ON THE ROAD BACK:
MIKOYAN AND THE 'HARDS'

The Djilas Case Is Not Over!

Old Script: 'Dawn Over Reuther'

G. D. H. Cole's Socialism of Despair

No War to Defend Chiang's Police State on Formosa!

EISENHOWER LIGHTS A MATCH NEAR
THE POWDERKEG OF WORLD WAR III

By HAL DRAPER

President Eisenhower has asked for, and undoubtedly will get from a doleful Congress, a "predicted declaration of war" against China. That is what former Vice-President Barkley is reported to have called it, accurately.

The American people would be ready to support any declaration of war whose sole purpose is to keep Chiang Kai-shek in power. Hence the assiduous repetition by Eisenhower, and by the parrallactic press of the country, that this "calculated risk" is really the only way to ensure peace.

But U. S. belligerency and armed blistering on behalf of the Formosa war-locks is no road to peace. To be sure, there may be a small probability that it may lead to war immediately. But in tendency and in longer-term effect, the new U. S. war threat is part and parcel of the drive toward a catastrophic Third World War in which U. S. imperialism will be just as responsible as the Stalinist totalitarianism of Peiping or Moscow.

Eisenhower is acting out the ancient role of the warmonger, threatening war in the interests of "peace" and other good things. And in this crisis, truly the U. S. stands before the world as a warmonger, just as clearly as do, the Stalinist regimes.

It is true that neither Washington nor Peiping wants war. (Few governments in the history have ever wanted war. They merely want the dominant power, and the fruits of dominant power, that are impossible to win without war, in the long run.) But viewed from the standpoint of their common international vulnerability, the Warmongers in Washington is that breathing the gun.

We say "viewed from the standpoint of their common morals" because we socialists do not share the very first assumption that is common to both the Chinese Stalinists and the American U. S.-bombers and all of their hangers-on: the assumption that the fate of Formosa and disposal of the island is something to be decided by Americans, or by Chi- nese, or even by the UN.

It is almost impossible for a reader to gather from an American newspaper that such people are such people in the world as FORMOSANS. Chiang Kai-shek, his government, his army and his Formosanese conquerors of Formosa, a foreign occupation over the native population of the island, which has traditionally fought, worked, and sacrificed, are implacably a part of the mainliners of all persuasions. The Formosans are a national people in their own right.

The best testimonial to the absence of the smallest admixture of democratic thought in the foreign policy of the imperialists is the fact that none of them propose the only democratic solution to the problem of what to do with Formosa.

Let the people of Formosa decide. The Chinese Stalinists, who declare against "imperialism" when it is British or American, or Imperialism other than their own and their friends in Moscow), are against this as much as are their Western enemies.

(Continued on page 2)

Rearmament Is the Issue
In the German Class Struggle

By GORDON HASKELL

Resistance to the Paris agreements and the rearment of Germany continues to mount in West Germany. Even more important, the character of the resistance has begun to change. It has broadened out from the realm of pure parliamentary debate to become the character of a general social struggle. In doing so, it is bringing into active participation in German political life a broad stratum of the population, primarily industrial workers, who in recent times have tended to assume a passive role.

The most dramatic event in this struggle to date has been the demand strike of some 800,000 miners and metal workers which took place on Saturday, January 22. (It should be noted that in Germany factory workers now average 50 hours of work a week, which means that for them Saturday is like any other working day.)

Although the ostensible reason for this strike was to protest a statement by Hermann Reusch, general manager of the Gutehoffnung steel combine, that labor had not received co-management rights in industry as a result of blackmailing the owners and the government, everyone in Germany knew that the strike was really a demonstration of the strength and solidarity of the workers against the government, and particularly against its drive for the ratification of the Paris agreements.

The miners' and metal workers' strike was only one part of a widespread campaign on the rearment issue. Parades and demonstrations by students and young workers affiliated with the Social-Democratic Party have been held in many regions (see last week's Challenge article).

IMPORTANT REFERENDUM

In addition, the Bavarian Federation of Labor has decided to hold a referendum among its 900,000 members on the Paris agreements, and also recommended to the German Trade Union Federation (DBH) that it hold a similar referendum among all the 6,000,000 organized workers in West Germany. It is quite plain that the effect of such a military plebiscite, taken among such a significant section of the population as the miners rather than by the government, would be an open and extremely serious challenge to the power and prestige of the Adenauer regime.

