropriate Ministry. At the least the Ministry examined each such project twice: during the setting of norms when drawing up the project was under way, and when the project was up for approval for serial production. In the case of top priority articles of major importance to the national economy, intended for mass production, this sort of procedure was to some extent justified. But when this routine of a centralized investigation into

any and every kind of project was carried on, the result often was that the whole schedule for examining projects was disrupted.

In this period we are working to master a large variety of new products, in every branch of industry. For a careful examination to be made of every new proposal and project in the apparatus of the Ministry was something that was obviously impossible. The Ministry's technical administration, therefore, reserved the right to confirm projects on the basis of judgments arrived at by an army of experts. This created a certain reluctance to assume any responsibility in passing on the merits of new articles. The plant director felt that the burden of responsibility had been lifted from his shoulders, seeing that the project had the Ministry's stamp of approval. The Ministry, in turn, put its trust in the staff of the enterprise and in the experts. The latter, exercising no administrative rights and appearing only in a consultative capacity, felt that they too could pass the buck.

Our opinion is that the projects developed at an enterprise ought to be confirmed by its director, in agreement with the principal bodies consuming the products manufactured there, or by the trading organizations involved—this, with the exception of certain of the most important products which ought to be confirmed by the Economic Council or by the appropriate All-Union or-

gan. This procedure would increase the responsibility of enterprise directors and of personnel of leading organizations for the manufacture of new types of articles, and allow the unified economic apparatus to be freed from the burden of examining projects for a large range of projects; permitting, at the same time, a sharp cut in the time schedule for working out projects for new products and rendering more efficient modernization of types of products previously mastered. . . .

* * *

Of major importance for success in introducing new techniques into production processes is also the organization of scientific research in industry. A large number of branch institutes are now being transferred to the Economic Councils. In view of the complexity of contemporary research tasks, they are, as a rule, elaborated in cooperation with a number of institutes which in many instances are scattered over several different economic-research regions. Scientific organizations of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and various institutions of higher learning, participate with these institutes in working out the problems involved.

The elaboration of specific research tasks by these organizations requires coordination and active leadership. Neither the Scientific-Technical Committee nor any of the other institutions are qualified to give successful guidance to the day-to-day

operations of all the above organizations. In this connection, the practice has proved its value of assigning each task jointly developed by several research and production enterprises to some one institute, laboratory or enterprise that is outstanding in the field, and charging it with the responsibility for coordinating and effectively linking up the activities of the entire network sharing in the work of seeking a solution for a common problem. This sort of organization ensures all-over guidance and close contact for the activities of all the groups engaged in solving common problems.

In the recent period a cut has been put through in the number of articles centrally planned and distributed. The next thing is to expand the range of the classification of products which the plant director can accept orders for, under the obligatory quotas for centrally planned articles. A large degree of independence must be accorded the enterprise for approval of quotas for fuels and materials consumption, as well as for other expenditures.

Another important point is the clear definition and the observance of the rights and duties of each unit in the management apparatus and of the individuals of which it is composed. The absence of a clearcut position on the rights and responsibilities of each such unit and individual in the management apparatus of an enterprise renders its function-

ing more complicated. Just what things each staff member should and has the right to make decisions about must be firmly established; and here the problem is not one of drawing up voluminous theses on the subject of Rights and Duties, but of allowing plant personnel a free hand in making decisions on a specified range of questions and demanding this of them. . . .

Some attempt to pass along decision-making on many questions to the next higher up; the latter in many instances not only fails to oppose such tendencies on the part of his subordinate, but takes an indulgent attitude towards them. As a result, a mass of useless correspondence is created, decisions on many questions are endlessly dragged out, management forfeits its effectiveness. . . .

We know that the Government has assigned enterprise directors the right to confirm the financial estimates for measures relating to the installation of new techniques and modernization of equipment—within the limits of certain set totals. In many cases, however, the GOSBANK (State Bank), which approves the granting of credit for such purposes, demands that all the computations involved be submitted to it. Sometimes they find these computations unsatisfactory and insist on alterations, even in instances in which these computations have been already sanctioned by the enterprise director.

We are not opposed to the control of the activity of each and every member of the staff of an enterprise, the director included, but we are opposed to this sort of pettifogging tutelage. Having confidence in the director, we must not fence him in with small detail. It is even more impermissible to deprive the director of those rights which the Government has accorded him and others in positions of leadership. The newly created Economic Councils ought to take note of this situation, and accord directors of enterprises the rights that would allow them to give leadership to production in the full sense of these words, and not turn leadership into petty tutelage.

Until the present time government decisions on extension of the rights of the section foreman have not been fully implemented. Thus, the regulations on foremen state that theirs is the responsibility for quality of section output; but in practice, in the majority of machine-building plants the section foreman is denied the possibility of checking quality of output because of the way he is loaded down with a tremendous amount of other sorts of detail—above all, by the need to carry on a constant hunt for materials indispensable to section operations.

In the ordinary run of things, carrying out plant operations should come under the workers' control. In addition, when plant equipment has been repaired, initial output

should be checked by the repair mechanic. According to the regulations, it is the foreman's job to verify production. But besides him there are still other controllers—in the shops, in the factory management; and often, as well, buyer representatives and trading organizations take on the same function. This kind of multiple control involves an enormous waste of time, and does not always guarantee the desired results, not infrequently, leading to a situation in which it becomes extremely difficult to determine just who is, in fact, responsible for quality of production.

* * *

Putting into effect improvements in industrial planning necessitates, in the first place, a rise in the level of the technical and the economic foundation of the Plan of the individual enterprise. A comparison of measures for achieving savings in working-time and tools which were projected under the 1957 organizational-technical Plan with the savings which were slated to be achieved in the Plan for higher labor productivity, reveals a great discrepancy. The meaning here is that a significant part of the planned quotas lack technical foundation, and that the path to their achievement was not charted in advance. . . .

Within the confines of these quotas and the average production rates as confirmed by the Ministry, the limits for variation being indi-

cated, the enterprise should decide questions in connection with the Plan independently. It is extremely important to increase the degree of stability of the Plan within the enterprises and shops. The government decisions regarding confirmation of annual Plans on a quarterly basis should be implemented throughout the entire network of industrial administration.

Setting up the Plan is only the initial planning stage, following which the big job of organizing implementation of the Plan begins. Here an important role is played by the organization of material-technical procurement. Under the conditions of the complex system of agreements and reciprocal obligations operating among the enterprises, responsibility for meeting delivery schedules is still very weak in our industry. Material sanctions applied to the supplier do not cover even those amounts which the plant is compelled to pay out for production delays for which the supplier is to blame, let alone the losses the plant itself suffers over and beyond the effects of stoppages and other consequences stemming from an interruption in planned plant operation. What then is needed here is to heighten the responsibility of the suppliers in meeting delivery dates. Expanding the rights of enterprise directors must, at the same time, be accompanied by an increase in the responsibility they bear for the results of operations.

It is also necessary to expand the enterprise's possibilities in the area of independent decision of questions regarding material-technical procurement. Setting up warehouses through which materials and manufactured articles may be obtained by the enterprise, as well as regional supply-sales headquarters, will make it possible for the enterprises to eliminate stoppages. Worth noting too are proposals advanced by a number of plant directors that they be given the right to make independent decisions on questions connected with the disposal of surplus materials to other organizations—with the exception of materials in very short supply.

* * *

Similarly, expansion of the rights of the enterprise director is necessary in connection with the problem of setting financial incentives for the force employed there. In our opinion it is now definitely possible to allow the director the right of determining the procedure to be followed in assigning bonuses to plant personnel, basing himself on the all-over incentive system in use, as confirmed by leading organizations. . . .

A correct structure for a regular incentive system of labor payment demands the most careful selection of indices for the awarding of bonuses. The indices used to set bonuses should be closely tied to the economic indices of the operations of a given production sector. The

criteria for selecting the indices for the award of bonuses, as well as for selection of the group of workers among whom the bonuses are to be distributed, consist in the tangible economies attained by the enterprise. . . .

A rational system of awarding bonuses must be established in such a way that it stimulates a definite material improvement in the work of the enterprise, the shop and the production section. Although production costs are included among the several factors involved in setting bonuses, the fact of cutting costs beyond Plan is not one of these factors. In 1950 a limited group of enterprises decided to introduce cutting costs beyond Plan as a factor in awarding bonuses, but later the decision was reversed.

