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INTERNATIONAL NOTES

HIGHLIGHTS OF 1953

1953 was a year of important changes in world politics. A few of the highlights follow.

Throughout the year there was a marked increase in the clash between the colonial peoples and imperialism. The Tory Government adopted a more naked and open imperialist policy. We saw a continuation of the terror bombings; collective punishment and suppression by Templer in Malaya; the ruthless campaign against the rise of massed armed resistance of Africans in Kenya—the so-called Mau Mau. In British Guiana a leftist Government, newly elected under the new constitution, was deposed and the constitution suspended. Towards the end of the year there was the crude removal of the Kabaka of Buganda.

1953 opened with the inauguration of General Eisenhower as president of the United States. Shortly afterwards, at the beginning of March, came the sudden death of Joseph Stalin, followed by turns in Russian internal and also her foreign policy.

In June, came the uprising of the workers throughout Eastern Germany, set off by a strike of building operatives in the Stalin Alee in Berlin. The East German stalinist government was proved to have lost all popular base. Only with the aid of the fully mobilised Soviet occupation forces could it put down the uprising.

July saw the conclusion of the armistice in Korea. In August the general strike in France revealed a ruling class virtually prostrate. The year closed with France once again in a governmental crisis, the over-riding issue being foreign policy, particularly Indo-China. In Indo-China, Ho-chi-min’s Vietminh forces cut the country in two, meantime indicating willingness for peace negotiations.
No wonder that opinion in France, in capitalist circles, is

diminishing. Although there is a serious risk that the cost of the war will be very high, the French have been instructed by their leaders to remain united and to continue the war. The French army is one of the most powerful in Europe, and the French people are determined to fight until victory.

In Indo-China, the French government has been advised by its leaders to continue the war against Vietnam until victory is achieved.

**INDO-CHINA**

Their international relations with Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia are complicated by the presence of American and Soviet troops in the region. The French government is determined to maintain its influence in these areas and to prevent the spread of communism.

In summary, the French government is determined to continue the war against Vietnam until victory is achieved, and to maintain its influence in the region.
Assembly taunted the Government recently with "trading French blood for American dollars." This gibe hit the target.

The frustration is all the more profound because of the equal failure of the other line of French policy referred to, the creation of puppet regimes loyal to themselves. The grand plan was, firstly to create several separate puppet regimes (divide and rule); secondly to ensure that their rulers supported Indo-China remaining part of the French Union, or Empire; thirdly, to see that these native Governments threw their own man-power into the War, to enable the withdrawal of badly needed French troops to Europe. The U.S. gave its backing in full to this policy, sent Donald Heath as its boss-on-the spot to bribe all these regimes with the same kind of financial and military aid that Chiang Kai Shek and Syngman Rhee receive.

But the programme has stalled an every conceivable issue. First, the regimes were clearly unrepresentative, and unable to take over "responsibility" in the face of tremendous mass hostility to the War and to the French. Secondly, what has upset the French even more, the heads of these regimes (reflecting their own precarious position in their territories) are proving less co-operative than the French could wish!

Both in Vietnam and in Cambodia, the most reactionary politicians are forced to tell the French to get out, and to say that only the Indo-Chinese can settle their own future, and the question of the Vietminh. No self-respecting politician in the country can be made to say a good word for the idea of "French Union" which is the most that the French will offer and means much less than dominion status.

THE COLOMBO PLAN

Whatever the prospects are of an early economic depression in the West, there is no doubt whatever that a serious economic crisis already grips every colonial country in the East within the orbit of Imperialism. This crisis, which is the result of a steep fall of agricultural prices, and prices of other raw materials in the world market, underscores the distorted and one-sided development that has marked all
Pakistan has been faced with severe economic difficulties—

**U.S. IMPERIALISM IN PAKISTAN**
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spent on military purposes, and the people of Pakistan have the comfortless prospect of seeing U.S. dollars go into aerodromes, airplanes, etc., instead of into their own economic projects. But apart from this, the entry of the United States into Pakistan is going to have far-reaching consequences for this part of Asia.