If the trade union referendum renders an overwhelming vote against ratification of the Paris agreements and rearment, it could be a powerful opening move to last page)

MacArthur Vindicated

The anti-Soviet and capitalist program of the Democrats and liberals, as they fall in line with Eisenhower's war threats, can be measured by a single fact: By underwriting the President's message, they are validating General MacArthur's defense of Truman in the Korean war.

All MacArthur wanted to do was to warn Eisenhower of a midair collision between his atomic bomb and the Red Chinese forces in Korea. It was the President's proposal to bomb military installations in China that was substantially more modest. For MacArthur made this proposal in the midst of a war in which U. S. forces were directly fighting Chinese troops. Eisenhower preferred it as a preventive bombing, and the shot of a Hiro.

MacArthur made this proposal in the midst of a war in which U. S. forces were directly fighting Chinese troops. Eisenhower preferred it as a preventive bombing, and the shot of a Hiro.

MacArthur was vindicated when the President's message was adopted as the platform of the Democrats and the Republicans. MacArthur, after a lifetime of service, even in the early years, had formed the view that the American people were not ready for a war which would be fought in large part by the people of China. Eisenhower, after a lifetime of service, had formed the view that the American people were not ready for a war which would be fought in large part by the people of China.
By BEN HALL

"To begin with," said Walter Reuther at the CIO convention in Los Angeles in reply to Mike Quill, "everyone who knows anything about the elementary facts of political history in America knows that building labor organizations is still an uphill business." He still favored a "new political realignment." But when this phrase was first put forward by him some years ago, he strongly suggested that it meant the formation of a new political party to represent the common people. Now, however, he insists, "Basically what we are trying to do is work within the two-party system, for a fundamental political realignment within the two-party system, for a fundamental realignment of the basic political forces so that political parties can become responsible."

Although Reuther's speech was featured by the press as a repudiation of a labor party, and he did specifically reject such a proposal, his renunciation went much further. In the name of the two-party system he rules out the formation of any new party, call it what you may—liberal, liberal progressive, or people's party.

We offer, for the record, some other recent opinions, views which are not quite opposed to Reuther's but which are different. In mid-December, Louis Holland, president of the New York State CIO, demanded that the newly elected Governor Harriman take action in support of labor legislation in the state. Holland contended that he did not favor the formation of a third party representing labor, but how different his emphasis! "I re- fuse to believe," he said, "that we have to join in a political ghetto by moving toward a third party now." (Holland's statement is undoubtedly in part a repudiation of the Liberal Party, which the CIO does not support.)

But note the "now." And later. "When labor is ripe for independent political action," he said, "it will not be the third party. It will be the first party." This man rejects a labor "third party" in the name of a "first" party. Surely a nolle prosequi. But, he asks, where is our "first" party from our "labor" no party? We remember that AFL Paper Makers President Paul Forberg has said, in his address to the Buford Union Congress that a real labor movement needs its own party. Elwood Swisher, president of the CIO Chemical Workers Union, was one of the few labor leaders to comment on this speech. Reporting the talk in detail in his newspaper, the United Chemical Worker, Swisher is non-committal but sympathetic. "Brother Phillips is evidently too close to the truth for our comfort," he writes.

More bluntly, Matthew Burns, listed as a former president of the AFL Paper Makers, writes in the Industrial Paper Maker under the heading: "Time Has Come For Labor Party." It is "clear," he says, "that there must be a new political realignment, a labor party which can rise above the "marketplace" of labor, represent the mass of people and preserve our liberties and freedom." Then, criticizing the two old parties, "Doesn't this prove that we should start building a new political party?"

Reuther Comes Out Foursquare Against Biting Fingernails

One thing, though—Reuther insists that "The CIO is not the tail to the Democratic kite." In fact, he and Reuther have participated in a single Democratic Party function as such. And, if the Democrats let labor down...

"We are independent because, if the Democratic Congress on January 1 begins to do things that we think are wrong, does anybody think that the CIO will sit back and bite its fingernails and say, 'Too bad we didn't criticize them because we are the tail to the Democratic kite?'