Such a situation, of course, tends to weaken stimulation of more efficient accounting, and introduction of an economic regime. We believe that the index for lowering production costs must be one of the basic indices taken into consideration in setting bonuses. At the very basis of a new bonus system must be the direct dependence of the material conditions of the working force on the economic indices of their labor. . . .

In our opinion, the starting point for the bonus should be the level of work at which enterprise, workshop or section operates in a given base period, in regard to output, costs and other indices. The better

a shop or plant operates, the larger the bonus its working force would receive. Under this arrangement, the obligatory condition for awarding bonuses, remains the fulfillment of the State Plan, which is the law for every enterprise. . . .

* * *

The creation of organs of industrial management within the economic administrative area permits, at the same time, a significant cut in the management apparatus of the individual enterprise. The perspective trend in the rationalization of the managerial apparatus is, in specific terms, towards the centralization of a series of operations in the field of directing production. At the present time, designer, technological bureaus and other such bodies are set up locally in every enterprise. This not only increases the number of personnel in a given category, but often leads to the virtual isolation of drawing up projects and other activities, with harmful effects on the quality of the work done.

At the same time, under conditions of the social ownership of tools and means of production, every possibility exists for the rational division of labor among various enterprises, scientific-research and engineering-designing organizations. In view of this fact, we believe it possible to centralize the fundamental work of designing and planning in the enterprises where the most fa-

avorable conditions for such activities exist, so that the designs created in those enterprises may be utilized in other enterprises in a given branch of industry as well.

In precisely the same way, it is advantageous to concentrate the major technological forces available in certain picked enterprises, so that for other enterprises technological results worked out there need only be altered in certain specific details, adapting them to concrete local production conditions. Such a division of labor will make it possible to limit the number of top-flight engineering-technical personnel in many of the enterprises; and to transfer major rationalization ideas which have been submitted to one of the enterprises to key plants and factories for elaboration in detail.

Also apropos of the division of labor, there is another interesting pos-

sibility in connection with services related to production—one which has been very little utilized in our industry. This is the idea of centralized installation of accounting for a number of enterprises, and for the accounts they carry with suppliers, consumers and the plant working force.

New forms of industrial management suggest the need for further improvement in the system of finance, credit and accounting in industry—first of all, by developing standards for working capital, an accounting system, and utilization of an amortization fund, the expansion of profits, etc. Especially important for a steady improvement in the functioning of our industry is the perfecting of the system of cost studies in connection with industrial production. These are questions that require a special survey.



Translator's Note: On July 1, 1957, the 105 Regional Economic Councils established under the May decisions of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, officially went into operation. Taking over the functions of twenty-five central industrial Ministries, which have been abolished, these Councils control three-fourths of total industrial output, including steel, coal and oil. Central Ministries are retained for power stations, and the aviation, defense, shipbuilding, chemical, radio-equipment, and medium machine-building industries.

Before the Supreme Soviet decision, nation-wide discussion was conducted on a vast scale, with the utmost vigor, freedom, concreteness and weight; it provided, as Glasgow University's scholarly quarterly, *Soviet Studies* observed, rich material for some phases of large-scale organization in the USSR, "and indeed, in the modern industrial world." One thing that came through was that the same rapid development of scientific, technical and engineering forces that made Sputnik possible, made

decentralization possible; that the present scale of Soviet industry, the advent of automation and the needs of democratization made the change imperative.

One comment on a particular phrase that appears in the foregoing article: The term "one-man management," or more precisely, "individual responsibility in management," was introduced in the 1930's when the three-man top management—including a representative of Party and Soviet as well as plant director—was superceded; it does not have the sinister implications given it recently by Harry Schwartz of the *New York Times*.

SATELLITE DECLARES ITS OWN DIVIDEND

This is a time to forget that we are Russian, or British, or American, white, black or brown, and to throw out our chests because we are MEN.

It does not matter that it is the Russians who have been the first to throw a man-made satellite into space. The great thing is that it has been done.

For a thousand generations men have watched the stars and dreamed of journeying through the heavens. To the Russians goes the honor of being the first to bring the dream to the edge of reality. Only a churl without imagination would begrudge them their triumph.

We should ask ourselves WHY the Russians have been so successful. One fundamental reason is that their scientific development is not dominated to the extent that it is in the West by the question: "Will it pay?" . . . that is, will it pay dividends to some giant company or corporation.

They have freed themselves from the incubus of vested interests that capitalism imposes on the West. It is possible to absorb an immense amount of muddle and bureaucracy—and the Russians undoubtedly still suffer plenty—and still shoot ahead when other considerations than the annual dividend or bonus issue are the measurement of success.

It is only in time of war that the West forces the pace regardless of "sound business" considerations. The Russians' interest in science in peace or war is insatiable and continues and starts from a different conception of what is "sound business."

It is this quality, and not super-spies or stolen secrets, which is the real reason for their triumph.

—*Editorial from the liberal London newspaper, Reynolds News, October 13, 1957.*

A Discussion of the Political Economy Textbook*

By SOVIET ECONOMISTS

IN MAY 1956 a joint discussion on the second edition of the *Political Economy Textbook* was held between the Faculty of Political Economy of the Moscow State University and the Faculties of Political Economy and Social Science of other institutes.

The meeting was opened by a short statement from Academician K. V. Ostrovitianov. He stated that the first and second editions of the textbook had on the whole been favorably received by the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Congress, creatively developing Marxist-Leninist theory, had also elaborated a number of new principles and had demanded a re-examination of certain mistaken theoretical conclusions which had their origin in the cult of personality. As a result, historians, philosophers, economists, students of law, and workers in many other fields as well as the authors of the textbook, were faced with a whole number of new, complex questions. The new edition of the textbook would have to meet the high demands which the Twentieth Congress made on the social sciences in general and on political economy in particular. These new

and heavy tasks could only be solved by drawing in the widest circles and enlisting their cooperation.

A lively discussion followed.

* * *

Dr. A. W. Bachurin raised objections to that section of the textbook which dealt with the transition period from capitalism to socialism. In his opinion, the chapters in question contained too much emphasis on questions of the history of political economy and of economic policy, whilst the main problems of political economy were either relegated to second place or not properly treated. Thus the special features of the rise of socialist production, as well as the main features and laws of economic development in the period of transition were not elaborated with sufficient clarity.

Bachurin considered that the existence of two forms of property were insufficient justification for explaining commodity production under socialism. The character of so-

* These are extracts from a full summary of the discussion that originally appeared in the *Proceedings of the Moscow University's Economic, Philosophy and Law Section*, No. 2, 1956. The full text appears in the German magazine, *Sowjetwissenschaft*, July, 1957, from which the translation offered here was made.—Ed.

cial labor in the period of socialist construction is also a factor. One was also led, Bachurin stated, to question Stalin's conclusion that the means of production are not commodities under socialism. From the standpoint of Marxist-Leninist economic theory, it is difficult to understand how means of production can have value but at the same time not be commodities. Such a naturalistic interpretation was already rejected by Marx himself. According to Bachurin, the means of production are commodities also under socialism. Certainly they are commodities of a special kind, clearly differentiated from means of consumption, which are commodities in the fullest sense of the word. But, despite this, the means of production are real commodities, not just things decked out with the "appearance" of commodities.

Caused by the cult of personality and in contradiction to the logical and convincing arguments of Marx, the textbook denies that there is a division of the product into necessary and surplus product under socialism. Such a division continues to exist even though in socialism it expresses different relations of production. It is true that the definition of surplus product is changed—now it is a product for society and not for the exploiting classes.

* * *

Dr. Gluchkov was concerned mainly with questions of modern

capitalism. He agreed with the authors of the textbook that the law of surplus value is the basic economic law of capitalism, but considered that the operation of this law under monopoly capitalism was not explained in a sufficiently concrete way. It is true that surplus value is the general foundation for monopoly profit, but, in addition to this, it is necessary to show that the monopolies have other, different, additional sources and methods for securing super-profits.

There is much that is unclear in the textbook in relation to how the laws discovered by Marx in his examination of capitalism in its pre-monopoly stage operate in modern capitalism. This applies especially with regard to the law of the tendency of falling rate of profit; for here there is a failure to show that with the increase in the organic composition of capital in monopoly capitalism, the degree of exploitation is most strikingly increased. When the capitalists invest in fixed capital they face the danger that their rate of profits will fall very steeply. However, this is compensated for by the fact that the exploitation of the working class is intensified. The increase in the rate of exploitation in modern capitalism is an important factor moderating and hindering the fall in the rate of profit. A further countering factor, not mentioned in the textbook, is that of state monopoly capitalism, as a result of which the monopolies acquire fan-

tastic wealth through their utilization of the apparatus of the state. The textbook fails to deal with the export of capital, which also holds up the fall in the rate of profit. The result is that the law of the tendency of falling rate of profit and its operation in modern capitalism are treated very slightly in the textbook.

