

---

---

March 1945

# Fourth International

---

---

## WHITHER THE USSR

1. The Fight Against Stalinism . . . . . *By The Editors*
2. Revolutionary Tactics . . . . . *By G. Munis*

---

## Liquidation of World War II And the Mass Upsurge

(Theses of the European Trotskyists)

---

*The Arsenal of Marxism*

## Twenty Years of Stalinism

By LEON TROTSKY

---

---

*Twenty Cents*

## Manager's Column

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL sales in Allentown have increased during the last few months. Not only did our agent, Leona Massey, order additional copies of the January issue, but requested that we "increase the regular monthly bundle three copies until our new Literature Agent Newell sends the new order."

We welcome H. Newell as Literature Agent for Allentown.

\* \* \*

A new high in sales for one of San Francisco's newsstands is reported by R. Haddon, agent:

"Whitey's Smoke Shop in Berkeley sold their entire order of fifteen this month, so we'll increase his bundle to twenty with the current issue.

"The new F.I. publicity is most impressive. It will be interesting to watch the results."

Our agent refers to a printed card which will be inserted in each issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. The card gives brief information about the magazine and offers our readers a special subscription rate of \$2 for the first one-year sub and \$1 for each additional sub. Every reader of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL is urged to utilize this offer to either renew his subscription and get a sub for a friend, or subscribe for two friends.

\* \* \*

A. Field reports plans to increase the number of subscribers in Minneapolis:

"In line with your campaign to get more people to subscribe to FOURTH INTERNATIONAL we are planning to intensify our work in the sale of the F.I. We plan on working especially among our party people, some of who do not get the magazine through the mail. Would it be possible for you to make up a list of the F.I. subscribers we have here in Minneapolis, so that we can get to work?"

\* \* \*

Los Angeles has opened a new bookshop in Southside, according to our agent Al Lynn, where FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, THE MILITANT and other Trotskyist literature can be purchased. The "Workers' Bookshop" is located at 8026 Seville Avenue, South Gate.

\* \* \*

Appreciating the lasting value of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, Bill

## FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 6 March 1945 No. 3 (Whole No. 52)

Published monthly by the  
Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: Algonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 15c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles, 16c for 5 copies and up.

Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Managing Editor: E. R. FRANK

### CONTENTS

Review of the Month . . . . .	By The Editors	
The Fight Against Stalinism . . . . .		68
The Yalta Conference . . . . .		70
Canadian Anti-War Struggles . . . . .		72
World Trade Union Conference . . . . .		72
Forced Labor in U. S. . . . .		73
Defense of the USSR and Revolutionary Tactics . . . . .	By G. Munis	74
Liquidation of World War II and the Revolutionary Upsurge (Theses) . . . . .		78
The Arsenal of Marxism Twenty Years of Stalinist Degeneration . . . . .	By Leon Trotsky	87
Report of An Honest War Correspondent (Book Review) . . . . .	By Li Fu-jen	90
Socialism Reaffirmed . . . . .	By Lily Roy	91

Crane reports a project to bind them, thus permanently preserving the magazine for the use of the Milwaukee Branch:

"We are planning to have our loose files of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL bound and would appreciate receiving the indexes for them.

(Our files go back to 1934 as we were fortunate to pick up most of them from Chicago.)

"The contents of the January F.I. are excellent (as usual), but I did miss the archive section's regular reprint of an article by the Old Man."

### Subscription Blank

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL  
116 University Place  
New York 3, N. Y.

I am enclosing \$ . . . . . Send me

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for

( ) 6 months . . . . . \$1.00  
( ) 1 year . . . . . \$2.00

Name . . . . .

Address . . . . .

City . . . . .

Sidney Crabbe of Boston writes: "A contact and subscriber to the F.I. would like to know if she can obtain a full-size reprint, suitable for framing, of the Lenin cut which appeared on the cover of the January issue."

At present we do not have any prints suitable for framing, but so many of our friends are inquiring about the possibility of getting pictures of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky and other revolutionary leaders that we are considering a portfolio of such pictures that can be sold to readers of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

\* \* \*

The following inquiry was sent to us by D. Hilson, our agent in Akron: "Have you received a subscription to FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, sent in on a coupon clipped from the January issue, from the Akron area? The Akron Public Library copy of this issue has had its coupon clipped."

Although we have received several subscriptions recently on the coupon clipped from the F.I., we have not received one from the Akron area recently.

\* \* \*

Subscriptions to FOURTH INTERNATIONAL during the month indicate that our magazine is making new friends over a wide area. New subscriptions, for instance, have been received not only from India and South Africa but from Brecksville and Novelty, Ohio; Wonalancet, N. H.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Baltimore, Md., etc.

\* \* \*

We quote several letters received from friends in other countries.

Canada: "Received your magazine for December and thank you all a million. Very interesting indeed. I read Morrow's article and E. R. Frank's."

Iraq: "I am an English FOURTH INTERNATIONALIST, newly posted to this Command and I am anxious to get copies of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and THE MILITANT, also other material published by the Socialist Workers Party if you can possibly manage to send it to me regularly. Our English organization's efforts to keep in touch with me while I was stationed in India were continually interrupted and I don't doubt that you labor under the same difficulties. But you know the value we all place on the stuff you turn out and I'll be very pleased if you can keep me supplied."

# FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 6

MARCH 1945

NUMBER 3

## REVIEW OF THE MONTH

*The USSR and Struggle Against Stalinism—Conspiracy at Yalta Conference  
Against the German Revolution—The Campaign Against Forced  
Labor in the US—World Trade Union Conference in  
London—Canadian Anti-War Struggles*

By The Editors

### Trends in the Soviet Union and the Struggle Against Stalinism

The Crimean conference has further reinforced the sinister alliance of the Kremlin bureaucracy with Anglo-American imperialism. The "Big Three" have further perfected at Yalta their ghoulish schemes to bleed the German people, to reduce Europe to the status of a wretched beggar, to carve up the ruined continent into spheres of influence of the respective three giant powers.

It is clear that the foreign policy of the Kremlin ruling caste has undergone profound change in the past two years with the emergence of the Soviet Union as the first military power of Europe. Stalinist foreign policy was for two decades an essentially defensive one. Stalin gave voice to this outlook of the bureaucracy in 1936 in a statement which became the official formula of Soviet foreign policy: "We don't want an inch of foreign land, but we will not surrender an inch of our own . . . Let them keep their snouts out of our Socialist garden." The Stalinist bureaucracy, despite its braggadocio, was only too well aware of the USSR's industrial inferiority to the western powers, especially Germany and the United States. The bureaucracy was in, the main characterized by the qualities of conservatism and national exclusiveness. It feared the western powers, for twenty years its foreign policy was dominated by its dread of war and its determination to avoid it. Having lost all faith in the working class revolution, the bureaucracy attempted to secure the Soviet Union, insofar as that was necessary to secure itself, by embarking on a course of alliances with the "democratic" imperialists, supplemented with the organization of pacifist congresses and people's fronts. From the setting up of the Peasant International and the creation of the Anglo-Russian trade union committee right up to its joining the League of Nations and the signing of pacts with France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, its foreign policy was dominated by this one pervading thought of avoiding war. The bureaucracy ruled uneasily and was uncertain of its ability to maintain power through the rigors of a big war or the ability of the Soviet Union to survive in battle against major powers.

Stalin's peace policy collapsed ignominiously, we know, in 1938. Frightened by the Four-Power Pact at Munich directed against the Soviet Union, Stalin reversed his diplomatic course and turned frantically to Nazi Germany. By his pact with Hitler, he gave German imperialism the green light to proceed against Poland. The Stalin-Hitler Pact provided the signal for the second world war. But all of Stalin's treacherous maneuvers and ghastly

betrayals of the world working class proved impotent in securing his main aim—peace for the USSR. It was the Soviet Union that for more than three years was converted into the main battlefield of the war.

### THE EVENTS OF 1941

The events of 1941 are still fresh in everybody's memory. We remember how in all the chancelleries and military staffs of the world they thought that the Red Army would collapse three or at most six months after Hitler's attack. The poor showing of Red Army troops in the Finnish war only strengthened the conviction of the diplomats and military experts that the annihilation of the Red Army was only a question of time. We Trotskyists were the only ones who had any real appreciation of the inherent strength of the Soviet Union; we were the only ones who fully understood that the Russian Revolution, though stifled and desecrated, was still not completely destroyed; that the nationalized economy and planned production would reveal herculean powers in war just as they had previously been revealed in the course of the Five Year plans in peace. In 1939 Trotsky predicted that an attack on the Soviet Union would most likely unleash a wave of Soviet patriotism.

The imperialists thought otherwise. Both Hitler and the Allied imperialists believed that the Kremlin purges, massacres, famines, the GPU brutality and tyranny had so exhausted the country, evoked such embitterment among the masses and kindled such hatred against the bloody ruling caste that the masses would not and could not struggle effectively against a powerful invader.

Our estimate, it is now clear, was the only correct one. We Trotskyists, in truth, had far more faith in the Soviet Union and its powers of resistance than the Kremlin bureaucracy itself. But even we, it must be admitted, did not fully comprehend the tremendous resources inherent in nationalized planned economy. The Soviet Union proved capable of absorbing gigantic defeats and the unparalleled destruction of its industries and lands, and still retained the vitality to regird its loins for battle and rebuild its military force. The Red Army stands today, as much to the surprise of the Kremlin ruling caste as to the imperialists, as the most powerful offensive force in Europe, with its spearheads on the outskirts of Berlin. An unprecedented, an almost miraculous achievement!

The repulse of the Nazi military machine and the emergence of the Soviet Union as a first rate military power enormously heightened the appetite of the greedy Kremlin oligarchy. Where previously in 1939 they thought in terms of eastern Poland, the

Baltics, Finnish Karelia, they now envisage their influence stretching over all of eastern Europe and Germany. Soviet foreign policy has lost every vestige of its former isolationism and defensiveness and is becoming aggressively expansionist and adventurist.

The Anglo-American imperialists were at first seriously alarmed at the ambitious Stalinist designs and moved to oppose these grandiose pretensions. But after much vacillation and indecision, they finally resolved to recognize reality, base themselves on the new relationship of forces and modify their diplomacy in accordance with it. The western imperialists were able to overcome their previous fears, accept Stalin as a third partner and in business-like manner arrange with him a division of the spoils because among the three there existed a common ground on the all-important, the fundamental question—suppression of revolutionary upheavals in Europe and throughout the world, and employment of their joint military forces to prop up and preserve decaying capitalism.

### HEINOUS CONSPIRACY AT YALTA

The "Big Three" criminals wove their heinous conspiracy against humanity first at Moscow, then at Teheran. And now at Yalta they have sealed their conspiracy in blood—the blood of the Polish and Greek insurgents. Greece especially provided a terrifying illustration of the present effectiveness of this combination: the imperialists moved in to crush the mass revolt by naked military force and the native Stalinist agents betrayed the movement from within. Moreover the Red Army, an instrument in the hands of the counter-revolutionary Kremlin caste, is now being more and more directly used to suppress and strangle popular movements and uprisings in Rumania, Bulgaria and the rest of eastern Europe and to artificially bolster the discredited rule of the capitalists.

Foreign policy, Marxists know, is an extension of domestic politics. The censorship conceals much of the true situation that exists inside the USSR but the bits of information that come through make it unmistakable that here too important changes are taking place in every sphere of Soviet life. Politically, it has been clear for some time, the bureaucracy has gone the limit in effacing the remains of the October revolution. It has destroyed the Bolshevik party, the Soviets, the trade unions, the generation of leaders and fighters who made the October revolution. The bureaucracy is a totalitarian caste that employs the political methods of the Fascist regimes. Economically, nationalized property and planned economy—the gigantic conquests of the October revolution—still remain and it is on this material basis that the oligarchy is still compelled to rule. We have long been aware, however, that even in this sphere the tendency has been away from Socialist planning and development and in the direction of capitalist anarchy. Trotsky analyzed the process with a wealth of statistical detail as far back as 1936 in his work "The Revolution Betrayed" and even earlier.

Despite the fact that the Stalinist bureaucracy rules in the manner of an Asiatic despotism, it cannot convert itself into a stable ruling class unless private property is restored in the Soviet Union. Undoubtedly at least a section of the bureaucracy, if not the whole, is seriously thinking in these terms and has such a perspective. The country is today devastated; millions of the flower of Soviet manhood are dead or wounded; a great section of Soviet industry is destroyed and innumerable cities as well as great sections of the countryside lie in ruins. Despite its appearance of unlimited strength, the Soviet Union is debilitated as a result of the war and is essentially weaker in relation

to the capitalist world. Stalin envisages entering into close economic relations with the imperialist powers and securing huge long term loans to rebuild the shattered economy. Undoubtedly among large sections of the top bureaucracy, the determination is increasing to go the whole way in removing all obstacles toward achieving amicable relations with the imperialists by restoring capitalism inside the Soviet Union. At the same time the bureaucrats hope to legitimize their present unstable position and emerge as a fully legal and avowed capitalist property owning class.

What changes have been wrought in the economy as a result of the stresses and strains of the war? What changes have occurred in the position and situation of the ruling caste, which has arrogated additional new privileges for itself and further raised itself above the population in the course of the war? What is the true present status of the planned economy and what changes has it undergone as a result of the war? These are all questions of enormous importance and now require close examination and study in order to arrive at the most precise analysis of the exact *degree* and *tempo* of the degeneration of the Soviet state.

### MILITARY DEFENSE OF USSR

The American Trotskyist movement has been closely watching these momentous developments. Many months ago it came to the conclusion that the question of military defense of the Soviet Union against the attack of the imperialists was receding into the background and that the burning question of the day was the defense of the European revolution from the attacks of the imperialists and the Kremlin bureaucracy and its agencies. The fight to defend the Soviet Union against the military onslaught of Nazi imperialism had essentially been won. The new reality in Europe was the beginning of the European revolution, the military occupation of the continent by the Anglo-American and Red Army troops and the conspiracy of the imperialists and the Kremlin bureaucracy to strangle the revolution. The shift in tactics was formally embodied in the resolution of the Socialist Workers Party on the European Revolution adopted by the Eleventh Convention of the American Trotskyist movement and explained by the editors in the December 1944 *Fourth International*.

This tactical shift carried with it a corollary one. The Trotskyist program has since 1936 embodied the position that it is necessary for the Soviet masses to organize a political revolution to overthrow the Stalinist ruling caste—a *political* and not a social revolution, as the revolution would preserve the economic groundwork; only the marauding bureaucracy would be wiped out and replaced with the rule of the Soviets. Such a political revolution, declared the Trotskyist program, was indispensable for the preservation of the Soviet Union and for the further development of Socialist construction. Failing this, the Soviet Union would inevitably slide back into capitalist channels either through internal counter-revolution or external intervention or a combination of both.

With Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, we pushed to the fore our slogan of *unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against imperialist attack*, subordinating our struggle for the overthrow of Stalin to the needs of military defense. We called on the Soviet masses to continue their political struggle against the Stalin regime and prepare the forces for its political overthrow; but to conduct the struggle in such a manner as not to injure the needs of Soviet defense. Today, with the altered objective situation, with the question of military defense off the agenda of the day, the section of our program which calls for

the organization on the part of the Soviet masses of a political revolution to overthrow the Stalin regime *again comes to the fore*. In the words of the SWP resolution: "The Bolshevik fighters inside the Soviet Union face the paramount task of organizing the revolutionary forces to oust Stalin and his arch-reactionary gang and to restore the Soviet Union on the principles of its founders, Lenin and Trotsky. . . . We call on the Soviet workers to organize the forces for the revolutionary overthrow of the oligarchy in the Kremlin and set up a genuine Soviet democracy as the essential condition for the preservation of the Soviet Union and of socialist construction." The destruction of the Stalinist oligarchy—that is now a life and death question for the Soviet Union.

## EVOLUTION OF KREMLIN CLIQUE

A number of other weighty questions are connected with the problem of the present pro-capitalist evolution of the Kremlin ruling caste. There is the position of the masses of eastern Europe and now of eastern Germany whose countries are under Red Army occupation. In 1939 Trotsky analyzed the significance of the then Red Army occupation of eastern Poland, the Baltic states and Finland and laid down a course of revolutionary action for the Fourth International. As events have so brilliantly confirmed, only Trotsky, on the basis of his analysis of the Soviet Union as a degenerated workers state, was able to evaluate correctly the happenings in eastern Europe and consequently provide the revolutionary vanguard with a correct guiding line. In substance, Trotsky said that it was most likely that the Kremlin bureaucracy would have to nationalize property in the process of absorbing eastern Poland and the Baltics, because it could not tolerate inside its own borders a rival ruling class of capitalist property owners. Trotsky predicted that the Red Army occupation would provide a bureaucratic impulse towards civil war and the expropriation of the property of the capitalists and landlords. This is precisely what occurred. The bureaucracy, of course, undertook this expropriation not out of allegiance to the Socialist program but because of its own needs to safeguard its caste privileges and power. No sooner did it accomplish its purpose of driving out the old ruling classes than it locked the masses in the deadly vise of the GPU. The unbridled tyranny and oppression practiced inside the Soviet Union was extended into the occupied territories.

Basing himself on the contradictory character of the Stalinist annexations, Trotsky proposed in 1939 that the revolutionary vanguard fight side by side with the insurgent workers and peasants and *to that extent* of the Red Army in seizing the factories and land, dividing the land among the peasants and the setting up of workers' committees. At the same time the Trotskyists had the duty of warning the masses of Stalin's arch-reactionary aims; conducting revolutionary propaganda in the spirit of hostility towards the Kremlin and its local agents and organizing the forces to prepare the revolutionary overthrow of Stalin at the next stage of developments. Trotsky wrote: "To know how to combine these two tasks or more precisely two sides of one and the same task—just this is Bolshevik politics." Such was the tactical prescription laid down for the occupied territories by Trotsky in 1939.

The objective situation is far different in 1945, and demands therefore a different practical orientation. The Kremlin ruling caste far from providing a bureaucratic impulse to civil war in Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland and the other countries under Red Army occupation is brutally stifling every independent effort of the masses to overturn the rule of their capitalist ex-

ploiters and is using the Red Army troops to bolster the tottering rule of the capitalists. The Stalinist bureaucracy has moved rightward in such headlong fashion that the Red Army, which is its instrument, is now the main prop of capitalism in eastern Europe. Under these circumstances there can of course be no talk of the insurgent masses fighting side by side with the soldiers of the Red Army. The new tactics now dictated to the revolutionary vanguard in the countries under Red Army occupation are thus summarized in the SWP resolution: "In the countries under Red Army occupation, the advanced workers will have to organize workers and peasants councils, factory committees, trade union bodies, etc. in a spirit of deepest distrust of the Stalinist agents. They will warn that Stalinist promises of fundamental reforms are lies. They will urge the masses to organize their *independent actions* to confiscate the landlords' estates, to place factories under workers' control, to arm the masses. In this *independent activity* of the masses lies the only guarantee for the success of the European revolution and its protection from the Stalinist hangmen.

## THE ONLY ROAD OUT

"Through these measures and in no other way, will the European masses be able to approach the Red Army soldiers and organize fraternization with them in order to protect the European revolution. Only in this way, and in no other, will the European proletariat be able to forge bonds of solidarity with the Red Army soldiers and the Soviet masses and help the latter settle accounts with the murderous Stalinist bureaucracy."

The resolution further indicates that if Red Army troops move against the insurgent masses, we side with the revolting masses and their struggles. *The attitude of the revolutionary vanguard toward the Red Army occupation troops in eastern Europe is thus essentially no different than its attitude toward Anglo-American troops in western Europe; except that in its propaganda and work of fraternization, it will take into consideration the different social basis of the USSR, the necessity of defending it against imperialism and the necessity of putting through in the USSR a political and not a social revolution against the Stalin regime.*

The present far-reaching external policy of the Bonapartist bureaucracy raises a further question, The Red Army already occupies eastern Europe and parts of eastern Germany. Everywhere the Kremlin preserves the capitalist system and backs the old ruling classes. In 1939 Trotsky wrote that if "the Moscow government leaves untouched the rights of private property in the occupied areas and limits itself to 'control' after the fascist pattern, such a concession would have a deep-going principled character and might become a starting point for a new chapter in the history of the Soviet regime; and consequently a starting point for a new appraisal on our part of the nature of the Soviet state." And again: "War accelerates the various political processes. It may accelerate the process of the revolutionary regeneration of the USSR. But it may also accelerate the process of its final degeneration. For this reason it is indispensable that we follow painstakingly and without prejudice these modifications which war introduces into the internal life of the USSR so that we may give ourselves a timely accounting of them."

