

Discussion and Controversy

The Cold War

To the Editor:

I am sorry to find that in the symposium *American Socialism and Thermonuclear War* (Spring 1962) Julius Jacobson makes some comments about my book *May Man Prevail?* which distort it rather drastically. He quotes the sentence: "the basis [for an American-Russian understanding] is the mutual recognition of the status quo, the mutual agreement not to change the existing balance of power between the two blocs" as proof for his assertion that I propose a "chemically pure imperialist solution" and he speaks of "the cynicism of this plan" because it leaves East Germany, the Balkans, etc. in Russian hands. Jacobson might at least have been fair enough to mention that my proposal is made from the standpoint that peace can not be preserved without the recognition of the existing borders. (This has been the de facto policy of the Western governments thus far as the example of Hungary and the American concern not to let things in Berlin come to a boiling point where a rebellion against the Ulbricht government would take place shows.) His implication that I have a cynical attitude toward the fate of the East Germans is contradicted by the whole book and my other writings. But Jacobson goes further: he simply misrepresents the ideas of the book. I propose that the balance of power between the two blocs should not be changed, but I point out that internal changes which may occur in various countries should not be used by either bloc to draw such a country in its sphere of influence. How can Jacobson ask whether I mean that the neutral nations should give up their neutrality—by force if necessary—if one of the main theses of the book is precisely the demand that a

strong neutral, non-aligned bloc has to play an important part in the world if peace is to be preserved? Of course this falsification is necessary to support the misrepresentation that I propose that the two blocs divide the world among themselves.

Jacobson says that socialism is not possible without freedom, with which I agree. But I believe socialism is also not possible without peace. Eventually I would like to add that socialism is not possible without objectivity and that the kind of treatment Jacobson gave *May Man Prevail?* is not even commensurate with the standards of non-socialist liberalism.

ERICH FROMM

Julius Jacobson Replies:

1. Erich Fromm, in my opinion, just does not understand the nature of the Cold War. For example, in *May Man Prevail?* he tells us that "Khrushchev's main aim is the ending of the cold war with the United States,..." That is not Khrushchev's main aim; it is not even his subordinate aim. And Fromm is no less wrong when he describes the West's "projective-paranoid attitudes toward communism." There is nothing "paranoid"—projective or otherwise—about capitalism's fear of Communism.

Both of these quotations—such thoughts are legion in his book and other political writings—reveal a misunderstanding of the irrepressible nature of the conflict between Communism and capitalism. The Russian ruling class *needs* the Cold War, it thrives on it; and capitalism has no choice but to resist the forward surge of Communism—a resistance which inevitably takes forms which are wholly unacceptable to socialists. Certainly the Cold War carries the threat of mutual physical destruction of all contending forces. This is known

to Kennedy and to Khrushchev, to Fromm and myself. This awareness tempers the actions of Washington and Moscow but it does not and cannot eliminate the basic sources of conflict which carry with them the permanent threat of nuclear disaster.

In my article I went into a little detail on what I consider to be the dynamics behind the expansionist drives of the Kremlin. I developed, though briefly, the idea that the relaxation of terror within the framework of the Russian totalitarian system generates additional imperialist impulses. It is a pity that Fromm did not see fit to come to grips with this idea which contradicts his assertions that "Khrushchev's main aim is to end the cold war" and, as he writes in the same book, "There is no evidence that the Russians want to incorporate West Berlin into the Eastern Zone" or dozens of like statements about the Kremlin's pacific potential.

2. In his letter, Erich Fromm writes that his is the "standpoint that peace cannot be preserved without the recognition of the existing borders" (in East Germany, the Balkans, etc.). In the same letter, he claims that I falsify and misrepresent his position because I equated it to an old fashioned imperialist division of the world. If the preservation of peace depends on recognizing Russian control over East Europe and American influence in the West, what does this mean in real life if not dividing the major portion of the world's population between the two large power blocs? Are neutral nations permitted to win, say, Bulgaria away from the Russian bloc? Surely, it follows from his proposals that no matter what the Bulgarian people want to do, whether it be to join the Western bloc, the neutral nations or strike out on their own, they are condemned to the Russian bloc. It is unnecessary for me to argue that this is what Fromm's solution means. He says it explicitly in *May Man Prevail?* On page 218, he writes:

It is a fact that the majority of the inhabitants of East Germany are living under a regime that

they do not want, and that this regime is obnoxious to all those who love political freedom. Hence, the decision to reconcile oneself to the continuation of Communist rule in East Germany is a hard one for those who truly cherish freedom.