In response to sharp protests from India that the "balance of power" in this region was being altered, the Americans announced that no military bases were being established in Pakistan by them. Nevertheless, the rearmament of Pakistan brings closer the danger of War in Kashmir, which remains an unsolved Indo-Pakistan problem.

The American aim of ringing the U.S.S.R. with bases from which air and atomic attacks can be made (the airfields in Pakistan bring the hitherto invulnerable Urals industries within striking distance) is thus creating an entirely new power-relationship in this part of Asia, and if the American plans go much further, we are bound to see a reaction in the form of India seeking guarantees in other quarters from attack.

INDIA'S CRISIS

India is running into the same sort of difficulties as her neighbours. Here again we have strange combinations of features—famine and a fall in agricultural prices going together, for instance. The Five Year Plan adopted by India is proving a difficult one to fulfil. Here again it is the lack of Capital—the fulfilment of the Plan depends on foreign aid—that undermines the Plan.

The chief feature of Indian politics today, is the lack of an opposition party to the Capitalist Congress which Nehru leads. The Indian Socialist Party, led by Jayaprakash Narain has made the most sorry capitulation to capitalist pressure, and merged within the Praja Party, a breakaway wing of the Congress. Those militants who refused to join this suicidal merger have continued to work in the name of the Socialist Party, but have not yet developed their forces on a national scale.
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The depression in America will speed up the growth of his movement. McCarthyism is the American form of fascism. Its victory would signal the crushing of the labour movement in America.

It is heartening that the McCarthy danger has been realised by sections of the American Labour Movement.

In December six thousand San Francisco members of the International Longshoremens’ and Warehousemens’ Union struck work in protest when one of the witch-hunting Congressional Committees visited that city and launched a red baiting attack on their union.

The Socialist Workers Party of America has called for a National Congress of Labour to consider the problem of fighting McCarthyism and to launch a campaign to put labour’s own candidates in office in 1954 and a Workers’ and Farmers’ Government in power in Washington in 1956.

ANNOUNCEMENT

This is “Labour Review” number 5. Our readers must have wondered at its somewhat belated appearance. This has been due to a number of reasons, chiefly financial.

The ever quickening tempo of international and national events has brought about an increased demand for a serious journal such as this. And so, we resume publication. More important, we are resuming publication regularly. From now on we will appear bi-monthly.

We will attempt to cover the main international and national developments. In this period we feel it absolutely necessary to cut through all the confusing theories that will arise out of the turmoil and our contributors will attempt to give a serious analysis, to help the left wing of the Labour Movement.

Future issues will deal with the colonies, the Soviet Union, the development of the American slump and international events. We will maintain a close analysis of economic, industrial and political developments in Britain.

We appeal for your support. Take out a subscription now.
The American War Drive Meets Difficulties

By C. Healy

Peace Talks? What is Behind The
its base. German rearmament met with deep resistance from French capitalism. European war preparations were slowed down by economic difficulties and strong anti-war feelings among the masses.

All these combined factors exerted their pressure to bring about the cease fire in Korea last July. But no sooner had the war tension eased up than American capitalism began to face trouble from another, not unrelated source. A marked decline in production set in, which towards the end of the year was close to a 5 per cent drop in the business index. And this beginning of the American slump cannot fail to have its effect on the American working class, in politicalising their movement and engendering a resistance that American capitalism must smash. It is thus faced with the necessity of attempting to secure its base at home as well as in Europe before launching an all-out attack on the third of the world which has been withdrawn from capitalist exploitation.

Undoubtedly, the American capitalist class is now in the process of reconsidering and re-evaluating foreign and domestic policy. It is more inclined than previously to listen to those capitalist spokesmen, like Churchill, who favour, for the present, discussions on a ‘deal’ with the Soviet leaders. The outcome of such discussions can help them to decide, not only on a definitive foreign policy, but also on what policy to pursue on the home front.