The present control of the Kremlin ruling caste over half a dozen capitalist countries, the Kremlin policy of upholding the capitalist status-quo in contrast to their 1939 policy in eastern Poland and the Baltics plus the imposition of savage reparations and a system of slave labor for the conquered peoples must perforce produce the profoundest changes inside

the Soviet Union itself and in the position of its ruling gang. The SWP resolution correctly states that "the present transition period cannot long endure." The Soviet Union stands on the verge of far-reaching developments—the developments which will affect profoundly the course of the class struggle and the tactics of the Fourth International.

For all these reasons it is now imperative to study very closely the developments inside the Soviet Union and to arrive at as precise an analysis as possible of the *degree* of degeneration of the workers' state and the *tempo* of developments. In this way the revolutionary vanguard will at all times be properly armed and able to adjust its tactical course in consonance with the actual changes in the objective situation.

## The Yalta Conference

The Yalta conference closed amid jubilation over the "complete accord" among the victory-flushed Anglo-American imperialists and their ally in the Kremlin. But the peoples of the world, whether they emerge in the camp of the victors or the vanquished, have no cause whatever for joy. While the decisions of the "Big Three" remain cloaked with impenetrable secrecy as were all their previous agreements, their actions have long ago testified that the only charter sponsored by them is the charter of the counter-revolution. Their common goal is not to promote progress, freedom and prosperity but to perpetuate reaction, slavery and degradation in a world moving towards savagery.

If the scope of secret diplomacy in the Second World War has surpassed all previous performances in this field, it is because of the enormity of the conspiracy that is being consummated behind the backs of the masses. The sum and substance of this conspiracy is to deprive the peoples of the world of any voice in determining their own fate. Left to their own volition, the war-tortured masses of Europe would swiftly and unfailingly embrace Socialism as the only way out of the bloody morass of capitalism. Tendencies to transform the imperialist war into the struggle for the abolition of capitalist rule and of capitalist property forms manifested themselves early in the second world war. This was the meaning in its initial stages of the civil war that flared in Yugoslavia in 1941. This was implicit in the downfall of Italian fascism. The same trend manifested itself in France, Rumania and Bulgaria, and most recently in Greece. With the collapse of Hitler's regime, the mightiest force for Socialism on the European continent—the multimillion-headed proletariat of Germany—would be set in motion and would invest the unfolding European revolution with irresistible force. The three conspirators at Crimea know this. Their main objective is to atomize the forces of the German working class, clamp its dismembered sections in the vise of tri-partite military occupation and drown in blood every attempt of independent action on the part of the masses. With the main detachment of the Socialist revolution in Europe thus paralyzed, they hope, with the aid of the treacherous Stalinist and Social Democratic leadership to demoralize all the other revolutionary sectors and to bleed them white in a series of isolated battles, patterned after Churchill's recent bestial exploits in Greece.

### PLANS FOR GERMAN DISARMAMENT

The plans for the disarmament of Germany agreed upon at Yalta are, of course, cynically presented as safeguards of peace. There is nothing pacifist about them. The impelling considerations are to deliver the country to the mercy of the im-

perialist "democracies" by robbing it of every possibility of resistance and self-defense. The barb of this "disarmament" is aimed primarily at the German masses whom the "Big Three" intend to disarm at all costs. Against the insurgent workers Churchill and Roosevelt will not hesitate for a moment to place armaments at the disposal of the Nazis, with whom the American military authorities have been so brazenly collaborating in the occupied areas.

Least of all will this measure bring alleviation so far as the monstrous burden of militarism is concerned. After the first world war Germany remained completely disarmed for almost a decade and a half. This did not lead to a diminution in world expenditures on armaments. On the contrary, larger sums were expended on armies, navies and armaments after the Versailles Peace than in the era of the armament race which preceded the war of 1914—1918. The peak year of that era was 1913. If the monetary values spent on armaments in 1913 are set at 100, we shall find that the index for 1925 amounts to 135, climbing to 157 in 1929 and soaring in 1936 to 350, or three and a half times that of 1913. The growth of militarism is inseparable from capitalist decay. It constitutes a striking confirmation of Lenin's analysis that capitalism breeds war. It ought to be added that this intolerable growth of militarism was one of the causes of the dislocation and paroxysm of world economy in the 'twenties and 'thirties. To get rid of militarism it is necessary to sever its capitalist roots.

A peace treaty can prove just as destructive, if not more so, than the war which preceded. The economic pillage of Germany, projected at Yalta, should it be realized in life, will bring this truth home with crushing force. Leon Trotsky pointed out during the first world war that Europe is "not only a geographic term, but a certain economic and cultural-historic community." Germany is the most advanced component part of this economic organism. The bulk of Europe's productive apparatus is concentrated on her territories. The greatest productive force in Europe is the German working class. How can Europe survive, let alone successfully undertake reconstruction, if these are decimated?

The problems of reconstruction after the first world war appear insignificant compared to the problems and tasks that lie ahead. Each day brings new reports of famine spreading throughout Europe. In France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Greece—everywhere millions face slow death by starvation. The threat of epidemics looms more and more starkly. Anne O'Hare McCormick provides in *New York Times*, March 5, the following glimpse of how the accumulated labor of centuries is being reduced to heaps of rubble:

"Mittel-Europa is being turned into a zone of desolation. . . . This picture (of ruin) is repeated in practically every European country. . . . And we haven't yet beheld the worst. Budapest and Vienna are skeletons and Germany will be a cemetery of dead cities. . . . There is no precedent for such wreckage of industrial plant, communications systems, urban life and social order, and we do not know what the sequel will be or to what extent post-war plans based on old preconceptions will have to be revised. To any one who has looked into the chaos, most of these plans seem to contemplate the world that was instead of the world that will be. All the victorious countries are counting on 'reparations in kind,' for instance, while German machinery is going up in smoke."

### WORK OF RECONSTRUCTION

The work of reconstruction will have to be carried on in a world fearfully impoverished by the war, a war which is estimated by the authoritative *New York Times* as a trillion dollar enterprise. This astronomical sum is more than three times the estimated national wealth of

the United States. But even that sum does not include the huge amounts of fixed capital destroyed when entire cities, industrial and mining areas, agricultural inventory, livestock, etc., were laid waste. It fails to take into account the casualties, especially among skilled workers, the wear and tear of the productive plant still in operation, the additional losses which must be incurred in reconversion to peacetime production, not to mention the damage suffered by world economy through the diversion of scores of millions from consumer goods production to the production of the means of destruction. In these circumstances, even with planned production, *impossible under capitalism*, it will take years to restore European economy to pre-war levels.

The American and English imperialists are least of all concerned with the restoration of Europe. England's primary consideration is to retain her colonial empire. The United States has embarked on world conquest. The American Trotskyists have consistently warned: "Today, the Allies, under the hegemony of Wall Street, enter Europe as the new imperialist overlords. For their part, they aim not to unify Europe but to keep it Balkanized. The Allied imperialists do not desire the revival of European economy to a competitive level. On the contrary, the program of the Allies calls for the dismemberment of the continent to render impossible the revival of an economically strong Europe. Their program of dismemberment, despoliation and political oppression can only deepen Europe's ruination." (Resolution of the Socialist Workers Party "European Revolution and Tasks of the Revolutionary Party," adopted November 1944.)

Events are bringing their verification of the correctness of this analysis. Yalta is the banner of the counter-revolution. Here the seal was set on Europe's doom. Here Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin arrived at a division of labor in their program to crush all opposition of the insurgent masses to this death-sentence. The completion of the process of Europe's ruination already far advanced—that is their avowed charter for the agonized continent.

Stalinism emerges from the Crimea Conference as the hangman of the revolutionary workers. The gory handiwork of the Noskes and Scheidemanns who after the last war shot down in Germany tens of thousands of followers of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, is this time entrusted to the Kremlin and its agents.

In return for this, Roosevelt and Churchill have underwritten the territorial booty that the Kremlin grabbed as a result of its 1939 pact with Hitler, along with spheres of influence in eastern Europe and the Balkans. In addition Stalin has been promised his share in the looting of Germany.

**STALINIST METHODS** In the period preceding Soviet involvement in the war the Stalinist bureaucracy sought to solve the great problems with its hand-to-mouth methods. They were sure they could escape war. And so they sought for every avenue—from "peace congresses," "non-aggression pacts," entry into the League of Nations, etc., etc., down to a "peace pact" with Hitler. This escapist policy instead of safeguarding the USSR served only to isolate the country and utterly expose it to the fullest blow of German imperialism, under conditions and at a time chosen by the enemy. Now faced with the incredible tasks of reconstruction, which in large measure arise as a consequence of the previous policy, the Kremlin still fumbling empirically grasps at a panacea—at what? At the very solution attempted by none other than Clemenceau who once promised to rebuild France, likewise at the expense of Germany. Clemenceau's scheme appeared

much more feasible at the time inasmuch as the havoc in France was relatively limited, while Germany then emerged with far fewer losses, with her territories, cities and plants unravaged by direct military operations and, in other respects, in a condition infinitely superior to the existing one. Yet victorious France of 1918 found herself unable to squeeze out more than a fraction of the stipulated reparations. With Clemenceau's 1918 policy Stalin who demands—and requires—much more will get much less, if he ever collects.

Furthermore, Germany after Versailles lost far more than France ever gained. This quickly exhausted the defeated country, rendering further payments out of the question. The end results this time will be the same, except that the stage of Germany's complete insolvency will be reached even sooner. In any case, were Stalin to loot every remaining resource on German soil, it would not suffice to restore devastated Soviet agriculture and industry.

But Stalin was never primarily concerned with the economic well-being of the masses inside or outside the USSR. His policy has unfailingly been determined by entirely different considerations, namely: the subordination of everything else to the interests of preserving his regime, and the power and privileges of the usurping Soviet bureaucracy. Stalin knows that this regime could never maintain itself in the face of a successful German revolution.

But it is precisely the Soviet Union which will be the first to suffer the effects of a crushed German revolution. Nationalized property, collectivized agriculture, planned economy have all been deeply undermined by the war. They can be stabilized only on the basis of the economic unification of the continent, first and foremost, central Europe, and the Socialist collaboration of all its peoples. Failing this, the restoration of capitalism is inevitable in the USSR; and with that *an equally inevitable worsening of the economic plight of the population.*

## STAKE OF AMERICAN WORKERS

What is the stake of the American workers in the Yalta conference? A peace involving the ruination of Germany, which in turn entails the ruination of Europe, directly affects the American people. The second world war and the destructive peace can, unless the Socialist revolution intervenes, lead only to the complete disruption of the world market, with disastrous consequences on domestic trade, far transcending those of the past. What can the capitalists, who produce solely for profits, sell to a ruined Europe or to the rest of a pauperized world? Far from being offered "60,000,000 jobs," the American workers will be plunged into a situation in which the day of the Hoovervilles and breadlines of the 'thirties will seem by comparison like good times.

Wall Street seeks to transform the American people into the executioners and enslavers of the European toilers. Karl Marx long ago warned that no nation that enslaves others can ever remain free itself. If the American workers participate or even remain indifferent to the plans for Europe's enslavement, not only will they become accessories of the greatest criminals in history, but will leave themselves helpless before the tyrants at home who are bending all efforts to Prussianize every aspect of American life.

The peace plotted at Crimea can only plunge the proletariat on both sides of the Atlantic into deepest misery. The welfare of the American workers is inextricably bound up with the fate of the European revolution. Its enemies are our enemies.

## Canadian Anti-War Struggles

The process of mass radicalization as the direct consequence of the second world war is by no means limited to war-torn Europe. Significant signs of it have been for some time now discernible in the Western Hemisphere, particularly in Canada. One of its elementary expressions is the growth of unionization. The labor movement in Canada has grown apace.

The Canadian CIO numbers in its ranks more than a quarter of a million, a membership exceeding that of the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress (AFL) in 1920 and representing almost a fivefold increase in the last five years for the CIO unions. The AFL has likewise registered a proportionate growth. Canada has never known an organized labor movement of such scope and power.

The growth of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) expresses this mass radicalization in the political field. In unprecedented numbers, Canadian workers have recorded their complete break with the native capitalist parties. Especially significant is the fact that the soldier vote for the CCF candidates in wartime elections represents a higher percentage than in the civilian vote.

These developments almost automatically pose the question of what the developments in the United States would be, with its far more powerful labor movement, if the workers here were given the same opportunity as in Canada to vote for a party of their own in direct opposition to the candidates of the Democratic and Republican parties.

The opposition of the Canadian masses to the war is hardly a secret. From the outset this opposition acted to restrain the authorities from sending conscript troops abroad. With the growing war weariness the opposition has tended to assume increasingly sharper forms. The number of Canadian soldiers AWOL is admittedly large, the latest estimate being more than 6,000. The soldiers have other ways of demonstrating their feelings. According to Canada's Tory leader John Bracken it is the custom of drafted men to throw their arms and equipment overboard upon sailing.

Recent dispatches from Canada tell of sharp clashes between the populace and military authorities in search of draft evaders. Canadian students and youth in general are evincing less and less enthusiasm to shed their blood for the glory and profit of Canadian capitalism and the British empire.

**OPPOSITION IN CANADA** During the first world war militant opposition likewise manifested itself. But it was primarily restricted to the French Canadian population with a long tradition of revolt against British rule. This was the main source of opposition in the initial period of the second world war. The striking fact is that such is no longer the case. Oppositional elements are today strong among the English Canadians as well. As a matter of fact, the bitterest conflicts over the draft have occurred precisely among the latter.

Conditions of ripening social crisis invariably act to polarize the population. The camps that grow are those on the left and on the right. The intermediate formations tend to disappear. In Canada the first stage of this polarization is clearly observable. The ground is slipping beneath the Mackenzie King government which seeks to straddle or compromise issues. It is caught between the leftward moving masses and the capitalist die-hards.

The Canadian Tories, alarmed at the growing class consciousness of the masses are seeking a showdown. They have administered a cruel blow to the regime by defeating in a recent by-election General McNaughton, who is the Defense

Minister. Fearing defeat in the national elections, Prime Minister King has prorogued the Canadian parliament for a month, in the hope that the hostilities in Europe may terminate by that time.

But this will halt neither the leftward swing of the masses, nor the determination of Canadian reactionaries to check it by the use of the sharpest measures at their command.

The program of the CCF is far from revolutionary. It is the "respectable" program of reforms and does not transcend the framework of capitalism. But the pressure of the unfolding conflict is bearing down with full fury on this movement. How far the CCF will go depends not on the wishes of the present cowardly leadership but on the degree of self-action achieved by the masses. The more confident and demanding the latter become the more surely and easily will they move on the road to socialist solutions.

The coming elections, which cannot be indefinitely postponed, will provide a significant measure of the crisis. The events in Canada are of especial importance because they will be mirrored on the morrow and on a much vaster scale across the border where similar processes are taking place at a slower tempo.

## The World Trade Union Conference

Coincident with the latest secret conclave of the "Big Three" in Crimea, a World Trade Union Conference on February convened in London. The initiative for this conference came from the British union chieftains. In addition to the latter, the main delegations came from the camp of the so-called "United Nations." Among those present were the Russian (Stalinized) trade unions, the CIO, the British dominions (including India), Latin America (Mexico, Cuba, Columbia, Uruguay) and a scattering of neutral countries (among them Spain, Sweden and Ireland). China, where the labor movement has been crushed for years, was represented by two handpicked flunkies of Chiang Kai-shek. The AFL refused to participate.

The assembled body boasted of speaking in the name of 50 to 60 million organized workers. This is indeed a mighty force. In point of numbers, no such labor gathering had ever been assembled before in wartime. But the London conference did not serve the interests of labor. Instead it wrote another page of infamy into the annals of the betrayal of the world working class. Individually and collectively the delegates ranged themselves on the side of the "democratic" imperialists. Their primary task was to dragoon the workers behind the infamous "peace" plans of the three grave diggers of civilization at Yalta. The conference not only telegraphed to Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin its "satisfaction with the results of the Crimea Conference," but incorporated this "unanimous endorsement" in a Manifesto.

Servility vied with treachery. These creatures begged Churchill to address them. This is the same Churchill who is fighting to enforce in England the strikebreaking legislation—the Trade Disputes Act—passed in 1927 after the defeat of the General Strike. This is the same Churchill whose hands still drip with the fresh blood of slaughtered men, women and children in Greece.

These flunkies underwrote in advance the plan for the dismemberment and looting of Germany. They even approved slave labor for the German toilers, doing so under a weasel formula: "if" despite their "protests" slave labor is instituted, then it "must be placed under international supervision with trade union participation."

They don't even ask for direct participation in "all phases"



of the peace settlement. All they beg for is to be accredited in "an advisory and consultative capacity."

These utterly corrupt bureaucrats talk and act as if mankind had never passed through three of the bloodiest and most catastrophic decades in history which have proved to the hilt that there is no way out for the masses except through Socialism. They behave as if capitalism in its death agony had not already plunged society into ten years of world warfare. They want to benumb the workers into forgetting that the "peace" which followed four years of the last world war turned out to be a mere interlude between two slaughters, an interlude punctuated by incessant military clashes, by economic depressions and crises, by the growth of political reaction and the resulting decimation of the labor movement. After almost six years of the current holocaust, they want the workers to forget the conquests which were made in the struggle for Socialism by the Russian masses in October 1917 and defended successfully under Lenin and Trotsky against the entire imperialist world in a Civil War of three years duration.

## EXPERIENCE OF FIRST WORLD WAR

During and after the war of 1914-1918 this same course was pursued by the reformist Socialist parties. In the process of trying so criminally to perpetuate capitalism and to obstruct the fight for Socialism, these parties succeeded in destroying themselves. The Second International was moribund even before the outbreak of World War II.

The new mobilization of reformists in the Third International, after its corruption and degeneration under Stalin, likewise failed to survive. Similarly swept away have been the centrist formations, the braggart and impotent London Bureau, the "International" of all the Brandlers and Lovestones. The London-Amsterdam Bureau, International Federation of Trade Unions, is another casualty of the war.

The imperialists keenly feeling the lack of a yellow international labor center issued passports, provided transportation facilities and otherwise expedited the creation of this new world body.

The conference took as its starting point the fact that the IFTU was all but defunct and thereupon proceeded to set up a substitute international labor center, as an auxiliary to the master world body projected by the "Big Three," to be dominated by the labor lieutenants of English and American imperialism and the Kremlin bureaucracy.

This servile new world center will have a far briefer lease on life than its equally perfidious predecessors, the Second International, The Third International and the London-Amsterdam "International." For these bodies began their existence with genuine roots in the workingclass and as genuine instruments of labor whereas the present wretched formation represents from the outset nothing but a selection of agents of imperialism who cynically flaunt their sell-out program.

## Forced Labor in the U. S.

The current drive to jam through Congress the May-Bailey slave labor bill comes as a culmination of a calculated and protracted campaign to Prussianize America. Under imperialism the inherent tendency is away from democratic forms of rule and towards centralized reaction, or totalitarianism. This is the whole tendency of U.S. capitalism today.

The first stride toward totalitarianism was taken after Pearl Harbor when Roosevelt proposed his "7-point program," which included the proposal for a labor draft. This proposal was

sugar-coated at the time with demagogic promises to take profits out of war, to place a \$25,000 limitation on salaries, etc. The whole concoction was peddled as an "equality of sacrifice" program. When the smoke cleared, it was seen that the capitalists had sacrificed nothing but the workers found themselves saddled with the wage freeze.

One year later Roosevelt again came forward with a labor draft. This time in the guise of full conscription of both capital and labor, a proposal incorporated in his "5-point" program. All the points against the capitalists, naturally, went by the board. But the workers found themselves in the strait-jacket of the job freeze.

Throughout this period the labor bureaucrats kept retreating step by step. They used the pretext of "national emergency" to restrain the workers from any decisive display of their power. Bound hand and foot by these policies, and above all by the no-strike pledge, the labor movement became so demoralized and weakened that Roosevelt was enabled to come out the third time flatly for the labor draft minus any demagogic sugar-coating.

The fact that Roosevelt's previous two proposals to enslave the American workers were not legislated by Congress does not at all mean that the organized labor movement was left free. Not at all. The shackles were being riveted on. Each time the vise was turned a little tighter. Thus after the April 1943 coal strike, the job freeze was extended to include 27,000,000 industrial, agricultural and government workers. The draft boards proceeded to induct into the army anyone who left his job without "authorization." Two other decrees issued by Roosevelt—one in December 1943 and the other in July 1944—invested the War Manpower Commission with sweeping powers to shift workers to any job, factory or area. After Roosevelt's decrees there was not much "freedom" left to the workers.