A good point about the textbook is that it examines the two tendencies in technical development which appear under imperialism. However, though the authors recognize an industrial advance under imperialism, they limit this to those branches of industry which are concerned with armaments production and thus they remain standing halfway, for technique also advances in other branches of production under the pressure of competition. Though the textbook correctly shows that technical advance takes place under imperialism, it does not elaborate these points. It is also absolutely essential to draw attention to the contradictions which accompany this process.

Gluchkov suggested that the law of the uneven development of capitalism—economic and political—in the epoch of imperialism be given much more attention in later editions of the textbook. This question cannot be separated from the many and varied forms of transition from capitalism to socialism in different countries; for this reason the law should be examined in a more funda-

mental and comprehensive way. In doing this, there should be no one-sided concentration on uneven economic development, but due attention should also be paid to uneven political development. In the second edition of the textbook only one aspect of the uneven political development is treated, i.e., the class struggle; other important aspects like the national liberation struggle and the anti-fascist struggle and the peace movement are not even mentioned.

* * *

Professor S. B. Lif criticized the structure of the section in the textbook that dealt with the capitalist mode of production. He drew attention to a number of incorrect formulations in the textbook. For example the textbook stated: "The *maximum limit* of wages under capitalism is the value of labor." One cannot agree with such a conclusion put so categorically. Wages are extremely elastic. In certain phases of the industrial cycle they can very much exceed the value of labor power. Certainly this is of very short duration. The fact that successful class struggle by the proletariat can also force an increase of wages should not be overlooked either.

In treating the problems of imperialism we should stop using the term "maximum profit". Lenin speaks of monopoly profit or monopoly super-profit. And not without reason. The concept "maximum

pro
tive
dra
com
pro
pro
the
wit
qua
con
nop
the
mu
in
Len
one
am
in,
ma
as
ten
reas
of
val
I
real
fou
tali
mor
zati
nop
corr
volv
poir
stat
fine
its
ion
gov
cap
this

profit" expresses only the quantitative side of this phenomenon; it draws attention to the fact that it is considerably above the average profit. But the concept *monopoly profit* or *monopoly super-profit*, on the other hand, provides us not only with a quantitative but also with a qualitative concept. It immediately conveys the relation between monopoly profit and the domination of the monopolies. Moreover, maximum profit and monopoly profit are in no sense synonymous terms. Lenin regarded monopoly profit as one of the varieties of profit, profit amassed by monopoly capital. Stalin, on the other hand, really equates maximum profits with surplus value, as profit necessary for ensuring extended reproduction. There is no reason for such a jumbling together of monopoly profit and surplus value.

In the textbook there is also no real elaboration of the economic foundations of state monopoly capitalism. All that is said is that state monopoly capitalism means the utilization of the state apparatus by monopoly capital. This is, of course, correct, but it is not all. What is involved—from the economic standpoint—in the subordination of the state by the monopolies? Lenin defines as one of the foundations of its development the personal union of monopoly capital and the government in which monopoly capital is the decisive factor. From this it also becomes clear how the

monopolies are in a position to harness the state for their own interests.

* * *

Dr. N. S. Spiridinova opposed the view that the means of production were commodities under socialism. In this connection she recalled a statement made by Lenin in 1920 that state products, the products of state enterprises, exchanged for food produced by peasants, are not commodities in the politico-economic sense of the term, in any case are not only commodities, are no longer commodities (Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 32, Russian edition). This statement of Lenin's also has validity to the entire period of the first stage of communism, especially in regard to the means of production. Considered correctly, the means of production are seen to be no longer commodities. The transition from commodity to product proceeds not at one blow, but by a series of leaps. True, this dialectical process of development from commodity to non-commodity signifies that the means of production still have value as the measure of labor embodied in them. They still have the value form, and appear in the form of commodities. Value here does not express the relations between different classes, but has already lost a number of specific features, for beneath the utilization of the old form the commodity gradually grows into the product. The fact that the means

of production retain the commodity form and are paid for in money is not just a game, but is of considerable importance for the economy.

* * *

N. W. Chessin dealt with the meaning and the content of basic economic laws. In his opinion, the introduction of the category—basic economic law—to economic practice must be ascribed exclusively to Stalin. Marx, Engels and Lenin, the classical exponents of Marxism-Leninism, did not venture to deduce a basic law from a series of other laws. Chessin argued that one should not concern oneself with the idea of how to improve the formulation of basic economic laws, but rather with the question as to whether the elaboration of such a category is justified scientifically at all. The construction of a basic law out of several other laws, and having the content ascribed to it by Stalin, contradicts Marxist dialectics.

By a basic economic law, Stalin understood a law that determines all the most important sides and process of development, and consequently all that is most essential in a mode of production. The authors of the textbook used the word "expresses" instead of "determines" in various places. This alteration is absolutely correct, for an economic law can only *express* and not *determine* this or that aspect of relations within the relations of production. It is not an economic law which

makes possible the rise of a definite system of production relations, but, on the contrary, the production relations which give rise to economic laws. However, despite this correction, the authors have plumped for the idea that amongst all the laws there is *one* which expresses what is most essential in the mode of production.

We are faced here with a wrong conclusion. The essence of the mode of production cannot be confined within the framework of *one* law. Every law reflects only one single side, one aspect, one essential feature; it does not, however, embrace the essence in its totality. The real inner essence of such a complicated organism is a mode of production, which can only be expressed by all the economic laws taken together. Although Stalin sought to find *one* law which expressed the essence of a mode of production, he only brought confusion into economic theory and also into economic practice as a result. According to Stalin, the law of value as the law of commodity production had no connection with the essence of capitalism. For Marx, Engels and Lenin on the contrary, capitalism without commodity production was unthinkable; for them it was precisely commodity production which is the basis of capitalism, and without the law of value there could have been no law of surplus value.

Influenced by the cult of personality the authors of the textbook

have
law
duct
the
law
to c
the
tion
for
tion
refe
this
the
tion
only
cial
surp
sic

have taken pains to formulate basic laws for the various modes of production. The inevitable result was that the formulation of the basic law of a mode of production had to contain all the main features of the corresponding production relations. This could not be avoided, for the essence of a mode of production cannot be adequately defined by reference to a single feature. For this it is necessary to describe all the important features. An exception is made in the case of capitalism only, and, to a certain extent of socialism. For capitalism the law of surplus value is elevated to the basic law. This, according to Ches-

sin, was quite wrong. The basic features of the capitalist mode of production are expressed in the category *capital* and not in the category *surplus value*, which itself only constitutes a definition of capital. Marx, who in the famous three volumes of *Capital*, investigated the content of capital, found ever new definitions, and in this way provided us with a comprehensive characterization of the essential features of capitalism. To discover the basic laws of capitalism involves, therefore, revealing all the fundamental laws of motion of capital, including the law of surplus value.

"Great changes have taken place in the Soviet Union since my last visit. The rate of progress in the USSR is higher than in the West. Great changes have also taken place in the material conditions of the people, as well as in housing construction and also in the scope of scientific work. The budgets of the research institutes are very considerable, the laboratories are supplied with modern scientific equipment. The activities of the various Soviet scientific organizations are coordinated and are purposeful. The research on the relation between the work of the brain and the internal organs evoked my greatest interest. I think that for us American physiologists it is very important to acquaint ourselves more profoundly with this research as we are just starting on similar work in the USA. We can learn much from Soviet physiologists in this sphere."

—Prof. W. Horsley Gantt, Director of Pavlovian Laboratory, Johns Hopkins University, visiting the Soviet Union, October, 1957.

Hungarian Intellectuals on the U.N. Report

In the September 25, 1957 issue of *Les Lettres Francaises*, leading weekly journal of the literary Left in France, edited by Louis Aragon, appeared a highly significant statement relevant to the Hungarian question. So far as the Editor knows, this statement has appeared nowhere in the United States.

Some preliminary remarks are in order. The statement was read, at a well-attended meeting in Budapest, by the poet, Jozsef Fodor, who had played a leading part in the criticism of the Rakosi government. It was signed by 217 writers and intellectuals, all of whom had also been quite critical of the conduct of affairs prior to October, 1956, and some of whom remained distinctly dissatisfied with the efforts of the Kadar government.