If this is a "hard" decision for Fromm to make, imagine how much harder it is for the German people. It is such attitudes I find cynical.

3. Fromm may feel that "internal changes which may occur in various countries should not be used by either bloc to draw such a country in its sphere of influence," but as the quotation above amply demonstrates, he is prepared to reconcile himself to the continuation of Communist rule. His proposal, then, implies that internal changes cannot break the bondage of national oppression.

4. Washington's paralysis before the Hungarian revolution was due less to its de facto policy of recognizing existing borders to preserve the peace, as Fromm would have it, than to capitalism's repugnance at the sight of an entire people engaged in revolutionary, socialist combat.

Suppose the Hungarians won their freedom and joined, not the West but the neutral nations? Regardless of whether Fromm and/or the West should recognize existing borders, those borders would have been changed and the balance of power seriously affected. Not that the West would have grown stronger, but the East immeasurably weaker. Would this not justify, within Fromm's framework, the judgment that the Hungarian people engaged in a dangerous adventure that could be appreciated but *not* supported. I am sure that Fromm does not make such a frightful retrospective judgment, but that is what his solutions imply to me.

5. I believe that the realistic struggle for *peace* is intimately related to the struggle for *democracy*. A strong democratic socialist movement in the West would be the greatest obstacle to Western military adventures, and a powerful resistance movement in the East offers the most effective counterforce to Communist imperialism.

Israel

To the Editor:

I was very interested by the announcement in your first issue that you would publish an article on Israeli socialism and I eagerly looked forward to reading it. The article which appeared in the Spring issue was a great disappointment. It was glib, superficial, shallow, and, worst of all, contained so many factual inaccuracies that I shall not have space to list all of them.

First, let me write about some of the distortions of fact. The first World Zionist Congress and the founding of the Bund did not occur in 1893 as Mr. Jacobs said but in 1897. Of course, in the sweep of history a few years are not terribly important but a misstatement such as this indicates a basic unfamiliarity with the subject. If a writer on the Russian Communist Party stated that the revolution occurred in 1921 he would be marked as a dilettante in the area. 1897 in the Zionist movement is certainly the equivalent of 1917 in the Communist movement.

Mr. Jacobs writes that when Mapai was founded in 1930 by a merger of Hapoel Hatzair and Poale Zion "the bulk of the Poale Zionists had gradually moved from a Marxist view of the world to one not precisely identifiable in such terms." This is only partly true. It neglects to mention that the Poale Zion split in 1920 with the more Marxist wing constituting itself as the Left Poale Zion. This group continued in existence until it merged with Hashomer Hatzair and "Faction B" of Mapai to form Mapam in the mid-40s. Until the split-off of "Faction B" in 1944 there was a large Marxist element in Mapai.

It is just not true to say that "On most domestic questions, Achdut Ha'avoda is hardly distinguishable from Mapai." There are vast differences. Even within the coalition with Mapai, Achdut Avoda manifests these differences. After the recent devaluation of the currency Achdut Avoda forced the government to adopt new policies to

protect the wage earner. Achdut Avoda militantly opposes Ben-Gurion's plan to nationalize the Histadrut's health organization. If one reads the Israeli press one could never get the idea that these two groups are similar on domestic policy.

When it comes to Mapam, Mr. Jacobs writes with the veracity of someone who has been "briefed" by an individual who did not know what he is talking about. He says that "Almost all of Mapam's strength comes from its kibbutzim, which were settled in the 1920s and 1930s." It is impossible for all of Mapam's strength to come from its kibbutzim. The number of residents there equals only a small fraction of the total votes Mapam received in the general election. I looked up the founding dates of Israeli kibbutzim and it appears that more than two-thirds have been founded since 1940. (This is not a minor detail but is a basic point in Mr. Jacobs' thesis that Israeli youth are not socialist any more.)

