



INTERNATIONAL

WORKERS OF THE WORLD — UNITE!

The Sino-Soviet Polemics

By LIVIO MAITAN

Editorials on: WORLD SITUATION; U S ELECTIONS; CONGO CRISIS; BRITISH LABOUR PARTY; BRAZILIAN ELECTIONS

Permanent Revolution in Cuba

By A ORTIZ

MICHEL PABLO: THE LIBERATION OF WOMEN

An Open Letter

TO THE LEADERSHIP AND MEMBERS OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

Documents on: PABLO AND SANTEN; CUBA; CEYLON; YOUTH

From the Archives of Marxism

A TIMELY TEXT BY LEON TROTSKY

NEWS OF THE WORLD WORKERS' MOVEMENT AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL

AUTUMN 1960

11

2 SHILLINGS
35 CENTS

Contents

Editorial: <i>The Situation on the Eve of the Sixth World Congress</i>	1
Editorial Notes: <i>The U S Elections</i>	3
<i>The Congo Crisis and the Forces of the African Revolution</i>	4
<i>Decisive Hours for the British Labor Movement</i>	6
<i>The Brazilian Elections</i>	7
<i>Report on the International Campaign to Free Pablo and Santen</i>	9
<i>Problems and Prospects of Our Time in the Mirror of the Sino-Soviet Polemics,</i> by Livio Maitan	11
<i>The Liberation of Women</i> , by Michel Pablo	21
<i>Permanent Revolution in Cuba</i> , by A Ortiz	27
<i>German Social-Democracy from the Godesberg (1959) to the Dortmund (1960) Congress,</i> by A Gerbel	34
<i>Thirty Questions and Answers about the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet</i> <i>Union</i> , by Ernest Germain (second of two installments)	38
Documents: Three Declarations and an Open Letter by the International Secretariat --	
I: <i>For the Release of Michel Raptis (Pablo) and Sal Santen, Leaders of</i> <i>the Fourth International</i>	52
II: <i>Let Us Defeat the Imperialist Blockade and Aggression against Cuba</i>	53
III: <i>On Ceylon</i>	53
<i>An Open Letter to the Leadership and Members of the Chinese</i> <i>Communist Party</i>	54
<i>Draft Manifesto Proposed by the Youth Organizations of the Partidos Obreros</i> <i>Revolucionarios (Trotskyist) of Argentina, Chile, Mexico, Peru, and</i> <i>Uruguay to the First Latin American Youth Congress at Havana</i>	58
From the Archives of Marxism: <i>Our Position on War as Nurturing Revolution,</i> by Leon Trotsky	61
News of the World Workers' Movement and of the International:	
France: <i>Intervention of Intellectuals Spurs Resistance to Algerian War</i>	63
India: <i>Unification of Revolutionary Marxists</i>	64
New Zealand: <i>Trotskyists Form Branch of Australian Section</i>	64

All Correspondence and Subscriptions via:

PIERRE FRANK, 64 rue de Richelieu, Paris 2.

Rates: Single copies: 35 cents; One year (4 issues): \$1.25
 " " 2 shillings (2/5 postpaid); " " (" "): 8 shillings

In the Far East, *Fourth International* is available through the Lanka Sama Samaja Party, 49 Drieberg's Avenue, Colombo 10, Ceylon.
In Great Britain, through Jordan's International Bookshop, 4 Dane Street, Nottingham.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, the English-language edition of the theoretical organ of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International, is published four times a year at 59 via della Frezza, Rome, Italy. *Direttore Responsabile:* LIVIO MAITAN. Autorizzazione Tribunale di Roma N° 7763 del 22 Novembre 1966. TI.BA., Via della Frezza, 59, Roma
Printed in Italy



FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

ENGLISH - LANGUAGE EDITION OF THE THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE
INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Number 11

Autumn 1960

Editorial

THE SITUATION ON THE EVE OF THE SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS

The Autumn 1960 session of the U N O well deserved the interest it aroused in international opinion because it represented first of all the tangible evidence of the important changes and constant transformations that the reality of the contemporary world is undergoing. The fact that the traditional European powers and the North American colossus have seen their role become more and more disputed and limited has by now found an expression on a formally "legal" basis, for the Afro-Asian countries were in a majority at the U N O after the accession of a number of new African states to independence.

