

DISCUSSION BULLETIN

A-31

October 1955

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. Motion adopted by the September 1955 Plenum	1
2. The Third Chinese Revolution and Its Aftermath (Discussion Draft)	2
3. The Rise of the Colonial Bourgeoisie (Discussion Draft)	15

Published by the
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

30¢

MOTION ADOPTED BY THE SEPTEMBER, 1955 PLENUM

1. To approve the general line of the three draft sections of the international resolution entitled: The Third Chinese Revolution and Its Aftermath (as amended); The Rise of the Colonial Bourgeoisie; and The Soviet Union Today.

2. To submit the three drafts for general party discussion, with the members of the National Committee free to express any differences they may have in the internal discussion.

3. To instruct the PC to complete the remaining draft sections of the international resolution dealing with the United States, Europe, Latin America, the crisis of proletarian leadership, tasks and perspectives; and that, after preliminary submission to the NC, these remaining draft sections and other International Committee discussion material be submitted for general party discussion.

* * * *

THE THIRD CHINESE REVOLUTION
AND ITS AFTERMATH

(DISCUSSION DRAFT)

The Third Chinese Revolution drove out the Kuomintang regime, ended a century of imperialist freebooting in China. It carried through the tasks of the belated bourgeois democratic revolution, put an end to the country's dismemberment, uprooted the landlord and usurer domination of agriculture, destroyed the Asian relations in the family and swept away other feudalistic rubbish. The country has advanced materially and culturally; has undertaken a struggle against illiteracy, campaign against filth and vermin, etc.

The Third Chinese Revolution has abolished the capitalist state; instituted planning on the basis of government-ownership of the key branches of industry, finance, credit; and introduced the monopoly of foreign trade.

By reason of its conquests, the revolution tore China out of the orbit of imperialism, dealing world capitalism an irreparable blow. It drastically altered the world relation of forces between:

- a) the imperialist powers and the colonial and semi-colonial countries;
- b) the capitalist countries and the Soviet bloc;
- c) Stalinism and the Social Democracy; and finally
- d) confronted Stalinism with changing interrelations and new contradictions within its world-wide apparatus.

For the revolutionary vanguard a number of new problems have been thereby posed. We must assay the scale, weight and tempo of the Third Chinese Revolution and the resulting class relations, as well as the limitations imposed by the Stalinist leadership, by the country's heritage of backwardness, by the continued pressure of imperialism and the Kremlin bureaucracy.

The fate of the Third Chinese Revolution, as of mankind, hinges on the extension of the revolution to the advanced capitalist countries. This in turn depends in no small measure on the ability of the workers' vanguard to defend the revolutionary conquests in China as elsewhere, to foresee the dangers to them, internally and externally, warn against them in time, and in general guide the workers toward fusing their socialist struggle with the conquests of the Soviet and Chinese masses, thereby assuring the final triumph of the world socialist order.

The Chinese Revolution and Imperialism

In the sphere of international politics the Third Chinese Revolution has determined in a new way the postwar class relations and forces.

China was the chief prize for which the U.S. had fought the war in the Pacific. With the defeat of Japan, the U.S. monopolists expected to take over China and rule the country through Chiang Kai-shek. In this spacious, undeveloped land they saw a solution to the postwar economic problems of American capitalism. Here was a matchless field for capital investments, a potential market for consumer goods, a rich reservoir of raw materials, an overflowing source of cheap labor. What the U.S. believed it had won in the war and at Yalta, the revolution took instead.

The overturn of 1947-1949 blotted out the political and territorial isolation of the Soviet Union. It added almost four million square miles and a population of over 550 million to the Soviet pole of world economy. China and the USSR together represent an unbroken land mass of 12.2 million square miles, nearly one-fifth of the earth's surface, with a combined population of over 750 million. These bare statistics indicate the international impact of the Third Chinese Revolution.

This revolution proved its power on the world arena. It was China's revolutionary armies that hurled MacArthur's forces back from the Yalu and compelled the U.S. to abandon its plans for the conquest of all Korea. It was the material aid furnished by China, not to speak of the inspiring example her revolution furnishes, that helped Viet Minh to score its victory over imperialism.

The emergence of China, through the revolution, from semi-colonial degradation to the position of a world power -- and by this token, the tearing from the imperialist orbit of a huge human and land mass, along with Manchuria, Tibet, North Korea, North Indo-China has modified the international relationship of forces, especially the social relations throughout the colonial pole of capitalism.

The impact of the Chinese Revolution on the colonial masses has forced the native bourgeoisies to raise the banner of "neutralism." Nehru personifies this neutralism on the world arena today, just as Gandhi personified passive resistance on Indian soil, and for the same reason, fear of the masses. The native bourgeoisie can remain in power only insofar as it is able to neutralize the Chinese revolution, that is, keep the permanent revolution confined within China's borders.

The Chinese Revolution and the Imminence of War

The Third Chinese Revolution had other consequences. The wartime alliance between the "democratic" imperialists and the Kremlin bureaucracy broke up when the imperialists decided they no longer needed the Kremlin's aid in containing the European revolution. The imperialists were prepared to take the offensive against the European working class, when the Asian masses imposed on them a struggle on another front. In this struggle, the cold war became punctuated by bloody localized wars -- Indo-China, Korea, Malaya, etc.

The Asian masses were mainly responsible for the postponement of the projected imperialist assault upon the USSR; the U.S. has been forced instead to prepare for a war of far greater scope.

With the new world relation of forces determined in the main by the Third Chinese Revolution the imperialists could no longer be sure of victory in World War III. U.S. strategy, military and diplomatic, has consequently pursued the attainment of overwhelming global superiority.

The Chinese Revolution and the Social Democracy

The Stalinists in Peking, as in Moscow, have used and will continue to use the Third Chinese Revolution in order to improve their relations with the Social Democrats in Britain, as elsewhere. There is nothing the classic reformists hate and fear more than the revolution. They demonstrated this in the course of the Chinese upheaval. They supported the imperialist intervention in Korea. Therein was expressed their dread of the spread of the Chinese revolution. They could make peace with the Chinese revolution and pretend friendship for it only after Peking avowed its narrow nationalist objectives and when it served the interests of their respective bourgeoisies. A junket to China, an appeal for co-existence, is a cheap price for a left cover, especially when Peking foots the bills.