The relationship between religion and the state in Israel is an enormously complicated one. It cannot be approached with the attitudes of American Protestants. Dogmatic attitudes cannot be automatically applied to a culture where they have no meaning. It is patently absurd to speak about "separation of church and state" in regard to a Jewish state. The Jewish nation was always a unique instance of a combination of the two. This is not to say that there are some aspects of the relationship between state and religion in Israel which cannot be changed.

Mr. Jacobs' statement that "It is maddening that a society conceived in high ideals should treat its Arab members as shabbily as has Israel in the past" is certainly open to dispute. I think an objective evaluation of the subject would reveal conclusions vastly different. The educational and economic standards of Israeli Arabs are higher than those in neighboring Arab countries. There is certainly no Arab country where the vote is as free as it is for the Arabs of Israel. Israel was

also the first Middle Eastern country to allow Arab women to vote.

Mr. Jacobs' description of the man who told him "please don't write that Israel is a socialist country. We need to attract outside investments and that kind of talk just frightens people away" is a piece of nonsense that could arise only out of someone who intended to injure the subject he is writing about. There are more public manifestations of socialism in Israel than in any other country. (I do not consider the Eastern European countries as socialist.) On May Day the country is closed down. What if this person did say those words? Is it fair to give this as a typical attitude to open up an article? Most Israeli socialists would be as disgusted at the speaker of those words as is Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Jacobs' article comes to its *reductio ad absurdum* in the last paragraph when he makes the incredible statement that "It is conceivable that if the present young generation in Israel continues to display as little interest in ideology as it does at the moment, socialism might someday become a dirty word there." This sounds like a typical Communist attack on Zionist socialism which the Communist movement has been making for years. In truth nothing could be more inaccurate. In no country is the percentage of all youth enrolled in socialist youth movements equal to that of Israel. Most of the younger intellectuals are oriented to Mapam or Achdut Avoda. This statement ignores the collective educational system of the kibbutzim which trains a considerable number of youth. Proof of the attachment of Israeli youth to socialism is contained in the results among soldiers for the voting in the last parliamentary election. Since the army contains almost all youth, male and female, from ages 18-21 its election results are irrefutable verification of political trends among youth. The left-wing parties, especially Achdut Avoda received considerably more votes among soldiers than they did among the general population. Mapai received about the same percentage.

Even the many true things in Paul Jacobs' article are written in such a superficial and simplified way that they border on the old observation that the half or three-quarter truth is frequently worse than the whole lie.

HARRY LIPSET

Paul Jacobs Replies:

Oh my. I had almost forgotten there were people like Mr. Lipset still around. His attack on my article as being "like a typical Communist attack on Zionist socialism," his remark that "the half or three-quarter truth is frequently worse than the whole lie," and his statement that I write "with the veracity of someone who has been 'briefed' by an individual who did not know what he is talking about" leads me to conclude, reluctantly, that he doesn't like what I wrote.

Let's push aside, in the interests of saving space, Mr. Lipset's nitpicking quarrels with me over such miniscule questions as "Faction B" of Mapai and concentrate instead on questions like Arab-Jewish relations and church-state differences in Israel. Mr. Lipset says that my description of the "shabby" treatment given by Israel to Arab citizens is open to dispute and that an "objective evaluation would reveal conclusions vastly different." Let me quote what Professor Norman Bentwich, the eminent Zionist and first Professor of International Law of Peace at Hebrew University, wrote in June 1962 about how relations developed between Jews and Arabs in the mandate period. He says that the Jewish National Fund, "*which became the chief instrument for acquiring land for settlement of Jewish immigrants on the soil adopted a regulation prohibiting leases to any non-Jews and requiring Jewish tenants not to employ any non-Jewish workers. Land sold by the Arabs to the Fund was thereafter barred to Arabs. The powerful Federation of Labor (Histadrut) likewise made it a rule to employ only Jewish labor in all the enterprises which they conducted or which were affiliated to them. This exclusiveness and separatism of the responsible Jewish leaders*

and bodies were bound to frustrate the fulfillment of the idea of the bi-national Arab-Jewish state which was the declared aim of the mandatory policy and which was upheld by Dr. Weismann, the president of the Zionist organization."