Luckily, 1955 will give the CIO plenty of opportunity to demonstrate its independence. In fact, it already has had such a chance.... Apparently it was overlooked."

The United Mine Workers Journal, official organ of John L. Lewis's union, editorializes: "All signs point to the same coalition of conservative Southern Democrats and Republicans running things on Capitol Hill, Research and investigation indicates that the questions of both Houses to the Democrats." As a case in point, "Bep. Graham Barden who will be chairman of the phase of poor Committees has made it clear that he won't permit any labor legislation to come out of his Committee." And the Journal concludes, "It is best not to engage in too much wishful thinking about the new Congress."

Since then, Congress committees have been put into the hands of conservative Southerners. The CIO won substantial union recognition in Congress. CIO forgot to register its independent objections.

But opportunity but knocks again and again.

"It can generally be expected," we read in the Michigan Post, "in 1955, particularly with a more liberal Congress in the saddle.... will see a fighting labor movement determined to make up for previous anti-union acts expected to be put in the industry. If there is a fight, the CIO will see its political friends in action or inaction."

And in the CIO News we learn, "There is no indication of a plan to increase employment in the CIO said last week.... The forecast is in the current issue of Economic Outlook, publication of the CIO Research and Information Department." Unemployment benefits will expire; workers will need extended and increased protection. How hard will the Democratic Congress fight?

1955 will be a great year to show independence.
A Glimpse of G. D. H. Cole: 'Lonely and Near Despair'<br><br>BY BERNARD DIX<br><br>LONDON, Jan.—Three years ago the monthly journal Fact, published by the British Labor Party, carried on its cover a photograph of Professor G. D. H. Cole with the caption, "Lonely and near despair." The photograph was taken by the Labour Member of Parliament given by Cole five days after the defeat of the Labor government at the polls in 11651 which was reviewed in its printed form n issue of that Fact.

"Factotum," expressed his disappointment with Cole's lecturers; in particular he referred to the term "lamentation," at which Cole ended his lecture and which led him to the idea that went into its making. In fact, he expressed with great social issues which have a good case against Communism in the world, which was an evident challenge to the problem of that concept without accept- ing it. "Factotum" has been using the word "lamentation" for its substitute for its "lamentation" value, "torment," in the case of those who feel lonely and near despair in a world which seems so much more than an insensible glibness of Communists worldwide. In such a case, one of the worst social problems is a sign of its continued existence, since it has become an almost unlimited and in some way meaningless, "lamentation" may be preserved.

"Factotum" concludes that Cole intends to do just this in a series of articles in which he foretold "the end of socialism," which are being published in the current issue of New Statesman and Nation.

BREAK ACCOUNT

The first part of this short article by a young man is to write a very important question: "Is socialism as it exists today, a nationalistic approach to the problems of democracy, and the basis of his despair, and the reader there- fore has an interest in the stated views of principles by the professor. In his last article he wrote the country is not "standing for socialism," and not for internationalism, as the attitude of the Third International into "an agency for that of a country," because of its complaint about the "socialist" aspect of the state in England.

The recent survey of the broadcasts of the Church of England, church's criticism of the state and the recent history of the Church of England, have indicated that its interest has been focused on the relationship between the church and the state in England.

As we reported last year, an assistant lecturer on psychology at Aberdeen University, Dr. John Major, described himself as an "unbeliever" and something of a public storm has resulted.

THE HOLD OF RELIGION

The first point I would like to make here is that a religious point of view, Britain and Europe is a country of the United Kingdom, with a population of 56,000,000 inhabitants (non-Christian, Non-Confessants, and Non-Gentiles, 3,000,000 who are not members of the Church of England, but the rest a variety of lesser known persuasions. If it is true to say that every one among the Churches are religious views related to political ones.

The Labor Party, as founded by John Major, and the Quakers, who have shown how one could be aware of the fact that the Church of England has been concerned with the idea that this church can still be claimed to be "above politics" and that it has existed as an idea that it has been kept "above politics" by a number of attempts to keep politics out of the church. Britain is religiously homogeneous, and because both are on the whole a country of the Church of England, the church can still be claimed to be "above politics," and it has existed as an idea that it has been kept "above politics" by a number of attempts to keep politics out of the church.