The Chinese Revolution and the Kremlin Bureaucracy

The Chinese Revolution has confronted the Kremlin bureaucracy with new interrelations where previously it has ruled unchallenged and uncontrolled within the monstrous international apparatus of Stalinism. The Kremlin bureaucracy was the sole "World Leader," lone repository of all knowledge, wisdom, authority, etc., etc. Moscow's political monopoly has been irretrievably lost. Today Peking has at least equal voice and weight.

The world "monolith" of Stalinism has already been carved up into respective spheres of influence by Moscow and Peking, creating unforeseen problems for both partners. Mao & Co. is as nationalist as Khrushchev & Co., but each operates on a different national soil. Imbedded therein are seeds of dissension. The very fact that Peking must rely so heavily on Moscow for economic and military equipment, makes Mao & Co. more dependent on the one hand and more resentful on the other.

In line with Stalin's program of socialism in one country, the Communist parties the world over subordinated their interests to the diplomatic requirements of the Kremlin. The Mao bureaucracy too aims to build "socialism" in its country. It can no longer subordinate its interests to the interests of the Kremlin. Its material base is no longer derived from Moscow but from its own state power.

The Chinese revolution has imposed on the Kremlin an alliance with the most populous agricultural nation on the globe

which has weighty needs -- capital goods, heavy equipment for industry, for transportation, mining and agriculture plus equipment to modernize her armed forces. All the things the Kremlin urgently needs itself. After decades of effort to compress Soviet productive forces into the narrow national limits, the Kremlin bureaucracy is suddenly faced with the need to plan in accordance with its new interstate obligations, in the first instance to China.

These are new contradictions shearing the web of the old contradictions of Stalinism and aggravating its crisis.

The Permanent Revolution On Chinese Soil

The Trotskyist line in China flows from the following basic propositions:

The Chinese bourgeoisie, represented by the Kuomintang, would not and could not carry through the tasks of belated democratic revolution, first and foremost solve the land problem and unify the country.

This could be accomplished only by class-struggle methods, only in head-on struggle against imperialism and against the native bourgeoisie, a temporary, unreliable ally at best.

Regardless of the episodic leadership at the time, once the revolution entered its democratic sequences, it could not be restricted within capitalist limits, but would transgress and transcend them.

Once the revolution unfolded on Chinese soil, it could not remain within national boundaries but would leap over into other lands.

Finally, the triumph of the Chinese revolution depends on the victory of the workers in the advanced countries.

These fundamental propositions of Trotskyism were confirmed in the negative during the Second Chinese Revolution, and during the mass upsurges up to 1947; they were confirmed in the affirmative by the Third Chinese Revolution of 1947-49 and its aftermath. The 1925-27 revolution was wrecked by the Menshevik theory of "revolution by stages" which proclaimed that China was not ready for proletarian dictatorship, that the native bourgeoisie had a progressive mission and a leading role to fulfill in the democratic revolution. The Stalinist class-collaborationist line of the "bloc of the four classes," completely subordinated the working class to the bourgeoisie rejected and resisted agrarian reform in order to enlist the landlord support.

In the struggle of the Russian Left Opposition against Stalinist degeneration the issue of China was next in importance only to that of the USSR. The split of the world Communist movement came as the consequence of it, a split that led to the founding of the Fourth International.

The defeat of the Second Chinese Revolution imposed the bloody dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek for the next twenty years. In the course of these decades, the Chinese bourgeoisie exposed itself as an agency of foreign imperialism; the enemy of the Chinese masses incapable of granting any concessions or reforms, or ruling by democratic means; so inept and corrupt that they lost all support in the population, remaining in power only thanks to U.S. imperialism on the one hand, and Stalin, Mao & Co. on the other. Washington supplied funds and arms for Chiang's bloody dictatorship, the Stalinists subjugated the masses to him by their policy.

Mao & Co. -- A Fetter on the Chinese
Revolution

By the end of 1936 the Japanese armies conquered the coastal areas of China and extended their tentacles into the mainland; the masses were in open revolt against Chiang. Thousands of strikes and demonstrations of students and workers took place in the cities; the peasants rose in the countryside. The struggle against the foreign invader thus tended to merge with a war against the native oppressor. Chiang took to the hills, with him a section of the Chinese bourgeoisie; the rest, the landlords in particular, cuddled up to the Japanese. Everything that was vigorous and resolute in China surged from the cities and towns into the countryside to fight this national revolutionary war.

Meanwhile, Chiang was personally directing the war not against the Japanese but against the Stalinist-dominated territories. He was arrested by the Sian garrison. It was Mao, Chou & Co. who liberated him. Precisely at the height of this movement of the masses the Stalinists also abolished their "Soviets," dissolved their "Red Army," abandoned land reform, in brief, subordinated everything, once again, to class-collaboration, in the name of the anti-Japanese struggle. They pursued this line, a component part of the Yalta agreements, throughout the war.

Following the Japanese surrender, the U.S. with Stalin's agreement, sought to impose the old Kuomintang order. A new upsurge came of the Chinese masses, part of the postwar world revolutionary wave. Once more the Chinese Stalinists, as the Stalinists in Western Europe, resisted the pressure of the workers, peasants, students who rallied under their banner for the showdown fight against the existing order. But unlike the European bourgeoisie, who to save their rule welcomed the Stalinists into their Cabinets, Chiang repulsed their advances. Instead he opened a war of annihilation against Mao & Co.

But as late as March 1947 (the occupation of Yen-an by Chiang's troops), the CCP still did not raise the slogan for the overthrow of Chiang's regime; did not offer the program of agrarian reform. Only on October 10, 1947 was a manifesto issued in the name of the "People's Liberation Army" openly advocating the overthrow of Chiang, the building of "New China," and announcing agrarian reform through the expropriation of the land of landlords and rich peasants, while exempting the land which belonged to "industrial and commercial enterprises."

Even when in self-defense they were compelled to break openly with the Chinese bourgeoisie and landlords, the Stalinists tried to do so within the framework of their bankrupt line of "the bloc of four classes." The exigencies of the civil war imposed upon the CCP the carrying out of democratic tasks, the agrarian reform, the destruction of feudal relations, etc.

Throughout the revolution, Mao & Co. continued to impose arbitrary restrictions and limits upon its course. The agrarian reform was carried out "in stages" and was completed only when the assault of American imperialism stimulated the opposition of the landlords during and after Korea. By imposing arbitrary restraints on the revolution Mao & Co. thereby safeguarded their bureaucratic control over it.

They came into collision with the masses at every ascending sequence of the revolution, at every critical stage. Their objective was to restrict the struggle as much as possible to the military plane. It was above all in this way that they could prevent the Chinese workers from emerging on the arena as an independent force.