It is true that there was an important absence from the New York spectacular, that of People's China. But it was a formal rather than a substantial absence: no one could forget in fact that, if the relationship of forces has so considerably changed during the last decade, this is mainly due to the fact that the revolutionary armies of Chinese peasants had swept away Chang Kai-Shek's gangrenous regime in the late forties. The attitude of Khrushchev himself has been largely conditioned by the existence of the Chinese workers' state and in particular by the trend the Chinese leaders follow today in differentiating their action from that of the Kremlin.

Reactionaries of all countries were frothing at the mouth after speeches such as those of Castro and even Nkrumah, and they tried to use their sarcasm about the Congolese events (while they were really trying to hide their anxiety). But they cannot be unaware of the fact that this simply shows that the big wave of the colonial revolution, far from ebbing, is on the contrary, spreading.

The year 1960, as it has been often emphasized, has marked the upsurge of Africa as a new and powerful historical factor: it is no longer a matter of rebellion on the part of the Arab masses on the shores of the Mediterranean or of heart-rending protest by the Bantus in the barbaric citadel of South Africa, but it is right in the centre of the dark continent that new forces are growing and developing more and more dynamically. Meanwhile, in spite of all the ridiculous hysteria, the Cuban people keep on defying American imperialism on its very doorstep, while the latter can no longer envisage, without enormous risk, a repetition of the 1954 Guatemala operation.

The Yankee policy-makers felt sure they could somehow bolster a tottering prestige by making the U N O session coincide with the launching of a rocket around the moon. As this was a hopeless failure, they obtained quite the opposite result, namely, they completed the negative picture by demonstrating once again that in decisive technical matters the U S A is very clearly in an inferior position and that the recovery which was hoped for is far from being achieved.

Furthermore, this same Autumn, the demagogic and often childish prattle which has as usual distinguished the election campaign has not succeeded in stifling the really anxious voices raised about an economic situation which seems to have betrayed the hopes of even the recent past. The spectacular boom which many expected did not occur, and while only 60% of the steel production capacity is utilized, new names are added to the list of the unemployed. Official sources have hastened to state that there is no danger of

a new recession and even less of a depression. But, even leaving aside the reservations usually aroused by official optimism, the situation nevertheless appears to be serious, for, under the conditions of the contemporary world, the comparison to which capitalism is forced is no longer elliptic, but has become concrete. It is no longer a matter of rates of development theoretically possible under new social conditions, but on real rhythms achieved by the Soviet economy — which means that, even with no depression, a protracted stagnation or only a limited and jerky development would involve a serious defeat for the Americans and for capitalism on the world scale.

Need we add that at a stage in the world situation in which the colored populations of Africa have gained independence or are on the point of doing so, the Negro problem in the United States will play an always more explosive part, for the colored people in America will no longer endure their condition of inferiority, which represents, at the very least, a conspicuous anachronism?

It was very rightly emphasized that the American political leadership revealed in such a situation an almost complete deficiency. More and more criticisms have been raised in the last few years and are very openly expressed in certain American publications. There are a few attitudes, in fact, which cannot fail to astonish if they are considered from the viewpoint of imperialism's interests. Let us just mention a very recent example. How can a fuss be seriously made about the miserable sum of \$500 million for Latin America at a time when the White House has every reason to consider with great anxiety what is happening south of the Rio Grande?

Of course the new administrations might, and probably will, introduce important changes. In spite of everything, Yankee imperialism still has very big resources, which it might try to exploit better than it has done during the last period. Yet, all this being granted, there are objective limits that no new policy could eliminate.

It is true, for instance, that Washington could be a little less short-sighted as far as "aid" to underdeveloped countries is concerned. But we have frequently emphasized the structural reasons which seriously limit this type of policy and give it quite a different concrete and objective meaning from that of aid on the part of the Soviet Union or other workers' states. There is no reason for us to change our evaluation on this matter; it must not be forgotten, on the contrary, that the possibilities of the workers' states are bound to increase in the years to come.

This seems to be even more evident with regard to the important political manoeuvre of impe-

rialism in the field of the colonial revolution. This manoeuvre, which consists of a certain withdrawal of imperialism with a view to ensuring an alliance with the native leading classes and especially with the national bourgeoisie, was outlined by the British as early as the morrow of the Second World War; the aim of the Americans seems to be to push it further and to generalize it under their own ægis.

The experience of the last four or five years has already shown the difficulties imperialism runs up against in this field. It is first of all very difficult for it to satisfy the requirements of colonial or semi-colonial countries, for it must sacrifice many of its own direct interests to do so. Secondly, it runs the risk of weakening some of its European allies, whom it considers essential for the survival of capitalism as a world system. Thirdly, it cannot avoid constant clashes with the national bourgeoisies themselves, which, under the pressure of the masses, are obliged to become more and more exacting. This means finally that it is and would be able to obtain at the utmost only precarious results.