In the Church of England, the Church has an interest in the relationship between the religious and the political. The Labor Party, as founded by John Major, and the Quakers, who have shown how one could be aware of the fact that the Church of England has been concerned with the idea that this church can still be claimed to be "above politics," and that it has existed as an idea that it has been kept "above politics" by a number of attempts to keep politics out of the church.

In the Church of England, the Church has an interest in the relationship between the religious and the political. The Labor Party, as founded by John Major, and the Quakers, who have shown how one could be aware of the fact that the Church of England has been concerned with the idea that this church can still be claimed to be "above politics," and that it has existed as an idea that it has been kept "above politics" by a number of attempts to keep politics out of the church.

In the Church of England, the Church has an interest in the relationship between the religious and the political. The Labor Party, as founded by John Major, and the Quakers, who have shown how one could be aware of the fact that the Church of England has been concerned with the idea that this church can still be claimed to be "above politics," and that it has existed as an idea that it has been kept "above politics" by a number of attempts to keep politics out of the church.


WHY THE TO-DO ABOUT H-BOMB WEATHER?

By PHILIP COHEN

There is something ironic about the present-day obsession with the potential impact of H-bomb explosions on the freakish weather of 1951. Both the U. S. Federal Civil Defense Administration and the United Nations have been insisting that there can be no possible connection, that even the H-bomb is not anti-antic a force to affect the gigantic structure of forces which control the weather; whereas, certain of the just-indicted foreign policies have been guilty of being so keen to seize on this question as another reason for demanding outlawry of the bomb.

Official word handed down in Washington from meteorological sources has scoffed at the possibility that H-bomb tests might have had something to do with the over 600 tornadoes, hurricanes or hurricanes-locally reported (an all-time record), this past year. It was one thing to note, when the Soviet Union first announced the H-bomb tests, that Leningrad himself, who is better known as a painter than as a meteorologist, had given a public that the amount of radioactive ash thrown up by bomb explosions could not be sufficient to interfere with the sun's rays to the extent needed to explain the peculiarities of 1954 weather.

Some experts have kept referring to the 1883 eruption of Krakatoa, when a volcanic island in the South Seas blew up, sending dust through the atmosphere a little on the same note as a bomb explosion. However, by some arcane alchemy, they have suggested that something about the size of 10 percent, and yet did not produce the freaks of that year, and that the still larger, the 1954, have demonstrated that an H-bomb explosion would amount to a billion tons of radioactive ash in the eruption, and so what could it do? The implication is somewhat complex, they have explained, and that's all.

Many meteorologists have deservedly aroused suspicion among their colleagues, that it is they are patently the "h-Bomb-baby, holy type". These were the days of the "h-Bomb-baby, holy type". This is the time when such "tests" have been described as "political" as some of the expressed fears. They have been subject to some knowledge about the effects of the H-bomb on the weather, the "h-Bomb-baby, holy type" did not deny the possibility of some "experimental" or "false alarms.

The point is that the last few years has been a time of great uncertainty and anxiety for those who are worried about the effect of the H-bomb on the weather, and the "h-Bomb-baby, holy type" are the ones who are doing the most damage to the atmosphere in their efforts to stop the test.

"The British 'dean' of science writers, T. B. Cadbury (who has written books on this subject) has just been published here), and this one is a reality that the already" is hardly confirmable.

The British 'dean' of science writers, T. B. Cadbury (who has written books on this subject) has just been published here), and this one is a reality that the already" is hardly confirmable.

"There is, however, another possibility, apart from the flash bomb or the radioactive flash on the bomb, the release of air and vapor and water transients to the effect of the performance of the atmosphere, and perhaps a possibility that this might have been of some importance, as suggested by some of the authors. However, this is a possibility that is considered to be relatively small, and is therefore of little concern.

The point is that the last few years has been a time of great uncertainty and anxiety for those who are worried about the effect of the H-bomb on the weather, and the "h-Bomb-baby, holy type" are the ones who are doing the most damage to the atmosphere in their efforts to stop the test.

"The British 'dean' of science writers, T. B. Cadbury (who has written books on this subject) has just been published here), and this one is a reality that the already" is hardly confirmable.