The Chinese workers, in big cities and small alike, were demoralized and rendered apathetic by the bureaucratic-military conduct of the civil war, by the deliberate discouragement of workers' struggles, by orders to await liberation through the arrival of the "Liberation Army," by the courting of the "industrial and commercial" capitalists, etc.

The Stalinist Deformation of the Third Chinese Revolution

The Third Chinese Revolution was deformed by the Stalinist leadership and control. The agrarian reform was made to appear as a gift from the bureaucracy to the landless and poor peasants; so was the "Liberation" of the workers; so was the overthrow of the Kuomintang regime; so was the subsequent unfolding of the revolution -- beyond the democratic sequences, beyond capitalist relations -- and the proletarian conquests it brought.

The Stalinist deformation of the revolution rendered its development more costly, convulsive and protracted. The armies and regime of Chiang could have been knocked down like rotten pieces of wood had the CCP at any time summoned the masses in the cities to rise. The Chinese Stalinists were able to rise into power because the Chinese working class had been demoralized by the continuous defeats it suffered during and after the Second Chinese Revolution, and by the deliberate policy of the CCP, which subordinated the cities, above all, the proletariat to the military struggle in the countryside and thereby blocked the emergence of the workers as an independent political force. The CCP thus appeared in the eyes of the masses as the only organization with political cadres and knowledge, backed, moreover, by military force.

The CCP leaders are declassed petty-bourgeois, their cadres were trained in the course of the long history of CCP's struggles against the permanent revolution, coupled with the systematic physical annihilation of Trotskyists. Schooled in Stalinism, they started taking shape as a bureaucracy in the course of this struggle.

After the defeat of the Second Chinese Revolution, they withdrew from the cities and established an armed peasant base. For a span of over 20 years, they used this armed power to rule over the backward and scattered peasant masses. In this manner the uncontrolled, cynical, self-willed bureaucracy consolidated. They applied to the revolution the methods of deceit and ultimatism, in order, at every stage, to safeguard their interests, their power, their privileges. Each success rendered them more contemptuous and fearful of the masses, more convinced they could cheat the class struggle with impunity.

Their great asset was the link in the popular mind with the 1917 Russian Revolution. The masses felt they were repeating on China's soil what the Russian workers and peasants had done. The prestige of the Soviet Union, coupled with Soviet industrial successes and Soviet victories in World War II, proved decisive in aiding Mao & Co. to maintain their political monopoly over the revolution. To safeguard this monopoly they physically annihilated every oppositional element, first and foremost, the Chinese Trotskyists. The blowing up of Chen Tu-hsiu's grave epitomizes the Maoist fear of the day of reckoning for their crimes of 1925-27, repeated from 1936-47, which sustained Chiang's rule so long.

The Permanent Revolution Prevails

What prevailed in China was not Mao's program; not the line of coalition with Chiang but that of struggle against him; not the solution of democratic tasks hand in hand with Chiang, but by class-struggle methods, even though deformed, against Chiang, against the landlords, against the "bureaucratic" capitalists -- and against imperialism.

Despite Mao's schema that "New China" would follow a course different from that of the 1917 Russian Revolution, in China, as in the USSR, the revolution could not be kept within the capitalist framework, especially not after U.S. military assault and blockade. Mao who began by nationalizing "only bureaucratic capital" had to turn against his capitalist allies, nationalize the key branches of economy, impose the monopoly of foreign trade, institute planning, and mobilize the workers to save the revolutionary conquests.

Despite Mao's attempts to confine the revolution within China's borders and effect an agreement with the imperialists, the revolution could not be contained, the imperialists could not be neutralized.

And finally, the revolution had to be defended against the counter-revolutionary intervention on Korean soil of a coalition of imperialist powers headed by Washington.

The collision of Stalinism with each of the sequences of the permanent revolution on Chinese soil has deformed the revolution and obscured its proletarian nature.

The Class Character of China

When the CCP established itself in power in the fall of 1949, it continued to cling to its program of a "bloc of four classes" and its theory of a "revolution in stages," i.e., the passage of China through an allegedly "new" stage of capitalist development. The ties connecting China with capitalism were cut when the American military forces drove toward the Yalu and the imperialists clamped an economic blockade on China. The CCP was then left no choice except to seize the imperialist assets in the country and to open, at the same time, a campaign against the native capitalists (the "Three-Anti and Five-Anti" movements).

The course of the civil war had, at a preceding stage, forced the Mao bureaucracy to abandon its efforts at a coalition with the Kuomintang and to assume power instead. The objective dynamics, the inner logic of the struggle against imperialist intervention forced the bureaucracy to break with capitalism, nationalize the decisive means of production, impose the monopoly of foreign trade, institute planning, and in this way clear the road for the introduction of production relations and institutions that constitute the foundation of a workers state, which China is today, even though a Stalinist caricature thereof. China is a deformed workers state because of the Stalinist deformation of the Third Chinese Revolution.

The contradiction between the conquests of the revolution and the bureaucratic rulers is the central internal contradiction of Chinese society, determining its movement. At the same time, it is the point of departure for the Trotskyists to base their policy for China.

Revolutionary China is today characterized by the following contradictory relations:

1) China's productive forces are backward; in industry the light goods sector predominates; the economy remains overwhelmingly agricultural and raw-material producing; in consumer goods, trade and other fields capitalist relations dominate "as per plan" -- in brief, China's productive forces are far from adequate to give the statized property a socialist character;

2) the tendency toward capitalist accumulation on the part of native capitalists plus the tendency toward primitive accumulation created by universal want seeps through innumerable pores of the first Five-Year Plan;

3) norms of distribution preserve a bourgeois character and are at the bottom of a new differentiation of Chinese society;

4) the economic growth, while slowly bettering the situation of some sections of the toilers, promotes a swift formation of privileged layers in city and village;

5) in agriculture the ever increasing demand the regime is compelled to make upon the peasants while it is unable to supply them with manufactured goods is bound to bring it into a head-on collision with the peasantry;

6) exploiting the social antagonisms, along with their prestige as leaders of the revolution, the Chinese Stalinist bureaucracy has entrenched itself as an uncontrolled caste alien to socialism;

7) the revolution, deformed by the ruling bureaucracy, manifests its proletarian character in the new property relations and planning; the superiority of these new productive relations and institutions is bound to assure a stormy growth of industry and of the Chinese proletariat, numerically and qualitatively, increasing its specific social weight and bringing it into conflict with Stalinist methods of rule, management and administration; in these new conditions, the young Chinese proletariat will grow not only in skills and culture but above all in socialist consciousness;

8) the Mao regime which appears popular today must come into an evergrowing conflict with the workers who are first awakening to their central role in Chinese society, and who do not suffer from the feeling of isolation and the succession of world defeats which the Russian bureaucracy was able to exploit so successfully;

9) today the Third Chinese Revolution is at an historic turning point, with the Mao leadership seeking to impose on revolutionary China the nationalist course of Stalinism in the Soviet Union;

10) a further development of the accumulating contradictions can just as well lead to socialism as back to capitalism;

11) on the road to capitalism the counter-revolution would have to break the resistance of the awakening and growing Chinese proletariat;

12) on the road to socialism the workers would have to abolish the bureaucracy along with the Mao leadership that now heads it.