## SECRET OF LATEST DRIVE

Why then the latest drive? The whole secret lies in this, that it is designed not so much to strengthen wartime measures as to reinforce, extend and guarantee totalitarian control after hostilities cease in Europe. Having loaded the burden of the war on the backs of the workers, the ruling class intends likewise to unload on them all the burdens of "peace."

As usual the chicken-hearted labor bureaucrats retreated in the face of this major offensive. Their chief concern was to file a few face-saving objections. They have brought their treachery to a climax by uniting with the National Association of Manufacturers to draft "labor's own" forced labor "compromise" bill. Few spectacles are more revolting than this spectacle of these creatures proposing that labor, when faced with threat of being put in chains, voluntarily assume them.

The Stalinists have likewise remained true to themselves. These venal agents of the Kremlin who have arrogated to themselves the role of the shrieking extreme right wing of the labor movement have each time hailed Roosevelt's moves to draft the workers. They boast of this vile record today in their all-out support of the May-Bailey slave labor bill.

The trade unions are confronted today with the gravest threat to their existence. Failure to resist can lead to catastrophic consequences. But the working man's will to resist reaction is not enough. It is in addition necessary to have the indispensable means at hand. The present trade union bureaucracy is sapping labor's strength. It is necessary to build a new leadership with a genuine fighting program. There is no other salvation for the trade unions.

# Defense of the Soviet Union and Revolutionary Tactics

By G. MUNIS

We are printing the following article as a contribution to the *Fourth International* discussion of the question of the Soviet Union and the Stalinist bureaucracy.—Ed.

For the Fourth International the defense of the Soviet Union has always been a task subordinated to the strategic objective of the proletariat: the international socialist revolution. In no case could the interests of the latter be overlooked or put to one side in order to give preference to the defense of the USSR. Any revolutionary gain, even a partial one, was considered to be of greater positive aid in defense of the October revolution than mere military victory of the state founded by it. In the capitalist countries allied with the Soviet Union the revolutionary struggle must continue having as its aim the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war, in accordance with the Leninist method of revolutionary defeatism. Only within the Soviet Union did the struggle against the Bonapartist bureaucracy cede primacy to the necessities of military defense of the country. The Fourth International never advocated, we repeat, abandoning political opposition to the bureaucracy in general and its reactionary methods of war in particular. On the contrary, political opposition was considered a guarantee of military victory insofar as it succeeded in lessening bureaucratic totalitarianism or even its complete defeat during the war itself, a possibility not excluded from the theoretical thought of the Fourth International. But political opposition to the bureaucracy or its defeat was subordinated to the supreme interests of military defense. Revolutionaries of the USSR were advised to carry out any struggle that would not affect the conduct of the war. If furthering workers' demands against the bureaucracy developed into contradiction with the interests of the military struggle against the imperialist enemy, the workers' demands ceded priority to the military interests.

This attitude flowed, first from the defeat of the world revolution, secondly, from the inherent contradiction in the Stalinized soviet system. This attitude, counterposing proletarian democracy and planning to bureaucracy and totalitarianism, furthered the conflict between these factors, and consequently the possibility of saving the remains of the 1917 revolution by means of military defense of that state, which is based on the conquests of 1917.

In effect, the successive defeats of the international proletariat beginning with the German revolution (1919-1923), then the Chinese (1926-1927) and again the German (1930-1933), to the tragic defeat of the Spanish revolution (1931-1939), reduced the world revolution in its aggregate to what remained of the Bolshevik revolution in the Soviet Union; nationalized economy plus the monopoly of foreign trade. These two elements have been directed by the Stalinist bureaucracy. In essence voracious and counter-revolutionary, its development burdened the USSR with the cost of exorbitant privileges in its favor besides the unleashing of dictatorial high-handedness. Up to a certain limit industrial growth on the basis of planning was

compatible with the growth of the bureaucracy and the increase of its privileges, although at the cost of the standard of living of the great mass of workers. But *only to a determined limit*. The extension of privileges and bureaucratic arbitrariness headed toward the rupture of planning. And inversely the prolongation of planning created indispensable objective conditions for the destruction of the bureaucracy.

When throughout the world the socialist revolution seemed to have disappeared in an abyss, the defense of Soviet planned economy internally represented the only lever at the command of the poor masses against the bureaucracy. Externally, it granted time to the world proletariat, principally the European, to react, to recover from its defeats and to place again on the order of the day the struggle for the proletarian revolution. Our defense of the USSR had that double aim, internal and external, converging towards the single aim of the world revolution. Whoever was incapable of thus regarding the international panorama and subordinating his actions to it, calling for defeatism in the Soviet Union similar to that legitimate in capitalist countries, threw out the window the most important material basis for struggle against the bureaucracy.

## A Forced Pause

In brief, the unconditional defense of the Soviet Union always stood for the Fourth International as a factor that would permit the unfolding of the struggle against the Bonapartist bureaucracy, up to its defeat and the reestablishment of Soviet democracy. But neither directly nor by deduction could the idea be attributed to it that the simple military triumph of the USSR would bear within itself automatic revolutionary political consequences. No, military defense under the conditions imposed by Stalinist Bonapartism was a sort of forced pause bequeathed to us by the catastrophic outcome of the international class struggle during the years previous to the war. In this period the task was to resolve the internal contradiction of Soviet society and to renew the revolutionary activity of the world proletariat. Thus the defense of the Soviet Union carried with it the ineluctable exacerbation of the opposition between the planned economy and proletarian democracy on the one hand and the bureaucracy and Bonapartist despotism on the other. Military victory did not assure the survival—still less the development—of the remains of the October Revolution; it assured more favorable conditions by which the Soviet proletariat could overthrow the bureaucracy. By itself, the defense of the USSR, as conceived by the Fourth International only leads to the denouement of the prolonged internal struggle between the revolution and the counter revolution.

What relation is there between the ideas of the Fourth International as they were enunciated before Hitler's attack on the USSR and the material evolution we see before us today? The proletarian revolution, principally in Europe, no longer appears buried beneath the triumphs of the bourgeois counter-revolu-

tion. The masses are stirring, are recuperating their energy, are profoundly agitated and again and again take the road of great revolutionary offensives. The European revolutionary movements cannot fail to have a favorable repercussion on the Soviet proletariat despite all the efforts of Stalinist lies and censorship to isolate it from the rest of the world. In all the calculations of proletarian politics, including those of the USSR, it is necessary to take into account this new extremely important factor. Great revolutionary movements, whose outbreak cannot be doubted, are *elements of support in defense of the planned economy, incomparably better than the military struggle directed by the Bonapartist bureaucracy.*

Internally, the antagonism between the proletariat and the bureaucracy or, put in another way, between the necessities of economic planning and the arbitrariness of its bureaucratic directors, could not fail to have been accentuated to the breaking point during the war. The absence of abundant and precise data should not lead us to error. The war has permitted the bureaucracy to intensify its political and economic domination. Today it is closer than yesterday to converting itself into a new propertied class; not into a new class different from those already well known, but into a new bourgeoisie. Only the existence of nationalized and planned economy impedes this. But the necessities of self-preservation impel the bureaucracy inevitably to break with and annul both. What point has been reached in this process of dissociation—from which must emerge, either the political revolution that will restore the proletarian power or the return to capitalism on the basis of the bureaucracy? This is the decisive question, the cornerstone on which our policy with respect to the USSR must be based.

Until the end of the second Five-Year-Plan, the planning directed by the bureaucracy continued to show a favorable balance for the economic progress of the country. Only some branches of industry declined or remained at previous levels. In 1939, the same year as the declaration of war, the retrocession of planning was general according to studies based on Soviet statistics by the "Societe d'etudes et d' Information Economique" of Paris.

## Increase in Individual Ownership

In the rural areas, the bureaucratic methods and the rapaciousness of the bureaucrats in particular had given rise to a great increase in individual ownership at the expense of collectivized land. Both phenomena flowed from the same cause. Groups of bureaucrats placed at the head of the various industries and of agriculture conducted themselves as real saboteurs of planning. Their privileges and abuses rupture its unity. And the high bureaucracy of the Kremlin, whose most solid support is in the privileges and abuses that it permits the bureaucracy in general, cannot help but strengthen the tendencies that rupture planning; this is demanded for its salvation. The measures, which in the course of its existence, it has been obliged to take against certain abuses of isolated bureaucrats constituted deceptive examples in the midst of the constant multiplication of new and graver bureaucratic abuses. Even in the middle of 1939 the Kremlin tried to restrict the robbery of lands carried out against the kolkhozes by the bureaucrats and the rich farmers. But in the beginning of 1940 it abruptly decreed toleration of speculative capitalist tendencies to the point of conceding to the decision of the kolkhozes the amount and quality of crops to be sowed. The kolkhozes as arbiters necessarily means the arbitrary rule of the bureaucrats and the rich kolkhoz peasants. Planning, instead of extending, disintegrates. In industry, since the last five year plan, no new plan of production has been

elaborated—an unmistakable sign of the disintegration of industrial planning.

There is nothing surprising about this. The privileges of the Stalinist functionaries and their differentiation from the working masses have reached the stage where the rupture of planning represents for the bureaucracy as a whole a requirement for its functioning. The plan has become converted into an insupportable discipline for the entire hierarchical strata of economic and political directors. From the chiefs of small divisions up to factory directors and presidents of the kolkhozes, without mentioning their numerous fellow-participants in privileges, they have already reached the limit of advantages compatible with planning. Having exhausted the incentive of differentiation which the plan offered them, there remains for them only the achievement of total independence, the rupture of planning. From the viewpoint of the bureaucratic interests, the rupture of planning will appear as a necessity and as progress in economic functioning. A system based on privileges bears as its law their culmination. In this culmination the director of a factory or the group of directors of trusts sees the greatest incentive for his own work and a guarantee for better management of the workers.

Stalinist despotism has gained its strength and its durability as a governing political element from its character as "arbiter" and beneficiary of the class contradictions existing in the USSR. Standing between the opposition of the left and the capitalist tendencies of Nepmen and Kulaks, it defeated the former, by basing itself on the latter. Menaced in turn by the economic vigor of the latter, it found itself obliged to combat them by placing in the forefront the industrialization, advocated by the [Trotskyist] Opposition, extending still more its own bureaucratic base and creating a powerful worker's aristocracy. In this way the danger of bourgeois restoration proceeding from pre-October capitalist elements was defeated. But at the same time that the old capitalist classes disappeared as a factor for consideration the social antagonisms grew on the soil of planned economy. Stalinism, in its capacity as director of the state, continued performing the function of arbiter, but an arbiter more and more partial to the privileged strata. It did not reduce the economic distances which separated the social poles; it augmented them completing at the same time their material fusion with the more privileged and reactionary strata. From a partial arbiter it itself became integrated as one of the parts.

## The Fate of Bonapartism

It is the inescapable fate of Bonapartism. Relative independence from the antagonistic elements, the foundation of its rule, is by its very nature provisional. It resolves itself necessarily into partiality and complete dependence on the privileged, or it is destroyed before completing its course. The particular destiny of Stalinist Bonapartism is determined by the pressure of the bureaucracy to which it owes its life. Since nothing is static but on the contrary everything is in motion, in the process of disintegration or completion, the bureaucratic privileges, dragging Stalinism along with them, seek completion, converting themselves from "an abuse into a rule" (L. D. Trotsky), that is to say, from an extra-legal and abusive possession into a legal property right. And the maximum legal privilege is private property in the means of production. If on the basis of capitalist society Bonapartism was a political phenomenon destined to create the conditions of direct rule by the capitalist, on the basis of planned economy Bonapartism is converted into the active creator of economic and political elements favoring restoration of private property. With the possibilities for its

labor circumscribed as much by the internal contradictions as by the world duel between capitalism and socialism, the moment in which they confront each other decisively on a world scale for a long epoch must correspond exactly with the moment of the condensation of Bonapartism into capitalism or, with that of its destruction. The world correlation of forces will provide the decisive impulse in one or the other direction. We arrive at this precise point with the end of the present imperialist war.

Based on this analysis, it is our firm conviction that Stalinist Bonapartism today must be consciously and necessarily restorationist. As such, it must be judged and combatted. It no longer reflects even a minute part of the interests of planned economy; it reflects interests impatient to rupture it . . . plus the difficulties which they encounter in consummating this rupture. Revolutionary policy must orient itself on the certainty that, as a consequence of the present war, the bureaucracy will emerge as a capitalist class or be destroyed by a new revolutionary offensive of the Soviet and world proletariat. And at this point the mechanism of the objective forces cedes preeminence to the mechanism of the subjective forces. In other words, the immediate fate of planning no longer depends on the connection that the Stalinist bureaucracy has with it, but rather *on the capacity of the proletariat to destroy this bureaucracy and continue the planning on socialist bases*. Either the socialist objective of planning finds its continuity in a new subjective governing element, (renewal of the dictatorship of the proletariat) or the reactionary objective of the bureaucracy will be completed in the capitalist consciousness of a new class emerging from the bureaucracy itself. We are at this point now; it is merely a question of helping one or the other factor.

Politically the bureaucracy has already completed its cycle of reactionary evolution. No further step remains for it except legalization of its situation, converting itself into a class. The few measures taken during the war that we know about, fully confirm this appreciation. The creation of a praetorian privileged group within the army—already privileged with respect to the rest of the population—reveals the accentuation of bureaucratic differentiation and the extreme sharpening of the social contradictions. The latest constitutional reform announces a double danger; that of incorporation into the Soviet Union of territories in which property is to be respected; or simply covered up with apparent measures of regulation or expropriation; and that of military autonomy promising a greater disintegration, if not the definitive rupture of the planned economy. In brief, the most moderate calculation authorizes us to conclude that the Soviet Union has now arrived at its decisive crisis just as the war approaches its end, and when already in all Europe we see a mounting powerful revolutionary wave.

## A Change of Tactic

In our opinion, this makes a change in the tactic of the Fourth International indispensable in respect to the defense of the USSR. As the denouement approaches, the bureaucracy converts itself from the overseer forced to protect planned economy into its principal menace. On the other hand, as the coming revolutionary outbreaks in Europe come nearer and nearer, one can and must count on them as the weight that will contribute to tipping the scale in favor of the Soviet proletariat. The main and more immediate danger to the remains of the October revolution no longer comes from external imperialism but rather from the Stalinist government itself. Anglo-American imperialism will work in collaboration with the bureaucracy in order to reestablish private property, or at any rate will seek

to support itself in one group of bureaucrats as against another. The military guardian of planned state property, which the Stalinist bureaucracy was in relation to world imperialism, has been converted into the thief of this same property. Planning is menaced by the bourgeois enemy and by the bureaucratic enemy, but the latter emerges as the spearhead of the threat. The complex of our unconditional defense of the USSR is reduced to one of its factors. The culmination of the period allowed for the internal contradiction to resolve itself into capitalist restoration or political revolution, coincides with that allowed for the defeat of the world proletariat to be transformed into a new revolutionary offensive. It is impossible to carry out a correct policy toward the USSR without taking into account the presence of these two new factors. Our slogan of unconditional defense at this moment has achieved its objective, that of preventing bourgeois restoration via the imperialist road. The European revolution knocks at the door; the decisive clash between the socialist tendencies of the economy and the Soviet proletariat on the one hand and the capitalist tendencies of the bureaucracy on the other, is also at the door. The immediate defense is no longer military but political; the real defense of the planned economy has been displaced from the battle front to the internal and external class struggle.

It is well understood that the imperialist enemy has not ceased to exist. But while at the beginning of the war it was considered the most important enemy and the struggle against the bureaucracy ceded preeminence before the military struggle against the bourgeoisie, at present the terms must be inverted. The struggle against the bureaucracy must occupy first place in the activity of the Bolshevik-Leninists within the Soviet Union. The same viewpoint must be employed toward the problem of the USSR in any part of the world. It is necessary to present and combat the bureaucracy as the main enemy of the planned economy, as the expropriator of the proletariat and the restorer of capitalism. A victory of the Soviet proletariat against the bureaucracy is today more important than a victory of the Red Army. Without forgetting the military struggle against the imperialist enemy, the Soviet workers must turn the bulk of their forces against the traitorous bureaucracy, preparing to turn the might of their arms as soon as possible.

It is clear that the slogan "unconditional defense of the USSR" is inadequate for characterizing the new situation and for indicating the new needs. Its peculiar categoricalness corresponded to the imminent necessity of saving the USSR from any imperialist aggression. But when the imperialist danger becomes weakened to the point of appearing almost utopian, as at the present moment, and when at the same time the philo-capitalist tendencies of the bureaucracy reach the stage of a conscious necessity, the slogan becomes excessively unilateral and does not provide the Soviet and world workers with an exact idea of what must be done and of the enemy against whom it is necessary to defend the menaced remains of Red October. *In the Soviet Union today it is a question of saving from the bureaucratic menace and the menace of the penetration of Anglo-American imperialism what has been saved from German imperialism.* The activity of the Bolshevik-Leninists in the USSR and our politics over the entire world must reflect this necessity. The Fourth Internationalists have the duty of continuing to fight on Soviet territory against German imperialism, but of according primary importance to the struggle against the bureaucracy. This kind of defense continues to be unconditional insofar as it does not demand of the bureaucratic power any concession in order to be carried out. But it is conditional insofar as it is carried out under the condition

that it does not deter or weaken the struggle against the pro-capitalist bureaucracy. The complexity of the situation prevents the formulation of slogans so categorical as "unconditional defense" or "revolutionary defeatism."

## For Red Army Victory

We are interested in the victory of the Red Army, but its victory does not assure the defeat of the pro-capitalist bureaucracy. Revolutionary success depends on the defeat of German imperialism being complemented by the defeat of the bureaucracy. The formulation of this necessity in the presence even of war, cannot be given by the slogan of unconditional defense, but rather by this: military defense so long as it doesn't damage the revolutionary struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy. Thus both the Soviet and world workers will know that the main threat to planned state property resides today in the governing caste of the Soviet Union. Down with the bureaucracy! Long live the dictatorship of the proletariat! This is the essence of revolutionary activity in the USSR. The same analysis likewise carries special consequences on the question of bureaucratic expansion of Soviet territory. Already during the Finnish-Soviet war, Trotsky said, "The primary political criterion for us is not the transformation of property relations in this or another area, however important these may be in themselves, but rather the change in the consciousness and organization of the world proletariat, the raising of their capacity for defending former conquests and accomplishing new ones."

But in the territories occupied by order of the bureaucracy, following the schema established by the necessity for the military defense of the USSR, we advised political independence, not a struggle for the expulsion of the army of the Russian bureaucracy. With the defense of the USSR transformed into an *immediate* problem of struggle against Stalinism, the attitude adopted in 1939-40 ceases to be valid. The *only criterion* must be the revolutionary advance of the proletariat and the peasants in the territories coveted by the bureaucracy. The interests of the local proletariat (including the salvation of the USSR), must be considered much more important and superior to the strictly military interests of the latter. The Bolsheviks residing in those territories must not cede an inch in their struggles either in demands or mass movements in order to facilitate the operations of the Red Army. They must unfurl the revolutionary principle of self-determination and of social revolution as a solution contrary to that which the Nazis, their own bourgeoisie and Stalinism wish to impose on them with intentions that are not dissimilar at bottom. The slogan "an end to the Nazi occupation" must be complemented with another one: "an end to the Stalinist occupation."

The masses in the territories coveted by the Stalinist bureaucracy must become convinced—and practice will leave no room for doubt—that the Kremlin will seek friendship and alliance with the bourgeoisie. Far from representing aid against the exploiters, Stalinist occupation will represent aid in their favor, an active element against the masses. The key to revolutionary activity must be given by this incontrovertible fact: the bureaucratic extension of the Soviet frontiers no longer serves the defense of the USSR against imperialism; it only serves to extend the bureaucratic power and to satisfy the reactionary and nationalistic tendencies which convert it into the principal element for the restoration of capitalism. To make a revolutionary war against Nazi occupation is the tendency of the mass movements in occupied Europe; in the territories where Nazi occupation is replaced by the occupation of the Stalinist bureaucracy the tendency must be to make revolu-

tionary war against the latter. Only it must take into account for the tactical application of the strategical objective, the revolutionary tradition of the Soviet soldiers, workers and peasants.