The British 'dean' of science writers, T. B. Cadbury (who has written books on this subject) has just been published here), and this one is a reality that the already" is hardly confirmable.
The Appeal and the Dangers of the 'Coexistence' Mood

The following article by Michael Harrington is a discussion of the problems posed for the socialist movement by the slogan of "coexistence." Comments and further discussion contributions on this question from its readers.—Ed.

By Michael Harrington

Within the context of the present imperialist conflict, the Young Socialist League, true to its traditions, is absolutely committed to the struggle for peace with the use of force if necessary. For instance, we did not support the imperialist armies of either side; rather, we took our stand with the Korean people who suffered through two bitter years of war to find themselves in a still class-opposed occupied country.

Moreover, we have consistently pointed out that peace is threatened today by the existence of two gigantic imperialist blocs, both of which are driven toward war by the dynamics of exploitation. We have opposed both of these blocs; we have taken an intransigent stand against the militarization of the United States and of Stalinnism.

What a great shift has occurred in our position since the recent shift to the slogan of "coexistence." The powerful coexistence of the Stalinnists, the coexistence of the United States with the Soviet Republics, etc.

It is evident that this slogan has massed itself to its banner. Especially in the United States, the blocs of power in the working-class movement, Progressives, and Schlesinger, in the form of so much political discussion today, we must define our attitude toward it. In its present form, it will be those who have always used it: those such as Schlesinger and Progressives whose attitude is toward peace, toward democracy, toward socialism.

Three Fallacies

The new slogan is a typical example of the coexistence argument in the slogans of the day: "coexistence." This slogan is not a politically meaningful slogan! Or is it merely a semantic play on words? (In both of these cases, it is a slogan that opposes the continued existence of the state of war, of exploitation, and of peace. It assumes that you must be right for rationalist rules of rules and class war. There is no third way. As a consequence, the"coexistence"within the two blocs is sacrificed to continued exploitation; the struggle against the exploitive rules of both blocs is abandoned. The world is conceived as divided between two blocs.

Secondly, both slogans assume that one or the other bloc can be transformed into a bloc for peace. The United States and Russia can serve as the basis for such a bloc. It assumes that such a division can, and should, achieve the fundamental aim of the two blocs against imperialist war. These assumptions are not abstract logical conclusions. Already, Tito and Nehru have used them to establish their policies of coexistence in order to delineate any idea of a third world.

(1) Underlying such a view is an ideologically deleterious historical process. It holds that war is the result of "bad wobble" and that coexistence can be avoided by "civilized" talks. On the contrary, the war is the result of exploitation, and that an explorative dialogue will lead to war.

(2) The argument, in point of fact, is that war is the result of coexistence, and that no explorative dialogue will take place. The argument of argument is summarized in their conclusion that "coexistence"is a guaranteed guarantee of non-war. This can be assumed only if imperialist politics is automatized into a chess game where issues are settled for rational, national rules and stalemate ends the game.

Moreover, coexistence must identify peace with the status quo. Yet there is any one who regards our present state, the absurdity of a world under the control of Nazism, the absurdity of the imperialists as an idea, as an analogy, as a basis for the prevention of the two imperialist social systems, as an end in itself, and as a means rather than an achievement of peace.

Behind the Illusions

It will be difficult in our criticism of these illusions that a real and lasting peace can be brought about through "coexistence." There is no concrete, specific, and immediate legitimate act of this point of view, of the concrete action which constitutes peace as a mass action.

By the majority of the peoples of the world, we profess imperialism to be imperialism. We should not lead us to the illusion that imperialism can stop the drive toward imperialism. It should make its realism that imperialism can stop a drive toward imperialism and that it creates a genuine anti-imperialist, anti-exploitation consciousness in the world, the changing nature of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against War

Inevitably in such a gathering the main event was on these problems which are universal. There was an absolute peace for parochialism. In a long statement on the congress resolution to stop the all-out devastation under international law, there was an international development fund for the underdeveloped areas, and poverty as a basic problem of the statement ended by declaring:

"Whoever wants peace for simulation wars or disarmament under international control.

"Whoever wants peace is always ready for the settlement of disputes by negotiation between the belligerents. Thus, whoever wants peace opposes totalitarianism. Whoever wants peace works toward TUGF's efforts to stop war and peace are indivisible. For international socialism. The Congress reaffirmed its belief in the role of the United Nations Organization in the effort to assure peace, and called on the democratic socialist parties to work for a realistic and vigorous Charter to enable this UN to develop into a form of world government. It strongly protested "against the failure of the Security Council to take effective action to open open aggression against the recognized government of Guatemala. It extended its congratulations to the People's Republic of China to the UN and to the people of Peking."