And, fortunately, there are in Israel many, many labor Zionists who, unlike Mr. Lipset, do not defend Israel's present policy toward the Arabs. Such men as Pinchas Rosen, Martin Buber, joined by war heroes like Yigal Allon and Moshe Carmel have for a long time opposed the treatment given the Arabs by the Israeli establishment. In November, 1961, *Ma'ariv*, the paper with the largest circulation in Israel, published an article by Shmuel Shnitzer on the Arab problem which, in language far more harsh than any I used, raised questions typical of those being asked by thoughtful Israelis. . . . *"Our Arab policy or what is called by that name has reached a crisis or even bankruptcy. . . . Consciously or unconsciously, we have created the ugly reality of discriminating against a national minority in the state of Israel. . . . The Arab does not participate in the cultural life of the country and he cannot cultivate a culture of his own. . . . He cannot attain any real position in public service. . . . Not a little courage will be required to try a new path. But the old one led us to a dead end, to hopelessness and the trampling of the moral principles of our renaissance movement."*

Now to church-state attitudes. Here I am not so clear about Mr. Lipset's whining. He says the problem is complicated in Israel. Of course it is. It's also complicated in the United States. But, fortunately again, there are people in Israel who admit the existence of this grave problem and are trying to solve it there, rather than minimizing it or automatically defending the present status. Although Mr. Lipset does weakly concede that "this is not to say there are some aspects of the relationships . . . which cannot be changed," he seems satisfied with what is happening in Israel. But since I wrote my article, the tension in Israel

over this question has increased rather than diminished, especially because of the refusal of some rabbis to perform marriages involving members of an Indian Jewish sect which emigrated to Israel. One need not be a "dogmatic Protestant" to be critical of the rabbis' domination of Israeli civil law; even non-dogmatic Jews are deeply disturbed by the situation.

However, Mr. Lipset is correct about one item. Of course the Bund was founded and the first Zionist Congress held in 1897, not 1893. I have no idea whether the typographical error was in my original copy or in the proofs, but in either case I should have caught it. Such mistakes do happen, however. Finally, I think Mr. Lipset's letter could only have been written by a Zionist living in the United States, since Zionists living in Israel are not nearly so defensive about the country, nor so offensive, either.

PAUL JACOBS

COMING

We have received for publication a number of very interesting letters taking issue with the views expressed by Herbert Hill in his article, "Organized Labor and the Negro Wage Earner: Ritual and Reality," (Winter, 1962) and with the comments made by Mr. Hill, Seymour Martin Lipset and William Gomburg in their subsequent exchange on "Negroes and the Labor Movement" (Spring 1962).

These letters will be printed in our next issue along with replies and comments by Hill, Lipset and Gomburg.

Frank Allaun, M.P. and Walter Kendall are English socialists whose articles have been widely printed in the European socialist press.

Common Market Debate Continued

Frank Allaun, M.P.

NEW POLITICS, which is providing a most valuable forum for American socialist opinion, should be congratulated on the debate on the Common Market.

It so happens that, although I strongly agree with the case against Britain's entry into the European Common Market so well presented by Michael Barratt Brown in the Spring issue, his opponent Eric Heffer is a personal friend of mine. He is one of the few on the Left of the British socialist movement who support the ECM. It is often said that the Left and Right inside British Labor are divided on this issue. That is not my experience. I can think of only two Left M.P.s who say Britain should go in. The remainder are against it. It is the Right wing of the Labor Party which is divided.

Last week my own Constituency Labor Party met and decided, without opposition, to put down a resolution for the annual conference of the Party to be held this October. There can be little doubt that this will be the big issue before that conference, though it would be hard, at this moment, to predict the outcome. It is fairly certain, however, that the leadership will no longer be able to persuade the rank and file that the Party should sit on the fence, as it did in October, 1961.

A reliable national poll of public opinion, it is worth mentioning, has just revealed a sudden swing against the Common Market. For some reason the 43% to 26% point support for Britain's entry has in the last few weeks been almost exactly reversed.

My own opposition to Britain's entry is not based mainly on economic arguments. There are some industries which would be advantaged and others which would suffer, though even the Common Market enthusiasts have admitted that the British housewife would have to pay higher food prices. My reason is that the prospect for peace would be worsened if this country went in.