Unfurling the program of Lenin and Trotsky, the program of the proletarian revolution, against the occupying bureaucracy, the masses of the occupied countries will find thereby a ready echo amongst the soldiers of the Red Army and an effective base for allying themselves with them against the bureaucracy. In their turn, the Red Army soldiers have the duty of establishing contact with the exploited populace of the countries which they may enter, and of allying themselves in all their struggles against the bureaucracy and against the military occupation. In a word, for the masses of the countries bordering on the USSR, it is not a question of dove-tailing themselves with the Germany Army or the Red Army; it is a question of defending from the menace of both, their own interests as a local expression of the interests of the world revolution. This is the only rule of action which can be prescribed from a long distance; in practice, each of the particular actions must be decided on the scene.

## The Decisive Consideration

What must decide for the revolutionists on following through to the end this or that revolutionary action is progress towards the seizure of political power by the proletariat. Their attitude should not be different from revolutionary defeatism with respect to either side except on this point: they are not indifferent to overthrow of the territory in which planned state property exists; they are for its defense, but they struggle against annexations and against the bureaucratic occupation which, far from reinforcing planned economy, would facilitate its destruction by the bureaucracy. That struggle must be extended from partial or democratic demands up to the armed insurrection. Everything depends on the possibility of success! The revolutionists in each local territory must judge whether one or another action should or should not be undertaken, and it is hardly necessary to add that if in one or another of the territories threatened or occupied by the Stalinist bureaucracy, the proletariat should come to power, it would undertake integral revolutionary defeatism as much in the S. U. as in the territories occupied by the latter.

Let us be convinced that the military victory of the USSR cannot guarantee the continuity of the first proletarian revolution! This will only be guaranteed by the Soviet and the world proletariat. Its attack must be placed on the order of the day. With it also goes the fate of the international revolution.

## A Correction

Editor, Fourth International

My article, "The Future of the Soviet Union and the Victories of the Red Army" appears in the November issue of the magazine. An editorial note preceding it criticizes the article for saying, "The workers' state fell and was replaced by the Stalinist despotism," which, in fact, is false. But it is a question only of a defect in the translation, which you can check by comparing with the original Spanish. This states: "El poder obrero cayó y fué reemplazado por el despotismo stalinista—the workers' power fell and was replaced by the Stalinist despotism." And since the translation published in *Fourth International* tends to place me among those who consider the bureaucracy as a new class and who reject the definition "degenerated workers' state", I ask you to publish this correction in the next number of the magazine.

G. Munis

# Theses on Liquidation of World War II and the Revolutionary Upsurge

EDITOR'S NOTE: The record of Trotskyism in Europe is an inspiring record of relentless, unyielding, heroic struggle in the face of overwhelming odds. For years our co-thinkers in Europe had to conduct their struggle under the Hitler dictatorship. This struggle for Socialism is exemplified by the French Trotskyists who published in illegality 73 issues—19 mimeographed and 54 printed—of their central organ *La Verite* in a period of 4 years beginning with August 1940.

Bearing on its masthead the slogan "Neither Petain Nor Hitler—For a Workers and Peasants Government!" *La Verite* took the lead in the fight against fascism and imperialist war at a time when *l'Humanite*, organ of the French Stalinists, served the Kremlin's policy of maintaining the alliance with Hitler and was distributed in France with the tacit approval of the German authorities.

While *l'Humanite* kept appearing without a single word against the imperialist occupation, the French Trotskyists appealed to the German soldiers to turn their arms against their officers and to fraternize with the workers of Europe; and, on the other hand, summoned the French workers to fraternize with their brothers in uniform dragooned into the German army, calling upon them to join in a common struggle against fascism and capitalism.

From the first the French Trotskyists fought deportations, racism and anti-Semitism. They advanced the slogan of the right of all peoples, including those in the colonies, to self-determination. They gave material support to the Maquis against the Nazis and their collaborators. They called for the creation of workers' militias and throughout sponsored working class unity of action. They remained in the forefront of the struggle for workers' demands, organizing the resistance to the steadily declining living standards. They urged the organization of factory and housewives' committees to assure the distribution of food supplies. When the French Confedera-

tion of Labor issued the call for a General Strike, in preparation for driving the Nazis out of Paris, our co-thinkers supported the action.

Mindful of their international obligations they aided the German comrades in issuing various publications, among them *Unser Wort*, *Der Arbeiter* and *Arbeiter und Soldat* (addressed to the German soldiers).

The struggle exacted a heavy toll. Hundreds were arrested, deported and murdered. Among those caught in the Gestapo dragnet were eight members of the Central Committee; the entire leadership of the South zone (1941); almost the entire leadership in Brittany (1943), where 65 members were seized among whom were 30 German soldiers; regional leaders in Paris, Bordeaux, Marseilles, Lyons and Nantes.

Among those murdered by the Nazis were Meichler, manager of *Unser Wort*; Marc Bourhis, former secretary of Concarneau district; Guygen, former Communist mayor of Concarneau who joined the Trotskyists; Cruau, regional leader of Nantes and many young workers like Lebacher of Drancy and Van Hulst of Suresnes.

With the installation of the de Gaulle regime, the lot of these irreproachable anti-fascist fighters has scarcely been alleviated. The lid of censorship remains tightly clamped. All the publications of our French co-thinkers must still continue to appear illegally under de Gaulle as under the Nazis.

In February 1944, within the very tentacles of the Gestapo, a six day conference convened in France with delegates from *France*: Internationalist Workers Party (POI), Internationalist Communist Committee (CCI) and the "October Group," a small independent Trotskyist formation; *Belgium*: Revolutionary Communist Party; *Greece*: Internationalist Communist Party; *Spain*: Lenin and Trotsky Group; and the Internationalist Communist Group of German emigration in France. The Trotskyists in Belgium had maintained their organization, publishing *Lenin's Voice*

and *Class Struggle* (in Flemish). Among the victims of the Gestapo were two Belgian leaders, including the secretary. The German group which took part in the conference issued *Arbeiter und Soldat*. Their leader Wintley was shot by the Nazis. The Greek comrades issued their organ *The Proletarian* and a theoretical magazine *Fourth International*. They suffered the loss of their secretary and two other leaders, executed by the Nazis.

One of the fruits of this European Conference was the consolidation of a unified French party through the fusion of the POI, CCI and the "October Group." In the name of these three groups an appeal was issued to the French workers summoning them to build the revolutionary party as the task of tasks in the unfolding revolutionary crisis.

Out of the European Conference come the theses, sections of which are published below for the information of our readers. It will be apparent to the readers of *Fourth International* that in the main essentials there is a solidarity of ideas between the theses of the European Conference and the programmatic documents adopted by the Socialist Workers Party at the November 1943 Plenum and November 1944 Convention (see *Fourth International*, Dec. 1943 and Dec. 1944). Our European comrades are also aware of this ideological unanimity. In republishing the November 1943 Plenum Resolution of the SWP, the editors of *Quatrieme Internationale*, September-November 1944, append the following appreciation:

"The members of the European sections of the Fourth International cannot help but note the striking coincidence of the general line of this text with the resolutions of the European Conference of February 1944. This is still another proof of the firmness of the program of the Fourth International and the organic ties which bind all its sections together in their thought and action."

## II. The Transformation of the Imperialist War into Civil War

1. Almost five years of war have completely shaken the foundations of the capitalist system. Everywhere insoluble economic, social and political contradictions are accumulating. Everywhere the revolt of the masses is growing. The Italian crisis was the first advance signal of the tremendous social explosion which will accompany the conclusion of the second imperialist world war.

While the first revolutionary crisis which unfolded over the world after the war of 1914-18 never swept beyond the frontiers of eastern and central Europe, at the present time all of the five continents will be thrown into social convulsions. In this sense the coming revolution can be characterized as a world revolution.

2. There are three central spheres of revolution which cannot, to be sure, be mechanically or absolutely separated one from another, but whose historic conditions are sufficiently differentiated to allow for the possibility of a difference in tempo and for a delay in the transference of explosions from one sphere to the other. These are:

a) Decadent Europe; b) Japan; c) America.

Powerful economic and social convulsions will of necessity mark the conclusion of the war in the *United States*.

If the latter signifies in a way the apogee of the power of North American finance capital and realizes in great measure its domination over world economy, it contributes thereby to

the storing up within its structure as a whole the contradictions of all of international capitalism.

"The world power of the United States and the irresistible expansion which flows from it forces it to embody in the foundation of its edifice the powder magazines of the entire earth: all the antagonisms of the West and the Orient, the class struggle of old Europe, the colonial insurrections, all the wars and all the revolutions. . . . That is why the basis is being laid for the immense revolutionary explosion of this world imperialist power, which already dominates and cannot cease growing." (L. Trotsky).

*Japan*, overwhelmed under the weight of her conquests, incapable because of the structure of her industry and of her restricted capital of assimilating these rapidly, plunging into the most atrocious misery and demanding the bloodiest of sacrifices from a people of wretched peasants and over-exploited proletarians, choking within its backward feudal-capitalist social framework, is destined to collapse in the near future.

The inevitable defeat of Japan will mean, of necessity, the outbreak of a crisis which, sweeping the country, will embrace the entire Orient.

China, for thirty years wracked by the convulsions of a bourgeois revolution which the bourgeoisie cannot and will not bring to its conclusion, sold out by its capitalists and generals to the competing imperialists; India, whose masses languish under the burden of the war while its industry develops and its bourgeoisie becomes rich; Indo-China, the Netherlands Indies, the Philippines, Burma, which Japan, while attempting to install its own domination, has cut off from their imperialist contacts and in which she has aroused the nationalist movement; these are the fundamental elements of the enormous crisis which is making its appearance in the Far East.

But it is *in Europe*, above all, that the contradictions of capitalism, at the present stage, attain their most acute form. The signs of the decomposition of the German imperialist effort foreshadow at the same time the revolutionary crisis and characterize the present period in Europe as pre-revolutionary: the disintegration and the confusion of the possessing classes, the exasperation of the petty bourgeoisie and the renewed confidence of the working class are taking place amid the failure of imperialism to unite Europe on a capitalist basis, the outbreak of the Italian revolution and the offensive of the Red Army.

3. Two essential factors have sharply altered the world situation, particularly in Europe: the offensive of the Red Army and the Italian revolution. Not only have these two events upset all the military and diplomatic plans of the Axis, they have also forced American imperialism to radically change its whole strategy. Washington required, in fact, a long war in order to crush Germany, harass Japan, exhaust Britain and vanquish the USSR. But, first the Italian events, and now, even more, the Russian advance, have constrained American imperialism to bend every effort to destroy the revolution with the greatest speed, thus placing a question mark on all the military, political and social plans of the "Allies".

## The Italian Crisis and Its Lessons

4. Once again the chain of world imperialism has given way at its weakest link. The crisis which gripped Italian imperialism ever since Versailles broke out with full force the very moment the war was carried onto the soil of the peninsula. The pathetic crack-up of Fascism, swept off the political scene in two hours, passes sentence not only on the literature of its naive or cynical apologists, but even more so, on the fantastic

theories of the pseudo-Marxists in search of new formulas. Fascism has revealed its real essence: it is nothing more than the knavish servant of the industrial and financial bourgeoisie whom the latter dismisses when its services are no longer required, without even giving the customary week's notice.

The reappearance today of a Fascist pseudo-government resting on German bayonets, far from being a sign of the vitality of the regime, is the most irrefutable evidence that it is historically doomed. There is no longer place for a forceful Italian imperialist state because there is no longer room for an independent policy among secondary powers: Mussolini is thus reduced to the rank of a simple Quisling whom the Hitlerite regime will of necessity drag along into its defeat.

5. By breaking up the Fascist state, the bourgeoisie has also broken the chains which paralyzed the proletariat. The discontent and the hatred which have accumulated for twenty years have suddenly erupted into the open. July 25 was thus not only the last day of Italian Fascism. It was also the first day of the proletarian revolution in Italy, the first day of the coming European revolution. Precipitated into the revolutionary struggle without leadership, without an organization, without a program, the workers of the big centers in Italy spontaneously resurrected through the "internal committees" the organization form which marked the high point of the revolutionary post-war wave. They built, in the factories, the first elements of workers' power to counterpose to the bourgeois power. The first elements of dual power appeared in outline form. From that time on the fundamental question posed in Italy is which will conquer the other; the power of the workers and peasants, of which the "internal committees" in Milan and Turin were the beginning, or the power of the clerical and militarist reaction?

No intermediary road is possible. The contradictions of the bourgeoisie are too acute, the threat of revolution is too pressing to expect a rebirth of bourgeois democracy. Either the ferocious and senile, reactionary state, supported by the army, the police and the church—or the workers' state. That is the alternative before the Italian masses. The reprisals being visited at present upon the workers' vanguard in northern Italy may well force this movement temporarily underground. But it will only be reborn with all the greater power and vigor in the course of a new change in the imperialist and revolutionary relationship of forces of Europe; it will link its fate directly with the proletarian movement in the occupied countries, with the movement of the German workers and soldiers.

## The Italian Revolution

6. The Italian bourgeoisie can only hope to save a few crumbs of its former power by placing itself entirely at the service of American imperialism. That is why the great masses of the Italian people find themselves once more drawn into the cycle of the war. But this is not at all the perspective of the masses. To the program of the bourgeoisie—war, famine, reaction—they continue to tirelessly counterpose on both sides of the front their own formula: bread, peace, freedom.

In Italy, as in all Europe, the masses' desire for peace is one of the most powerful levers of revolutionary propaganda.

7. The disappearance of Fascism on July 25 had as its consequence the disorganization of the state apparatus and the violent entry of the masses into the political arena.

By means of popular agitation, the anti-Fascist parties (Catholic, Republican, Socialist, Communist) forced the government to recognize them. Today their whole policy consists of promising to support the Italian bourgeoisie against German

imperialism as well as against the threatening revolution, if the bourgeoisie will only place these parties in power; and to American imperialism, in exchange for a few concessions. But, in the course of the whole first period, while they voiced their opposition to Fascism and the Fascists, to the royal family, to the most reactionary measures, they were able to confuse the masses, who wanted peace, with their proposals to abandon the war on the side of Germany. Thus they assured themselves (at least insofar as the Socialist and Communist parties were concerned) of considerable influence among large layers of the working class.

They utilized this influence to destroy from within the powerful movement of the workers. By signing the agreement affecting the "internal committees" (signed by Buozzi for the S.P. and Roveda for the C.P.), they accepted the transformation of these embryonic organs of workers' power into purely economic committees. The protests of numerous factories against this agreement as well as the strikes in Sicily and southern Italy which are under American occupation, are the first signs of the masses breaking with these parties.

8. Between July 26 and September 8, northern Italy was the arena on which the dress rehearsal of the coming European revolution took place: the working masses spontaneously created the first bridgeheads of their own power.

Our whole revolutionary propaganda has the task of popularizing this experience. All of our revolutionary action, in the next wave of struggle, will be directed towards extending the power of the "internal committees," towards multiplying the contacts between the factories, towards seeking everywhere links to the soldiers and the poor peasants, towards organizing local assemblies which will substitute their power for that of the municipalities, the reactionary and Fascist prefects, towards beating back every attempt to incorporate them within the framework of the bourgeois state (as was the case in the September agreement), and thus to prepare the way for a National Congress of Workers, Soldiers and Peasants Committees. In illegality the Italian revolutionists will strive to increase the contact between the militants of the different workers' parties, the different factories, the different cities, to lay the underground bases of a powerful movement of United Front Committees ready to openly intervene in the new phase of the upsurge which will inevitably come.

## How to Win the Masses

9. In the first stage, the Italian revolution was characterized, on the one hand, by the isolation of the most advanced layers of the population, the proletariat of the great industrial centers in the North, from the rest of the population. The mass of the small peasants only followed its struggle from afar. In northern Italy itself, the absence of any party, of any organization, of any contact beyond the framework of the factory, considerably paralyzed the offensive capacity of the workers. By straining to channelize all attempts at working class organization into trade union forms, the reformist and Stalinist bureaucrats hoped to prevent the further development of the Italian revolution. In the new wave of struggle, the Italian proletariat will have to break down all the barriers which these bureaucrats will seek to erect in its path.

Undoubtedly, the new wave of the Italian revolution will spontaneously take on an infinitely more thorough-going character. This time the example of Milan and Turin will be emulated by infinitely broader layers of the proletariat. In proportion to the reaction which followed the September armistice, the radicalization of the masses will grow anew.

But the proletariat will be able to draw behind it the broadest masses only by becoming the tireless champion of the most immediate and urgent political and economic demands of the middle layers of the population. Only thus will it be able to unify the revolutionary movement in the whole country. Only thus will it be able to meet all attempts at a counter-offensive on the part of reaction with an impenetrable barrier.

To a degree in which the advanced proletariat succeeds in welding the struggle for its own immediate demands with the struggle for the demands of the backward proletarian layers and those of the city and country middle class, to the degree in which it strengthens in the course of these battles its own class organization, can this struggle become a link in the Soviet power.

The creation of Soviets itself depends upon the struggle for economic aims and elementary political aspirations common to the broadest layers of workers and toiling masses.

It is the task of the advanced proletariat to make its own the vital economic and political needs of the masses, and to place themselves at their head in the most impassioned struggle for their demands.

In the high cost of living, in unemployment, inflation, the restrictions and difficulties of food rationing lie the source of the immediate economic demands.

Extreme political oppression under the war regime, on the other hand, places at the very top the elementary democratic slogans: freedom of organization, of press, of assembly, the right to strike, etc.

But it must not be forgotten for an instant that the aim of democratic slogans is to advance the struggle for Soviets and for power; that in the present period the economic and democratic "minimum" program is very rapidly outdistanced by the very logic of the mass struggle itself. When the masses actually take the offensive it is necessary to project the struggle around transitional demands (workers' control of production, factory committees, Soviets, workers' militia, arming of the workers, etc.) in order to immerse them in the systematic preparation for the proletarian revolution.

"... Democratic slogans as a means of mobilizing the masses against Fascism . . . at certain moments can play a serious role. But the formulas of democracy (freedom of press, the right to unionize, etc.) mean for us only incidental or episodic slogans in the independent movement of the proletariat and not a democratic noose fastened to the neck of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie's agents (Spain!). As soon as the movement assumes something of a mass character, the democratic slogans will be intertwined with the transitional ones; factory committees, it may be supposed, will appear before the old routinists rush from their chancelleries to organize trade unions; soviets will cover Germany before a new Constitutional Assembly will gather in Weimar. The same will be true of Italy and the rest of the totalitarian and semi-totalitarian countries.

"Fascism plunged these countries into political barbarism. But it did not change their social structure. Fascism is a tool in the hands of finance capital and not of feudal landowners. A revolutionary program should base itself on the dialectics of the class struggle, obligatory also to Fascist countries, and not on the psychology of terrified bankrupts." (Transitional Program.)

10. Only a genuine revolutionary party can establish a constant link between the daily struggle of the masses for their immediate demands and the battle of the proletariat for its historic objectives. Such a party does not yet exist in Italy. Moreover, twenty years of Fascism have dispersed the Marxist cadres of the Italian proletariat—they have also been extremely reduced—from the great masses of the young generation.

During the first phase of the revolution, the old worker



cadres and the traditional leaderships could still continue to occupy the forefront of the political scene. But in the course of the hard lessons taught by the defeats and the setbacks, the new generation of the Italian proletariat will take the path of struggle for workers' and peasants' power. The task of the Bolshevik militants in Italy consists above all in finding a way to the youth; to appeal beyond their ignorance and ideological confusion to their revolutionary ardor, to their enthusiasm; to provide them with a revolutionary Marxist education in the course of the struggle.

Thus there will spring from the new generation the basic cadres of the party of the Fourth International . . .

18. The war has converted Europe into the main powder-magazine which threatens to blow up the whole structure of capitalism. The war has overturned its whole economy. It has marked the liquidation of the French, Dutch, Belgian and Italian national empires and has thereby upset the entire economy and the entire social equilibrium of these countries. Even if these countries recover fragments of their empires at the end of hostilities, their possibilities of exploitation will be considerably curbed by the important Anglo-American investments made in the course of the war.

On the other hand, the war has marked a new phase in the industrialization of Europe. It has modified the specific weight of the various countries and provinces. It has aroused new, albeit secondary antagonisms. The peasant masses of all countries face the greatest difficulties since 1928, which have only become aggravated by the war-time protectionism that has postponed a solution. This war has heaped up ruins and destruction in far more terrifying measure than the last. Industrial equipment and rolling stock have undergone frightful wear and tear. The methods of production and the technical equipment have been lagging far behind the United States and thus facilitate immeasurably the immediate conquest of the European market by the latter.