Long ago the colonial affairs of the congress condemned the Apartheid policy of South Africa. They were the voice of horror against the people of China. Guevara and "The governments of all the Western powers irresponsibly to engage in efforts to establish ties or cultural and economic cooperation with representatives of nationalist movements. At the same time the reminder was made that the UN has no real role in order to fulfill its "intentions for defense." It also condemned by "militarily the people in its "peaceful fight for independence," the opposition of the new political groups in Morocco. It passed a long resolution on Latin America in the following terms: "For a political policy toward democracy and in order to support democratic governments and their sub-

This report on the recently held congress of the International Union of Socialists, which was presided over by Comrade Fred S. Moorman, chairman of the National Association of Labor Students (Britain), a member of the European and American Socialist Conferences, from the time Copenhagen the IUSY was also best described as a European body, and with the in-\n
The Young Socialist League and Challenge are sharply ort
tional opposition to the IUSY's failure to carry out its mandates as a co
or of the British Labour Youth, for attaining the article for

This report on the recently held International Congress of the Young Socialist League, was held at the beginning of November in Copenhagen and attended by over a hundred persons, a significant gathering in that it threw what can be viewed as a hopeful light on the future of international socialism.

To date, it has not been possible to describe the international socialist movement as a world movement. The adult movement is divided into parts: the International, primarily a European or-
ON THE ROAD BACK

Is Mikoyan Through? The 'Hard' Faction
In the Kremlin Exploits the War Danger

By A. STEIN

The question all the world has been asking since the French National Assembly voted in favor of West German disarmament—What will the Kremlin do?—has now been answered. The suddenly discredited and despised Mikoyan, minister of trade on January 24, and the vicious propaganda onslaught by Pravda Editor Shepilov against those who would raise living standards by limiting the further growth of heavy industry, point the road the Kremlin intends to take.

That road leads in the direction of an arms buildup.

The dominant faction in the Kremlin collective leadership apparently intends to maintain Russia's position in Eastern Germany. At the same time, it is obvious that these forces and their satellites of power will make the choice between the twelve or more German divisions will make to the military strength of the Anglo-American bloc.

That the change in line applies to the entire satellite empire is clear from events in Hungary. The day after Mikoyan was dismissed and Shepilov was hurled into the vitriolic black, Matyas Rakosi, the Hungarian Stalinist leader, echoed Shepilov's words in a speech to a coal miners' meeting. "The New York Times correspondent in Vienna, John MacCorrane, quotes the following excerpt from a Budapest radio broadcast of February 3:

"Because of a war threat from the West and the rearment of Germany, it is necessary to tie in Hungary's economic production tightly with the military needs of the satellite camp. Considerations of defense policy compel us powerfully to develop heavy industry and to force its development."

Mikoyan's dismissal from his ministerial post—he still holds his position as a deputy prime minister and as a member of the Politburo—is only the first rank of lightening that announces the gathering storm in the anti-harmony between the "hard" and "soft" factions in the Kremlin: It is difficult to believe Mikoyan will be allowed to remain suspended in mid-air without either being reappointed to his former powers or else kicked unceremoniously further down the ladder of the hierarchy.Whatever Mikoyan's fate may be, it is important only in so far as it reflects the struggle of more powerful forces inside the Kremlin.

Anatlas Mikoyan has always played a secondary role in the inner circle of the Stalinist clique. Although a faithful supporter of Stalin from the early days of the civil war, he did not achieve prominence until the early thirties when he was chosen by Stalin first to head the food industry and later in 1938 to head the Commissariat for Foreign Trade. Mikoyan's advancement in these fields was not due to any special training, but rather was his reward for catching Stalin's fancy with his wit.

He became Stalin's court jester and in return was favored with the much-desired post. This was Stalin's idea of a joke at the expense of his court jester. For in the thirties, with their grim years of starvation and permanent hunger, there was not much for Mikoyan to do in the field of internal trade.