China's Future Course

In terms of political organization the Mao bureaucracy succeeded in the very course of the Third Chinese Revolution in imposing a totalitarian state power. They are now seeking to entrench this bureaucratic superstructure on the proletarian foundation, on the conquests of the revolution. This insolvable contradiction, which

characterizes the USSR, and which renders the regime that of permanent crisis, is now being reproduced on Chinese soil, posing before the Chinese workers the iron necessity of political revolution against the bureaucratic caste.

So long as the Chinese revolution faced the tasks of the belated democratic revolution the Peking leadership was able to display unity and cohesion. But the revolution has a logic of its own. The 1955 split in the leadership came precisely at the moment when the regime had to tackle the unpostponable task of industrializing the country.

It had to decide how this was to be accomplished in so backward a country. The Chinese revolution found no extension into the advanced capitalist countries.

How then is this industrialization to be accomplished? China cannot tap the capital resources of world economy -- these remain in the hostile hands of world imperialism, mainly the U. S. The Kremlin can supply, at best, inadequate aid. The remnants of Chinese capitalism can contribute little, if anything, to China's industrialization, despite the new constitution adopted September, 1954 which envisages "four economic" categories:

state-owned property; cooperative property; ownership by "individual working people /read: well-to-do peasants and bureaucrats/;" and capitalist ownership. (Articles 5, 11 and 12).

After six years in power the Mao leadership has staked everything on building a self-sufficient industry, with China's own resources. Unable to find a solution for China's economic needs along the capitalist road, the Mao regime has taken the Soviet economic road.

But there is another reason for this course rooted in the social nature of Stalinism as a declassed petty-bourgeois formation. "The control of the surplus product opened the bureaucracy's road to power" (Trotsky). To secure its income, power and privileges, the bureaucracy must assure itself this monopolistic position as the disposer of the nation's surplus product. "He who disposes of the surplus product has the power of the state at his disposal" (Trotsky).

Lacking a base of its own in the productive process, the Stalinist bureaucracy tends to make alliances with the petty-bourgeoisie. But here again the class struggle asserts itself. The bureaucracy quickly comes into collision with the peasantry. In the matter of the national surplus product the bureaucracy and the petty-bourgeoisie, regardless of the national soil of the revolution, quickly change from allies into foes. Such a collision is shaping up today in China. It is a collision with a 400 million mass of individual cultivators of midget plots.

Under different conditions and peculiarities, Peking's 1955 economic policy reproduces in its basic essentials, the economic policy Stalin originally promulgated for Russia, and for the same basic reasons.

The March 1955 Conference adopted a resolution which sets the following objective:

"In the course of three Five-Year plans we can build a socialist society. However, in order to build a state with a high level of socialist industry, it will require several decades of stubborn and intense work. We can say that it will take fifty years, that is, the second half of the 20th century. Such is the great historic task -- the great and glorious task -- which we must solve." (Leading editorial in April 5, Peking People's Daily as reported by the Moscow Pravda on April 6, 1955.)

For the Stalinist line to triumph in the Soviet Union, a counter-revolution was required. This counter-revolution had to destroy physically the entire generation that led the Russian revolution to victory under Lenin and Trotsky. Before he could impose his bureaucratic regime, Stalin had to destroy the Leninist party and International.

As against this, the same basic cadre under Mao who rode the revolutionary wave to power are now following in Stalin's footsteps in China. For this reason, the implication and consequences, at home and internationally, of Peking's shift in line are far more difficult to understand, especially for the Chinese masses and the rank and file of the Chinese Communist Party.

In the Soviet Union, the issues were debated over many years, and the struggle of the Russian Left Opposition, led by Leon Trotsky, illuminated the nature and meaning of Soviet developments, despite all of Stalin's falsifications, repressions and frame-ups.

The differences over policy in China have been confined to narrow top circles. The disputes are shrouded in secrecy, camouflage and misinformation.

The March 1955 Conference ordered the immediate setting up of nationwide purge machinery -- via the creation of special "control commissions" -- on central, regional, district and local levels. Thus the purge of two of the top leaders (Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih) signaled the introduction of the purge system.

The similarity between Peking's internal regime and that set up by Moscow is further underscored by the recent introduction of ranks and insignia in the Chinese armed forces. This rise of an officer caste epitomizes the process of social stratification that is taking place under the Mao leadership. Unable to satisfy the needs of Chinese workers and peasants, from whom fifty years of toil and sacrifice are now demanded, exhausting its mass base, the regime deliberately seeks to create for itself special points of support, above all in the armed forces. This tendency will become more and more pronounced.

The program of industrialization and the crisis in agriculture compel the Mao bureaucracy to seek the active support of the

Chinese proletariat. But the interests of the bureaucracy collide with the interests of the workers. Moreover, while carrying out the plan, the bureaucracy compels a section of the workers to toil in capitalist enterprises, under working conditions that assure profit to the private owners.

The mobilization of the Chinese working class goes hand and hand with ideological terror against opposition from the left, above all, against the Trotskyists. In a programmatic speech before the National Assembly, September, 1954, Vice-Chairman of the Central People's Government Council, Liu Shao-chi said:

"In order to undermine our cause in building socialism, our cunning enemies hired certain people -- who like Trotskyists and Chen Tu-hsiu-ites -- pretend to be 'Left' but attack our specific steps and measures in carrying out the socialist transformation of our country. They say that we have 'not made a thorough job of it,' that we are 'too compromising' and that we have 'departed from Marxism.' With such nonsense they try to confuse the people. They suggest that we sever our alliance with the national bourgeoisie and immediately deprive them of all they got. They also complain that our agricultural policy is going 'too slow.' They want us to break our alliance with the peasants. Aren't such ideas sheer nonsense? If we did what they want, it would please only the imperialists and traitor Chiang Kai-shek." (People's China, No. 19, 1954, page 17).