As to the record of some of the signers: On November 2, 1956, the *Literary Gazette* of Budapest put out a special issue, widely republished throughout the world, edited by writers who had been in the forefront of the struggle against Rakosi. One of the editors is now in London; twelve are signers of the statement below, including Lajos Kassak, Laszlo Nemeth, Lajos Tami, Lajos Konya, Gyula Illyes, Jozsef Fodor, Aron Tamasi, and Peter Veres. Further, of the Hungarian writers recently featured in Jean-Paul Sartre's special Hungarian Literary Issue of *Les Temps Modernes* (January, 1957) eight signed this statement: Peter Kuczka, Imre Keszi, Sandor Gergely, Janos Foldek, Jozsef Darvas, Ferenc Sartha, Geza Molnar, Sandor Nagy.

The statement itself* follows in full—Ed:

DEEPLY CONSCIOUS of the responsibility which falls on us, and of the role which we play in forming national public opinion, and also of our responsibility before humanity, we protest against bringing the events in Hungary before the United Nations as a subject for discussion. We would like our voices to reach those who

say they are our friends—in the first place our colleagues, the writers of all nations. We would want them to understand our anguish, and that they will make our protest their own.

We can act only with our people; we know all the vibrations of its soul. We know it and we assert it: the

* The translation was done by Milton Howard.

Hungarian people did not wish, and do not want counter-revolution. Only a small minority wants the return of the old order. Nevertheless, on the 23 of October, 1956, following a tragic convergence of historic and social circumstances, there unfolded a series of events which neither public opinion, nor the honest intentions of the majority of the original participants, could any longer control. The activities of hostile imperialism, intervening under its own command, played no small part in bringing to the surface residues of fascism, which for a few days created a situation recalling the White Terror of 1920.

We represent the most diverse shades of Hungarian opinion and all literary tendencies. A whole series of specific details as well as some fundamental questions are still being discussed by us; but one fact already is clear for us today: the formation of the workers-peasants government and its appeal for aid to the Soviet forces saved our country from the danger of a bloody counter-revolution—a danger that was becoming ever greater.

We had not all understood at the time the necessity and the importance of this move. Our positions at that time reflected our anxieties and our doubts. Since then, we have learned to evaluate better those who, in those difficult hours, held fast and saved the country of the working people from social regression, from civil war, perhaps from an even more ter-

rible eventuality, war.

Certain of us still have serious reservations on questions of internal politics which have to do with methods for building socialism; but as patriots, as loyal citizens of the Hungarian People's Republic, all of us desire with all our strength to contribute to the consolidation of the economic and social situation and to the upsurge of cultural life; we all rejoice at every gain made in these fields, at every sign which demonstrates the force and vitality of this evolution. This is the feeling of the majority, of the best part of the nation.

Whose interest is it then to reopen the wounds? Certainly not our country's, nor that of our ordinary people on whom weigh these difficult historic conditions. It is impossible for us not to see the real origin of this malicious propaganda: the political maneuvers of the capitalist powers. They want to reinvigorate the declining morale of the most barbarous counter-revolutionary forces; they want to lash once again our now calm public opinion; they want to maintain and increase international tension. We cannot approve this kind of politics. And we cannot approve those, however they may say they are our advocates, who make a mockery of our national drama, who turn our tragedy into a farce. Whoever is our friend cannot approve of that. Whoever is our friend will try to heal, not to reopen our wounds.

We are a small people; but our place in history and the role which we assume in the cause of humanity gives us the right to cry to the world: We will not be used for the political designs of anyone! We will not be a plaything in the hands of dubious persons! We will not be the object of international scandal-mongering!

We know that there are Hungarian writers who talk otherwise. They talk in our name; we have to say something on our part about them. The road of Hungarian writers united with the people has been bitterly difficult in the past; and today, also, it is not easy to assume our responsibilities in a country which is creating a new social order. But we cannot accept any other destiny. We are certain that this destiny is as noble as it is difficult. Let him who has fled be silent because his

voice can only be that of a renegade. His words can only betray the people whose destiny he has not had the courage to share. This is what all writers and all patriots will understand.

Finally, we deem the UN an important international forum. We respect it as an organization whose mission is to be the place where peoples can be reconciled and where peaceful co-existence is worked out. We would like to continue to respect it. We were happy when our country became a member of the UN; we would like it to continue to be a member.

Writers of the world! Intellectuals of good will of all the peoples of the world! For the mutual respect of nations, for our country which has suffered so much, for your own dignity, for the honor of the United Nations, protest with us!

By

T
form
but
is c
wor
the
Leni
mov
part
revo
tion
the
pean
mon
elab
Com
"Peo
Ame
lous
inter

T
years
of th
Both
tense
perio
to th
such
back
erati
stand
day,

Sti
Ame

* p
York,

People's Capitalism—and Djilas

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

The New Class,* by Milovan Djilas, formerly vice-president of Yugoslavia but now a deserter from Communism, is currently being widely hailed in the world bourgeois press as constituting the theoretical demolition of Marxism-Leninism and of the world Communist movement in general. The State Department thinks highly of this counter-revolutionary book, and Radio Liberation is sending it word-by-word over the radio to the USSR and the European People's Democracies, a two months' steady job. The book is an elaborate attempt to develop an anti-Communist theoretical basis for the "People's Capitalism" propaganda that American imperialism is now so sedulously peddling in this country and internationally.

The "People's Capitalism" of these years is a direct political descendant of the "New Capitalism" of the 1920's. Both were born during times of intense economic boom in their respective periods, and both gave vivid expression to the "prosperity illusions" current at such times. By taking a brief glance back at the New Capitalism of a generation ago, it will help us to understand the People's Capitalism of today, and also Djilas' role in it.

Still fresh in the mind of the American people is the deep intoxica-

tion that was generated around the demagogy of the New Capitalism during the hectic 1920's. The United States, which had emerged victorious and undamaged from World War I and was just starting out upon a determined effort to win world domination, was then passing through a frenzied economic boom, based mainly, but not exclusively, upon repairing the vast property damages done and the commodity shortages created by the first world war. The only capitalist rivals that the American imperialists had to face had been deeply injured by the war.

American capitalism, with its industries booming along, was hailed by the soothsayers here and abroad, as having become crisis-proof; a wild speculation raged on the Stock Exchange; Ford had defeated Marx, they claimed, and the class struggle was ended. Drunk on this capitalist prosperity propaganda, the conservative leaders of labor declared strikes to be obsolete; hailed the theory of Professor Carver, (*The Present Economic Revolution in the United States*), that the workers were buying a decisive control of the stocks of American industry; organized a whole series of wildcat labor banks, and asserted that the road of the workers to emancipation lay through active cooperation with the employers for more and more produc-

* Published by Frederick A. Praeger. New York, 214 pages, \$3.95.

tion. These were the halcyon days of "trade union capitalism" and of intense class collaboration with the employers. The Communist Party warned against all this labor folly, and it pointed out that an economic crisis was certain and in the offing. But the Party's voice went practically unheard until the great economic crisis of 1929 knocked to smithereens the whole New Capitalism house-of-cards. The "New Capitalism" turned out to be very much the old capitalism.

THE PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM OF TODAY

At present, we have a fresh edition of the New Capitalism of long ago, this time more demagogically named "People's Capitalism," or the "Welfare State." Once again, in the aftermath of a great war, in which it got strong and wealthy while its main capitalist rivals were almost cut to pieces, the United States is carrying on a more determined effort than ever to make itself the imperialist master of the world. Again a big post-war boom is afoot, and once more the mouth-pieces of capitalism are telling us, in every conceivable way, that the United States will never again know a serious economic depression or crisis. Capitalism is pictured as a progressive regime, in which monopoly capital, formerly dominant and ruthless, is now tamed and essentially defeated.

Again the conservative leaders in the unions who are ardent defenders of People's Capitalism, are going in for "trade union capitalism," but in a new way. With union treasuries a hundred times richer than those of the 1920's, they are buying into industry

on a big scale, and as individuals, they are plunging with the unions' huge welfare funds. No longer is it even frowned upon for a labor leader to be a capitalist in his own right. Speculation with the workers' fund is going on upon a far greater scale than is indicated even by the current shocking racketeering scandals in the Teamsters, Bakers, and Textile unions. Again we are hearing the old song that the workers are becoming capitalists and are buying out the industries.