Mikoyan's precarious position was revealed in the reshuffle of posts that accompanied the struggle for power in the weeks that followed Stalin's death. Although he retained his position in the Politburo or Presidium, and was named head of the combined ministries of domestic and foreign trade, he was ignored in the makeup of the Council of Ministers announced on March 9, 1953.

In the second reshuffle that followed two weeks later, Molotov succeeded the post of party secretary to Khrushchev and assumed the position of premier. Mikoyan achieved a unique and interesting position in the new cabinet: Shuman, Beria, Molotov, Bulganin and Kaganovich were all named First Deputy Ministers, while Mikoyan was only designated as a Deputy Minister.

In this comedy of titles and places, some more powerful figures were succeeded to higher posts by bringing him into the Council of Ministers with the other party officials, in fact, to the only official post in the cabinet, that of First Deputy Minister. The only question that remained to be answered was: Who had undertaken to act as Mikoyan's patron? That question will remain to be answered. But one thing is clear; Mikoyan has been identified with the general line of Government concern for the economic development of the consumer industries. To be sure, the trend of his "new line" has not been clear and consistent of propaganda promises; nevertheless the question of the general direction was unmissable.

Khrushchev's influence over the Central Party Committee has now been identified with the old Stalinist line, then it is safe to say that, Miko-
yan's protector and patron was none other than Molotov.

In other very important personality in the Kremlin is the Mikhaylov inspection, now second in line—after Molotov. A letter from the director of the Mikhaylov inspection, on March 7, gives an indication how the new line is being interpreted.

How About Molotov?

One other very important personality in the Kremlin hierarchy enters the equation—Molotov. If Mikoyan's dismissal foreshadows the dangers that await Molotov, the Mikhaylov inspection's attitude towards the new "hard line" has been revealed in recent reports that these were consistent with propaganda promises; nevertheless the question of the general direction was unmissable.

Furthermore, the struggle over economic policy is tied up with foreign policy—and both of these disputed issues in turn are inextricably bound up with the struggle for power in the Kremlin and on the Soyer council. The hard-line faction—represented, let us assume, by Molotov—stands to benefit in the economic and industrial assignment more than in foreign policy. The French ratification of the Paris Treaty meant that the French were expected to stay by Washington. The strategy of the European allies has ended in dismal failure. Should the division of Europe continue, then the division of the world will be completed and Molotov accordingly discarded.

A resolution adopted by the Hungarian Communist Party's Central Committee on October 31, 1953, declares, for example, that although the decision to slower down the tempo of heavy industry in favor of consumer goods was a "negative" move, it will not be implemened and "even won with open resistance in exec-
cution, which the government will carry out with determination so that the party's plans for renegotiation of the economy in favor of heavy industry more specifically, for example, the granting of the State Planning Office of the Ministries for Heavy and Light Industry, Ministry for Heavy Construction and for the Iron and Steel Industry.

On January 4 of this year, the Hungarian newspaper Nepszabadsag carried an article urging a renewed emphasis on heavy industry as the foundation of the country's economy. The line seems to be moving towards the creation of opposition within the Communist Party itself.

First Stage

There can be no doubt that with Mikoyan's ouster from the Kremlin, the new stage in a new struggle for power has been entered. More clearly than in the case of Berlin, the conflict is concentrated around specific issues of domestic and foreign policy, and the lines between "liberalizing" and "oldguards" Stalinists are being drawn accordingly.

It would be premature to assume that the victory for the "hard" faction is assured in advance. For example, if the German working class supported by large sec-
tions of the workers, was able to compel a German ratification of the Paris Treaty, the Khrush-
chev faction would lose the powerful weapon of the "German danger" it is now wielding so tellingly.

This does not mean, by the way, that the German government would immediately rebel against the Soviet Union. A victory for the working class in Western Germany would raise the hopes and fighting spirit of the East Germans and create dangers of another order for Stalinists.