THE KREMLIN ALSO HAS PROBLEMS

Their readiness to discuss is also based on considerations of developments in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet sphere of economy has its own contradictions sharpened by the pace of the armaments race and the difficulties of assimilating the economies of Eastern Europe. There is a crisis of agricultural production. Kruschev, in his speech in the autumn of last year put it that: “A definite disproportion has set in between the rate of growth of our large scale socialist industry, the urban population and the material well being of the working masses, on the one hand, and the present level of agricultural production on the other.”
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The aims of the capitalist policies, of Eisenhower, of
up by it.
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other at the United Nations for a world pool of atomic
and the Soviet Union? Indeed—in view of Eisenhower’s
petition between the “two systems” between capitalism
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WILL CAPITALISM AND THE SOVIET UNION NOW LIVE

like its position.

Firstly, the Beria purge shows a crisis within the confines
and China since the war.

and China has been modified by the developments in Eastern Europe
and the fact that the isolation of the Soviet Union
and Indestructible in their eyes in view of the growth of the
unilateral extensions and sacrifices. The bureaucratic structure
are more monstrous
have grown considerably in numbers, culture and skill and
Khrushchii is facing increasing and exploitive pressures from
The East Germany uprising in June showed that the
objective remains. They aim to open the vast markets of China, of the whole Far East, of Eastern Europe and even of Russia to capitalist exploitation.

For this basic reason socialists cannot give the slightest shred of credence to the benevolence of Eisenhower and his plan for atomic energy. Nor can socialists, for the same reason, have any illusions in Churchillian secret diplomacy "to reduce world tension." They merely aim to exploit the deep desire for peace with the objective of jockeying the Western Powers into a better position to pursue their war against the East. There can be no settled era of "peaceful co-existence of capitalism and socialism" to use the formula of stalinism.

CAN THE SECRET DIPLOMACY OF THE SOVIET LEADERS ENSURE OUR FUTURE?

There is an argument heard in the ranks of the working class movement. It is: the Soviet sphere does not want war, on the contrary, it needs peace for further development. If the Western Powers can but be brought to sit down with the Soviet leaders, we can therefore depend on them (because their economies are non-capitalist) to represent the interests of the masses of the world at top-level talks. This is more or less the line put forward by Communist Parties and their supporters, not only in Britain, but everywhere. It is the argument behind their slogans for a Five Power Conference.

Now there is no doubt that the economic foundations laid by the Russian Revolution in 1917 are entirely different to those of the capitalist world. Nationalisation of the means of production brought about a tremendous upswing of Soviet economy, which has proved its vast superiority over private ownership. Russia has, in the space of three decades, risen from a backward, semi-feudal, mainly agricultural country, to a major industrial power.

A drop in armaments production means a slump for the United States under "private enterprise." The Soviet Union faces no such danger. It can truly be said, regardless of what the intentions or ambitions of individual leaders may be, that the Soviet economy, unlike capitalism is not
The history of the Communist International shows how

Influence should be maintained in Yugoslavia. With the Western Powers there is a capitalist sphere of influence, and in the Eastern sphere, the Communist movement within the confines of its agreement with the Kremlin. It seems that the Western powers and the Kremlin will develop a balance of influence between the Soviet leaders, the Western leaders, and the other leaders. A study of relations between the Soviet leaders and the Western leaders is instructive in this connection.

If it would be foolish to think that the Kremlin can no longer make deals with imperialists, it is also foolish to think that the Cold War will end with a balance of influence. All that did not prevent the Cold War from spreading to Eastern Europe, the Balkans, and the Mediterranean. Lenin's dictum, "You either destroy the capitalist or destroy the people," is reflected in the policies of the Kremlin, which depend for success on the support of the mass of the people. The idea that it becomes a secret diplomacy is alien to Socialism and Socialism will not remain the least bit secret or untrustworthy. The Kremlin leaders and their war and commerce need protection and development, driven by economic necessity, to the conquest of markets,
STALINIST FOREIGN POLICY HAS NOT CHANGED

In the post-war period the basis of stalinist foreign policy remained the same. For fear of provoking retaliation from imperialism and becoming directly involved in war; for fear that revolutionary movements might pass beyond its control, the leaders of the Soviet Union have shown themselves always ready to hamstring these movements or permit them to bleed to death. Moscow, for instance, gave the North Koreans supplies enough to drag out the war, but not enough to win, even when their armies were sweeping the invaders toward the sea.