Of course, the analogy between the situation in the 1920's, with its New Capitalism, and that in the 1950's, with its People's Capitalism demagoguery, must not be pushed too far. Lots of water has run under the bridges in the meantime. But the changes that have occurred have in no sense given a more sound justification to the present People's Capitalism, so called, than was had by the erstwhile ill-fated New Capitalism, which blew up so spectacularly in October 1929. In the interim, although American capitalism has become much richer, basically the world capitalist system has grown relatively and actually weaker. The general crisis of world capitalism has markedly deepened. The Socialist world, struggling for a foot-hold a generation ago, has now become very powerful, consisting of a whole system of states which embrace about 900,000,000 people, or over one-third of all humanity. Meanwhile, the capitalist system although now passing through a hectic economic boom, is confronting a series of mounting difficulties. Most important of these is the disastrous break-down of the col-

onia
maj
The
nes
been
pow
dole
ther
serio
trou
Nati
basie

THI
O

Pe

ten

prim

It is

by

save,

capit

cum

grow

cialis

is to

for

dom

war.

tion

cial-l

the c

ident

pirat

the

TH

the

talism

and

the p

stant

in v

are

the

onial system, which was one of the major props of world imperialism. The English, German, French, Japanese, Italian, and Dutch empires have been shattered, and these erstwhile powerful regimes are now all on the dole of the United States. Nor are there lacking in the capitalist world serious signs of coming economic troubles of a major sort, as the 16th National Convention of the CPUSA basically indicated.

THE DEVELOPING IDEOLOGY OF PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM

People's Capitalism, or as it is often called, the "Welfare State", stems primarily from monopoly capitalism. It is a conscious and organized effort by American monopoly capital to save, for itself, the threatened world capitalist system—from its own accumulating weaknesses and from the growing competition of world Socialism. Its most immediate purpose is to provide a "democratic" screen for Wall Street's ruthless attempt to dominate the world, even by atomic war. It is essentially class collaborationist in character, in that the Social-Democratic leaders of labor in the capitalist countries have definitely identified the achievements and aspirations of the working class with the program of People's Capitalism.

The substance of the argument of the Welfare State, or People's Capitalism, is that, in the United States and other major capitalist countries, the people are now living under substantially a new form of society, in which the monopoly capitalists are no longer dominant and where the state has as its basic objective,

the cultivation of the interests of the working class and other domestic strata. The Welfare State is conceived as a sort of evolutionary, intermediate stage between monopoly capitalism and Socialism. But all this is a gross misconception. The American people are still living under monopoly capitalism, and the state still has the elementary objective to further and protect the interests of the capitalists, especially the monopolists, at the expense of the working class, the farmers, the Negro people, and other mass strata. The only favorable consideration the working masses may get from the present state is what they are able to insist upon by virtue of their powerful economic and political organizations. The danger in the Welfare State and People's Capitalism demagoguery is that it weakens the fighting spirit of the workers by sowing illusions among them to the effect that the main enemy, monopoly capital, is already essentially defeated.

The political ideology and economic practices of People's Capitalism have been long in the making. Already in the mid-1920's roots of it were to be seen in such books as, Foster and Catchings', *Business without A Buyer*; Tugwell's, *American Industry Comes Of Age*, and others. The real economic ideology of the movement, however, was outlined by the well-known book, published in 1935 by John Maynard Keynes, entitled, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*. Keynes' theory was that by increased government intervention in industry, by manipulating taxes, interest rates, and other fiscal factors, and especially by feed-

ing languishing industry with fat government orders for public works, war munitions, etc., economic crises could be averted, or at least minimized below the point where they could constitute a real danger to the capitalist system. Thus Socialism was to be defeated and capitalism saved.

Keynesism, which is the basic economics of the period of the general crisis of capitalism, became in various forms, the economic policy of all the major capitalist governments, including the United States. The United Nations also subscribes to it. Franklin D. Roosevelt, with his New Deal, was the first President to put the Keynesian program into effect, in his fruitless efforts to overcome the economic breakdown of 1929-1933 — it took World War II, however, to end this crisis. In the immediate post-war period, President Truman followed the same general line of giving industry a shot-in-the-arm by huge and highly profitable munitions orders. President Eisenhower has gone in the same general direction, except that his 74 billion dollar peace-time budget far outdoes anything previous of the Keynesian brand, and his gigantic atomic war machine, scattered all over the world, is a constant menace to international peace.

Generally, the reformist leaders of the trade unions and the Social-Democratic parties have adopted the Keynesian capitalist thesis of a "progressive capitalism" or "Welfare State", weaving their own program into this general pattern. They have supported the aggressive and warlike policies of American imperialism, on the futile theory that the interests of the people are best served by following

militant American imperialism. They are again singing the song of a capitalism that is supposedly gradually being transformed into a "People's Capitalism". Far and wide, in the bourgeois press, capitalism is pictured as having lost all its previous exploiting character, and its insatiable greed for maximum profits, is now supposedly diverted to promoting the welfare of all the people. Books and articles along this general line have multiplied unendingly.

A very notable contribution to the developing ideology of People's Capitalism, which deserves special mention was the recent book by John Strachey, a former Marxist writer but nowadays a prominent reformist leader of the British Labor Party, entitled *Contemporary Capitalism*. This is a basic endorsement of Keynesism and the so-called welfare state. Its elementary aim is to so emasculate Marxism that it can be fitted into Welfare State illusion. Its specific role is to sow more effectively the seeds of People's Capitalism in the ranks of the working class. In this respect the book has had a considerable effect among the reformist labor leadership, especially in the English-speaking countries.

DJILAS, IDEOLOGIST OF PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM

Now we come to the role of Djilas and his book, *The New Class*, in all this. And this is a very special role in the cultivation of the propaganda of the imperialist conception of People's Capitalism. Djilas, like Strachey, is a highly experienced former Marxist writer, and he has a keen sense of the basic role that Communism is

now
dan
this
de
of
mu
He
lish
the
tegr
foun
D
enti
mat
org
olog
He
far
he a
mer
bou
ious
form
exist
class
clin
to t
of h
this
has
pure
to h
nam
ishin
fluer
D
thesi
lead
cular
and
pow
whic
peop
sis,
the

now playing in the World. His fundamental approach is that at all costs this Communist "menace" must be destroyed. Practically all the advocates of People's Capitalism are anti-Communist, but Djilas is of a special kind. He has set as his major task to demolish Marxism-Leninism, and with it the Communist movement, by disintegrating, if he can, its theoretical foundations.

Djilas has completely discarded the entire Marxist ideology—its dialectical materialist philosophy, its centralized organization, its methods, its terminology, and its Socialist perspective. He has made a clean sweep of it so far as he himself is concerned, and he aims to have the Communist movement generally do the same. Many bourgeois writers of today accept various aspects of Marxism in limited forms. They recognize, in a way, the existence of social classes and the class struggle, and they are often inclined to give a great deal of weight to the economic factor in the shaping of history. But not so Djilas; for him this is all gone and done with. He has become a bourgeois ideologist, pure and simple, who has taken unto himself the impossible task, in the name of People's Capitalism, of abolishing the theoretical and practical influence of Marx and Lenin.

Djilas sets out to prove as his main thesis that the body of Communist leaders throughout the world, particularly in those countries where they and their allies have acquired state power, constitute a new social class which is oppressing and exploiting the people. This is an old and stale thesis, which has been with us ever since the earliest days of the Russian Rev-

olution; but Djilas presents it with such cunning and vigor that it must needs be answered all over again. This is doubly necessary because of the confusing consequences of the re-evaluation of the role of Stalin and the events in Hungary, which, of course, constitute meat and drink to Djilas and the main impulse for the writing of his book.

The Djilas book is already widely popular among the Right-revisionist trend that has sprung up recently in a number of Communist parties. It is just what the doctor ordered for such ex-Communists as Howard Fast, Joseph Starobin, and Joseph Clark. These people still talk about being Marxists and favoring a Socialist perspective, but consciously or unconsciously, they are supporters of People's Capitalism, which is alien to Socialism. This is the substance of what they have been advocating in and around our Party for the past two years.

One of Djilas' many slick devices in trying to make his case is to indulge in the grossest distortion and exaggeration. Thus, he will take some weakness or shortcoming in the Communist movement and blow it up out of all relation to reality. This is especially true with regard to his development of the concept of the Communist leadership comprising a new social class. He creates his new class by grossly exaggerating the evil of bureaucracy which has affected the various Communist parties. Now, bureaucracy is admittedly a great evil, and Lenin himself never ceased inveighing against it. To overcome it and to establish real democracy in its organizations is one of the most basic problems confronting the working

class in all countries. The Social Democratic parties have long been notoriously bureaucratic; so, too, are the trade unions—see the A.F. of L-C.I.O. in general, or the Teamsters (and scores of other unions) in particular. And especially during the past two years, Communists have become very conscious of the serious manifestations of bureaucracy in the Communist parties.