This manoeuvre, however, which in the past was developed in Asia, the Middle East, and Egypt, is now turning to Africa. Now it is precisely in this part of the world that its chances seem to be very small, not to say non-existent. If the British were able to find a Nehru in Asia, the objective situation is far more unfavorable in Africa (besides, the present world situation is much more difficult for imperialism than in 1948 when India gained its independence) and in the majority of cases the necessary social and political premises are lacking, for either a native bourgeoisie is absolutely non-existent or else it is limited to very small nuclei. We must add that at a stage when African masses are progressively awakening, even experiences on which imperialists set high hopes (as, for instance, the British imperialists with regard to Nigeria, which has recently become independent) may turn out to be extremely short-lived.

Obviously the fate of all manoeuvres and calculations on the part of the imperialists will after all depend upon the attitude and movement of the masses. If the masses are mobilized on an ever greater scale, and carry their struggle beyond the limits that certain leading strata or native élites would like to impose, and if they represent a true alternative for the economic and social development of the dark continent, not only French or British but also American neo-colonialism will see every possibility of manoeuvre rapidly disappear. The situation is all the more open to such possibilities in that the union between work-

ers' states and the colonial revolution constantly becomes closer, in spite of the bureaucracy and its peaceful "coexistence." Common anti-imperialist objective interests act in this direction and Khrushchev himself must take his own initiatives, if for no other reason than to exert pressure upon the imperialists on the one hand, and, on the other hand, to prevent the Chinese influence from growing stronger.

Outside America, the only solid stronghold of capitalism is still Western Europe where the economy has recorded new spectacular advances. It is therefore logical that the United States is more anxious than ever about the alliance with European countries and that the advocates of capitalism try to find favorable auspices to restore shaken confidence, based especially on European "prosperity."

We have no reason to minimize this aspect of contemporary reality, which, by the way, faces Marxists with very serious theoretical problems. There is no doubt that if the capitalist system has not yet been completely overthrown, if it can still organize its defense in spite of the disastrous decline of its world hegemony, this is largely due to the economic reconstruction of post-war Europe, apart from American economic power.

It would, however, be wrong not only to forget the overall picture we have just outlined but also to neglect symptoms such as the profound uneasiness existing in France today following the unsurpassable consequences of the struggle of the Algerian people in the mother country itself, or the July disturbances in Italy, or the aggressive vitality of the left wing in the Trade Unions and in the Labour Party in England. The old man of Bonn seems to consider all that is happening with haughty assurance: the German "miracle" follows its course and the workers' movement stagnates and trails painfully behind a leadership which has lost all sense of decency. But a new crisis in Berlin (which is far from being unlikely) would

be sufficient to jeopardize even Germany's present "stability."

This is the situation amid which our movement stands on the eve of a new World Congress, which it has sufficient reasons to face with optimism in spite of the blows its leaders have received from our opponents.

How will the colonial revolution, which has been the most dynamic force of the last decade, be able to develop and spread further, how will it go beyond the bourgeois framework and grow into a proletarian-socialist stage of development; how will the workers' movement in the advanced capitalist countries be able to regain the initiative it has lost for several years due to the treason of the traditional leaderships; how will the struggle for socialism and for setting up proletarian power develop; how will the masses of the workers' states be able to free themselves from bureaucratic tutelage and ensure the flowering of a real socialist democracy, under what transitional slogans will their action start to be organized; what is the real approach to the problems of war and peace, the problems of the final overthrow of capitalism and of the passage from capitalism to socialism on the world scale; how must the masses be mobilized against the danger of a nuclear holocaust brought about by imperialism: these are the problems of capital importance to which the Congress will find the answer, these are the questions which are already answered in the documents now submitted to a broad democratic discussion in our ranks.

The Congress will further specify our tasks and prospects and confirm an optimism which derives from no wishful thinking but is based on the fact that all the conservative forces in the world — from the imperialist bourgeoisie to the bureaucracy which for entire decades has worked havoc in the workers' movement — are now undergoing a crisis which will find no conclusion except in their final defeat.

4 October 1960

Editorial Notes

THE U S ELECTIONS

In 1952, it was above all because he promised to put an end to the hated Korean war that Eisenhower "the peacemaker" was elected. In 1956, he was re-elected with the slogan of "Peace and Prosperity."