## The Revolutionary Upsurge in Europe

Europe has been deprived of all means of making payments abroad (gold or collateral). The populations lack the most indispensable consumers' goods. The cleavage between town and country is constantly widening. Prices are rising dizzily. Inflation proceeds without a halt. The entire economy is badly polluted with the gangrene of speculation and the black market.

Everywhere reaction is triumphant, loading the masses with the burden of exhausting labor, famine, deportations, shootings, imprisonment, abject anti-semitism. Culture has become a spectacle of ignoble decadence and decomposition. This is the true picture of a Europe wallowing in the contradictions of putrefying capitalism.

19. The revolt of the masses in Europe against the capitalist order is also reaching the stage of paroxysm. Reaction has felled the best militants, disorganized the workers' organizations, disrupted the political and organizational cohesion of the proletariat. The war, raising exploitation and oppression, murder and reaction to an intolerable degree, has disclosed enormous crevices in the facade of the authoritarian structure and has once again thrown the masses into the struggle.

The European masses very quickly took the measure of the bloody dictatorship which was pictured to them as leading to the "triumph of socialism." The powerful technical means at the disposal of Hitlerite demagoguery never succeeded in covering up the tremendous profits accorded to the trusts and banks, the rapid concentration of capitalist enterprises, the crushing of

the middle class, the ferocious exploitation of the working class. Never did a dictatorial regime possess means of repression approaching those in the hands of German imperialism; but never was a dictatorial regime so incapable of subduing the revolt of the masses in the occupied countries. For precisely the monstrous character of Hitlerism is only a consequence of the abysmal contradictions in which agonized capitalism is thrashing about.

Anarchy grows even more rapidly than the pile of decrees issued hastily one after the other, for the maintenance of order. The effectiveness of repressive laws decreases in inverse proportion to their increasingly bloody character. Fascist bands are hurriedly formed to curb the hostility of the masses. But the latter disintegrates these bands at an equally fast pace.

The corruption of the functionaries, the demoralization of the coercive forces, the disarray of the possessing class goes on apace. The revolutionary flood-tide rises uninterruptedly, while the strength of the barriers erected against it diminishes constantly. The hour of the proletarian revolution in Europe is approaching with full speed.

20. The awakening and the combativeness of the masses manifests itself first of all in resistance to the oppression and exploitation of the imperialist occupation. The chauvinism cultivated by the emigre governments and the London radio was merely a vile and repulsive smokescreen designed to conceal the rapacious appetite of the imperialist masters of Europe, the dreams of conquest of the big American and British banks; the national sentiment of the masses, on the other hand, while extremely confused, expressed in a reactionary form, above all their hostility to the super-exploitation of German imperialism, their opposition to the reactionary state installed under the protection of German bayonets, their refusal to submit to Fascist dictatorship.

This revolt contained, underneath its reactionary national form, a revolutionary content at bottom—despite the attempts of the various national bourgeoisies and of world imperialism, to channelize it for their own benefit. The continuation of the war, however, and the constant sharpening of the social contradictions in the occupied countries, have endowed the resistance of the masses with an ever more notable class character, placing in the enemy camp not only the "enemy" imperialists but also their own bourgeoisie and "Allied" imperialism.

21. The entry of the USSR into the war made for a new step forward on the part of the resistance of the masses. It decisively pushed the proletariat to the forefront of the struggle and reinforced the unity of the workers' ranks. With a sure instinct the working class of all the countries of Europe sensed that the cause of the first workers' state was also its own cause. It joined forces with the Soviet State and rose in a body to defend it. Thereafter the conditions were established for a powerful re-awakening of the masses. But, on the one hand, the defeats of the Red Army in the first phase of the war arrested this spurt. On the other, the Stalinist bureaucracy bent every effort, especially in Europe, in orienting its best militants along the lines of terrorist action and sabotage carried out outside the mass movement.

The foremost task was the mobilization of the masses by linking the struggle for the defense of the USSR to the struggle for their daily needs and demands, the integration of military actions of service to the USSR within the framework of a general working class offensive, the organization of mass sabotage, of fraternization with the German soldiers, of demoralizing their army by means of revolutionary propaganda; but the various communist parties sacrificed the best militants of the

working class—precisely those who could have become its organizers and leaders—in a struggle without results.

Nevertheless, the irresistible tide of the workers' upsurge, the great spontaneous strike movements which arose from the very depths of the masses and swept Europe and, finally, the improvement of the military situation in the USSR, made possible the avoidance of the threatening catastrophe.

22. The German revolution remains the backbone of the European revolution. Imperialist Germany is today marching head on towards its inevitable collapse.

The monstrous dimensions of the tax in blood drained from the German population, the superhuman efforts extorted from the workers and peasants ever since 1933, added to the years of misery, ruination, unemployment and despair, the miserable conditions of the German proletariat in contrast to the accumulation of dividends by the war industries, the latter's swallowing up the thoroughly ruined middle class, whom the rulers had promised salvation, the wear and tear of the economic apparatus, the burden of public debt and inflation, the constant reinforcement of discipline and terror, the daily contact between the new layers of the German proletariat and the proletarian masses of occupied Europe transplanted into Germany—these are the factors which are organizing the toiling masses against the domination of capitalism and its Hitlerite agents. At the same time, the perspective of the inescapable military defeat, inevitably foreshadows the doom of the whole national-socialist edifice.

## Imperialist Strategy

23. While Allied strategy is dominated in the last analysis by constant concern to prevent the outburst of the revolutionary crisis, to weakening and overpowering the USSR, to safeguard everywhere the capitalist system, it is simultaneously occupied with the realization of its immediate plans, that is, the unconditional subjugation of the opponent imperialisms to the interest of the Anglo-American.

Thus a compromise between the latter and German imperialism in Europe, or Japanese imperialism in Asia, which would leave intact their economic and military strength, remains impossible so long as the changing relation of forces on the world arena does not become manifestly favorable to the revolution.

24. Fundamentally therefore there can be only one solution of the German question for the Allies: unconditional surrender and the liquidation of national-socialism as a tendency favorable to a policy of territorial and economic expansion. That implies, in the last analysis, the seizure by Anglo-American imperialism of Germany's industrial and banking structure, the liquidation of a number of competing industries and, eventually, the more or less extensive dismemberment of Germany.

The plans of the London super-Bainvilles and the Washington super-Poincares are not merely the results of delirious chauvinism. They express the innermost logic of the whole Allied policy to the degree to which they will be able to subdue the revolutionary crisis, as well as a desire to establish a military, economic, political, intellectual and moral receivership over a country of eighty million inhabitants.

The Fourth International conducts a pitiless struggle against all the chauvinist outcries of revenge which attempt to justify such a policy, against all the "anti-Fascist" sophistry which only throws the German people back into the arms of Hitler and which, of necessity, will tomorrow push them behind the banners of a new Fascism. It tirelessly struggles for the fraternization of the proletarians of the occupied countries with the German workers in uniform. It constantly emphasizes that the

German revolution constitutes the essential base of the European revolution; that it alone can provide the indispensable, genuinely harmonious political and economic organization for the Socialist United States of Europe.

25. In the coming period the fate which Fascism encountered in Italy awaits Hitlerism as well. In its rise to power, national-socialism widely utilized and compromised the ruling bourgeois circles, including those of the army. Thereby it sought to limit the political possibility of providing itself with a successor. But it has thus opened wide the gates to the most violent and contradictory reaction of the masses in the very moment of its liquidation.

The Italian events can only lead the German bourgeoisie to act with the greatest circumspection. Nevertheless, the German capitalists know that they cannot hope to save their social regime and a share of their profits, that they cannot make their last attempt at a compromise which would leave them a few crumbs from the Hitlerite conquests except, precisely, by throwing Hitler himself overboard.

## German Workers

26. The German working masses up to 1933, despite all the hesitations and betrayals of leaders protecting the interests of big business or of the Russian bureaucracy, hurled the capitalist regime into complete disarray time and again, with ever renewed enthusiasm, with unequalled self-sacrifice and the most admirable discipline. These masses will not stop with a few fake conquests. They have gone through the experiences of aborted revolutions, of bourgeois democracy with its accompaniment of misery and unemployment, of the regime of "exceptional legislations," and finally of the capitulation to Hitler. The German proletariat, stronger than ever in numbers, more concentrated than ever, will from the first play a decisive role. Soldiers' committees in the army and workers' and peasants' councils in the rear will rise to oppose to the bourgeois power the power of the proletariat. The revolutionary crisis, more profound than that of 1919, posing before the more disoriented, more impotent, more worn-out bourgeoisie, far more difficult and delicate problems than those it had to solve at the end of the last war, will inevitably open up a long period of turmoil. The most favorable conditions will exist for a victorious revolutionary movement.

Lacking cadres and leadership as a result of the ferocious repression, inevitably leaning in the first period on all the emigre gangs whose political programs remain just as inept and reactionary as in the past, the proletariat will nevertheless, in the course of this crisis, draw the lessons from its own experience, clear the road, rally to the Fourth International and march with it toward the seizure of power.

## The Revolutionary Crisis

27. The outbreak of the revolutionary crisis in Europe will be accompanied by the crack-up of German imperialism and of the vise in which it has held the European continent. The forms of this crisis can nevertheless take on varying forms in the different European countries. The intensity and the internal pace of the revolution can, for a time, proceed along different levels on a world scale. A disparity in tempo between the revolutionary upsurge and the victory of the revolution in Europe, on the one hand, and its repercussions in America, in Japan and in the colonial world on the other hand, leaves open the possibility of a struggle between a workers' and peasants' Europe and an imperialist America (perspective of Socialist Europe against Imperialist America).

### **III. The Proletarian Revolution and Tasks of the Fourth International**

1. Inexorably, the second imperialist war is evolving every day more rapidly towards its transformation into civil war.

The awakening and the struggle of the masses will go through different phases, depending on the individual characteristics of each country and on the time element. Sometimes it will take on confused, even reactionary forms, borrowing for a given time the insignia and the formulas of previous periods.

But the movement as a whole will retain its profoundly revolutionary character, growing in extent, in firmness, in clarity and rejecting because of its internal logic and internal dynamics all that has become outlived. It will not be brought to a halt before the accomplishment of its historic mission which is: the socialist revolution.

Under these conditions, the political and organizational preparation of the sections of the Fourth International consists in the first place, of acquiring at once a clear appreciation of the scope and stakes of the unfolding struggle; and bending all efforts toward the unification and the organization of the mass struggles under the banner of the seizure of power and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

2. In Germany as well as in the other European countries, the laboring masses have had enough of famine, bombardments, the yoke of dictatorship and the militarist atmosphere. The workers of all countries long today for a swift end of the conflict more than for anything else. They ardently want *peace, bread and freedom*.

Every day that the war is prolonged appears to the masses as a demonstration of the lightmindedness with which their intolerable suffering is viewed. The struggle for immediate peace thus becomes one of the most powerful levers for the mobilization of the masses along the revolutionary path. In Germany in particular the slogan of immediate peace must be linked to the international fraternization of the workers, to the struggle against a new Versailles treaty, to the Socialist United States of Europe. Likewise, in the occupied countries, particularly those of western Europe, this slogan is an especially effective means of opposing the complete reestablishment of the bourgeois armies, of opposing all attempts to mobilize the masses under the banners of imperialism and counter-revolution.

The Fourth International firmly bases itself on the desire of the masses for an immediate and unconditional peace. But at the same time it conducts tireless propaganda to show the masses that only the proletarian revolution, arising in the course of international civil war, can bring peace and that only the Socialist United States of the world can organize a stable peace.

It denounces pitilessly all the machinations of international diplomacy, demands the publication of all the diplomatic archives and open negotiations. It combats with all its energy the idea of a new "League of Nations" as a cauldron of international intrigues and of the counter-revolution at the service of victorious imperialism. It fights particularly against all attempts to constitute an international police force by capitalist reaction. It denounces with all its means all those charlatans who promise by means of treaties, pacts and arbitration to suppress the conflicts which result from the system itself. It unmasks all the hypocrites who preach an equal distribution of raw materials, division of markets, and control of exchanges as though competition and anarchy were not the very earmarks of this economic system.

3. In the course of the imperialist conflicts, world economy is divided up among a constantly restricted number of great

powers. The small capitalist states and the secondary imperialist states progressively lose every vestige of real power. In Europe, German imperialism has reduced to impotency practically all the other capitalist countries.

The bourgeoisie of these countries is striving with might and main (by means of bargaining, mercenary services, sabotage, armed struggle) to maintain part of their influence. It is self-evident that the proletariat of these capitalist countries, which have been conquered or reduced to an insignificant role, is defeatist with regard to the national struggle of its bourgeoisie, a struggle whose specific and transitory form does not in any way change its imperialist and reactionary content. The proletariat firmly rejects unity with the bourgeoisie, a unity which can only lead to the crushing of the working class. This attitude does not prevent it, of course, from utilizing the antagonism between the bourgeoisie of the defeated countries and the victorious imperialism for its own class aims. It will exhaust every possibility offered by the chaotic situation of the defeated capitalist countries, a situation characterized by the complete putrefaction of the national state apparatus and the inability of the victorious imperialism to replace it.

The slogan of "national insurrection" must be condemned as vulgar and deceptive, designed in reality to cover up the transmission of control of the military and police apparatus to another "leadership" of the same bourgeois stripe.

The task of the Fourth International lies, not in "maneuvering" with the slogans of the bourgeoisie, but in projecting its own policy, to transform the imperialist war into civil war.

4. While the proletariat must reject any alliance with its own bourgeoisie, it cannot remain disinterested in the struggle of the masses against the oppression of German imperialism. The proletariat supports this struggle in order to facilitate and hasten its transformation into a general struggle against capitalism. This position implies the most energetic fight against attempts of the agents of the national bourgeoisie to win the masses and use their support to rebuild the capitalist state and army. Everything possible must be done, on the contrary, to develop the embryonic workers' power (militias, committees, etc.) at the same time as the most vigorous struggle is pursued against all forms of nationalism.

5. In the case of a mass uprising within the framework of a limited invasion or in preparation for it, the proletariat will strive to give the uprising a firm class orientation. To the reconstitution of the bourgeois armies it will counterpose the struggle for the arming of the workers, for the workers' militia. The struggle against the national bourgeoisie must be conducted just as energetically as the struggle against foreign imperialism. This struggle must be indissolubly linked to fraternization with the German workers in uniform. The proletariat will fight against the raising of armed bands in the service of the bourgeoisie as well as against every derailment of the mass movement towards reactionary ends.

6. In view of the partly spontaneous character of the partisan movement, an expression of the open and inevitable revolt of large layers of the population against German imperialism and against the rule of the native bourgeoisie, which bears responsibility in their eyes for all their present misery and suffering, the Bolshevik-Leninists must take into consideration this fighting will of the masses and seek to orient it toward class aims, despite the many dangers flowing from the nationalist form which this struggle assumes.

7. Concerning the assault groups organized by the nationalist and Stalinist-patriotic organizations, the attitude of the Bolshevik-Leninists derives from the objectives and actions of these groups: military, nationalist, essentially reactionary action in the service of national capitalism and Anglo-American imperialism. This attitude remains valid even if such partisan action claims to have as an objective the defense of the USSR by the exclusive organization of sabotage, guerilla warfare, disorganization of the transport system leading in an eastern direction, etc.

Naturally, the Bolshevik-Leninists are not against military aid to the USSR, including sabotage. But the military aid furnished to the Soviet Union by such groups remains insignificant. On the other hand, by destroying the class spirit of the workers, by developing and arousing chauvinism, by turning the workers away from their own struggle in the factory, by sowing division among them, by tying them hand and foot to national unity, by setting them against the German soldiers, these groups disarm the working class, tie the German proletariat to its bourgeoisie and Hitler and prepare the destruction of the German revolution and the strangling of the world revolution. That is to say, in exchange for insignificant military aid, they undermine the real base of support of the USSR and reinforce its dependence on imperialism.

Such has been the exclusive character of the Franc-Tireur movements, notably in the occupied countries in the West (Belgium, France, etc.) up to 1942. The Bolshevik-Leninists could only combat these movements, while saluting the individual heroism of the fighters in the groups who thought they were fighting for the defense of the USSR and for freedom.

## The Partisan Movement

8. But this position proved to be entirely inadequate once the partisan movement began to take on mass scope.

This has been the case:

a) IN THE BALKAN COUNTRIES where, due to geographic, economic and historical conditions, broad layers of poor peasants and in part, workers, took to the mountains to wage the struggle against the occupation authorities.

b) IN WESTERN EUROPE, beginning with the mass deportation of factory workers to Germany: the partisan groups thereafter were reinforced by important layers of workers and petty bourgeois, particularly the youth, determined to fight against the slavery of forced labor, for their freedom, against imperialist oppression and for the defense of the Soviet Union.

The participation of the masses does not, of course, change the objective role of the military organizations kowtowing to Anglo-American imperialism, in which most of the partisan movements were channelized. But it modifies several characteristics of the struggle:

It establishes the entry into the political arena of armed masses who tend to act in accord with their own objective class interests.

In mobilizing an important section of the active forces of the working class and petty bourgeois youth, it poses the burning question: will this youth further the revolution or the most reactionary forces of imperialism?

In the coming revolutionary developments, in the developing chaos, these small armies, directed at strategic points, can play an important role for or against the working class and the revolution.

9. Thus the Bolshevik-Leninists today cannot remain content with denouncing these organizations as working in the interests of imperialism. They cannot confine themselves to stressing to

the workers the priority of factory work. They must, at the same time, penetrate the ranks of the partisans with their own policy in order to organize the latent revolutionary forces in them on a class political and organizational basis.

With this aim in mind, they develop the following program:

a) They must understand that it is their task to play the role of armed detachments in the service of the proletarian revolution, forerunners of the workers' militias, and not that of successors to the imperialist army.

b) They organize themselves wherever possible independently on a democratic basis, excluding all bourgeois or reactionary elements.

## Bolshevik Tactics

c) They organize themselves within the ranks of the military organizations controlled by the National Unity of the anti-German bourgeoisie and the Stalinists as secret fractions, with their own discipline, and firmly oriented toward breaking with these organizations at the most advantageous or the most necessary moment.

d) They reject outright the policy of assassinating German soldiers (at random), every act of sabotage, even of a military character, which creates a breach between the native workers and the (rank and file) German soldiers.

e) To submit to the control and political leadership of the proletarian movement. They support workers' struggles with means appropriate to the general and local situation. They link partisan activity to that in the factories. They promote military cadres of workers and the large scale arming of workers and peasants.

f) They participate in the class struggle of the countryside while employed at agricultural labor, by supporting the working peasantry against state exploitation and against the wealthy peasants, landlords and middle-men, etc. All brigandage against the working peasantry must be pitilessly castigated.

g) They organize fraternization propaganda among the occupation troops and open their ranks to German deserters.

h) They develop proletarian militants by Marxist study and political discussion, in contrast to the bourgeois theory: "No politics in the army."

10. The sections of the Fourth International must pursue this policy both outside as well as inside the partisan organizations, with the aim of eventually reorganizing all the revolutionary elements of the partisan movement on an independent class base, ideologically as well as organizationally. Without a correct policy these forces will inevitably fall prey to reactionary currents.

11. In running a race with world imperialism in the arena of military conquest and territorial aggrandizement, the Stalinist bureaucracy is hastening the showdown between the international bourgeoisie and the workers' state. At the same time, it curbs and brakes the fighting spirit of the revolutionary proletariat, which constitutes the best defense of the USSR. That is why its policy must be mercilessly combatted by the revolutionary vanguard. But the latter must not for a moment forget that the struggle of world imperialism aims at the destruction, not of the social inequalities in the USSR, but of the economic system created by the October revolution, the liquidation of nationalized property and planned economy.

The international proletariat will continue the unconditional defense of the USSR against all attacks of world imperialism, because this struggle is an integral part of the international struggle to overthrow imperialism. It will also fight against every attempt of world imperialism to wrest from the USSR,

by armed struggle or political intrigue, the conquered or annexed territories.

It will meet with the most vigorous class action, up to and including sabotage, every attempt at Allied intervention.

12. Such a policy does not exclude, but on the contrary implies, the most ruthless struggle in the USSR itself, as well as on an international scale, against both the foreign and domestic policy of Stalin. In the USSR itself and in the countries occupied by the Red Army, the struggle for the unconditional defense of the workers' state against the plans of world imperialism, does not mean, furthermore, that we renounce a policy of revolutionary opposition, or that the common front with the communist parties for the defense of the Soviet Union in any way signifies a renunciation of the struggle for world revolution.