Obviously, especially under Stalin, the Soviet Party and State were seriously crippled with bureaucratism and this did a world of damage, which is only now being painfully corrected. A particularly powerful cause for this corroding bureaucratism was the fact that the U.S.S.R., because it was compelled, in self-defense in a hostile capitalist world, to build its industries at great speed had to be on constant guard against internal and external mortal enemies, and to fight two long and disastrous wars. It had to keep its people almost continuously under a discipline and in urgent organization drives that provided a very fertile field for bureaucracy. Stalin took advantage of this weakness, with the tragic results that we now all know.

One of the most basic lessons that was learned by Communists as a result of the drastic revelations about Stalin at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was the serious extent and destructive effects of the bureaucracy that had grown up during the Stalin regime and the imperative necessity of eradicating it. Every Communist Party in the world, including the C.P.U.S.A., is now deeply concerned with this elementary bureaucracy problem and is moving

energetically to eliminate it. Most active is the C.P.S.U., which is being stirred to its depths in this respect.

Djilas, with his customary exaggeration and distortion of every Communist error and weakness—and there are still all too many of these—takes the position that Stalin's gross errors were the ultimate and unavoidable expression of Communist organization. But this is false, as is evidenced by the universal cleansing of such wrong tendencies that is now going on in all Communist parties. Democratic centralism, as made clear by Lenin, can be made to work in the fullest sense of the democratic aspect of this indispensable proletarian formula of organization and action. Communists, while strong advocates of effective unity and discipline, are also the best champions of workingclass democracy in all its forms.

• • •

To say as Djilas does, that such bureaucracy as existed under Stalin in the USSR signifies that a new ruling class has arisen there, is absurd. Indeed, in an effort to bolster his "new class" nonsense, Djilas has had to concoct a fantastic conception of what constitutes a social class. Thus, he says on page 54, "The specific character of this new class is its collective ownership." He says also (page 45), "This new class obtains its power, privileges, ideology, and its customs from one specific form of ownership—collective ownership—which the class administers and distributes in the name of the national society." And again, on page 46, he avers that, "The ownership privileges of the new class and membership in that class are the

priv
fact
the
mini
to n
weal
shee
shou
avoi
man
Th
elem
rulin
own
weal
socie
this
that
own
that
by r
holdi
whic
a cla
do, a
in a
In
of w
whic
cialist
to hi
Social
ter
less, i
durin
errors
Unde
paid
butior
Such
correc
Dji
a cas
"new
charg

privileges of administration." Thus, the fact that the Communist leaders of the Party and the State are mainly administering the industries is supposed to make them the owners of the great wealth of the Soviet system—which is sheer nonsense. Perhaps the industries should administer themselves and thus avoid being "owned" by the authorized manager?

Throughout history, one of the most elementary characteristic features of a ruling class is that its members have owned and enjoyed personally the wealth being produced by the given society. Djilas is quite aware of this fact, and he would like to prove that the Communists as a "class" do own the industries in the only sense that has any real meaning; namely, by reaping the profits from them and holding them as personal wealth; which, if so, would indeed make them a class. But this, of course, he cannot do, as such a condition is impossible in a Socialist country.

In the USSR there is not equality of wages. Diversity in this respect, which is in accord with the basic Socialist principle of "To each according to his work," is indispensable under Socialism as a direct stimulus to better and more production. Nevertheless, in this matter, as in so many others during the latter years of Stalin, serious errors were made and favoritism shown. Undoubtedly certain categories were paid out of proportion to their contribution to the upbuilding of Socialism. Such errors, too, must and will be corrected.

Djilas, fishing around to construct a case in this respect for his stale "new class" theory, makes various charges that certain officials are fa-

vored regarding housing, automobiles, etc. All unjustified wage discrepancies and special favors granted to this or that group are bad and must be rectified; they are expressions of the elementary evil of bureaucracy. But to use such examples as groundwork for asserting that there is a "new class" of Communist functionaries in the USSR is nonsense. It is a typical example of the irresponsible exaggeration and distortion which are the chief working tools of Djilas. The only possible conclusion, from Djilas' own arguments (and the facts in the case), is that the Soviet people themselves own the industries and that they are reaping collectively the advantages of their growth and development.

A MAZE OF DISTORTIONS AND MISINTERPRETATIONS

In order to bolster up his basic thesis that the Communists have simply substituted a new class of exploiters for the old ones, Djilas develops a hundred and one falsities, half-truths, and exaggerations. He sweeps aside dialectical materialism as neither Communist nor revolutionary. Marx and Lenin, while great revolutionaries, were blunderers who really knew little or nothing of the laws that govern social growth and decay. He says that Communist leaders are "no better acquainted than others" in this respect.

Djilas equates the dictatorship of the proletariat with Party and eventually one-man dictatorship. He thinks that the Socialist revolution should have proceeded upon the basis of the principle of bourgeois democracy, although obviously it does not. He systematically identifies discipline, and es-

pecially the vanguard role of the Party, with bureaucracy; although, with his experience, he should know that, despite serious errors made in the practice, without a powerful lead from the Party, the revolutions in Russia, China, Yugoslavia, and elsewhere, could not have been brought about nor maintained.

Obviously, the Communist movement has suffered much from dogmatism, but it is fighting against and overcoming this harmful weakness. But Djilas, with his characteristic exaggeration and distortion, portrays Marxism-Leninism as hopelessly doctrinaire in its very being. And this in spite of the many profound additions and developments made to Marxism by Lenin, by Stalin's theory of Socialism in one country, by the People's Front policies of the 7th Congress of the Comintern, by the policy of People's Democracy of the post-World War II period, by the many theoretical innovations of the Chinese Communists, by the popularization of the concept of various national ways to Socialism, by the recent adoption of the possibility of a parliamentary road to Socialism, and by the present widespread fight against dogmatism. Contrary to Djilas, and despite admitted weaknesses of dogmatism, Marxism-Leninism, over the years, has proven itself to be basically flexible and highly responsive to the widely differing needs of the labor movement in all countries. In this respect, as in many others, Marxism-Leninism is far ahead of Social Democracy.

Djilas, in his own special way, rehashes all the arguments that bourgeois and Right-Social Democratic intellectuals have been making against

Communism and the USSR ever since the fateful November 7th of forty years ago. Naturally, therefore, he pulls out all stops when dealing with the question of the ideology of peoples under Communist leadership. He says: "An enemy to thought in the name of science, an enemy to freedom in the name of democracy, the Communist oligarchy cannot but accomplish complete corruption of the mind." But this attack is hardly sustained by the notable scientific and technical progress made by the USSR which he grudgingly acknowledges; by the outstanding contributions made to science, literature and the arts by Communists; by the long series of internal ideological struggles that have marked the history of every Communist Party, and especially by the profound ideological ferment that is now going on throughout the Communist world.

All through his book, Djilas harps upon the theme that the Communist-led revolutions are failures. But here, as usual, he frequently contradicts himself. Thus, on page 30, he says, "The Communist Revolution cannot attain a single one of the ideals named as its motivating force." But faced with a mountain of evidence contradictory to this, he characteristically departs from this absurd picture. For example, he states, page 30, that "The Communist revolution has brought about a measure of industrial civilization to vast areas of Europe and Asia"; on page 100 we learn that, "The Communist regimes have succeeded in solving many problems that had baffled the systems they replaced"; and on page 117, "Of course, once-backward Russia has attained second place in world production as far as the most

imp
conc
cont
a h
ma
whic
sing
D
deno
pid,
but,
corr
he r
some
we
the
prin
page
few
suffe
eve
and
was
more
broth
powe
him,
sense
of co
Dj
Com
divor
tenin
belie
diffe
It is
at th
polic
coun
whic
to w
illus
is in
the f
actua

important branches of its economy are concerned. It has become the mightiest continental power in the world." Not a bad record, even this sparse summary, one might say, for a revolution which allegedly could not achieve a single one of its motivating ideals.

Djilas exhausts his vocabulary in denouncing the Communists as stupid, reactionary, brutal, and what not; but, here again, writing especially to corrupt the international Left-wing, he must, however contradictorily, pay some tribute to reality. On page 148, we find, "In principle, and in words the Communists subscribe to ethical principles and humane methods"; on page 155 he says, "The world has seen few heroes as ready to sacrifice and suffer as the Communists were on the eve of, and during the revolution," and on page 13, "At first it (the Party) was guided by the most beautiful, primordial human ideas of equality and brotherhood." But alas, corrupted by power, the Communists, according to him, have been metamorphosed into senseless and callous brutes—which, of course, is ridiculous.