Since then, as for peace, Dulles had Americans' hearts in their mouths with his brinkmanship, his successor Herter has been menacingly bellicose, and the dramatic

failure of the summit conference has vividly demonstrated how fragile that peace is. As for prosperity, since the 1957 recession, it has been somewhat lame, with steel production now down to about half, high and unabsorbable unemployment, and the signs of a new recession already looming up.

Meanwhile, there has been a world-wide worsening in

the correlation of forces between those of capitalism, incessantly battered, and those of anti-capitalism, everywhere reinforced, save in capital's last "Western" fortresses. And in face of this situation, there has been an obvious lack of leaders capable of mobilizing the still enormous reserves of imperialism to try to organize effective counter-measures.

The leading circles of imperialism unquestionably have been aware of the need to work out a new global strategy after the lamentable failure of the roll-back dear to Dulles's heart. Indeed, as the British weekly, *The Economist*, remarked not without justification, it is the United States itself that is beginning to be rolled back at the end of the Eisenhower period.

It was this failure of the Republicans to deliver on peace and prosperity that caused the US electorate to engage in its characteristic reaction — "Throw this gang of rascals out, and see if the other gang is any better" — and to return to the Democratic fold. But without enthusiasm or conviction: it was distinctly the choice of a "lesser evil." The voters could see little difference in the two programmes (and liked neither very much) — a fact clearly reflected by the closeness of the popular vote.

The voters' inability to see fundamental differences was quite justified, for the key underlying fact is that the real behind-the-scenes leaders of US imperialism had decided on its new line of "political rearmament" and had got it adopted by *both* leading contenders for the nominations well before the voters were even called on to legalize that decision. That new strategy may be summarized as "inflationist expansionism" domestically and alliance with the colonial bourgeoisie internationally.

It was a distinct change from 1952, when Eisenhower had to fight and negotiate to win the Republican nomination from Taft, personification of the isolationist and conservative Old Guard, which expressed the interests of the middle bourgeoisie rather than those of the big trusts. This traditionally important current has practically disappeared as a political factor: at the Republican convention its last Mohican, Senator Barry Goldwater, capitulated without fanfare.

It was the same story with the Democratic liberal and labor wing. Whereas in 1948 Truman snatched victory from defeat by an extremely demagogic campaign against the trusts, monopolies, and "Wall Street," no trace of such a vocabulary was to be found in Kennedy's speeches. The union leaders have harvested the fruits of their endless

political capitulations in that the Democratic leaders, sure in any case of the labor vote, did not even pretend to buy it by any concession, and we saw the revolting spectacle of union leaders supporting a candidate who was the co-author of a particularly vicious anti-labor bill recently passed by Congress, and who nowise proposed to them to revise it. And the sentiments of the liberals, reflecting this time a vast sector of the electorate, was well expressed in *The Nation's* editorial of tepid endorsement, titled "Two Cheers for Kennedy."

The only real choice for labor and liberal US voters, and then only in certain states, was to vote for the candidates of the Socialist Workers Party, which carried out an energetic campaign despite savage efforts in several states by big-party bureaucrats and state election officials to deny it a place on the ballot, and despite new and particularly flagrant regulations designed to cut down far below legal limits its time on radio and television. Rarely has the formal and cheating nature of US electoral democracy appeared so flagrantly. As we go to press, we have not yet received, unfortunately, the figure of the vote for the SWP.

One of the SWP slogans — formation of a Labor Party — was well received, for it is becoming clear to more and more US workers that support of the Democrats has led them ever deeper up a blind alley. But it will require violent clashes before they learn to follow the lead of the Canadian working class, just over the border, which has decided to build a Labor Party based on the trade unions.

Once Kennedy takes office, there will no doubt be some modifications in US international policy — not serious concessions or the overall agreement dreamed of by Khrushchev, but adjustments to strengthen US imperialism's hand in a continuing bellicose and reactionary policy. Kennedy has indicated, for example, "disengagement" in Quemoy and Matsu (but a firm stand on Formosa). And, with the new expansionist financial policy, the attempt at alliance with the colonial bourgeoisie may be made on a really great scale.

But the limits of all such policies, once more indicated in our lead editorial, should by now be self-evident. No matter what adjustments and initiatives Kennedy undertakes, it is impossible for even the world's greatest imperialist power to reverse the present world-wide historical trend against capitalism. The US bourgeoisie still has the power to destroy the planet, but not otherwise to prevent its socialist destiny.

THE CONGO CRISIS AND THE FORCES OF THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION

The Congo crisis has already been going on for months without a stable solution, in spite of the fact that most powerful forces and pressures on a world scale have been turned upon it: the USA, the UNO, the NATO, the African countries, etc.