The threat to human survival springs from the division of the world between the American and Russian governments. Neither wants war, but both are so frightened of the other that they are aiming at military superiority in a nuclear arms race which is taking humanity to the precipice. The two giants are so clinched that only a neutral third force can keep the peace. The non-aligned nations are growing in numbers. If Britain joined them they would receive a tremendous accession of strength. On the other hand, if we could be forced into a Western economic bloc this would prevent Britain from taking the neutral line and force several other neutral and potentially neutral nations into dependence. In other words, the Common Market is to provide an economic base and accompaniment for the NATO military alliance.

I thought Michael Barratt Brown put it excellently when he wrote: "Britain's association with EFTA, whose members are either neutrals or have growing neutralist movements (with the exception of the ineffable Portugal) and Britain's association with a Commonwealth that includes Mr. Nehru and Dr. Nkrumah must have seemed a fatal weakness in the

Western front. What better than to push Britain into the Common Market behind Dr. Adenauer and General de Gaulle and at the same time open the British Commonwealth to easier penetration of United States' goods and capital."

I feel certain that this was Mr. Kennedy's main motive when he told Mr. Macmillan in his talks in America about a year ago to get inside. I feel equally certain that this private instruction was the reason why Mr. Macmillan, who had been wobbling for several years on the issue, decided to take the plunge. (For the Prime Minister knew well enough how the decision would antagonize important sections of the Conservative Party, notably M.P.s representing farming constituencies, those with strong Empire ties and others who are against any form of international organization.)

Strangely enough it is precisely because Eric Heffer is an internationalist that he is falling into the trap of thinking that *any* international link is progressive. Yet he is against NATO. I suggest it is illogical to be against NATO and for the ECM. And if he wants a British Labor government to influence the European Economic Community countries toward neutralism, surely to move in an anti-neutralist direction is a strange way to go about it. As for his argument that we should link up with, and provide leadership for, the socialist and trade union movements of the Six, that is possible whether we are inside or outside the Common Market.

Walter Kendall

Socialist politics comprise the art of estimating historical trends, judging their force and direction, finding ways in which to utilize their power to speed forward the drive towards social ownership and working class power.

By that test very few of the Common Market combatants emerge with distinction. On each side the van-

guard adopts a highly schematic political position and proceeds to chop about reality until bruised and bleeding it begins to approximate its own preconceived position. In the outcome Lord Beaverbrook finds himself ranged alongside Konni Zilliacus, on one side, while the British Communists link hands with Clement Attlee on the other.

Confronted with these facts, claims that the Labor movement is divided left and right over the issue is plainly absurd.

Capitalism by the turn of the last century had effectively united the whole globe into one vast international market. From that moment forward the national divisions which emerged with the birth of bourgeois society, and without which its enormous economic growth and libertarian political development would have been impossible, became obsolete. The history of our times, the agonies of blood and war which it tells, is in large measure the account of society's efforts to resolve its own savage international contradictions. International production and national accumulation have become barriers to human progress in the same sense that social production and private accumulation characterize the capitalist system as a whole.

The pace, scope, breadth, expense and complication of modern science, technology and production, whether military or civilian, is plainly such that only the monsters can expect to survive. All the others live in imminent threat of forcible or peaceful assimilation.

Great Britain, five decades ago, was the center of an Empire comprising 410 million people on which the sun truly never did set, with a navy which still exceeded (or very nearly so) that of all other nations in the world combined. Now shorn of most of her imperial possessions, she is reduced to the role of minor partner in a world dominated by two giants who, 50 years ago, were merely on the fringes of international destiny.

There are limits to that trend. There are no reasons for presuming that it will not continue.

The British Empire was based on armed force, naval strength, national oppression and imperialist exploitation. In the absence of these factors it seems to me that the Empire (read Commonwealth) must increasingly disintegrate and each section drawn off by centrifugal forces will enter into fresh orbit of its own. Africa toward Continental Unity, the Caribbean countries towards Latin America. Australia and New Zealand first toward the United States and possibly later toward the emergent nations of Asia. I can envisage no reason why, over the coming decades, the Empire (Commonwealth) or other ex-colonial territories should wish to perpetuate a paternalistic relation of the type envisaged by Barratt Brown. The whole experience of ex-colonial territories suggests otherwise.