Djilas says time and again that the Communists represent an isolated sect, divorced from the masses. Hitler, listening to the Djilases of his time, also believed this absurdity, but he learned differently, to his utter destruction. It is this same false idea which lies at the base of the Eisenhower-Dulles policy of "liberating" the Socialist countries of the world, a scheme which constitutes a most deadly threat to world peace. One of the incurable illusions of the bourgeoisie is that it is impossible for this class to accept the fatal fact that a given people can actually believe in Socialism.

DJILAS' ABANDONMENT OF SOCIALISM

The advocates of People's Capitalism are, by the same token, opponents of Socialism—although Right-Social Democrats, for tactical purposes, may still use upon rare occasions certain Socialist phrases. They usually equate Socialism with "People's Capitalism," as Strachey does. Djilas, however, minces no words in this matter, at least not so far as the Communists are concerned. He blasts Communism as reactionary, imperialist, warlike, and a threat to every form of social progress, as well as to world peace. Its planned economy, he says, is the most inefficient and wasteful system in world history. Djilas also makes no basic exception regarding "National Communism." For him that also is Communism, and therefore to be condemned. So he throws Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky, Tito, Mao Tse-tung, and Khrushchev all in one pot, making little of the conflicting concepts among them. In fact, he considers all Communism to be national Communism (page 174). Any Communist Party which seeks to advance the interests of the workers and its whole people (and they all do this), even while carrying on a most active policy of proletarian internationalism, is willy-nilly, "national Communist," according to Djilas.

Djilas is rather obscure, however, as to just what is his own social perspective. He condemns Communism outright and damns Social Democracy with faint praise. But he speaks kindly of the capitalist world, notably the United States. Monopoly capital, supposedly now practically dethroned by

the people under capitalism, is no longer a real menace, and he outlines no need for elementary democratic struggle by the working class or the people generally. The world, he concludes vaguely, "will go in the direction in which it has been moving, and must go on—toward greater unity and freedom" (page 214). Djilas' whole outlook, which is generally that of an advocate of People's Capitalism, is politically akin, despite its modern ideological trappings, to the pragmatic support of capitalism by a Gompers.

THE FIGHT AGAINST "PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM"

The United States is the birthplace and the major stamping ground of People's Capitalism and the Welfare State, so-called. And the dynamic cause of this doctrine, the force which called it into being and which gives it its apparent vigor and life, is the long-continued industrial boom in this country. People's Capitalism is the chief ideological expression of the upswing of American imperialism, of its bid for world mastery, and of its temporary prosperity. People's capitalism, as a concept, combines in itself all the major political illusions and political weaknesses to which the working masses of this country are subject and which Communists must fight—such as, American exceptionalism, class collaboration, prosperity illusions, national chauvinism, and tailing after the political parties of the bourgeoisie.

People's capitalism is doubly dangerous in the United States because of the deep inroads it has already made in the ideology of the working masses, including the trade union move-

ment and the active national organizations of the Negro people. The working programs of the AFL-CIO are in reality, if not clearly in theory, but so many statements within the framework of so-called People's capitalism. Such an acceptance of elementary bourgeois propaganda by labor's leaders and spokesmen cannot but injure and weaken the fighting force of the whole working class and its allies in every direction.

It is the major ideological task of the CPUSA to combat the illusions built into the concept of People's Capitalism, or its other name, the Welfare State, while at the same time fully supporting all the democratic demands of the workers, farmers, and Negro masses who may hold to this concept. The Party, of course, has recently done much in this general respect, and it is impossible here even to indicate the many fine articles, pamphlets, and books that have recently been written around this general subject or upon specific aspects of it. Of course, much more has to be done. This is a struggle for the minds of the American working class and its allies. By far the best general summary and analysis of People's Capitalism that has yet appeared, however, was the elaborate symposium on the question held recently under the auspices of the journal *International Affairs*, in Moscow, published in its issue of May, 1957.

In combatting People's Capitalism, the Communist Party will have to pay special attention to that demagoguery's new and most effective spokesman, Milovan Djilas. In his book, he has stated the whole case of the bourgeoisie against the Socialist world, and he has

done
the v
its w
forego
more
charac

in
19
in
So
co
de
be
as
of

done it in a way most harmful to the world's working class, fighting its way onward to Socialism. In the foregoing pages, we have done little more than indicate the general character of his anti-Socialist at-

tack. As the Socialist forces of the world march forward, we may expect the appearance on the scene of more ideological antagonists of the Djilas type, and Communist writers must be prepared to refute and defeat them.

The inner dynamism of Marxism is essentially scientific: a belief in inexorable material advance which the Western world has lost since the 19th century. Both in quantity and in quality, the Soviet educational effort in science far surpasses our own. Science occupies a central position in the Soviet universe which in the West is accorded only to God. Nor, as recent conferences have shown, have Soviet scientists succumbed to the fatal departmentalization which in the West has erected impassable barriers between pure and applied science: there, the Marxist image of science as a *continuum* has encouraged men to probe far beyond the visible reach of industry.

From an editorial in *New Statesman* (London), Oct. 12, 1957.

Letters From Readers

FROM AN AMERICAN TEACHER

(For obvious reasons, the editor feels it best not to mention the city from which this letter came.)

I have thirty-three wonderful pupils . . . but here they are very poor. I discovered one little girl who hadn't eaten for two days. She complained of dizziness and cramps, and when we got her something to eat, she consumed the food as though she never ate in her life. Another girl started to menstruate in school. She has no mother but lives with her elderly grandmother, and no one told her about this. She cried hysterically because she didn't know what was wrong. It took almost all morning to calm her down.

Almost one-half of my class have poor vision. Most of the families haven't money for glasses, and the poor eyesight has been attributed to poor nutrition. There is so much misery and ignorance in the world. . . . My children in school will not accept poverty as many of their parents do, but will demand a better life. This is what makes my job so inspiring. Every day I see a bit of the future and I see the seeds of many good things to come. . . .

B. A.

SOME THEORETICAL QUESTIONS

Philadelphia, Pa.

A conclusion which seems to have had general acceptance in our ranks as a result of the prolonged discussions of the past few years, is that there are a great many matters that require much study for a further elaboration of our theoretical position and its practical application.

In this necessarily restricted contribution, I want to raise two subjects which seem to me of some importance.

1) Are the Communist parties of the countries which belong to the "Socialist bloc" authorities on the problems facing our own Party (and the British, French and Italian parties?) I raise this question because of the fact that the parties in the socialist countries are concerned with the problems arising from the struggle to develop socialist systems, while our Party and those of the countries mentioned are concerned with finding the most effective means of developing the struggle for socialism.

The basic problems involved are quite different. Recognition of this fact will prevent, on the one hand, dogmatic applications of the experiences of a party in a socialist country to the tasks of our own and, on the other hand, hold us back from "laying down the law" to a Communist Party in a socialist land. This would help establish a better basis for the proper relations between such parties.

2) Are we for the "Welfare State" as an important factor in our "road to Socialism?" If so, how does this affect the theory of the State, as developed in Lenin's *State and Revolution*?

It seems to me that the American people—particularly the organized working class—increasingly will demand of the (capitalist-controlled) government social reforms which, to the extent they are realized, strengthen their feeling that this is *their* government in the sense that they can make it do what they want. Fundamentally, what they want is that it act as a mechanism for fulfilling their needs.

Big Business in general fights these labor demands, while it always has and always will attempt to utilize the governmental machinery to satisfy its own exploitative ends. It damns governmental action on behalf of labor as tending to develop a "welfare" state in the sense of providing "handouts" to the people as the result of "pressure" campaigns. Big Business aims to perpetuate the

"welfare" activities of the government so far as its own interests are concerned.

If it is a correct conclusion that the American working class and the people as a whole—and this applies to other lands—will not turn to socialism in a decisive fashion until they have exhausted the possibilities of having their needs satisfied through social mechanism under the present (capitalist) system, would it not be logical and in line with keeping ourselves in the mainstream of these forces to accept the conception of the "welfare" state as a step in social evolution towards the establishment of socialism in this country?

J.D.

ON TRADE-UNION WORK

Los Angeles, Cal.

In a discussion of Fred Fine's article in the June *Political Affairs*, some opinions were expressed which we thought might be interest.