What is it that gives the Congo crisis this importance, scope, and persistency? What is it that is preventing this affair from being arranged, as in the past, by a simple police operation by imperialism or the UNO? What are the reasons that explain the failure or neutralization of the

repeated attempts at dismemberment of the Congolese state, that have prevented it from breaking up in the midst of imperialist pressure and the pressure of the tribal chiefs?

It is not a simple mutiny of troops or attacks on the white population that made the Congo the centre of an international crisis, of a world-wide mobilization of forces and pressures.

The fact that the Congo has become a neuralgic point in the international crisis, that political and mass actions modest in their proportions have become the centre of

international attention, indicates above all the depth of the crisis of imperialist dominion over the colonial world. It is an indication of the powerlessness of imperialism to face up to these focal points in the development of the colonial revolution. It is an indication of how these movements, in small countries, which till yesterday seemed far away, are shaking the regime by the repercussions and mobilizations that they are engendering.

But if the movement in the Congo has reached this extent of international repercussions, it is because it is the expression of a new development of revolutionary forces, until yesterday powerless or in-existent in the midst of tribalism, and held in check by the political hegemony of imperialism.

The development of these forces is contradictory, anarchic, and not expressed through an organized and well delimited force, even of the type of those known in similar countries, but by reactions and explosions, with pauses of apathy. It has its strengths and weaknesses: strength and clarity when the enemy facing it is the white European exploiter, the white functionary; weakness and soft spots when it is a matter of delimitation from tribalism and the backward elements of Congolese society.

The Congolese army and the Congolese national movement of Patrice Lumumba are the only native forces that are not set up on a tribal basis. That is the reason why they were the first to express in the most centralized way this rebellion against imperialist oppression imposed by the Belgians. The Congolese army, in which all contradictions are reflected, was the first, after independence, to express the revolt against the attempt by white imperialism to prolong its grasp on the country in new forms. They were at the origin of a confused and contradictory movement, whose general line, however, was against imperialism, for a centralized state, and against secessionist or tribal movements, in most cases isolating them.

The force which inspires and supports this movement, with all its contradictions, is the Congolese masses. It is not the political skill of Lumumba which prevented the break-up of the Congolese state under the cross-fire of pressures from Belgian imperialism, US imperialism, the UNO, the NATO, the most right-wing African regimes such as Tunisia and Morocco, the tribal chiefs, the Union Minière, and the Belgian military forces stationed in the country.

It is a movement of masses which wants to emerge from its tribal backwardness, both economic and social, which is seeking access to new and more human living conditions, which, though still confused in its purposes, wants to see emerge a centralized government that expresses it, as occurred in other colonial movements, personified by Lumumba and his team, and by an army under Negro officers. This movement can be temporarily derailed or confused by actions like Mobutu's, but its deeper significance is that it prevents solutions that are openly opposed to the national movement, it prevents a Mobutu-Kasavubuleo solution, even though it does not have sufficient strength or clarity as yet to impose the Lumumba solution.

Unless this movement of masses were understood, it would not be possible to understand the Congo crisis, the "miraculous" survival of Lumumba, and the impossibility for Hammarškjöld, the UNO, and its "blue helmets" to impose their Kasavubuleo solution. Nor would it be possible to understand the paralysis and impotence of the old tribal forces on which imperialism is relying

against the centralized state. These forces are neutralized, they have begun to fall apart in face of the national movement for economic and social change developed by the masses. Tribal forces and parties formed on a tribal basis can keep a certain strength only as pressure groups, or by rendering more difficult a cohesive action by the national forces, the state, the government, the army, and the MNC (Congolese National Movement). The efforts of imperialism and the UNO to get Kasavubu, Shombé, Ileo, Kalondji, and Mobutu to give one another mutual support are not succeeding in getting together a force capable of offering a valid alternative.

★

There is another force that is supporting the Congolese revolution: the African revolution. The role of certain African governments (Guinea, Ghana) arises from their own situations, faced by the same pressures from imperialism, which, basing itself on the most backward forces of tribalism, is trying to check the drive of these newborn states and to prevent a force greater than that of the colonial companies from arising. To stabilize independence and progress in Africa, this double — external and internal — and decentralizing pressure must be fought against, and, in view of the weakness of these states, a certain alliance and mutual aid among the progressive forces is required. By supporting Lumumba, Sekou Touré or Nkrumah are seeking support for their own power internally. The break-up of the Mali by the alliance between French imperialism and the Dakar bourgeoisie is an example.