When Zahedi was making ready to seize the power in Iran, the leadership of the Stalinist Tudeh Party instructed its ranks to lie low, with the result that a landlords' government, pro-Shah, pro-American, was instituted, proceeded to arrest and deport workers and suppress their organisations. In August, the General Strike in France brought to a head the crisis of the French capitalist regime, showed the complete bankruptcy of French capitalism, and posed the question of replacing its government with a workers and peasants government. In this situation, the C.G.T. the French Communist Unions confined the strike movement to purely economic demands and failed to mobilise the working class to bring the government down. No serious student of French events last August, can draw any other conclusion but that the stalinists in France, although backed by the overwhelming majority of workers and poor farmers, were not prepared to undertake a struggle for the overthrow of French capitalism. Their policy was limited by Kremlin diplomacy, attempting to neutralise French capitalism.

Under Malenkov, as under Stalin, the Kremlin exerts its utmost influence to preserve the prevailing status quo as a lesser evil. It aims to uphold this by acting simultaneously on two fronts: against further aggression by imperialism on the one side and against any disruption of the prevailing equilibrium by eruptions and expansion of revolutionary movements on the other.

Today the leaders of the Soviet Union, as "practical"
This, a drive to a Socialist world, is the only way to

democratic rule in their countries.

and that the American working class itself will most certainly go
before. We can hope more than ever for favourable results
American working class for support—something never done
American capitalism. It means a massive appeal to the
American working class. In the real meaning of breaking loose from the alliance with reactionary
attack on the sources of capitalist power in this country
live of dividing the forces from power. We must replace
The movement here must necessarily pursue the opposite

 opposition, our contribution to the cause of peace
The economic difficulties of capitalism press in inevitably to
The problem of peace will not be solved by such a deal.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT MUST HAVE AN

Independent Policy

agreement in the objective needs of both sides.

situation. Hence the Four Power Conference. There is beyond our control. Let us try together to stabilise the
powers: you have your troubles, we have ours. From forces
power policies are saying in effect to the capitalist
THE CRISIS OF BRITISH CAPITALISM

by W. Hunter

From 1950 to 1952 the volume of world exports rose 7 per cent but the volume of British exports fell 5 per cent. Britain’s share in the exports of manufactured goods by the ten main exporting countries fell from 26 per cent to 22 per cent. The drop has continued this year.

The “Financial Times” of the 24th of November 1953 bluntly accused the Government of failure in its export policy. “The favourable balance of the U.K. balance of payments so far this year owes a great deal to sheer luck,” it declared “... the latest Treasury Bulletin of Industry points out that the same volume of exports as was actually achieved in 1951 would today buy 25 per cent more imports. It is chiefly this fortuitous movement in world markets that has made it possible for Britain to relax her import restrictions and to increase the range of consumer choice at home.”

The struggle for markets is becoming sharper, and Britain is losing out in its battle with its major competitors. The changes in the volume of exports of the three principle capitalist powers—Britain, Germany and the U.S.A. make this plain. If we take the volume of exports in 1950 as 100, then in June 1953 British exports were 96, the German figure, however, was 179 and the American, 144.

A bitter price war is waging, and Britain is getting the worst of it. Last November the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Butler, speaking to the “National Production Advisory Council on Industry,” declared: “In many important non-sterling areas we seem to have lost ground to competitors pretty steadily over the last two years...”, Heathcote Amery, from the Board of Trade, added to this —“... he regretted the loss of the Indian Locomotive Contracts...there was quite a substantial difference in the
The landlords are bidding with a rent increase and the same class of rent. Those who have the money do not require building of thousands of houses for sale. Here again the Government, the policy of the Government, the

Similarly with the housing policy, they can afford to pay. Living is worth the extra cost, they can afford to pay. Goods, particularly food, for them, a higher standard of order to receive a greater quantity and variety of consumer goods. They are quite prepared to pay extra in price, a higher price for the middle class, whom have moved to the higher ranks of the middle class. The capitalistic class has been appealing for the return of the Tory Government, the capitalistic class has been appealing for the return of the Tory Government. Retail food prices have risen by 11 per cent since January. Wholesale prices have risen, has been in line with wholesale food prices have fallen. Retail prices have risen, they have virtually wiped out food subsidies. The result of a policy of deflation and control of prices at home. "Fortisimus movemus," they have, since 1931. Pursued "Fortisimus movemus," which the "Financial Times" calls a "wont of world price," which the "Financial Times" calls a "wont of world price," which British exporters. Taking advantage of this move, wherever success, this Government has had in main.