The Russian and the international proletariat can and must fight side by side with the Soviet bureaucracy in defense of the workers' state under attack. But while striking together with the bureaucracy in the military struggle, the class conscious workers in the USSR must at the same time fight for the reestablishment of proletarian democracy and the overthrow of the bureaucracy.

In the army they must combat the omnipotence of the officer corps and fight for the reestablishment of control by delegates elected by the workers. By means of this demand they fight for the restoration of workers' and peasants' power which will once again make the USSR the advance fortress of the world revolution.

They demand the suppression of the privileges of the bureaucracy, for the freedom of the workers' press, for the legalization of Soviet parties, for the independence of the trade unions from the state, for their democratization, the pitiless suppression of hoarding, speculation and usury, aligning economy with the needs of the laboring masses.

This struggle is conducted not only in words but in the course of systematic class action including the political revolution for the overthrow of the power of the bureaucracy.

The requirements of Soviet defense, in contrast to our policy in a capitalist state, must be taken into account with regard to the development of the political revolution and today indicate the need for a "united front" with the Thermidorian party of the bureaucracy against the imperialist offensive. This does not signify, however, that we renounce the political revolution, for in the last analysis only the proletariat in power can effectively defend the USSR, reestablish its economy and compensate the masses for the sacrifices they have made.

## The Struggle for Transitional Demands

13. In all of Europe the bloody experience of the dictatorship arouses among broad working class and petty bourgeois masses profound aspirations for democracy.

The Fourth International cannot remain content with explaining to the masses that only the dictatorship of the proletariat in its Soviet form can achieve genuine democracy. Precisely because it knows that in the epoch of imperialism there is no room left for bourgeois democracy, the revolutionary vanguard transforms the struggle for *democratic demands* on the part of the masses into a powerful instrument against the bourgeois state.

It turns against the pseudo-democratic phrase-mongers of London and Algiers their own spouting about freedom and popular sovereignty. It fights for the complete restoration of freedom of organization, particularly for the trade unions; it defends the right to strike and demands the abolition of all compulsory arbitration laws. It calls upon the masses to install

everywhere, in all towns and villages, their own elected administrations. It calls upon the masses to elect their own delegates in the factories. In the course of the struggle it will foster everywhere the embryos of proletarian power. Linked to the struggle for economic demands, to the struggle for peace, the struggle for democratic demands thus becomes the most effective instrument for the mobilization of broad masses of the people against the bourgeoisie, and opens the road to power for the workers and peasants.

In certain countries and under certain circumstances, for example, if the masses have not yet been able to weld themselves into a solid bloc capable of making a direct bid for power, or if they are temporarily thrown into a defensive position, extreme democratic demands, such as the demand for immediate elections or for the convocation of a constituent assembly, can become powerful means of mobilizing great masses of people around the proletariat. On the other hand, to launch such demands in the midst of a revolutionary crisis, when there are actually in existence elements of dual power, would be the most unpardonable of errors. At no time can the revolutionary vanguard forget that the objective of the struggle which is opening up is the seizure of power by the proletariat, the establishment of the Soviet dictatorship.

14. For the broad masses of the population the years of famine and misery have placed in the forefront *demands of an economic character*. The Fourth International places at the center of its program of action the two basic demands which are intimately linked with one another: the *sliding scale of wages* and the *stabilization of prices*. It does not entrust this task to any government institution. It demands frequent revision of wage rates by workers' delegates and of prices by housewives' committees.

15. The problem of *food rationing* and of the black market acquires, in the present period, particular importance. Measures like the suppression of the middle men, control of distribution by housewives' delegates can partially abolish these inequalities. But the fundamental difficulty which prevents a genuine solution of the problem of food distribution is the profound economic rupture between town and country, between industry and agriculture.

The solution is linked, not only to the reconstruction of a stable and harmonious peace industry, but even more so to a deep-going reform in the social structure of the countryside. Real and lasting solution of the food problem can be achieved only by moratoria, by the abolition of mortgages, by cheap credits and above all, by distributing the land among the working peasants, under the control of councils of working peasants, within the framework of a general plan of land reform.

The reconstruction of industry and agriculture, the organization of food distribution, all this is linked to the establishment of a general plan of economic reconstruction.

The Fourth International puts forward the slogan of a great plan of public works and of peace-time reequipment of industry. It fights for nationalization, without compensation or indemnities, of all war plants and their reconversion; for nationalization of all monopolies; for reopening of all shut-down plants under the management of workers' delegates. It fights for the displacement of management committees of the trusts by committees of workers', technicians' and small owners' delegates. It fights for the nationalization of banks and credit institutions, for the abolition of the state debt owed the banks and trust.

In the struggle over wages and against the high cost of living, in the struggle for the improvement of food distribution and the reorganization of the economy, as well as in the

struggle against all the maneuvers and counter-offensives of the bosses (lock-outs, discharges, etc.), the central slogan of the period remains: *workers' control*.

16. Under all circumstances, it is necessary to call upon the workers to elect their delegates, to exercise their control in the shops over working conditions, over working hours, wages; to demand in each factory access to the book-keeping system and business accounts; control of the market price and of profits, of social institutions; control over hiring and firing.

In the country, delegates of the working peasants must impose their control over levies and planting, watch over the distribution of seed, fertilizer and credits.

In the towns, it is necessary to fight for control of food distribution by the housewives. In a word, it is necessary everywhere to mobilize the masses under the slogan of workers' control in the struggle against profits and the capitalist system, to educate them in the economic administration of society, and to create the first organs of the economic leadership of the proletariat in power.

17. The sharpening of the class struggle which characterizes the wind-up of the war unfaillingly provokes sharper counter-measures on the part of the bourgeoisie. We are entering the phase of open civil war where every, even partial, struggle begun in a factory or elsewhere will become transformed into an armed struggle in the streets.

It is necessary to begin to realize the slogan of *workers militia* and the arming of the workers, by utilizing every means and every opportunity. We must particularly utilize the revolutionary elements of the partisan movement in order to train detachments of proletarian fighters linked to the movement of the working class, recruit cadres for the workers' militia, and obtain arms.

## Socialism Or Barbarism

18. Thus the struggle for immediate demands, economic reforms and the struggle for peace, demands, in order to be successfully carried through to the end, that the working class build up its own power. It demands that the proletariat create everywhere, in the course of struggle, organs which will unify and lead the forces of the proletariat, in the army, in the factories, in the villages, in opposition to the forces of the bourgeoisie.

At every stage of the struggle the Fourth International puts forward the idea of workers', peasants' and soldiers' committees. In every specific struggle it calls on the masses to organize themselves into their own network of democratic organizations, to elect their own shop, neighborhood and village delegates, to unify them into local, regional or national congresses, to wrest from the bourgeoisie an ever greater share of its power, up to the moment of its final overthrow and liquidation . . .

20 . . . In the great crisis opening up the victory of the proletariat is certain: if it can coldbloodedly weigh the forces of its adversary and organize its own; if it develops a sharp class consciousness, a solid combat organization and a bold policy capable of utilizing every secondary crisis in every country as the point of departure for the offensive of the international proletariat.

21. However, if in spite of the profound crisis of the regime, in spite of the revolt of ever greater layers of the population seeping into the ranks of the bourgeoisie itself, the proletariat should prove incapable of taking into its own hands the fate of humanity, and by means of its dictatorship to lead it toward socialism and progress, the world will continue to plunge ever more deeply into the barbarism to which imperialism has con-

demned it for the past thirty years. The infernal cycle of wars, crises and unemployment will again rage all over the world. Reaction and fascism will triumph anew.

Socialism or barbarism, that is the choice which humanity faces. In the coming months and years the solution will depend entirely on the self-confidence, the audacity and the combativity of the advanced proletariat. Such are the stakes of the revolutionary struggle. Nothing less than the fate of all humanity is involved. Only the triumph of the world revolution can open the way to progress. Its defeat, on the contrary, no matter what the actual conclusion of the conflict may be, will signify the victory of the worst reaction with all the horrors and all the decadence that this entails.

22. The victory of the proletariat cannot be assured unless the latter opposes to the formations of the bourgeoisie its own formations, to the plans of imperialism its own plans, to the general staff of international reaction its own general staff. In order to conquer, the world proletariat needs a world party unshakably loyal to its class interest and program, a party which has never compromised and will never compromise with the class enemy.

In the course of twenty years of struggles and tests, overcoming all the difficulties accumulated in its path by the incapable and treacherous leaders of the workers, the international movement of the Bolshevik-Leninists has hammered out cadres in all countries, educated militants in the genuine spirit of revolutionary internationalist Marxism. In the face of the rising threat of imperialist war, it proclaimed in 1938, through the creation of the Fourth International, its determination to take the leadership of the masses in their struggle for the revolution. The defeats which the working class has since then suffered, and in the first place the unleashing of the imperialist war, have struck it a heavy blow. But the events have nevertheless demonstrated the correctness of its position in its entirety as well as the firmness of its cadres, their unshakable devotion to the cause of the proletariat.

Today as the new and tremendous wave of the revolution rises, the Fourth International will rally to its banner the best fighting forces of the proletariat and lead them to victory, to the victory of the Socialist United States of Europe and of the world. Our hour will soon strike. The future belongs to us.

# Fascism

- WHAT IT IS
- HOW TO FIGHT IT

*A Compilation*

By **LEON TROTSKY**

*With An Introduction*

By **E. R. Frank**

**15 Cents**

**PIONEER PUBLISHERS**

# From the Arsenal of Marxism

## Twenty Years of Stalinist Degeneration

By LEON TROTSKY

With the defeat of the German revolution in 1923 and the resulting isolation of the proletarian revolution in a backward country under the conditions of capitalist encirclement, a process of degeneration set in the USSR which is reaching, under the impact of the war, its culminating stages today. The usurping bureaucracy headed by Stalin is the fountainhead of this degeneration.

From the beginning Leon Trotsky studied and analyzed this process, not as an observer but as a direct participant in the struggle to regenerate the Soviet Union, a struggle inseparable from the struggle to spread the Socialist revolution throughout Europe and the whole world. In a whole series of writings, Trotsky demonstrated that the maintenance of Stalin's regime is incompatible with the needs of the Soviet masses and the preservation of the first workers' state. The pre-condition for the regeneration of the USSR is the overthrow by the workers of the Kremlin's rule and the restoration of Soviet democracy. Failing this, the development could proceed only in the direction of the triumph of the capitalist counter-revolution on the territories of the USSR.

This historical alternative was posed by the Trotskyist movement more than a decade ago. It is posed in the article which appears below and which was written in 1938 shortly after the termination of the infamous Moscow Trials and the accompanying blood purges. The Russian text was published in *The Bulletin of the Russian Opposition*, May-June 1938, issue No. 66-67, pp. 19-21. The English translation is by John G. Wright.—Ed.

\* \* \*

In order to correctly answer the question raised in the title of this article, it is first of all necessary to establish the difference between the basic conquest of the October Revolution—nationalized property—and the policy pursued by the present government. There is a contradiction between the revolutionary form of property and the Thermidorian, i.e. reactionary, policy. But up to the present this policy has been unable or hasn't dared or hasn't succeeded in as yet overthrowing the revolutionary form of property. The incumbent government's tendencies are diametrically opposed to the program of Bolshevism. But inasmuch as the institutions erected by the revolution still continue to exist, the bureaucracy is compelled to externally adapt its tendencies to the old principles of Bolshevism: it continues to swear by the covenants of October; it invokes the interests of the proletariat and invariably refers to the Soviet system as Socialist. One may say without risking a blunder that in the history of mankind there has never been a government so given to lies and hypocrisy as the Soviet bureaucracy of today.

In and of itself the preservation of state ownership of the means of production is of enormous progressive significance, inasmuch as with the aid of planned economy this permits of attaining a swift development of the productive forces. True, the economic statistics issued by the bureaucracy

do not merit any confidence: they systematically exaggerate successes while concealing failures. It is nonetheless unthinkable to deny the fact that even today the Soviet Union's productive forces are still developing at a tempo that was not and is not known in any other country in the world. Whoever refuses to see this side of the case, identifying the Soviet regime with fascism—as, for example, does Max Eastman—throws out, as the Germans say, the baby with the dirty bath-water. The development of the productive forces is the fundamental factor of human culture. Without increasing man's power over nature it is impossible even to think of destroying the rule of man over man. Socialism cannot be erected on backwardness and poverty. The technical premise of Socialism has taken an enormous forward step in the Soviet Union in the course of these twenty years.

However, least of all is this the merit of the bureaucracy. On the contrary, the ruling caste has become transformed into the greatest brake upon the development of the productive forces. Socialist economy must by its very essence take as its guide the interests of the producers and the needs of the consumers. These interests and needs can find their expression only through the medium of a full-flowering democracy of producers and consumers. Democracy, in this particular case, is not some sort of abstract principle. It is the one and only conceivable mechanism for preparing the Socialist system of economy, and realizing it in life.

### Workers Expropriated Politically

The incumbent ruling clique has replaced Soviet, party, trade-union and cooperative democracy by the domineering of functionaries. But a bureaucracy, even one composed entirely of geniuses, could not assure from its bureaus the necessary proportions between all branches of economy, that is, the necessary correspondence between production and consumption. What the lexicon of Stalin's justice designates as "sabotage," is in reality one of the evil consequences of bureaucratic methods of domineering. The manifestations of disproportion, wastefulness and entanglement, constantly increasing, threaten to undermine the very foundations of planned economy. The bureaucracy invariably seeks "the guilty one." Such in the majority of cases is the secret meaning of the Soviet trials of saboteurs.

To find an explanation of the existing regime in Stalin's personal "lust for power" is far too superficial. Stalin is not an individual but a caste symbol. Power is not something incorporeal. Power enables one to dispose of and appropriate material values. Naturally, complete equality cannot be attained in a single leap. A certain differentiation in labor payments is dictated at the given stage in the interests of raising

labor productivity. However, of decisive importance in evaluating the nature of society is the following question: Is the society evolving in the direction of equality or in the direction of privileges? The answer to this question does not leave room for any doubts whatever. The differentiation of [Soviet] society has long exceeded the limits of economic necessity. The material privileges of the bureaucracy have grown like a glacier. Fearful of their isolation from the masses, the bureaucracy seeks to create a new labor and *kolkhoz* aristocracy under the banner of Stakhanovism.

The division of national income in its turn determines the political regime. The ruling caste cannot permit a producers'-consumers' democracy for the simple reason that it ruthlessly despoils both the producers and the consumers. One may accept as an established fact that the bureaucracy devours not less than half of the national consumption fund, taking of course into account not only living quarters, food, clothing, means of transport and communication but also educational institutions, press, literature, sports, cinema, radio, theatres, museums and so on. We can therefore with complete justification say that although the bureaucracy is still compelled to adapt itself to the institutions and traditions of the October Revolution, its policy, which expresses its own interests, is directly opposed to the interests of the people and of Socialism.

### Role of Soviet Bureaucracy

The same basic contradiction can be corroborated in all other spheres of social life, such as the state, the army, the family, the school, culture, science, art and so on.

From the standpoint of *Marxism*, the state is a machine whereby one class rules over another. The dictatorship of the proletariat is only a temporary institution, indispensable to the toilers for coping with the resistance of the exploiters and for destroying exploitation. In a society without classes the state, an apparatus of coercion, must gradually wither away and become replaced by the free self-administration of producers and consumers. But what do we observe in reality? Twenty years after the revolution the Soviet state has become the most centralized, despotic and bloodthirsty apparatus of coercion and compulsion. The evolution of the Soviet state therefore proceeds in complete contradiction with the principles of the Bolshevik program. The reason for it is to be found in this, that society, as has already been said, is evolving not towards Socialism but towards the regeneration of social contradictions. Should the process continue in this direction, it must inevitably lead to the rebirth of classes, the liquidation of planned economy and the restoration of capitalist property. The state regime will in that case inevitably become fascist.

The October Revolution proclaimed as one of its tasks: to dissolve the *army* in the people. It was presumed that the armed forces would be built on the militia principle. Only this type of army organization, making the people the armed master of their own fate, corresponds to the nature of Socialist society. In the course of the first decade systematic preparation was made for the transition from a barracks-army to a militia-army. But from the moment when the bureaucracy succeeded in crushing every manifestation of working class independence, it openly transformed the army into an instrument of its own domination. The militia system has been completely set aside. An army of two million is now a purely

barracks-army in character. An officer caste with Generals and Marshals has been reinstated. From an instrument of Socialist defense the army has been turned into an instrument of defense of the bureaucracy's privileges. Things however did not stop there. The struggle between Stalin's narrow clique and the more authoritative and talented military leaders, genuinely devoted to the interests of defense, has led to the beheading of the Red Army.

The position of *woman* is the most graphic and telling indicator for evaluating a social regime and state policy. The October Revolution inscribed on its banner the emancipation of womankind and created the most progressive legislation in history on marriage and the family. This does not mean, of course, that a "happy life" was immediately in store for the Soviet woman. Genuine emancipation of women is inconceivable without a general rise of economy and culture, without the destruction of the petty-bourgeois economic family unit, without the introduction of socialized food preparation, and education. Meanwhile, guided by its conservative instinct, the bureaucracy has taken alarm at the "disintegration" of the family. It began singing panegyrics to the family supper and the family laundry, that is the household slavery of woman. To cap it all the bureaucracy has restored criminal punishment for abortions, officially returning women to the status of pack animals. In complete contradiction with the ABC of Communism the ruling caste has thus restored the most reactionary and blackest nucleus of the class regime, i.e. the petty bourgeois family.

### A Graphic Indicator

The situation is not much better in the field of *culture*. The growth of productive forces created the material premise for a new culture. But the development of culture is unthinkable without criticism, without faltering and error, without independent creative work, in a word, without the awakening of the human personality. The bureaucracy, however, refuses to tolerate independent thought in a single field of creative activity. And in its own way it is right: should criticism awaken in the sphere of art or pedagogy, it will inevitably become directed against the bureaucracy, against its privileges, against its ignorance and its arbitrary rule. Herein is to be found the explanation for the fact that the "purge," having started with the party, penetrated later into all spheres of social life without exception. With "Trotskyism" as the token, the GPU "purges" poets, astronomers, pedagogues and musicians, and therewith the best heads come under the muzzle of revolvers. Is it conceivable under such conditions to talk of "Socialist" culture?

In the sphere of ordinary *literacy* the successes are unquestionable. Tens of millions have learned how to read and write. Parallel with this, however, they have been deprived of the right to express their views and their interests through the medium of the printed word. The press serves only the bureaucracy. The so-called "Socialist" poets have the right to write only hymns to Stalin. The same right is bequeathed to the prose writers. The population is duty-bound to read these hymns. The same thing takes place with regard to cinema, radio, theater and so on. A new prize-winning textbook on Russian history has been recently introduced in the schools. One can say without exaggeration that this textbook consists solely of falsifications, the aim of which is to justify the despotism of the bureaucracy and the personal autocracy



of Stalin. Even textbooks on the history of the Catholic Church, published with the approval of the Vatican, are models of scientific conscientiousness in comparison with the Stalinized textbooks in the USSR. Tens of millions of children's heads are infected and poisoned by this meretricious literature.

The October Revolution proclaimed the right of every nation not only to an independent cultural development but also to state separation. As a matter of fact, the bureaucracy has transformed the Soviet Union into a new prisonhouse of the peoples. True enough, the national language and the national school continue to exist: in this sphere the mightiest despotism can no longer turn back the wheel of evolution. But the language of the various nationalities is not an organ of their independent development, but the organ of bureaucratic domineering over them. The governments of the national republics are, naturally, appointed by Moscow, or to put it more precisely, by Stalin. But the astonishing thing is that two score and ten of these governments suddenly turn out to have consisted of "enemies of the people" and agents of a foreign government. Behind this accusation, which rings far too rudely and ludicrously even on the lips of Stalin and Vyshinsky, there lurks in reality the fact that, in the national republics, functionaries, even those appointed by the Kremlin, fall into dependence upon local conditions and moods and become gradually infected with an oppositional spirit against the stifling centralism of Moscow. They begin dreaming or talking about replacing the "beloved leader" and relaxing the steel tentacles. This is the real reason why all the national republics of the USSR, were recently beheaded.

### Stalino-Chauvinism

It is hard to find in history an example of reaction uncolored by *anti-Semitism*. This peculiar historical law is likewise completely corroborated nowadays in the Soviet Union. In his interesting, though not profound, book, *Assignment in Utopia*, Eugene Lyons, who spent many years in Moscow, relates how the bureaucracy exploited systematically, even if covertly, anti-Semitic prejudices in order to intrench its rule. And how can it be otherwise? Bureaucratic centralism is unthinkable without chauvinism, while anti-Semitism has always been the line of least resistance so far as chauvinism is concerned.