The role of the UNO, for example, has been to isolate one section of the country from another, to paralyze the centralizing government of Lumumba, and, by itself becoming the only centralizing force in the country, thus to detour the road toward the more open solutions of imperialism. The contradictions among the ONU's own military forces stationed in the Congo, the withdrawal of contingents and threats to do so, show to what a degree the Congolese situation influenced the UNO's own unity of action, and prevented it from going further with the plans of Hammarškjöld and imperialism.

The intervention of the USSR was no whim of Lumumba's, but the African revolution's deepening consciousness of the growing strength given it by the existence of the workers' states and alliance with them. The scientific, technical, and economic successes of the USSR and China are exerting a strong attraction on this revolution, basically in search of a change in living conditions for the Negro masses, which the imperialist regime denied them.

The intervention of the USSR, together with that of the African states, helped neutralize Belgian aggression and the real threats of other direct interventions by imperialism. If, despite that, the Soviet and Czechoslovak embassies were closed, this partial and probably temporary success of the reactionary Mobutu wing was rendered possible only by the willingness of certain African states, anxious to avoid a too rapid growth of Soviet influence in Africa.

★

In the Congo, something more than a centralized state, something more than the expulsion of imperialism, is in discussion. The masses are seeking to enter civilization, and their only way to do so is to expel the "civilizers," who have been relegated to rely on the most backward elements of Congolese society.

Support of the Congolese revolution by the world workers' movement and by the workers' states must take into account above all these underlying aspirations of the national movement, supporting the expulsion of the imperialist companies and the use of these resources for the Congo's economic development, supporting at the same time a plan for the development of the Congolese economy, with aid by the workers' states in agricultural machines and techniques, with investments of basic capital, and in an industry of consumers' goods that permits raising the masses' level of consumption, and provides a material basis for wiping out illiteracy and for cultural development, for a change in tribal social organization. The workers' states must develop a plan for the training of Congolese technicians, etc.

It is not capitalism that will pull the Congo up out of its backwardness. A precondition for any step forward is the immediate withdrawal of the UN troops, and distribution of arms to the Congolese soldiers and people.

The Congolese people must open up the path to their own self-government, by means of popular organs of self-administration democratically elected, which can democratically elect the central government and form the basis nationally for its support and functioning. For this purpose, the international workers' movement must aid by every means the development of independent organizations of the Congolese proletariat (parties, trade unions), a vital necessity for going beyond the bourgeois framework — which has never been broken through, even by Lumumba.

DECISIVE HOURS FOR THE BRITISH LABOR MOVEMENT

From the Trades-Union Congress on the Isle of Man through the Labour Party Conference at Scarborough, the leftward turn of the British labor movement became steadily more clear, impressive, and laden with consequences. Observers of all tendencies are not mistaken: it is the future relations between the classes in Great Britain that are now being decided for a long period.

The right wing of the labor movement is increasingly exposed for what it is: yesterday apparently all-powerful, behind the broad backs of vicious bureaucrats like Bevin or Deakin, it is today proving to be a relatively limited nucleus of direct agents of the bourgeoisie within the workers' organizations. The more and more obviously bourgeois character of its chief, Gaitskell, especially after his leading the parliamentary group into a mutiny against the clear political mandate of the Scarborough Conference, becomes under these conditions a fundamental cause of weakness for the right wing.

That was clearly shown concerning "Point Four." Gaitskell took the offensive on this question, which touches the fundamental nature of the party as a party that wants to change the structure of society. He was crushingly defeated at the Trades-Union Congress by a motion reaffirming the need to put the great means of production and exchange under collective ownership. This orientation was confirmed at Scarborough, not only sealing Gaitskell's defeat, but also demonstrating the way that the overwhelming majority of the rank and file, both trade-union and political, rally round the fundamental principles of socialism.

The debates on military policy — unilateral nuclear disarmament, and opposition to US bases in Britain and membership in the NATO — followed the same logic.

This double victory of the left closes a whole historical period in the British labor movement — a period that began in 1945 when the Labour Party formed the government. During that whole period, the Labour Party kept the loyal though critical support of the overwhelming majority of the conscious British toilers. The Communist Party, the Independent Labour Party, and all the little sectarian groupings steadily lost influence among the masses. At the same time the vanguard workers became more and more critical of the reformist "old guard." Spontaneously and empirically, they sought the way to arrive at socialism in Great Britain, rather than be satisfied with a "social" reform of capitalism. That search naturally led them toward the

Labour Party left, which Bevan and his friends had already started to crystalize in 1950.