**CAPITALISM PREPARES AN ATTACK**

American markets, and increase the difficulties of British exports in Britain, which will push America into higher competition with Britain, and increase the difficulties of British exports in Britain, which will push America into higher competition with Britain, and increase the difficulties of British exports in Britain, and increase the difficulties of British exports in Britain.
promise of decontrol of rents in the near future. The Tory Government is serving its class and solidifying its base in preparation for conflict with the workers movement.

Capitalist Britain, in short, is moving into a crisis. That crisis can only be met by the most drastic methods. That must now be seen as the background to all political and industrial developments.

Costs are too high for British capitalist economy. The situation is in many ways anagous to 1931. British capitalism must cut labour costs. Real wages are already being undermined by the rise in food prices. But more will be demanded; money wages and working class standards built up during the war and post-war period must be directly attacked.

Despite the illusions expressed from the platform at the Margate Conference of the Labour Party on the possibility of an immediate election, the Tories since have demonstrated unquestionably, that they are determined to hold on to the Government to help British capitalism to meet this situation.

The big problem for the capitalist class is how to pass over to the attack on Labour's standards in face of a trade union and labour movement embracing a greater number of workers than ever before, which has not experienced any big defeats for many years; and in which there is a growing militancy despite the opposition of sections of the leadership to direct action, and despite their attempts to compromise with the Tories. At the present time they are conducting a defensive struggle against the wages movement, manoeuvring for the best possible ground for a battle to stem the tide, and strike a blow at the trade union movement.

The Government retreated in the face of a serious challenge from the railwaymen. It knows it cannot defeat a united working class movement and it feared that the railwaymen would be backed by the engineers, the miners, the building trade workers all of whom have wage demands and all of whom know that the railwaymens' case is more
The "Daily Herald" speaking for the right wing of the
was already warning the country against the "Drummond.
end of the Labour Government's policies, the "Daily Herald
class of politics and the post-war boom. In fact, the new
foundation of capitalism. It was a product of working
the "Daily Herald" can no longer be guaranteed. For
the "Daily Herald" just to defend the "Welfare State" against Tory attacks.
Labour must now take the lead of the crisis by taking over
funds of free health services back. Labour's task is not
Herald" would have us believe, of buttressing subsidies, con-
Il is not simply a question, however, as the "Daily

dangers in Government policy will not even gather
change in Government policy will not even gather
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lose heavily on the export market to Germany, Japan and
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processes and wages in this country. As a result, Britain has
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"Daily Herald" declares (December 29th, 1953):

If the fabric of the Welfare State were to fall away, the Tories have
Labour's task is simply to regain power in order to pitch up
less the disease itself is recognised than it can appear there
come of the diseases—the crisis of British capitalism. Un-
industry is simply that the Tory Government has been cut-
lead unions into the pressure for higher wages. How-
"Daily Herald" has found room for a little sympathy with
Labour must realise the seriousness of the situation.

PATCHING THE WELFARE STATE IS NO SOLUTION

Here, the arguments for industrial and political expediency are
it to resist and prepare for an offensive against Labour. All
workers-the economic difficulties of British capitalism force
growing determination among the basic sections of the
more difficult than their own. But even though there is a
Labour Party and Trade Unions, sees the threatening economic crisis from the same angle as the Tories. It has nothing to do with how we produce, but only with how much, and how cheaply, we produce. If wages and prices were frozen then Britain would not have “lost heavily on the world market.” That is the practical conclusion from the “Daily Herald” analysis. It talks of a change in Government policy and not a change of Government. But the Tories and the employers can do no other but attempt to unload the crisis on the workers’ back. It is not a question of more or less controls, but how to take industry out of capitalist hands.