This latest attack against the Trotskyists represents the bureaucracy's political preparation for manipulating the struggle of the workers under the new conditions. Mao & Co. never harmonize their program and policies with the tempo of the class struggle, with the needs and aspirations of the masses. On the contrary, the bureaucracy is in constant collision with the masses. Important for the revolutionary left is this, that the bureaucracy itself reveals the profound roots the Trotskyist program has in the working class. And it is this permanent conflict of the regime and the workers that will in the end bring about its downfall.

Peking's New Policy

The Maoist policy at home finds its extension in the foreign policy.

The Stalinist chieftains in China are animated by a twofold fear: the fear of imperialist assault and the fear of the permanent revolution.

Mao & Co. are now continuing an already well-established line of status quo, "peaceful co-existence," etc., for the next "fifty years."

This nationalist policy is bound to have the most reactionary consequences in foreign policy. For it means the policy of "neutralizing" the world bourgeoisie, for the sake of China's industrialization. It means a deliberate course to convert China from the

main bastion of the colonial revolution into a prop for the preservation of imperialist rule in the remaining colonial possessions in Asia and elsewhere and a guarantee to the native bourgeoisie that they can bank on native Stalinists, via Peking and Moscow, to bolster their regime.

The political gist of Peking's economic policy, formally adopted at the March 1955 National Conference is summed up in the proclamation of the "theory" of neutralizing the world bourgeoisie.

At Bandung in April 1955 Chou served notice that the Chinese Stalinists were prepared to derail the colonial revolution for the sake of "socialism in one country" (China) just as Stalin derailed in the post-Lenin era the proletarian revolutions in Western Europe in the name of "socialism in one country" (Russia).

Conclusion

The impact of the Third Chinese Revolution, the social transformations it brought about, the blows it delivered to world capitalism, have been second only to those of the 1917 Revolution in Russia. The "Russian Question" has been the main axis in world politics for nearly four decades; it now has found its extension and deepening in the "Chinese Question."

World imperialism which could never come to any lasting agreements with the Soviet Union is even less capable today of coming to any lasting agreements with the Soviet Union and China who have been thrown together into an alliance which neither Peking nor Moscow dares upset.

If the U.S. imperialists have not waged all-out war against them up to now, it is for one reason, and one reason only -- the test of strength on the Korean battlefields convinced them that they could not win such a war at this time. This is the chief reason for today's stalemate, which can only be temporary. Either U.S. imperialism will plunge into all-out war or the Chinese revolution will find its extension into other countries, above all, the advanced capitalist countries and end capitalism forever.

One thing is certain, there is no solution along the course of the Peking and Kremlin bureaucracies. Their narrow nationalist course, their co-existence line, brings them into conflict with the needs of the world socialist revolution, but it will not save them from imperialist assault. The interests of the working class in the capitalist countries, just as the interests of the workers of China and the Soviet Union are expressed in the program of the permanent revolution, the program upon which the Fourth International is founded.

June 16, 1955

* * * *

THE RISE OF THE COLONIAL BOURGEOISIE

(DISCUSSION DRAFT)

Old colonial forms of imperialist rule could not withstand the hammer blows of the colonial revolution. Parallel with the ascent of revolutionary China, such countries as India, Ceylon, Indonesia, Burma, Pakistan, etc. have gained their independence, with political power passing into the hands of their respective native bourgeoisie.

The imperialist rulers, able in the past to quell with comparative ease the uprisings of unarmed masses, were confronted during and following World War II with revolutionary masses able to enforce their demands arms in hand, arms they acquired in the course of the war and after the Japanese capitulated. This has confronted the imperialists with new problems, and with the search for new forms of domination.

Class relations in the Middle East, Africa and Oceania (Micronesia, Melanesia, Polynesia, etc.) tend to shape up in the same manner as in Asia. With the deepening crisis of outlived capitalism at one pole and the continuing crisis of the proletarian leadership at the other, the native bourgeoisie in these areas as well is impelled to make its bid for power and seek to play an independent role.

The New Relations in the Former Colonies

World War II laid bare the atrophy of old colonial powers, Great Britain, France, Holland and Japan. The colonial masses carried their struggle for independence to a new climax.

The imperialist belligerents had sought to enlist the support of native populations, first and foremost of the native bourgeoisies. The blows Japan dealt militarily to the Western "democracies," its "Asia for the Asians" campaign and the solicitation of support, forced both sides to promise native rule and independence. The masses proceeded to make these promises good.

The old forms of colonial rule had to be sacrificed in order to salvage capitalism. Otherwise, in the struggle for independence, the insurgent masses would, as in China, assault the very foundations of imperialist rule, i.e., foreign investments.

There was another reason why the colonial powers transferred power "peacefully" to some of the native bourgeoisies. Once the U.S. gained the ascendancy among the imperialist powers, it required different forms of domination.

The U.S. monopolists with their overwhelming economic fiscal and military superiority, do not need direct colonial rule, but

primarily an opportunity for economic penetration. Hence their war-time pressure on the old imperialist powers to grant self-rule in the colonies in order thus to enable U.S. capital to penetrate these areas.

To beat back the revolutionary masses who had entered the world arena, and to accommodate itself to U.S. demands, Great Britain yielded political rule to the native bourgeoisie in India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon. In this way London salvaged the main thing: British investments, the "commonwealth union," the sterling bloc, etc.

Wherever the old colonial powers attempted to restore the status quo ante bellum they were taught lessons costly in prestige, money and blood, e.g., the Dutch in Indonesia, the French in Indo-China, Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria and the British in Egypt, Malaya, etc.

This impasse of the old colonial powers mitigates against stability, feeds the colonial revolution and, simultaneously, adds to the frustration and exasperation of U.S. imperialism.

The fraud of Washington's attempts to play the role of an "anti-colonial" power has been exposed by the ferocity of its intervention against the Chinese revolution, by the Korea war, the intervention in Indo-China, the intervention in Guatemala, etc. U.S. pressure in favor of homerule and its backing of colonial depotism are two sides of one and the same policy of counter-revolution, rooted in U.S. imperialism's belated arrival as aspirant to world dominion.

Confronted with an unforeseen situation, above all in Asia, the heart of the colonial sector of world capitalism, U.S. imperialism needs time to make indispensable adjustments, to bolster the shaky positions of the native bourgeoisies in the colonial areas, etc. These and other considerations determine Washington's strategy for Asia and the turn of the Eisenhower administration toward new agreements with Moscow and Peking.