When the Common Market is examined against this objective background the arguments fall into proportion. It is true that the American Committee for a United Europe, with such luminaries as Allen Dulles and General MacArthur among its sponsors, has been for some 15 years a major proponent of the European Unity Campaign. It is equally true that the Common Market proposes to unite at the very most one half of geographical Europe and to exclude for political reasons that other half which stretches eastward as far as the Urals. It is also true that one of its aims is to strengthen the existing imperialist NATO alliance against the "East." Yet if all this is true we cannot fail to observe that the unity of Europe is a response to pressure of economic developments which, as Comecon illustrates, applies equally both to "East" and "West." In relation to the historical, economic and political objectives of the socialist movement

its progressive character is beyond challenge. The unity of Europe is taking place in spite of us and Britain, whatever one wishes, remains an island alongside Europe which cannot be towed by some giant Queen Mary to off the coast of Africa or beyond.

Thus, the question of for and against the Common Market is for me largely a false one. Historically the issue is decided. All that remains are the terms and the arrangements. Britain, neither capitalist nor still less socialist, cannot survive in isolation. The fate of a socialist Britain is inevitably linked with that of the socialist revolution in Europe and it is time the British working class movement shed some of its insularity and came to terms with the fact.

I am therefore in favor of directing British socialist and trade union opinion and action along lines which correspond to the realities of historical development. As a first step the T.U.C. should convene a conference of all genuine trade unions in Europe irrespective of political or religious coloration to discuss and organize action in relation to Common Market and all common problems. The Labor Party needs to turn outward and accept the duty which falls upon it as the largest and most powerful social democratic party in the world and exercise its true role as a force for the socialist transformation of Europe. European labor is divided by national, language, trade, and religious barriers, while against it capital in Europe is effectively unified. Unification of the European labor movement will move the balance of class forces in Europe in the direction of the working class. It is toward the aim of a socialist and independent Europe and not to sterile opposition or equally sterile support of bourgeois plans that Labor's thought and action ought to be directed.

Free Djilas Campaign

To the Editor:

The campaign to dramatize the imprisonment and plight of Milovan Djilas achieved its greatest success on August 16th. Norman Thomas, America's 77 year old socialist and civil libertarian, joined 75 pickets in protest before the Yugoslav Consulate on Fifth Avenue in New York. Mr. Thomas previously sent a personal letter to Marshal Tito requesting the release of Djilas. After Tito rejected the letter, Thomas agreed to dramatize his position by joining us in public protest.

Last June several individuals, indignant over the jailing of Djilas, decided to act. These people represented various political viewpoints. It was agreed that no organization would be asked to endorse the line. To date, the organizers secured the cooperation of individuals from the democratic left. Socialists, Liberals, Reform Democrats, trade unionists, pacifists, freedom riders, etc. have volunteered to picket in order to free the author of *Conversations with Stalin* and *The New Class*. The Djilas issue has succeeded in gaining the support of Norman Thomas, Sidney Hook, Ben Davidson, James Peck, as well as Harry Golden, Sam Bottone, Julius Jacobson, Max Lerner, Solomon Schwarz, Luigi Antonini, David McReynolds, Bentley Kassal, Moshe Decter, Herbert Muller and Dorothy Day.

At first the Yugoslavs reacted to our picket line by sending their officials out to talk with the picketers. In fact, one day during the early weeks of our picketing, Mr. Bogoljub Popovich, consulate chief, came out and spoke with Rudolf Pakalns, a spokesman for the pickets. He presented the typical Tito line that Djilas was guilty of a state crime because he revealed state secrets in his book *Conversations with Stalin*. He even stated that Djilas did not write the other books for which he was given credit in the West. According to Popovich, public relations men

wrote *The New Class* while Djilas was in New York. (Actually the essays which later became *The New Class* were first published in *Borba*.) The consulate chief angrily asked Pakalns why we did not protest racism in Alabama or picket before the Spanish offices in New York. Mr. Pakalns immediately introduced him to James Peck, a well known Freedom Rider, and several members of the Confederated Spanish Societies.