In fact the Tory Government itself may be forced to introduce some controls to ensure that capital investment goes to the export industries and not to industries producing consumers goods for the home market. Every capitalist crisis of markets is accompanied by greater interventions of the state. And a Labour Government, if it failed to lead a movement to take over the basic industries and plan Britain, would be forced, in order to maintain capitalism, to carry on a policy of concessions to the industrialists, to ‘stimulate’ production while cutting the workers’ standards.

THE LESSONS OF THE CRISIS

The big task for the Labour Movement shaping up for 1954 is to get a Labour Government which will take radical measures against capitalism. The first question arising from that is: how to get the Tories out? It is more than ever evident that they are determined to hang on to power. No smart manouevres in Parliament or filibustering is going to remove them. The fight to get them out must consist of more than Parliamentary debates. That much is clear.

The economic situation of Britain precisely means that the main struggle against the Tories is going to shift from Parliamentary speeches to the factories, the mines and the workshops. The left of the Labour Party can gain heart from the fact that many thousands of trade unionists will now be forced sharply to draw political lessons in action. Their wages struggle has deep political implications. When
International trade
petitions and subscriptions planned production and planned
sues here and abroad which will eliminate capitalism com-
Then we can end Tory rule, proceed with Socialism mes-
in the party and provide the bold leadership necessary.
be the left wing in the Labour Party to sweep the board
masses for wage increases. It will generate opportunities
That mass action is already developing around the de-
shaken down by mass action and demonstration.
against it. It is clear now that the Tory Government, ru-
expanded to draw out the serious lesson from this crisis of
capitalism and not afraid to mobilise the working people
A bold lead is needed from the Labour Party. One not
question and the class struggle remain and that the question of
show that all the classical problems of capitalism produc-
webs of new thinking in the Labour Party. They will
movements of the workers will sweep away the co-
been the bulwark of the right wing.
hence of militancy even in the organisations which have
will become high, these will invariably be a growth of in-
will give the unions new impetus to the Labour left. Relations in the
wings in the party. These industrial developments will give
since morecombe there has
Labour Party showed that, since morecombe there has
with the Tories are in conflict also with the growth of
the left wing in the Labour Party and for a hidden coalition
masses of workers are in movement in Industry, inevitably

What is of further importance is that those right wing

The Government which will represent the interests of this class.
the worker involved in struggle the question of securing a
the wages movement leads straight to problems of politics.
new in the workers organisations. Today more than ever
there is a more varied and intense life and political for-

By its wages policy the Tory Government serves the

The Government must intervene in every serious battle.

The wages movement leads straight to problems of politics.

The wages movement leads straight to problems of politics.
THE FALL OF BERIA

By T. Mercer

In December, Lavrentia Beria, former head of the Soviet secret police, was condemned to death by a secret court and promptly shot.

Just after the death of Stalin, Beira was being eulogised as the 'best son of Russia'. A few months later he and his associates were described as "reptiles in human masks," "an ampule of evil microbes" and as "pygmy Napoleons" at the public meetings called all over the Soviet Union to discuss his arrest.

Beria was at the peak of the Kremlin dictatorship. He appeared to occupy second place in the triumvirate—Malenkov, Beria and Molotov—which succeeded Stalin at the head of the Soviet State. His elimination is no small matter. His arrest last July was immediately followed by purges and arrests among leading officials in Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Byelorussia. A few months later the arrest of V. N. Merkulov, lately Minister of State Control and former Minister of State Security, indicated that the purge was still continuing.

This latest wave of purges, itself followed widespread purges in the Soviet Republics after Stalin's death. It appears Beria was then attempting to gain control of the State apparatus. The Soviet State Prosecutor in his indictment made the accusation that he "committed terroristic murders for the purpose of wiping out honest cadres devoted to the cause of the Communist Party and of the Soviet regime."

Six months after his dismissal as Vice Premier of the Soviet Council of Ministers and as Minister of Internal Affairs; six months after his arrest, it was announced that Beria and six others had confessed to crimes testifying to their "profound moral degeneration." All the familiar marks of a Stalinist purge technique were present in the announcement.
Republics, to sow hatred and discord between the peoples.

Bureaucratic rule in the Soviet Union has failed to solve the national aspirations of the Soviet Republics and the bureaucratic centralisation of the national aspirations of the inhabitants of the country. The national problem, the existence of sharp antagonisms between difficulties and antagonisms of the peoples.