The problem of "The Anti-Labor Drive and Business Unionism" is presented as a "two-fold struggle." We do not believe that the fight against these two evils can be simply equated. We disagree with any "two sides of the coin" approach.

The McClellan committee opened its attack on labor by hitting where it is most vulnerable. However, it does not necessarily follow that corruption is a central issue facing all unions.

Class corruption (not only the money-stealing variety) is a disease

of our labor movement.

It has been fought, and must continue to be fought, essentially, in the course of the class struggle against the bosses.

Corruption is an inner-union problem stemming from the capitalist class structure. Estimates of its extent, attitudes toward it, and methods of dealing with it, depend on conditions within each given union. Since these conditions will vary from union to union, a differentiated approach is necessary—one which takes into account the particular situation and history, of each union.

The McClellan committee, on the other hand, represents an attack on labor, and the working class as a whole, by the political representatives of the capitalist class.

Its aim is not to chisel from the labor movement, but to destroy it.

Criticism was also raised about certain inaccuracies and exaggerations. We believe that many *Political Affairs* articles in the past have been guilty of this kind of thing which

certainly does not help to develop a scientific method.

For example:

1) Page 5. "The rank and file of labor has demonstrated its readiness to fight the conspiracy of the employers." This is followed by a description of several perhaps noteworthy events. But are these specific events sufficient to justify generalizations about the readiness of the "rank and file of labor"? 2) Page 13. "Among the major reasons for the welcome of the AFL-CIO merger among the workers generally was the belief that the influence of the CIO unions together with that of some of the more democratically run unions in the AFL, would be a strong enough force to meet the racketeering menace and to defeat the leaders whose unions are infected with corruption and most bureaucratically controlled."

We could not recall many experiences which could verify that the "workers generally" held this belief.

A Group of Steelworkers

A REPLY

Thank you for forwarding the opinions of the group of Los Angeles Steelworkers on my article which appeared in the June *PA*. I read their observations with great interest and would like to make the following comments.

1. I do not believe the article "equated" two evils. On the contrary it centered attention on the developing drive against the labor movement by the corporations and their political agents (which in recent months has become even more ominous). It attempted to show the *relationship* between the fight against the main enemies of labor and the struggle against business unionism. The theme of the article was summarized in the introduction as follows:

Thus, the labor movement must engage in a two-front struggle: to beat back the attempts of the monopoly interests to utilize current Congressional hearings as a pretext for unfolding a new giant drive against the labor movement's political and economic program; *and in meeting the attack*, to revitalize the spirit and structure of democracy in the trade unions, to drive out the racketeers and corrupt bureaucrats from posts of leadership in the labor movement, and *to initiate a new chapter of militant trade unionism to cope with the new complex problems faced by the American workers.* (The italics appeared in the original article.)

Placing the question this way certainly doesn't equate two evils. It makes *meeting the attacks* of the monopoly interests the main task, and indicates the *relationship* of the other tasks to the struggle against the anti-labor drive.

May I add that any article I would write now—five months later—would lay even greater stress on the threatening nature of the unfolding anti-labor drive.

2. The article did not suggest that "corruption is a central issue facing all unions." It did say that the problem that faces most unions was the struggle to increase trade-union democracy by the greatest participation of the rank and file, and that the "problem of trade union bureaucracy goes far beyond financial corruption, high living and thug rule." Among other things, the article discusses the situation described in the draft trade-union resolution submitted to the 16th convention of the CPUSA: "In the course of the past two decades, a vast trade union structure has developed which tends to exclude the rank and file from the affairs of the union and in defense of their day to day shop conditions."

3. I'm afraid the Los Angeles steel workers may have a point about the tendency towards easy, sweeping generalizations that tend to exaggerate the ferment among the rank and file and the level of the fight-back movement. Nevertheless, none of us should lose sight of the developments within the steel union and the teamsters union, to name only the most prominent examples. These are new, important and promising—with significance for all of organized labor.

FRED M. FINE

ON WORK AMONG FARMERS

New York City

As one who spent 35 of my 38 years as a farmer and now has had to come to the city, let me throw in

my two cents worth on the Resolution on Agricultural Policy printed in the September *P. A.*

Most of the Resolution is pretty good except that it has a hundred

objectives all of them great but at this time out of the question. Maybe if there were 10,000 Communists and 100,000 Progressives in the farm belt a few points could be fought for and won but as conditions are today I fear it is just another resolution read and forgotten by most.

I want to deal with especially two points.

One is where the statement says that possibilities exist in many rural areas of developing discussion circles, forums, debates between Progressives, pro-Socialists, Communists, etc.

Well, this is a joke. You just show me a bunch of farmers after 10 to 14 hours of hard work who want to sit down and have a debate or forum. There are not many farmers in New York City; there it is the latest fad for so-called Leftists who are seemingly too tired or lazy to engage in action for peace, democracy, socialism and constitutionalism, but where I come from this would be a joke. Farmers want a way out of their crisis not talk, talk, talk which gets them nowhere.

Second, there is the point about the C. P. establishing a farm commission both nationally and state-wise wherever possible. This is very good *if it's done*—I have had too many experiences with commissions that were put on paper or composed of people who did not know a pitchfork from a combine. If the C. P. really wants to do something about the farmers here are some suggestions.

(1) Go to the farmers and don't just talk about it.

(2) Help the farmers understand why there's a crisis with use of pamphlets, papers, books, speakers.

(3) Send out a couple of good organizers to farm areas to get all the people who used to be active and the few who are still active together.

(4) Be a real vanguard in the farm areas by championing the farmers' struggles—by fighting for the small farmer, for the farm laborer, for the migrant worker.

(5) Help form and organize effective farm unions.

(6) Get a couple of "Johnny Appleseeds" of socialism to spread the message of socialism throughout the farm areas like some did in the 30's (one of whom converted me).

These, while only first steps, will not make the C. P. a tremendous power in the farm areas but at least the farmers will recognize that there is a C. P. fighting for their rights.

Since 1941 the farm areas with some exceptions (so I've heard) have been left completely in the hands of the bourgeoisie because Communists were too busy writing books and resolutions to work with the farmers. Let's see a change on that and the C. P. will get an agricultural policy that means something because it will be based on reality.

A FRIEND

These books belong in your

PERMANENT LIBRARY

THE ORDEAL OF MANSART, by W.E.B. Du Bois	\$3.50
PHILOSOPHY IN REVOLUTION, by Howard Selsam	\$2.00
LABOR FACT BOOK 13, prepared by Labor Research Association	\$2.00
LIKE ONE OF THE FAMILY, by Alice Childress	\$1.00
THE STALIN ERA, by Anna Louise Strong. Paper \$1.00; cloth	\$2.25
AUTOMATION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS, by Samuel Lilly.	\$3.75
THE BRITISH LABOR MOVEMENT, by A. L. Morton and George Tate	\$3.00
PROCEEDINGS OF THE 16th NATIONAL CONVENTION, C.P.U.S.A.	\$2.75
TOWARD NEGRO FREEDOM, by Herbert Aptheker Paper \$2.00; cloth	\$2.75

Pamphlets

THE INDIVIDUAL IN SOVIET LAW, by Leon Josephson	.15
ON THE CORRECT HANDLING OF CONTRADICTIONS AMONG THE PEOPLE, by Mao Tse-tung	.25
TO LIVE OR TO DIE, by Albert Schweitzer & Others	.10

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$4.00 a year; \$2.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$4.75 a year. Single copies 35 cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



INDISPENSABLE BOOKS

Decision in Africa

by W. ALPHAEUS HUNTON

A vast continent in ferment lucidly explained by a foremost specialist in African affairs, including the varied social structures and freedom movements from Capetown to the Mediterranean, the new state of Ghana, the fight against "apartheid" in South Africa, struggles in Suez, Kenya, Liberia, etc.

International, Price \$4.00

The Empire of High Finance

by VICTOR PERLO

A comprehensive, thoroughly-documented study of the structure and operation of the biggest monopolies of the United States, analyzing the various groupings of the monopoly giants and their financial empires, as well as their merger with, and domination of, the government.

International, Price \$5.50

The Truth About Hungary

by HERBERT APTHEKER

A full-length study of the 1956 uprising in Hungary which probes fearlessly into the sources of the popular discontent, the nature of the uprising, the forces involved, and the day-by-day course of the Budapest events, including the meaning of Hungary for world socialism and the lessons the uprising holds for the future.

Mainstream, Price \$2.00; cloth \$3.00

At Most Bookstores

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