In the sphere of *foreign policy*, in the course of these twenty years there has occurred a turn no less drastic than in internal policies. Only from inertia, or with some hidden thought in mind does the bourgeois reaction continue to indict Stalin as the inspirer of world revolution. As a matter of fact, the Kremlin has become one of the pillars of the conservative law and order. The period when the Moscow government used to tie up the fate of the Soviet Republic with the fate of the world proletariat and of the oppressed peoples of the East has been left far behind. Apart from the question of whether the policy of the "People's Front" is good or bad, it happens to be the traditional policy of Menshevism against which Lenin fought all his life. It signals the renunciation of the proletarian revolution in favor of conservative bourgeois democracy. The ruling Moscow caste seeks today one thing and one thing only: to abide in peace with all the ruling classes.

The contradiction between the October Revolution and the Thermidorian bureaucracy found its most dramatic ex-

pression in the annihilation of *the old generation of the Bolsheviks*. Vyshinsky, Yezhov, Troyanovsky, Maiski, agents of the Comintern and the GPU, journalists of the Dwianty-Louis Fisher type, attorneys of the Pritt type, will not dupe world public opinion. Not a single serious person any longer believes that hundreds of old revolutionists, leaders of the Bolshevik Party under [Czarist] illegality, leaders of the Civil War, revolutionary Soviet diplomats, military heads of the Red Army, heads of 30 national Soviet Republics, became—all at once and as if by command—agents of fascism. The New York Committee of Investigation, comprising of impeccable and impartial people, found, after nine months' work, the Moscow Trials to be the most grandiose counterfeit in human history.

Today the issue is not that of proving that Zinoviev, Kamenev, Smirnov, Pyatakov, Serebryakov, Sokolnikov, Radek, Rakovsky, Krestinsky, Tukhachevsky and hundreds of others had fallen victims of a frameup. This has been proved. What is at issue is to explain how and why the Kremlin clique could have risked undertaking so monstrous a frameup. The answer to this flows from everything that has preceded.

### Insolvable Contradiction

In its struggle for power and revenue the bureaucracy is compelled to lop-off and batter down those groups who are connected with the past, who know and remember the program of the October Revolution, who are sincerely devoted to the tasks of Socialism. The slaying of old Bolsheviks and of Socialist elements among the middle-aged and youngest generation are the necessary links in the chain of anti-October reaction. That is why the accuser-prosecutor at the trials came forward in the person of a former White Guardist—Vyshinsky. That is why the USSR is represented in Washington by a former White Guardist—Troyanovsky, and in London by a former Minister of Kolchak—Maisky. And so on and so forth. The necessary people turn up in the necessary places.

Hardly anyone will permit himself to be duped by the farce of the recent Moscow elections. Hitler and Goebbels have more than once perpetrated exactly the same thing, in exactly the same way. One need only read what the Soviet press itself has written concerning Hitler's plebiscites in order to grasp the secret of Stalin's "success." Totalitarian parliamentary experiments testifies only this: that once all the parties have been crushed, including one's own; once the trade unions have been strangled; once the press, the radio and the cinema have been subordinated to the Gestapo or the GPU; if bread and work are given only to the docile or the silent, while a revolver is placed at the temple of every voter—then it is possible to achieve "unanimous" elections. But this unanimity is neither eternal nor table. The traditions of the October Revolution have disappeared from the official arena, but they continue to live in the momery of the masses. Under the cover of juridical and electoral frameups, the contradictions continue to deepen and cannot fail to lead to an explosion. The reactionary bureaucracy has to be overthrown and it will be overthrown. The political revolution in the USSR is inevitable. It will signify the liberation of the elements of the new society from the yoke of the usurping bureaucracy. Only if this condition is given will the USSR be able to develop in the direction of Socialism.

# Report of an Honest War Correspondent

By LI FU-JEN

**STILL TIME TO DIE**—By Jack Belden. Published by Harper & Brothers, New York, 1944. Price, \$3.00.

\* \* \*

Across the mangled terrain of war-torn Europe, rising above the terror, agony and filth of many bloody battlefields, can be heard the rumblings of approaching revolutionary storms. The common people are beginning to assert themselves. They are thrusting their clenched fists in the faces of a ruling class which plunged them into this infamous horror. We hear voices. They are the voices of workers, peasants, the city poor—proclaiming that they do not intend to tolerate the old way of life, that they are determined to make a radical change for the better.

In addition to the civilian masses who have been dragged into the shambles, there are the soldiers, the millions of men put into uniform, weapons thrust into their hands, to the end that they may shoot and gouge each other, win a victory for their oppressors. What are the feelings of the soldiers as they go about the murderous business for which they have been conscripted by the masters of society? The capitalist press acclaims them as heroes. But do they regard themselves as heroes? American soldiers have been told they are fighting for a free and democratic world. Do they believe this? Do they fight with the intense earnestness of men fired by the crusading spirit? Or do they fight because they are compelled to fight?

War correspondent Jack Belden of *Time* magazine is the first of his profession to give us a fairly complete picture of the soldier at war. To be able to do this, he had first to get wounded at Salerno and return invalided to America, where, away from the prying eyes of censors, he was able to complete a book. *Still Time to Die* is the first really truthful book to come out of this war.

For more than seven years Belden has been at war—in China, North Africa, Sicily, Italy. Now he is on the western front in Europe. He has kept the closest company with Chinese, British and American soldiers, in and out of battle. He has studied the soldier and his reactions, recorded his thoughts and feelings. He has studied the army as an institution, war as a political phenomenon. He has reached conclusions. The conclusions are revolutionary.

Here is the American army as Belden has observed it:

The American Army is filled with men of courage, but one must search a much longer time to find men whose courage proceeds, as von Clausewitz says, "from positive motives, such as ambition, patriotism or enthusiasm of any kind." And rarer still, indeed, in the American Army, is that bravery which springs out of the heart of politics. Belief in a political goal can heat a man's courage up to a pitch of battle ardor, and higher still, to long, steadfast resolution. But in our army, today, there is little of this kind of feeling. The American is brave, daring and resourceful, but his courage is mostly that fatalistic kind which he wears like armor. Sometimes the armor is not enough, and it rusts away, revealing a hollow, broken man inside the soldier's shell. . . . Psychologically, the lack of belief in what he is doing expresses itself in the idea of the futility of endeavor. The soldier thinks: "What is the sense of undergoing all this misery? It is accomplishing nothing. I have nothing for which to fight." He would like to get

out of the bloody mess, but, because of his training, his social fear and his loathing to let down his comrades, he can't run away. It is an insoluble dilemma: he hates the business, because it is senseless, but still he can't get away.

The conclusion, which Belden leaves the reader to draw for himself, is that all the propaganda of the imperialist war-mongers has failed utterly to imbue soldiers in the mass with the idea that they are fighting and dying for something worthwhile. Their feeling of the futility of the whole business will lead, in time, to rebellion. Reluctant acceptance of war is but a step removed from revolt *against* war.

The first chapter of Belden's book, "The Nature of the Battlefield," is a powerful piece of writing in which the essence of war—combat—is discussed in its manifold aspects, material and psychological. From this one chapter the reader can learn more about the soldier than from the reams of dispatches which fill the daily press, in which the real personality of the soldier is concealed. The author has set down a series of generalizations derived from long and intimate association with war. They represent the compressed result of experiences and observations gathered on Chinese, British and American battlefields which are described with dramatic force in the chapters that follow. This first chapter pulses with sympathy for the soldier, victim of imperialist rapacity and greed, who fights and suffers and dies without—as yet—knowing why. Nor does the author reserve his sympathy for the Allied soldiers alone, although it is mainly about these that he writes. The warmth of his understanding encompasses *all* soldiers, no matter what uniform they wear. There is not a trace of chauvinism in Belden. It was from soldiers of many nations that he absorbed into his system a real conception of human solidarity.

Possessed of a reflective temperament, and with more opportunity to think about his experiences than the soldier in the field, Belden has been able to reach conclusions about the war itself. In the final chapter of his book he sets them down in a burning testament of faith in the common people—workers, peasants, soldiers—and proclaims himself on their side in the coming great battles for Socialism:

I recognized at last. . . that you cannot, no matter how much you wish, in turbulent times like these, stay out of the struggle and exist for yourself. You cannot sit on the fence. For a time you may get away with it, but sooner or later you will be dragged off on one side or the other. You have to choose. You are either for or against.

It was in China that Belden's political education began. A native of Brooklyn, he went to sea after leaving college and spent three years at seafaring. In 1933 he jumped ship in Hong-kong, went to Shanghai, got himself a job as a newspaper reporter. When the Japanese invasion of China began in 1937, he was hired as a war correspondent. He had acquired considerable mastery of the difficult Chinese language and was therefore equipped for intimate contact with the Chinese armies. In defeat and retreat he accompanied them through all the major campaigns. He shared intimately all the vicissitudes of the hard life of the Chinese soldier. That is why his chapters on the war in China are not just run-of-the-mill

stories such as were written by correspondents who viewed happenings from the outside. They are the live diary of a participant.

Belden gradually came to the realization that it was the decayed social order in China, and the reactionary regime resting upon it, that were bringing to frustration and impotence China's just struggle against Japanese imperialism. He saw the terrible oppression of the masses, the fearful lot of the soldiers. He observed the official corruption and ineptitude which nullified all the heroic efforts of China's fighting men. In each battle, by some seeming "accident," prospective victory gave way to humiliating defeat.

After a while, when my expectant hopes of victory were one upon another smashed on the rocks of battle, it came to me full flood that the recurrent nature of these seemingly accidental incidents could not be put down to the blind confluence of mischance alone. So I began my search backward from the battlefield for the reasons why reinforcements failed to arrive on time, why the peasants acted as guides to the Japanese and why orders were frequently disobeyed or ignored. I found that reinforcements never could arrive on time because of the state of the railways, the dearth of roads and the lack of transport; that peasants acted as guides for the Japanese because they did not see or believe that their individual fortunes were bound up with the outcome of the war; that division commanders often ignored orders because, like feudal lords, they were afraid if they lost their troops they would no longer be commanders. So back from the battlefield, my pursuit of knowledge led me to government, to society and its forces. I had to find why China had not been industrialized while Japan had, why landlords and their sons were not drafted into the army while tenant farmers and agrarian lumpen proletarians were, why commanders based their moves on personal relationships and not on strictly military procedure. Naturally, I was led into a study of agrarian economy and the social forces that exist within the womb of that economy, and that led me — I was only following the trail where inevitable facts stood up like bold signposts — to the Chinese Revolution. And so I came to world diplomacy, to Western imperialism, to world economy and at last to the heart of the whole anarchic, rotted social order of this universe, concealed, palsied over and polluted by the double talk of statesmen, the loud and lying legends of the newspapers and the cynical and brutal mendacities of the overseers of money and privilege.

In hospital in America only a few months ago, Belden's political education was brought many stages nearer completion. Rome had fallen. He read how workers in the Italian capital gathered in the streets when Mussolini was ousted and shouted: "Long Live Matteotti!" He noticed that they "had not yelled: 'Long Live the King!' or 'Long Live Badoglio!' No, from the depths of the past, and out of the bleak years of

*Fascism, they had summoned the ghost of a Socialist idea. They had shouted not for kings and 'liberal' fascists but for themselves."*

In China, India, North Africa and Italy Belden had observed that "everywhere was oppression of the people," Back in America, after an absence of ten years, he was able to observe "almost the whole metropolitan press baiting Labor, the one organized force in America that had opposed Fascism before Pearl Harbor . . . the slamming discrimination against the Negroes in the South, the soldier-vote fraud, the hysterical demagoguery of Congress . . . editorial writers screaming in the tones of insane monkeys that the Japanese were not members of the human race; the general who demanded that Tokyo be razed to the ground; and the well-bred Mr. Grew, with his country-club democracy, slyly insinuating that we keep the emperor in power in Japan."

Unique among the present corps of war correspondents, Belden has turned his back on the revolting miasma of capitalist politics and statesmanship and cast in his lot with the common people:

I believe in the long run these people will go on. I believe they will get what they are seeking. It may not come in my lifetime, but it will come in the lifetime after mine, or the one after that. But I will fight for it to come in my lifetime. . . I do not think Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin or Chiang Kai-shek will get us a better world. I think a better world is where a free-thinking people controls its own destiny and I think it can only be obtained by the people. I believe in the peasants of China, in the Partisans of Yugoslavia, in the underground of France. I believe in farmers and workers everywhere. . . I do not believe in the falsehoods, the shams and the deceits of the statesmen, the generals and the "leaders." I do not believe that if we only had a number of good people, the world would roll smoothly on its axis. I do not believe in good people ruling us, but only in the mass of the people ruling themselves.

The author does not define his political program. He does not define his political goal. He does not indicate how the people are to arrive at self-rule. He leaves the socialist society to be inferred by his readers. Because he is not yet a Marxist, his thinking is not always clear. Thus, in an otherwise fine and stirring dedication of his book (to the imperialists — "in hate"; to the soldiers — "in love") he does not describe the war as an imperialist war, but accuses capitalist statesmanship of having "twisted" it into "what it should not have been," thereby implying that it started out as a good and noble enterprise only to get derailed by ill-intentioned men.

These weaknesses detract but little from the value of the work as a whole. Soldiers and workers who read Belden's book will recognize in him an honest spokesman of the oppressed.

## Socialism Reaffirmed

By LILY ROY

In March 1944 a pamphlet was published in India which created a sensation. Its title is "Socialism Reconsidered." Its author is M. R. Masani, a renegade Indian socialist, now ensconced in the cushy post of Mayor of Bombay. The main thesis developed by Mr. Masani was borrowed by him from another renegade from socialism, James Burnham. In other words, Masani's pamphlet is an adaptation of the "managerial revolu-

tion" for Indian consumption. It will be observed that this breed is by no means restricted to the United States but dispersed widely over our planet.

"Socialism Reaffirmed" is a pamphlet written by Lily Roy, one of the leaders of the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India and Ceylon. With this issue we begin the publication of this brilliant and annihilating reply to an Indian Burnhamite by an Indian Trotskyist.

Twenty-five years ago, in the wake of the seizure of power by the Russian proletariat and in the midst of that vast upsurge throughout Europe and America which shook the power-structure of a capitalism whose very foundations had been undermined by the cataclysm of war, a veritable flood of petty bourgeois intellectuals flowed into the proletarian revolutionary movement. As the proletariat moved towards the seizure of power, the petty bourgeois moved towards the proletariat. Which was not strange: for whatever be the current bible of the petty bourgeois intellectuals, power is always their God!

For nearly fifteen years these "fellow travelers" of the revolutionary proletarian movement interpreted, or rather, subtly misinterpreted to the world their new faith, "Marxism." The book-stalls were littered with their sumptuous publications, against the bright yellow background of whose blurb-filled dust-covers the titles flamed in bold red letters. Appropriately—as any Freudian would have said: for behind their red-lettered boldness there still continued the yellow-hearted cowardice which ever characterizes the petty bourgeois worshippers of established power.

Then, history took a turn. Betrayed by the Second International and led down wrong paths by the Third, the revolutionary proletarian movement was smashed in Europe. Fascism rose like a flood. And when, in 1933, the most powerful proletariat in capitalist Europe—the German proletariat—betrayed by Stalin's Comintern itself, let Hitler into power without striking a blow, and underwent a smashing defeat, the already hesitant fellow-travellers began definitely to retreat. To whom the power, to him the petty bourgeois. The intellectuals began to return to the bourgeois fold.

## Intellectuals in Retreat

Nevertheless a section still clung on—not to the proletariat, however, but to the Red Czar in the Kremlin. Stalin still held power over one-sixth of the globe; and the petty bourgeois worships power. Stalin was ruthless; and the petty bourgeois admires ruthlessness. And Stalin was abandoning the international revolution—which the petty bourgeois too was doing. Above all, Stalin was willing to pay—and the petty bourgeois intellectual in particular, must live. So he clung to Stalin. Filling the world with syllogistic proofs of the correctness of the theory of "socialism in one country," they marched out of the revolutionary proletarian movement straight into the "Friends of the Soviet Union." Paeans of uncritical praise for Soviet productive achievements became the order of the day. Slander of Trotsky became a paying proposition. And all Bohemia stood breathless, if unconvinced, before the acrobatic agility with which they "proved" that if indeed their present actions were not consistent with what Karl Marx had actually *said*, they certainly were consistent with what Karl Marx had *really meant*. After all, wasn't Marx a "very obscure" writer whom only the intellectuals could understand—and "interpret"!

History unmasking every charlatany sooner or later. And history certainly unmasked these charlatans before long. For with the coming into power of Hitler the second imperialist world war came on the order of the day. And war permits of no middle positions—you are either on this side or on that: the side of the imperialists or the side of the revolutionary proletariat. For five years the intellectuals sought to dodge the choice—via popular frontism. But when Stalin failed in this maneuver to trade the international revolutionary movement for an alliance with the "democratic" imperialists and allied himself with Hitler instead, the intellectuals held up their hands

in horror and fled—to the bourgeoisie and to a new and, of course, paying pastime. The "unmasking" of Soviet reality became the prevalent fashion. The Kremlin Czar was still red—but only with blood. The Soviet Constitution, but lately hailed by them as "the most democratic in the world," was now discovered to be a fraud (which indeed it was). Democracy was in danger; freedom in peril. The Soviet Union had neither. So, down with the Soviet Union!

Thus the retreat of the intellectuals became a rout. But some among them, anxious to preserve some appearance at least of intellectual integrity, sought to cover their retreat, not indeed with a rear-guard action, but with a smoke-screen of new philosophical constructions. Littering their theses with a welter of verbiage about "socio-economic considerations" and such like, they set about "proving" that the issue was not socialism at all but Democracy (with a capital "D"). And as for the Soviet Union—why, the issue was simple. Hitler is a dictator; so is Stalin. Hitler murders his opponents; so does Stalin—on an even vaster scale. Hitler allows only one party, his own; so does Stalin. And above all, Hitler and Stalin are allies. Therefore—yes, *therefore* the Soviet Union and the Third Reich are states of one and the same order! Down with totalitarianism! Long live Democracy!

The subtlest effort thus to assimilate two essentially different social systems into the same category has been made by James Burnham, current darling of the neo-intellectuals. In a book entitled *The Managerial Revolution*, he seeks to prove that the alternative to the capitalist state is not the socialist state but the "managerial state"; the capitalist class will be replaced not by the working class but by a "new" "class," the managerial class. This is what has happened in the Soviet Union, and this is what has happened in Germany. And this, despite Marx—or is it because of Marx?—is what the socialist movement and a victory of the proletariat will lead to. The socialist ideal is a mirage and the proletarian dictatorship a myth. The reality will be the managerial state, i.e., a middle class heaven. For, here, that stratum in modern society which is hired by the capitalists to run the productive system they own and which is known as the new middle class will not only manage but rule!

It is plain that the managerialist thesis is one of the subtlest attacks on the socialist movement yet made. For if socialism is not the alternative to capitalism, then why a socialist movement at all? And if the proletarian overthrow of the bourgeois power cannot lead to the establishment of a proletarian power but only to the placing in power of a new bureaucratic "class," then why a proletarian revolution at all? What a brilliant justification for retreating intellectuals and renegade socialists! How simply it paves the way for a return by them to the service of the bourgeoisie! It will surprise nobody that the author of this thesis, James Burnham, is a renegade socialist who is in the service of the bourgeoisie.

The managerialist thesis has now found its way to India—appropriately enough also through a renegade "socialist," Mr. M. R. Masani. This gentleman was once a leading light of the Congress Socialist Party but later retired from politics. That retirement he fully observed right through the dangerous days of the August struggle. When Gandhi launched his fast, however, Mr. Masani suddenly emerged from his retirement, issued a Manifesto, led a demonstration towards the Aga Khan's palace, and was duly arrested. The sheer bravery of his conduct was in due course recognized by the Congress Party in the Bombay Municipality; for, on his return from prison, they promptly elected him Mayor of Bombay. It is

after this that his "*Socialism Reconsidered*" saw the light of day. And from that day unto this, despite his retiring nature, both he and his book have been well in the limelight. The bourgeois press has seen to that!