He and his accomplices became the scapegoats for the murder of the Bolshevik.

Bereza was accused of organizing an anti-Soviet plot to overthrow the government.

The sentence and penalties for participation in the plot were announced without the participation of the persons accused, and appeal against the conviction of Kirov. Under the laws of the country, appeal against the conviction of Kirov was not allowed.

His liquidation made use of the procedure in accordance with the statutes of the country. Bereza was not allowed to publish evidence against the accused.

Bereza therefore was hardly indicted in December as an agent of British Intelligence since 1919.

When Lavrentia Bereza was dismissed it was stated that

He was expelled into a Bureaucratic residence and became an agent of Imperialism.
of the U.S.S.R. and, above all, to undermine the friendship of the Soviet people with the Great Russian people.”

There are grave difficulties in Soviet agriculture. At the Central Committee meeting of the C.P.S.U., last September Kruschev declared while industrial production had risen by 130 per cent between 1940-52, agricultural production had increased by only 10 per cent. He attributed this primarily to the failure to realise the importance of the collective farmer’s personal plot of land. He denounced those who had adopted a strongly negative attitude towards the farmers’ personal production.

Whether Beria was among those denounced, or whether the Kremlin is finding a necessary excuse for not fulfilling its promises of rapidly increasing food production, is not clear. The indictment of the former head of the secret police, however, contains the following significant charges: “To subvert the collective-farm system, and to create food difficulties in our country, Beria, by all manner of means sabotaged and interfered with the enforcement of most important measures of the party and Government directed towards an upsurge of the economy of the collective and state farms, and toward a steady improvement of the well-being of the Soviet people.”

Like the accused in the Moscow trials before the war, like Rajk, Kostov and Slansky before the death of Stalin, now, after the death of Stalin, Beria and other former Soviet leaders are liquidated with a fantastic indictment that no-one but the most innocent members of the Communist Party will believe. The old familiar Stalinist pattern of purges and confessions which emerges makes it clear that the bureaucratic caste ruling the Soviet Union has no new methods of solving the problem of maintaining its power and privileges.

A BLOW TO THE LIBERALISATION THEORIES

Beria’s liquidation and the methods by which it was accomplished deal a shattering blow to the theories that the Soviet bureaucracy is being forced to don a ‘new look.’ Since the death of Stalin there has been much speculation on the theme of the “liberalisation” of the regime. Im-
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That is entering into the realm of speculation. In the struggle among the tops of the bureaucracy after the death of Stalin the supreme arbiter—a struggle which is not yet resolved—it is always possible that one or the other of the contestants can make a limited appeal to the masses by appearing to be against the worst excesses of the regime, particularly as the death of Stalin unquestionably released a flood of hope among the people that they would get a new deal. Beria may have been attempting to make such an appeal and himself be responsible for the release of the doctors. What is sure, however, is that had he gained the ascendancy, he, no more than Malenkov could permit an ever unfolding process of liberal reforms.

THE SOVIET WORKERS WILL DECIDE

The Soviet Union will not be cleansed from bureaucracy and its terror by evolutionary changes in the bureaucracy itself. Concessions from above are limited by one major factor. That all sections of the ruling group fear, like the plague, the development of an independent organisation of the workers. When the amnesty for prisoners was declared it specifically excluded those who had been imprisoned for 'counter revolutionary' crimes. The formula covers all those imprisoned for opposing the stalinist dictatorship including those who are anti-capitalist and defend the progressive economic base of the Soviet Union—the nationalised property. The leaders feared the release of any figures around which the oppositional currents among the Soviet workers could rally, and signified by excluding political prisoners that they intended to continue the political oppression.

However, events in Eastern Germany last June showed how the forces for the regeneration of the Soviet Union can organise and develop despite the political dictatorship of Stalinism. That movement developed among the workers against the bureaucracy and in severe conflict with it. The Russian working masses, inspired and helped by the socialist struggle in other countries, are the only guarantee of a regeneration of the Soviet Union. They will flush away from top to bottom the bureaucratic dictatorship and enable the nationalised economy of the Soviet Union to make real advances to Socialism.
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