We are all given an opportunity to aid Djilas, a man who has deliberately given up his privileges as a member of "the new class" for a prison which he occupied once before because he was a foe of the pre-war reactionary regime in his native land. He could have chosen either silence or exile to a Western country. Instead he proved to be more of a revolutionary than a Communist, more a lover of justice than a seeker of power.

Future plans call for once a month picketing before the Yugoslav Consulate, a proposed letter-ad to *The New York Times* signed by the academic community and letters of appeal to overseas socialists, liberals and trade unionists urging them to start their own Djilas protest movements.

We believe that readers of *New Politics* can wage their own free Djilas campaign as follows:

1. Write the Yugoslav ambassador, Mr. Marko Nikevic, 2410 California Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. asking for Djilas' release.

2. Talk to your friends and, where possible, write to out-of-towners or overseas contacts urging them to start their own protest movement. More detailed information may be received by writing either of the two names listed below.

3. New Yorkers, in particular are urged to send their name and address to either Rudolf Pakalns, 780 Riverside Drive, New York 27, N.Y. (AU 3-7912) or Marvin Maurer, 37-80 81st Street, Jackson Heights 72, N.Y. (IL 7-3862), making themselves available for future efforts.

MARVIN MAURER

Books in Review...

A Significant Contribution

WOLFGANG LEONHARD, WHO MADE SUCH a deep impression on so many of us with his *Child of the Revolution*, has written a second book, *The Kremlin Since Stalin*.^{*} Leonhard's new book is as complete a presentation of the facts of changes in Russian life in the last ten years as any volume of similar length produced in the various institutes of Russian studies. But Leonhard has more than facts; he has a "feel" for his subject. His facts are not disembodied quotations and statistics, they are related to one another and to an intelligently presented theory of the nature of Russian society and the significance of the post-Stalin reforms. Leonhard informs his subject with a degree of political sophistication, a knowledge and understanding of socialist theory, that is sometimes conspicuously absent among American scholars. He could never write as did recently one highly respected Kremlinologist of the "thesis of 'socialism in one country,' adumbrated by *Lenin*..." (my emphasis).

One of the academicians' frequent assumptions is that the fount of all that is malevolent about Communism is Lenin's "concept of the Party"—a concept that is usually misinterpreted, and sometimes misquoted, so that any resemblance to Lenin's views becomes purely accidental. It is also becoming fashionable to trace the genesis of Stalinism further back: the crimes of Stalin are not only the logical extension of Lenin's controversy with Martov and Plekhanov, but have their roots in Marxist thought.

This is a pitfall that is avoided by Leonhard. In his book there are no simplistic assumptions with standard quotations (which in their distorted form have become accepted as the real thing) to prove that Stalinism

flows from Leninism, and that if you want to understand the doings of Khrushchev, read what Lenin wrote in 1903.*

Another generalization that is becoming almost ritualistic is to assert that the rapid industrialization of Russia will bring about its self-democratization. Leonhard comes to grips with this mechanistic economic determinism. He shows what the limits to the reforms have been in actuality, pointing to the period immediately after the XXth Congress as the high point in Russian de-Stalinization with the process first checked, then reversed and an attempt made to normalize the situation.

Much of the conflict and purge in Russia from 1953 to 1957 is traced to the struggle for supremacy between the Party-men led by Khrushchev and those who wanted to strengthen the authority of the various governmental and administrative agencies. The purge of the so-called "anti-Party bloc," of men like Zhukov and the economist, Pervukhin, as well as the economic decentralization of 1957 were part of Khrushchev's campaign to establish the unquestioned primacy of the Party in all spheres of life, and to substitute the cult of Khrushchev for that of Stalin. This is not intended to deny that there have been major and welcome reforms, according to Leonhard, but it does indicate the limits to which "democratization" can go under the Russian class system. And Leonhard does consider Russia as dominated by a new social class. He writes:

It can hardly be denied that the new élite in the Soviet Union

* While Leonhard does not examine the relationship between Stalinism and Leninism in his book—at least in its English edition—he has a most interesting article on the question in the Summer 1962 issue of *The Review* (published in Belgium by the Imré Nagy Institute).

* THE KREMLIN SINCE STALIN by Wolfgang Leonhard, Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1962. 403 pp., \$7.75.