We do not grudge Mr. Masani his popularity among the Congress high-ups. The laborer is worthy of his hire! But it is necessary that Mr. Masani himself should realize what this popularity signifies. Congress is the political party of the Indian bourgeoisie. Those who are popular in its circles are not those who serve the cause of socialism but those who betray it. And when a socialist finds himself acclaimed as "brilliant," "detached," "impartial," etc. in the Congress press let him be sure that his socialism somehow dovetails with the bourgeois interest. And despite his protestations that he is still a socialist and seeking to serve its cause by reconsidering its alleged fundamentals, Mr. Masani does serve the bourgeois interest in his book. For in it he performs the acrobatic feat of "proving" that the only way to reach socialism is not through the abolition of the bourgeoisie but actually through their preservation! No bourgeois can demand more than that of any "socialist."

How does Mr. Masani perform this really astounding feat of intellectual acrobatics? Through the application of the bourgeois law of trusteeship! (Isn't that really clever—to use the bourgeois law against the bourgeoisie themselves?) It is worth quoting Mr. Masani at length.

"Trusteeship in law is the ownership of property by A under such circumstances that he is bound to use the property for the benefit of B, who is called the beneficiary. If trustee A should in any way misuse his legal ownership by seeking to make any personal gain out of it, the law sees to it that he is removed from possession. A's property rights are, to put it bluntly, a legal fiction. Applying this to the rights of property owners generally, what the theory of trusteeship comes to is that the state allows the present owners of property to continue in possession only on condition that they use the property for the benefit and profit of the entire community. Any property owner who uses his property primarily for private profit would be removed from possession on the ground of breach of trust. In other words, it is a concept in which the capitalist is defunctionalized. It is a repudiation of the entire capitalist conception of property rights. The owner must produce in his factory the kind of goods and the quantity of goods that he is asked to by the state, he must pay his workers the wages which are dictated by the state and he must sell his product at prices fixed by the state. *All he would get would be a five or six percent dividend.*" (Our emphasis.)

Isn't the matter crystal clear? The capitalist shall not use his property "primarily for private profit." But he shall get a "five or six percent dividend"! Do you see the distinction? Or don't you? Not *profit* but—*dividend!* This is more than acrobatics: this is veritably magic. You cover profits with your hat and you produce in its place—dividends! We cannot help asking Mr. Masani whether capitalist companies pay their dividends from any other source than precisely, profits. We would also like to ask Mr. Masani whether there is any modern big capitalist who would not be satisfied with a steady, guaranteed "five or six percent" profit, howsoever it be designated. The American rate of profit, that is to say, the rate of profit in the most advanced capitalist country in the world, had long fallen below this level before the war. So also Britain's, France's, Germany's. Which is precisely why German capitalism turned to fascism, and French, British and American capitalism developed strong fascist tendencies. Which is precisely why they also went to war. For fascism is but declining capitalism's internal means of raising the rate of profit by

brutally breaking down working class resistance; while war is an external means of doing the same thing by acquiring new markets for exploitation. It is a pity, therefore, that Mr. Masani was not there to advise international capitalism. He would on the one hand have saved the world from fascism and war and he would, on the other, have converted the capitalist dream of "five or six percent" into a reality. Wherefore, no doubt, international capitalism would have made him its trustee and the world would have acclaimed him its saviour. "All" indeed, Mr. Masani—and what an all!

## "Defunctionalizing" Capitalism

So Mr. Masani's "trustees" are to get private profit after all—and a guaranteed profit at that! What then happens to his celebrated "trustee A"? This estimable gentleman, you will remember, is to be promptly dispossessed by the "law," i.e. by the state, if he should "misuse" his property for "personal gain," i.e. for his private profit instead of the profit of the beneficiary. We now have the self-same gentleman, generalized into a capitalist class which acts as the trustee of the community, being allowed, nay guaranteed, "five or six percent" personal gain. In other words, the very person who was to be *denied* personal gain is now to be *entitled* precisely to personal gain. Another feat of acrobatics!—or should we say legerdemain? Have it which way you will; the point is that Mr. Masani's original "trustee A" has simply dropped out of the picture—and that in the very passage in which he was introduced.

However that may be, Mr. Masani would have us believe that this "trusteeship" of his is "a concept in which the capitalist is defunctionalized." And how? The specific function of the capitalist is precisely the *acquisition of private profit*. If then you expressly guarantee him his "five or six percent," how is he defunctionalized? On the contrary, do you not maintain him precisely in this his anti-social function? For the *source of capitalist private profit is unpaid labor, i.e. the capitalist exploitation of the worker*. All profit, we must stress, and not merely some or "excessive" profits as Mr. Masani would seem to imply with his supposedly low rate which turns out actually to be high. The source of all profit, whether high or low, is unpaid labor, i.e. the exploitation of the worker. If therefore you guarantee the capitalist his "five or six percent" profit, you guarantee to him precisely this very right which is *the basic right of capitalism—the right of exploiting the worker*. That is the grim reality which all the confused verbiage about penalizing property owners who use their property "*primarily for private profit*" (secondarily would apparently not matter), is designed to cover.

According to Mr. Masani, however, his concept is "a repudiation of the entire capitalist conception of property rights"—the entirety, note you: Mr. Masani is nothing if not thoroughgoing; he is satisfied with no mere encroachment. And how is it a "repudiation"? Because in his dispensation the capitalist "must produce in his factory the kind of goods and the quantity of goods that he is asked to by the State, he must pay his workers the wages which are dictated by the State and he must sell his products at prices which are fixed by the State." Does it not all sound like Utopia come true? But let us look at the matter a little more closely than is suitable for Mr. Masani.

It is indeed a *part* (but neither the entirety nor the *essence*) of the capitalist conception of property rights that the capitalist is entitled to produce what he wills when he wills. He is

entitled to do so: but, and that is the point, he *cannot* do so! For profit is his motive and profit is his aim. Therefore, whatever he be entitled to produce, what he *must* produce is *that which will enable him to make a profit*. And this, under the competitive capitalist system, may well be wheat at one stage, gramophones at another, and bombs always. Hence the necessity to the capitalist of the property right of producing what he wills when he wills. But *if the state guarantees to him his profit on condition that he produces what the state wants, then this right is simply not necessary to him at all*. On the contrary, he will gladly produce what the state wills. For his object—the acquisition of private profit—is achieved precisely thereby, inasmuch as his profit is guaranteed. We know of no capitalist who would not readily give up “the capitalist conception of property rights” for Mr. Masani’s conception. No capitalist, we say: for, on the one hand, a sure “five or six percent” is the current bourgeois dream, and, on the other, Mr. Masani’s “repudiation” of the capitalist conception of property rights turns out to be nothing but a *reaffirmation of the one basic capitalist property right of them all*—the right of appropriating private profit, i.e. the right of exploiting the worker.

Thus every time Mr. Masani purports to be catching his capitalist by the throat it turns out that he is only clinging to his coattails. This appears also from certain further considerations arising from the self-same classic passage in his brochure which we are now studying. Mr. Masani declares, as we have seen, that the capitalist is to “produce in his factory the kind of goods and the quantity of goods that he is asked to by the State, . . . pay his workers the wages which are dictated by the State and . . . sell his products at prices which are fixed by the State.” For doing all this, the reader will remember, our capitalist, who is to receive no “personal gain,” is to receive a presumably impersonal “five or six percent dividend.” Now all this sounds idyllic so long as it is not analyzed.

The State is to determine the goods to be produced. No capitalist will quarrel with that—at “five or six percent.” The State is also to dictate wages and fix prices: which sounds terribly determined, for presumably the capitalist will have to be forced (non-violently, of course) on that. But let us see. The State has guaranteed “five or six percent” to the capitalist. So the State must ensure the capitalist this. How can it do so? Only in one way: by “dictating” wages at a level low enough and “fixing” prices at a level high enough to ensure the capitalist a “five or six percent” profit, that is to say, by *exploiting the toiler mass for the capitalist benefit*. There is no other way.

Mr. Masani may, perhaps, suggest subsidies; but subsidies work out to the same thing—as can be easily demonstrated. The funds for subsidies can come only from taxation. Then who is to be taxed for the purpose? Industry itself? In that case it will simply be included in the cost of production when the price which is to ensure “five or six percent” is calculated. The working class? In that case it will only amount to a proportionate reduction in wages. Is it then to come from the capitalist class itself? If so, the capitalist class must have the income from which the tax is to be drawn. This it can have only if it already has a profit. And how can this be ensured? Only in the way we have pointed out: by dictating wages at a level low enough and fixing prices at a level high enough to ensure to the capitalist the guaranteed rate of profit. By *dictating*, we say: only not in the Masanian sense or to the Masanian “trustee.” The State will have to dictate—*low wages to the workers and high prices to the community*. Which also—let us give Mr. Masani his due—constitutes another acrobatic feat on his part. He set out with a State which would compel

the capitalist to act as a trustee on behalf of the community. He ends up with a State which, far from compelling the capitalists to be trustees for the community, is itself compelled to act as *the trustee for the capitalists against the community*.

And all this because of that historic “all,” the “five or six percent dividend” which Mr. Masani thoughtfully sandwiched in the middle of his paragraph explaining “trusteeship.” Profits are what is hidden in the Masanian wood-pile. What Mr. Masani forgot, overlooked or simply does not understand (Mr. Masani can take his choice; so can the reader) is that capitalist profit *derives* from capitalist exploitation. *You cannot preserve capitalist profit without preserving capitalist exploitation*. Or, if you wish it that way, you cannot preserve capitalist profit and abolish capitalist exploitation. All of which goes to show that not even Mr. Masani, or his renegade mentors, can square the capitalist circle. For, although Mr. Masani “allows” the present owners of property to continue in possession only on condition that they use the property for the benefit and profit of the “entire community,” he also “allows” them “five to six percent” profit. But the “five or six percent profit” can come only from the exploitation of the community—as we have shown. And not even Mr. Masani would argue that the exploitation of the community for the benefit of a section is “for the benefit and profit of the entire community”—indeed he is very strong on this self-same exploitation in contemporary Russia and is out to show us how to prevent it. In other words, capitalist private profit and “the benefit and profit of the entire community” are irreconcilable opposites. The former is an infraction of the latter. Wherefore, the protection of the latter demands, not the perpetuation of the former, but its abolition. And this can be done, as we shall see, not by maintaining capitalist private property, but only by *abolishing* it.

So much for Mr. Masani’s attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable, viz., the profits of the capitalists and the benefit of the community. It is necessary now to look a little closer at the magic weapon with which this historic feat is to be performed.

That weapon, we have already noted, is the State. Mr. Masani’s State is to square the capitalist circle. It will do so by allowing the capitalist that celebrated “all” on the one hand, viz., “five or six percent dividend,” and by compelling him, on the other, to produce “the kind of goods and the quantity of goods that he is asked to by the State,” to pay his workers “the wages which are dictated by the State,” and to sell his product “at prices which are fixed by the State.” This is Mr. Masani’s ideal State for India, the State which will do all these things. And presumably this State is specifically Eastern since Mr. Masani has some hard words to say about the “slave mentality” of the Indian intelligentsia “which expresses itself specifically in an exaggerated deference towards intellectual leaders in the West.”

Paradoxically enough, however, Mr. Masani’s ideal State of the Indian future has already come into existence in the very West that he apparently abhors. There is in Europe at this very day at least one State which claims to do, nay, actually does precisely what Mr. Masani would have his ideal State do. That is to say, it “allows” the capitalists their “dividend,” it determines the kind and quantity of goods the capitalist must produce, it “dictates” the wages to be paid to the workers and it “fixes” the prices to be paid by the community. Yes, it does all these things—*all!* In other words, it answers to every one of Mr. Masani’s careful specifications. Which is this State? If Mr. Masani hasn’t guessed, we shall give the answer. It is the Nazi State.

Adolf Hitler’s Third Reich not only claims to do these

things, it actually does these things. And in fact, it was brought into being precisely to do these things, namely, to ensure German capitalist profit, to regiment German capitalist industry, to dictate German capitalist wages and to fix German capitalist prices. Brought into being by whom? By the German bourgeoisie; more exactly, by the German *big* bourgeoisie, (everyone knows how they financed Hitler and helped him to power).

Incidentally, Hitler also promised in his publications that the Nazis would do still another thing, when they came into power, which Mr. Masani too promises for us in *his* book, when he comes into power with the neo-Gandhians. In reference to his "trustees" who are to receive that celebrated "all," viz., "five or six percent dividend," Mr. Masani also tells us vaguely: "the maximum permitted to such 'trustees' would not exceed twelve times the prevailing minimum." It is important to note, in the first place, that this limitation or qualification is not incorporated at all in his description of his "trustee concept." There, the "five or six percent" remains absolute: no question of any further or alternative limitation through proportion is even introduced; still less is there even a hint whether the "five or six percent" or the "twelve to one" proportion is to prevail in case the former is greater than the latter.

Secondly, the limitation itself is vague beyond understanding. Read grammatically, the sentence means that the maximum income of a "trustee" is not to exceed twelve times the minimum income of a "trustee"—a meaningless limitation, as the minimum itself is not fixed. If read, however, with a later remark of Masani's, that "Gandhi's ratio of twelve to one between maximum and minimum compares favorably with the existing disparity of eighty to one in Russia," his proportion appears to be between that maximum income of a "trustee" and the minimum wage of a worker. If this is indeed the intention, then what a normal big capitalist would have to be allowed is not Mr. Masani's "five or six percent," but something like *one thousandth of one percent*: which raises the question, thirdly, who is to enforce this on the capitalist?

Mr. Masani relies on "moral suasion *plus* State pressure." It is plain, therefore, that he himself does not feel he can rely on "moral suasion" alone. Then, whose State is to bring the "pressure" to bear on the capitalists; not this or that individual capitalist, note you, but on the capitalist class as a whole? The capitalist State? If so, we have the remarkable outcome that the capitalists are to impose upon themselves through their own State this drastic limitation upon, amounting to expropriation of, their own interests! What is this but a return to the very "moral suasion" which Mr. Masani himself, with his "*plus* State pressure," finds insufficient?

Is it then to be some other State? The only alternative to the capitalist State, as we shall prove later in relation to Mr. Masani's managerial thesis, is the workers' state. For, the State is not a disembodied entity but the instrument of a class. If, then, it is to be the workers' State, why should it leave the property in the hands of the capitalist class at all? Indeed, it doesn't; it expropriates them: which is why, as we shall see, Mr. Masani, who objects to expropriation of the capitalists, also objects to the workers' state itself. All of which leads us to our last point in this connection. Just like Mr. Masani with his "defunctionalization," Hitler too promised to abolish "the thralldom of interest." The reader knows how Hitler did *that*; so the reader will also know how to evaluate this supposed limitation which Mr. Masani throws in anyhow and nohow into his book. For ourselves, we are compelled to say that it is a typical example of that double book-keeping, which consists of *illusions* for the masses and *protection* for the capitalists, that is charac-

teristic of the Nazi State. Mr. Masani's "twelve to one" ratio, *unlike* his "five to six percent dividend," is both pointless and meaningless.

To return to our argument—we have noted that the Nazi State was brought into existence by the big bourgeoisie. Which raises the question, why did the German big bourgeoisie need such a State? We are sorry to have to say so, but it was precisely because of Mr. Masani's "five or six percent." The German capitalist rate of profit had long fallen below this level (as we have previously noted), and unless it was restored, German capitalism was faced with collapse. And how could it be restored? Only by driving down German wages to bare subsistence level, on the one hand, and extending German markets throughout the world, on the other. And this signified, internally, intensified class exploitation, externally intensified competition leading to—war.

All the world knows how thoroughly the Nazi State carried out these tasks for the German big bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, Mr. Masani would have us believe that somehow or other the Nazi State is not a capitalist State, nor the contemporary German economy a capitalist economy. Here are his very words:

"Neither Russia nor Germany today are capitalist countries in any strict sense of the word. If you have any doubt about Germany, you have only to read Burnham's book, Peter Drucker's *End of Economic Man*, Freda Uteley's *The Dream We Lost*. 'Almost the only freedom left to the German employer is to put his name on the firm's stationary,' says Geoffrey Crowther, editor of the *Economist*, putting the matter in a nutshell."

In a nutshell indeed! The German employer has, it seems, lost his freedom. Freedom to do what? To produce what he wants, apparently. If this is what makes a country cease to be capitalist "in any strict sense of the word," we would like to ask Mr. Masani a question. Has the contemporary British employer the freedom to produce what he wants? We shall answer for Mr. Masani: No, he has to produce what the State directs according to the needs of the war. Has contemporary Britain then ceased to be capitalist? We don't know how Mr. Masani would answer this question; but we do know the correct answer. It is a capitalist state organized for war. It directs what is to be produced for the war it is conducting in the collective interests of the capitalist class. And it ensures them a profit from the very destruction they have organized by paying for the products according to the formula "costs plus," i.e. costs *plus* an appointed rate of profit. Doesn't this, too, sound like Mr. Masani's "trustee capitalist" state? We don't think he would wish us to enquire too closely. So we shall return to his managerial thesis.

We are told that the German employer has lost the freedom to produce what he wants. But is this true? What the German employer, or any other employer for a matter of that, wants to produce is that which will bring him a profit. And this, the German employer produces. For the State gives him the orders and the State pays him for the product—with an assured margin of profit. (Costs plus is clearly not a British but a Nazi invention.) There's the rub—the assured margin of profit. For how does the State assure him the appointed margin of profit? Why, by the methods already pointed out, viz., by dictating wages at a level low enough and fixing prices at a level high enough to ensure the difference. That is the point, Mr. Masani, precisely the point. For it *proves* that the German employer still has the one freedom which he prizes, the one freedom which is basic to his existence, viz., the freedom to make profits, i.e. the freedom to exploit the worker.

(To Be Continued)

# Books and Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

## IN DEFENSE OF MARXISM

*(Against the Petty-Bourgeois Opposition)*

Trotsky's last works, contained in this invaluable volume, are among the most lucid expositions of the Marxist methods of thinking and the Bolshevik principles of organization. Presenting the Fourth International's analysis of the Soviet Union and the reasons for the defense of the U.S.S.R. against imperialist attack, Trotsky wrote these articles and letters which stand out as the most brilliant Marxist polemic against the petty-bourgeois revisionists who broke away from the Socialist Workers' Party in 1939-40.

240 pages, cloth \$2.00, paper \$1.50

## LEON SEDOV

A memorial tribute by Trotsky to his son and comrade.

32 pages, paper \$.10

## FASCISM—

• What it is • How to fight it!

*with an introduction by E. R. Frank*

This pamphlet includes sections of the writings of Leon Trotsky on fascism, under what conditions it is organized, what classes support it, who controls the fascist movement, the aims—and purposes of—fascism and how the working class can organize to crush it.

The pamphlet also includes a timely introduction on the significance and purpose of the recent trial of fascists in Washington and the problem of fascism in the United States.

48 pages, paper \$.15

## WAR AND THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

A fundamental document on the war—the product of capitalism—and the only program capable of eliminating it, the program of Revolutionary Socialism. The draft thesis of the International Communist League (precursor of the Fourth International) adopted by the International Secretariat in 1934.

36 pages, paper \$.10

## LESSONS OF OCTOBER

The most concise exposition ever written of Lenin's strategy in the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 and the opposition it encountered among some of the other leaders of the Russian Communist Party. Trotsky relates his analysis of the 1917 victory in Russia to the 1923 defeats in Germany and Bulgaria.

125 pages, cloth \$1.00, paper \$.75

## WHITHER FRANCE

Trotsky's writings on the French political and economic crisis from 1934 to 1936 which culminated in the great mass strike of May-June 1936. It includes the article—which the Blum government tried to suppress—urging the French workers to form Committees of Action leading to Soviets of workers and peasants.

160 pages, cloth \$1.00, paper \$.75

## IN DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

*A Compilation: 1927-1937*

A collection of writings and speeches intended to establish the *reality* of the author's standpoint. From them the reader can judge the extent to which Trotsky's real position corresponds to the real interests of the working class movement in general, and specifically, to the interests of the Soviet Union and its unconditional defense against imperialist attack.

40 pages, paper \$.10

## THEIR MORALS AND OURS

The first systematic exposition of the Marxist conception of the relation between means and ends as a dialectical interrelation. A revealing contrast of the anti-working class morals of the petty-bourgeois intellectuals with the Bolshevik morals which they condemn.

48 pages, paper \$.20

## STALINISM AND BOLSHEVISM

This great essay by Trotsky lays bare the fraudulent contention that Stalinism and Bolshevism are the same or that Stalinism grew out of "errors" inherent in Bolshevism.

40 pages, paper \$.10

# PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.