The Bandung Conference

The Bandung Conference of April 24-28, 1955 reflected the present stage of the liberating struggle of the colonial masses, the gains as well as the limitations. Represented were 29 countries of Asia and Africa, well over one-half of the world's population. This conference registered on a global scale the transformations that have already taken place throughout the colonial sector. The Western imperialists were barred from direct participation, so were their most discredited puppets (Chiang Kai-shek and others). The warmest welcome was accorded to the representatives of China, which in the eyes of the colonial people symbolizes the greatest victory thus far over imperialism.

Even Washington's stooges at Bandung had to join in a demonstration against colonialism and, moreover, had to accept the participation of China, while the U.S. continues to refuse to recognize the Peking government.

Bandung was a blow at the imperialist-dominated U.N., discrediting its claim to speak in the name of the former colonial people, and above all of those that still remain under colonial subjection. This inter-continental conference had to solidarize itself with the aspirations and aims of those peoples who still live under "colonialism in many areas of Asia and Africa under whatever form it may take," thereby spurring this struggle.

The limitations of Bandung found their sharpest expression in the dominant role played by the native capitalist politicians representing already established governments and interested primarily in maintaining their class in power. Their doctrine of anti-colonialism constitutes nothing more than opposition to the direct rule of any country by the imperialist powers. It does not connote the uprooting of all imperialist interests in a subject country, least of all, the driving out of imperialist capital already invested in a country which arises out of its colonial status. On the contrary, as Nehru's India, Sukarno's Indonesia, etc., show, their anti-colonialism is completely consistent with the continuance of imperialism's investments in former subject countries.

The anti-colonialism of Nehru and the other native bourgeois rulers rejects the revolutionary uprising of subject people against imperialist rule. In this respect the gist of their anti-colonial doctrine is reform, i.e., an "orderly" transfer of power by the imperialist rulers. Thus the doctrine of Nehru and similar capitalist politicians not only differs from revolutionary anti-colonialism but stands counterposed to it.

From this standpoint Bandung represents an effort by the native bourgeoisies to freeze the colonial revolution within the existing relations and maintain a status quo. Here Peking sees eye to eye with Nehru and the others.

China's emergence as a world power has made the Indian bourgeoisie and other native rulers feel protected in a twofold manner. On the one hand, China's manifest power gives them more bargaining room in relation to the imperialist countries. On the other hand, they use the cover of the Third Chinese Revolution against the masses at home.

Mao's opportunist line helps perpetuate the rule of Nehru and Co. by helping them subjugate the toilers through their bourgeois and petty-bourgeois organizations. In the quest for a status-quo deal with the imperialists the Chinese Stalinists are pursuing abroad the class-collaborationist line of the "bloc of four classes" they pursued so long at home. It is the traditional foreign policy of Stalinism, subordinating the needs of the masses to the needs of the bureaucracy.

National Struggle -- The First Step

National liberation from imperialist rule is indivisible from the permanent revolution. The Third International in its first resolution on the colonial question stated:

"Foreign oppression is a permanent brake upon the free development of every aspect of social life; for this reason the first step of the revolution must be to overthrow foreign rule. To aid the struggle for the overthrow of foreign rule does not mean to underwrite the nationalist aspirations of the native bourgeoisie. It simply means to clear the road for the proletariat in the colonies to emancipate itself." (Second World Congress of the C.I., 1920). This prognosis of 35 years ago that national struggle is inseparable from social struggle is the reality of our times.

Historical experience has amply demonstrated that national independence is indeed the prelude to proletarian emancipation. To put it differently, in backward countries it is the first sequence of the permanent revolution. Historical experience has confirmed this conclusively.

In China, following the First Revolution of 1911, the young proletariat did not long delay in coming forth as the challenger to the national bourgeoisie. In the Second Revolution of 1925-27 it made its own bid for power. Even after it lost, the bourgeois counter-revolution proved neither stable nor lasting. The Chinese bourgeoisie, headed by Chiang, could eke out only two more decades. For this borrowed time it was indebted to the Stalinists.

In Indo-China the struggle against foreign rule was led virtually from the beginning by a proletarian party, the Trotskyists under the leadership of Ta Thu Thau. This uncompromising revolutionary leadership based itself on the program of the permanent revolution. The Stalinists came into the leadership of Indo-China's national revolutionary war by gangster methods. They assassinated the Trotskyist leaders and imposed class-collaborationism on the movement. They opened the country to the return of the French imperialists; they advocated the incorporation of Vietnam in the French Union. The war of more than eight years that followed did not, however, bring the native bourgeoisie to power. Despite U.S. backing, its rule is shaky in the territory ceded to it by the Geneva agreement.

In Indonesia the organized working class is the most powerful and most decisive force. It is bound to come more and more to the fore as the weak bourgeoisie, whom the Stalinists today sustain in power, demonstrates how powerless it is to solve any of the tasks of the democratic revolution.

In Burma, the native bourgeoisie has assumed power, under a "socialist" cover, and has confronted a civil war. Its chances for stability are not bright.

In Pakistan, which has been carved out of the body of India, the Moslem League, in control of the country from the beginning, has discredited itself, lost its mass following, and rules mainly through its military forces, built up and supported by American imperialism.

Even countries as backward as Kenya prove how much explosive power there is in the national question. Here the British sanctioned a native movement, in the hope of channelizing the social struggle. Instead the social struggle erupted into the armed uprising of the Mau Mau.

Again, in the case of British Guiana, London consented to home-rule, only to move immediately to cancel this concession because a workers' movement gained the ascendancy in the very first elections. In Singapore the same process is asserting itself. The first election resulted in a Labor Party government and the workers underscored this victory by a wave of strikes to improve their working and living conditions.

The Ceylon Experience

In Ceylon the native bourgeoisie no sooner assumed power than its rule was challenged by the toiling masses, led by the Lanka Samasamaja Party (Trotskyist). The Ceylonese bourgeoisie through its ruling party, the UNP, failed to solve a single one of the burning problems facing the country. What is more, the UNP broke its own election promises, cut rice rations, removed the rice subsidy, hiked prices on basic foodstuffs (rice and sugar in particular), raised rail fares, postal rates and the prices of cloth and cheap cigarettes, abolished the free mid-day meal in schools, shut down the milk-feeding centers, etc. Therewith this capitalist government not only lost the confidence of the mass of the people but roused them to anger. The explosion came in the hartal of August 12, 1953.