The new turn back to the emphasis on heavy indus-
try and armaments in Russia raises a number of inter-
esting problems. What effect, for example, will the new line have on the policy of sending technical specialists and skilled workers into the countryside? Will the present trend toward a lesser and more decentralized planning be reversed? We hope to deal with these and other problems in future issues of LABOR ACTION.
THE Dillas Case Is Not Over

BY MAL DRAPER

In a hurried secret trial, the Yugoslav regime has convicted Djilas and Dedijer as criminally pro-democratic, and then suspended sentence in order to avoid embarrassing world opinion at this time, while still holding the two over the threat of the two men. The regime of its "public trial" of the oppositionists was made into a farce. The foreign press was kept out first, because they could not be trusted to give the proper report. Even the domestic press was excluded too, as well as the public generally. The N. Y. Times dispatch concludes: 

"When the correspondents entered the office of the president of the court for clarification of his statement on the conviction of the two men, the press were only allowed to make two questions. The upshot was that the foreign press and I have no time to talk to you!"

"Is this a secret trial?", he was asked.

"No, it is public," he asserted. It is true. It can be seen, at least, by any kind of complete report on the proceedings, the especially the investigation conducted by the controlled press.

According to the release of the court, his defense was heard and Dr. Djilas and Dedijer's actions constituted "hostile propaganda" (criticism) against the Yugoslav regime, the end result of which were the trials, tried on their conviction, foreign press, that is, foreign newspapers. It was pretty much incredible that the court would be able to make a smear campaign put up by the government.

The prosecution never declared from the box that the trial was a "public" or "judicial" against Yugoslavia, against "socialism," for capital punishment, for intervention by foreigners, etc.

The slanderous case worked out by the Yugoslavia government officials is under the "public" pronouncements of the regime after the trials began, the rest of which is not available, although already released to U. S. authorities. U. S. officials fail to notice previously declared the fight of day.

SORRA'S MUD-BOMB

The first blast by Sorra (central Titos-ist organ), which quoted the "mercurial" information before the world, which is now available to us, although already released to U. S. authorities. U. S. officials fail to notice previously declared the fight of day.

Sorra's MUD-BOMB

The first blast by Sorra (central Titos-ist organ), which quoted the "mercurial" information before the world, is no longer available to us, although already released to U. S. authorities. U. S. officials fail to notice previously declared the fight of day.
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Rearmament Is —

(Continued from page 1)

roused demands for a national vote on the question. The campaign against rear- armament receives a powerful boost in the movement which will be the closest watchful. It is clear that the initiative in the struggle has been assumed by the new challenge of the German der Kaiser movement (most heavily centered in the metal work- ers of West Germany) which has been a major factor in the growth of the movement. —Ed.

No wonder! As the struggle against rearmament and the complete integra- tion of Western Germany into the Ameri- can open struggle to a feverish pitch, a deep split on the question has been revealed inside the established lead- ership of the Social Democratic Party (SPD). BIF.

While the party was officially engaged in one of the major campaigns of its program, the Social Democratic lead- ers have publicly announced the Adenauer foreign policy is right, that they do not support the party stand on the matter.

But the party leadership of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) itself is not free from internal strife. In BRENNEN, Wilhelm Kelsen, Social- Democratic president of the Brenne, pub- lished an open letter addressed to the SPD's editorial board, and a campaign against the peace agree- ments in progress.

In Selg, Dr. Herman Knoerr, SPD deputy in the German State legislature, announced that he is in disagreement with the stalinism of the Ossenwein course. And Dr. Riebe, president of the Union of the West German Parliament, stated recently that the SPD must prepare for the day when it has been ratified by the Bonn government.

If the SPD is splitting, the Social Democratic Party (SPD) is not splitting. Carl Schmidt is anling to make the SPD the new party of Germany which wants to transform the SPD from a social party based on the labor movement into a 'people's party' which is a broad non-class party of reform which is not based on the petty-bourgeois strata of German society.

He and his co-thinkers have been the strongest advocates of "reformism," op- posed to the "radical" line of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) which has been the leading force in the German labor movement. —Ed.

In the new trade union leadership under A Studt, Stein's article in Labor Activist November 12, 1964. In this article, incidentally, Conrad Stein also raised the question of the need for unity of the labor movement and the Social Democratic Party (SPD). According to Stein, "What seems to be the most promising path to the Social Democratic Party (SPD) is the elimination of organizational differences between the Social Democratic and the American bloc. But the Social Democratic Party (SPD) is not splitting. Carl Schmidt is anling to make the SPD the new party of Germany which wants to transform the SPD from a social party based on the labor movement into a 'people's party' which is a broad non-class party of reform which is not based on the petty-bourgeois strata of German society."