But, having regrouped the great majority of the party "activists," the Labour Party left ran on a reef that it seemed impossible to get over: the bloc vote of the big unions, led by right-wing bureaucrats. For eight years the British labor movement was thus deeply divided between a political "left" and a trade-union "right."

When Frank Cousins took over the leadership of the biggest union, the Transport and General Workers, this equilibrium was overturned. But it would be wrong to attribute the fundamental cause to the matter of a single person. In reality, this overturn had been prepared by a long chain of rank-and-file revolts against the trade-union bureaucracy. In the T & G W U itself, this revolt had reached a culminating point in the '50s with a succession of wildcat strikes by the dockers of almost all British ports, and the appearance of a rival trade union that temporarily channeled this rising combativity. The spectacular fusion of the trade unions and the Labour Party "left," symbolized by the votes at Douglas and Scarborough, thus opens a new phase in the history of the British labor movement — a phase in which the majority of the movement, in all its wings, has come out frankly in favor of a more radical socialism than that of the old Social-Democracy.

The right wing was well aware of its danger. That is why, after Scarborough, it stiffened its attitude, despite the increased strength of the left. That strength was also shown by the fact that, though Gaitskell won a momentary success in getting the parliamentary group to mutiny against the Scarborough policy by reelecting him as leader, the vote for Wilson, even among these parliamentarians, was high.

Gaitskell, reelected, has made no secret of his intention to disregard the Conference decisions. The resultant situation is extremely tense, with dangers even of a split sooner or later. But though a split seems after all unlikely for the moment, the struggle inside the party will not stop building up and will reach very acute stages. The left has very great chances of winning a victory — and on the most advanced platform yet in this post-war period.

The British revolutionary Marxists must judge both the breadth and the limits of the fundamental turn by their class — or at least of its politicized and active wing —

and the acute intensification of struggle within the Labour Party that it has produced. Nobody can pretend that the majority of British workers have become Marxists overnight, or supporters of the Leninist theory of the state and the revolutionary conquest of power. But their interest in theoretical problems is steadily increasing, and the British comrades will meet it with a long and tenacious work of education and propaganda, in which *Fourth International*, more widely distributed, should prove a valuable instrument.

But in a mass movement action is more convincing than pure propaganda. British revolutionary Marxists will give priority to such concerted and organized action, aimed at certain short-term or medium-term transitional goals. These goals are easy to set. Despite its victories at Douglas and Scarborough, the "left" remains, paradoxically, amorphous and unorganized. It is regrouping, partly around *Tribune* and partly around Frank Allaun's publication. Young and more dynamic people are being found among the young socialist groups that are reappearing, but especially in the Movement for Nuclear Disarmament and the Movement for the Boycott of South Africa. It is partly active in the unions and partly in the more dynamic local parties.

The central task of British revolutionary Marxists consists in regrouping, inside the Labour Party, all these scattered forces of the labor left — without being sectarian or ultimatic, without artificially imposing on them a

"leadership" parachuted from outside — *around a programme of transitional demands*, in order to take by assault first the "dominant positions" of the movement itself and then a series of "dominant positions" of capitalist society as a whole.

This is not a matter of puffing up the illusion that the Labour Party can be "conquered from the inside" or can "change its nature." We have never advocated such reformist theses; and this is no moment to change our convictions. It is, rather, a matter of understanding that the British working class as a whole can draw the lessons from the extremely rich experience of the last 15 years only on condition that its organizations and combat generally rise to a higher level. In the course of these coming struggles, the vanguard will expand, its theoretical understanding will progress more rapidly, the path will be traced out for the appearance, for the first time in British history, of a revolutionary Marxist leadership of an important part of the toiling masses.

This exalting task should now inspire all the Trotskyists, all the revolutionary Marxists, of Great Britain. They should rise to the height of the historical tasks and possibilities opened to them by the radicalization of almost the whole mass movement in their country. They should above all develop their qualities as leaders, patient yet daring, as coordinators and unifiers of the left. The programme, the tactics, and the technique to reach our goal are known and understood. Now all depends on action.

THE BRAZILIAN ELECTIONS

The crushing figures of the vote whereby Janio Quadros won in the recent Brazilian presidential elections contrast with the lack of enthusiasm and echo aroused by the election campaign among the masses. Having to choose among three bourgeois candidates — Janios, Lott, and Adhemar — and without an independent class alternative, they felt little drawn to mobilize and take an active part in the campaign.