Both the Colombo and Moratuwa Town Halls flew the black flag of the hartal. Strikes tied up industry, railways, trams, buses and docks; government and municipal employes joined the hartal, so did the University students.

It was countrywide in scope, involving cities, towns and villages in every province. In twenty-four divisions of the Western, Southern and Sabaragamuwa provinces, the mass movement reached the level of a mass uprising.

The government in panic invoked "a state of emergency," little different from a declaration of martial law, and prolonged it with the aim of stifling all opposition. The attempt proved unsuccessful.

With the 1953 hartal, a new force has entered the political life of Ceylon -- the direct intervention of the masses. As the Ceylonese Trotskyists state: "Our politics hereafter can never be the same as before. The sense of mass power generated in the masses themselves as well as in their opponents ensures this."

The Ceylonese bourgeoisie is heading toward increasing collision with the masses. The revolutionary challenge to UNP rule far from decreasing is bound to intensify.

India, The Classic Colonial Country

India gives an outward appearance of a country whose native bourgeoisie is strong and stable. At all events, the odds seem to be in its favor.

The Indian bourgeoisie reaped lush profits from the war and expanded its industrial base. It was further reinforced by its retention of control of the national liberation struggle.

From its inception the Congress Party set up arbitrary limits to the struggle. Its goal was an amiable settlement with the British rulers, via petitions, redress-of-grievances campaigns, pleas for reform, etc. When the elemental mass movement took the road of open struggle, Gandhi elaborated a program designed to give an impression of struggle while in reality curbing it.

His doctrine of non-violence, passive resistance, etc., served to restrain the revolutionary awakening of the Indian peasantry, the first phases of which are marked by passive resistance.

Each time the masses broke through the barriers imposed by Gandhi's policy, the Indian bourgeoisie withdrew from the struggle, denounced the "excesses," and permitted the British to repress the movement. Amid the wartime crisis of British rule, the spontaneous mass uprising of August 9, 1942, the Stalinists sided with the British imperialists against the insurgent masses, denounced the uprising, and thus bolstered the position of the native bourgeoisie.

Gandhi's policy prevented the Indian masses from driving the British rulers out by revolutionary means. It prolonged British domination and finally facilitated an "orderly" transfer of state power to the native capitalists.

The Indian capitalists today confront the workers and peasants as the country's rulers. To hold power they must carry through agrarian reforms, abolish the massive survivals of feudalism. They must do more. They must industrialize to raise the living standards. India's living standards are among the lowest in the world; her population of 370 million is growing at a rate of 1½% annually.

To carry out agrarian reforms, and industrialize the country, Nehru would have to mobilize the workers and poor peasants for active support against the landlords, the usurers, the gentry, the princes, the Brahmins and other castes. Nehru must shy away from this. It would unleash the revolution, bringing about the downfall of his own capitalist class. That is why he can do no more than put patches on Indian society; that is why the capitalists must

rest instead on an alliance with the feudal exploiters against the poor peasants and workers. The native bourgeoisie cannot break its ties with imperialism, either. It must on the contrary lean more and more upon the imperialists.

In the economic life of India, as of the other former colonies, the world arms race is playing a major role. A considerable part of India's meager national income is being devoured by militarism. Such expenditures tend to rise because of Washington's aggressive military subsidies to such countries as Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, etc. In the interests of self-defense India, just as Burma, Indonesia, Egypt, etc., must keep pace with the growing military strength of their neighbors and rivals. They must unload the costs on the back of the masses.

The Indian bourgeoisie resorts to nationalizations because private foreign capital dominates the country's economic life. Lacking the necessary funds the native bourgeoisie uses statization in order to develop branches of industry. These nationalized projects and government planning remain entirely within the capitalist framework.

It is planned misery to provide a stabler home base for the native capitalists. India's first 5-year plan set as its target an annual increase of 1% of the per capita income, officially estimated at \$60. Needless to say the lion's share of any increase of national income will flow into the coffers of the bourgeoisie.

The imperialists frown upon even such nationalizations; their governments greet the projects with hostility; they threaten to cut off funds and clamp on a general economic and political squeeze. In the end the native government is compelled to retreat. In India's case, the most ambitious part of the plan is to increase steel production fivefold by 1961 (from 1.2 million tons to 6 million). New Delhi "in a move apparently intended to reassure foreign investors,..decided to allow already established private concerns to expand their steel production" (NY Times, June 5, 1955). The Tata family is dickering with the U.S. financiers to boost its output to two million tons a year; the Birla group proposes to boost its output by one million tons, thus assuring in advance that one-half of the projected increased steel output will be in private hands, backed by foreign capital.

The program of "planned economy" on capitalist basis cannot accomplish any of the primary objectives claimed by the capitalists, least of all, lead to socialism, as a Nehru demagogically declaims. It will not gain economic independence from private foreign capital and their governments, who play the decisive role in India's economic life. It cannot develop industry to a level in any way commensurate to the needs of the mass of the people, or significantly raise living standards. India's economy and the economies of other former colonial countries must remain primarily producers of food crops and raw materials and must suffer from both the crisis in the advanced countries as well as their own internal crises.

Historical experience has already exhausted nationalizations as a way out for native rulers. Turkey in the interval between the first and second world wars tried nationalizations on a scale beyond that now envisaged by Nehru & Co. Turkey remains today a semi-colony of imperialism. Mexico in the course of her national revolution, employed even more drastic measures, namely, nationalization through expropriation of foreign holdings in oil (British and American). And with what results? Today private foreign capital is reentering the Mexican oil industry. The native capitalists can no more escape the domination of finance capital than a small-scale concern can stand up against the big corporations.

The position of the Indian bourgeoisie under Nehru does not differ essentially from that of the Chinese bourgeoisie under Chiang Kai-shek.

Can Nehru do in India what Chiang Kai-shek couldn't do in China? Chiang, too, started out to industrialize. He, too, introduced nationalizations and "planning." He praised the Russian revolution, and had Russian political and military advisers on his staff, as well as the unqualified support of the Stalinists. Stalin hailed Chiang in terms more laudatory than those Bulganin now bestows on Nehru.

Chiang's failure was not a personal failure. It was the failure of a bourgeoisie relatively weak in regard to the native proletariat; at the same time, it was too weak to withstand the pressure of the imperialists. The Indian bourgeoisie is basically in the same position.

Peking and Moscow are today giving Nehru the appearance of strength and stability. In addition, Nehru has been made a hero by the neutralist petty-bourgeois tendencies in Western Europe because of his foreign policy. He couples the doctrine of anti-colonialism with "peaceful co-existence." To the Indian bourgeoisie, "peaceful co-existence" offers a way out for a class that is caught in a squeeze between decayed imperialism and the permanent revolution. Neutralism is the political expression of the Indian bourgeoisie's fear of the colonial revolution. It is an extension internationally of Gandhi's doctrine of "passive resistance" at home. That is why Nehru welcomes collaboration with Peking and Moscow in foreign policy.

At the same time, he remains irreconcilable against the native Stalinists. He needs completely free hands on the one hand in relation to the workers at home, and on the other, in relation to the imperialists. "Socialist" Nehru wants no obstacles in his way when he moves against the workers to whom his class cannot grant any significant concessions. "Neutralist" Nehru wants no interference when he is ready to turn against Peking and Moscow. Under conditions of "co-existence" the Indian bourgeoisie, together with the other colonial bourgeoisies, would soon discard neutralism and lean more and more upon the imperialists. It would do so for economic as well as political reasons.

For the Indian bourgeoisie, as for all the other native capitalists, the least possible of regimes is that of bourgeois democracy. "Surrounded by decaying capitalism and enmeshed in the imperialist contradictions, the independence of a backward state inevitably will be semifictitious and its political regime, under the influence of internal class contradictions and external pressure, will unavoidably fall into dictatorship against the people -- such is the regime of the 'People's' party in Turkey, the Kuomintang in China; Gandhi's /read Nehru's/ regime will be similar tomorrow in India" (Trotsky, May, 1940).

For the Indian bourgeoisie there is no way out. Its main antagonists are now at home.

There are the peasants. The Indian land problem is more heavily charged than in any other country because of the provincial multiformity of India, the diversified governmental forms and their equally diversified ties with the feudal-caste relations. In India, the tasks of the democratic revolution are saturated with an exceptional revolutionary content precisely because of the massive survival of feudal serfdom, of caste divisions and even of slavery side by side with the irrepressible antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the working class.

The Indian working class is young, but it already has a great tradition of militancy. It is not pro-capitalist, on the contrary, it is socialist minded. It is highly concentrated and organized. The workers have available the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, for India is now one of the biggest markets for Marxist literature because the bourgeoisie is in no position as yet to prohibit it.

The main obstacle in the workers' path are the Stalinists and the Social Democrats. The road for the success of the native bourgeoisie was cleared by the Kremlin which completely demoralized the workers' vanguard by ascribing to the Indian bourgeoisie a revolutionary role and by the class-collaborationist line of the "People's Front." The brazen Stalinist support of Nehru today will clear the road for class struggle policies and the building of the Trotskyist party in India.

Conclusion

The overwhelming majority of mankind who up to now have been the object of Western politics have proclaimed that henceforward they themselves are on the arena as the subject of politics, as a determining force in the world.

The new class relations in the colonies find their most concentrated expression in India, the classic colonial country. The colonial revolution has up to now been conditioned by this, that the working class in the metropolitan centers has been immobilized by the Stalinist and Social Democratic class-collaborationist bureaucracies. There has thus been no fusion of the liberating struggle of the

colonial people and the socialist struggle of the Western workers. To cite one instance, while the French bourgeoisie was waging for more than eight years a losing war in Indo-China, the Social Democrats and the Stalinists in France assured the imperialist bourgeoisie social peace at home.

The national bourgeoisies have been aided thereby. Moreover in countries such as India, the Socialists and the Stalinists played a major role in immobilizing the native proletariat, paving the way for Nehru's ascendancy. The national bourgeoisies have likewise been able to take advantage of the temporary stalemate between imperialism and the Soviet bloc, and their being wooed by both the Stalinists and the imperialists.

In defense of their interests and particularly in the interests of military self-defense, the Peking and Moscow bureaucracies are quite capable of undertaking progressive measures, especially so in periods of open rift with the imperialists. But in defense of the self-same bureaucratic interests, they will, as they have systematically demonstrated, sacrifice and betray the revolutionary masses and their own Stalinist parties for the sake of diplomatic agreements with the imperialists.

Right now the build up they are giving Nehru, their prostration before him, is cutting the Indian CP to ribbons, as witness the March 1955 defeat suffered in the Andhra elections by the Indian CP. It had excellent chances of winning control of the Andhra provincial government until Peking and Moscow pulled the rug from under the CP and assured victory to the Congress Party.

People's Frontism can be invested with a semblance of plausibility in the eyes of the masses in the course of struggle against colonial rule. But once the national bourgeoisie assumes power the bankruptcy of class-collaborationism is quickly laid bare.

There is no material basis for class-collaborationism in colonial countries. The traditional labor bureaucracies in advanced countries can impose such policies so long as the imperialist bourgeoisie is able to raise living standards and grant reforms. Impoverished backward countries cannot afford it. This tends to invest the struggles of the colonial proletariat with the sharpest forms, and renders colonial workers all the more ready to follow the leadership of the revolutionary party. Events are proving this in Ceylon.

In Ceylon a revolutionary mass party is on the scene. Three forces come into play therewith. First, as against the LSSP neither the native bourgeoisie nor the Stalinists can hope to control or decisively influence the workers or the mass movement. "Secondly, the Stalinists have no disguise for their reformist policies. In Ceylon everytime the CP turns toward collaboration with the capitalist class," say the Ceylonese Trotskyists, "the LSSP, with its policy of consistent class struggle, is able to expose the CP before the masses as a betrayer of the working class and the mass movement.

Indeed the masses themselves discovered the betrayal." Finally, there is a third and even more fundamental force. "The aim of the new CP line is impossible of achievement. The capitalist class of Ceylon despite any protestation from any quarter, cannot be kept neutral in a war between imperialism on the one side and the USSR and the associated states on the other."

With their opportunist line the Stalinists will come into ever greater collision with the insurgent masses. Right now the French CP is in open conflict with the embattled Algerian movement of national liberation. At the 1955 May Day meeting held by the French Stalinists at Vincennes, outside Paris, the Algerian workers walked out in a body when they were refused a speaker of their own choice; the Stalinists gave the platform instead to a right-wing Algerian conciliationist.

It is to the credit of the French Trotskyists that they have come to the fore as the only consistent militant fighters against French colonialism in North Africa.

The next stage will witness ever growing conflict between the masses and the ruling national bourgeoisie. In this conflict will be forged the leadership for workers' emancipation. It will not come from the defenders of the status quo but only from the partisans of the permanent revolution.

The Fourth International has every reason to look forward with optimism toward the growth of Trotskyist parties in the colonies.

June 29, 1955

* * * *