But in the election they voted massively for Quadros, the anti-government candidate, against Lott, the official candidate.

The Brazilian masses voted, first of all and above all, against the capitalist government of Kubitschek; they voted, though without great illusions, for a change, for the opposition candidate.

The candidate of the Kubitschek government, Marshal Lott, had the support of the "nationalist" sectors of the petty bourgeoisie and of the national bourgeoisie, and also the support of the Communist Party, in spite of his declarations against communism, against Cuba, and against relations with the Soviet Union. He was also supported by the Partido Trabalhista, ex-President Vargas's party, headed by Vice-President Jango Goulart, who is tied up with a sector of the trade-union bureaucracy and again ran for Vice-President.

Janio Quadros, as the opposition candidate, at first counted on the support of the big bourgeoisie of São Paulo, of sectors of the big landowners, on the good will of imperialism, and the parties that represent these forces, and, as central force, on the U D N.

The third candidate, Adhemar de Barros, as reactionary as these others, could not, nevertheless, count on the support of any important organized political force. His candidacy — and the relatively large vote he received — reflect mostly the Brazilian bourgeoisie's inability to or-

ganize its own forces and to solve the problems raised for it by the struggles of the masses.

From the beginning, however, the fight was centred between Janio and Lott. And, as the elections drew near, it was clear that the majority of the bourgeoisie accepted the victory of Janio as the only way out. Neither Lott's programme nor the fact that he could count on the support of the discredited government of Kubitschek allowed him to nurture serious hopes of winning. But in reality, though the Brazilian bourgeoisie had to accept Janio Quadros, this does not mean that that is the solution to its problems. On the contrary, it is rather the reflection of the insoluble nature of its crisis.

The programme of Janio's team is based on a policy of capitalist development carried out at the expense of the masses' living standards and by working together with imperialism, importing capital, possibly carrying out "stabilization" in the Argentine and Chilean style, and favoring large-scale agriculture and exports and the sectors tied up therewith, etc.

But it was not that programme that the masses voted for. During the election campaign, while Lott was keeping on with his anti-communist assertions, Janio was discussing a series of problems that attracted the attention of the masses and are in fact in contradiction with that programme: recognition of the USSR and possibly of Communist China, defense in general of the Cuban revolution, general support for the sliding scale of wages, maintenance of the nationalization of oil, and legality for the Communist Party. He traveled to Cuba, and to the USSR. Even though there is a great amount of electoral speculation in all this, it is also an indication of the crisis and unsureness of the bourgeoisie itself, one of whose sectors had to resort to such dangerous arguments in order to win the votes of the masses.

Janio obtained a vote far greater than the sum of the forces of the party apparatuses that were backing him. This gives him greater independence toward those apparatuses, closely tied up with the most reactionary forces. The situation is complicated for the bourgeoisie by the fact that the Vice-Presidency was won, not by the right-wing candidate running on the same slate with Janio, but by Jango Goulart, although by a narrow margin that shows the wearing away of the forces supporting him, which were formerly determinant in Brazil.

Janio will try to profit by the situation by endeavoring to carry out a policy for the Brazilian bourgeoisie as a whole, without being dependent on any given sector, and manoeuvring at the same time with imperialism. He is aware of the fact that the world situation — Cuba, China, Africa — gives him a greater margin of speculation and manoeuvre in his negotiations with the United States. This is, at the same time, his weakness, because he must face a rising mass movement which considers this election victory a success, which feels that it defeated the government in the elections, and which has not given Janio a blank cheque.

In addition, as *Frente Operaria*, the newspaper of the Brazilian Trotskyists, pointed out on the eve of the elections,

no bourgeois sector has great solutions for the situation of the country, for economic development, for the crisis in agriculture, for the crisis in foreign trade, for inflation, and, above all, for the social struggles that are rising and developing.

The bourgeoisie does not feel at all sure about a Janio government. It does not know exactly what that government will do. Even Quadros himself is uncertain about it. Everyone is aware that his election was the only way out, but merely a provisional way out, not a solution. Immediately after it, the struggles began again. Janio Quadros had taken a trip to Europe, to return only in January, when he must take office. He is trying in this way to remain apart from these struggles, to avoid taking stands on the problems hotly raised in the country until he takes over the government.

The masses unleashed a series of immensely powerful strikes and movements for their demands. This has made the bourgeois crisis more acute. President Kubitschek, at the moment that this editorial note is being written, has asked for the state of siege against the transport strike for higher wages that has paralyzed the country. Vice-President Goulart has come out in favor of the strikers, possibly trying to strengthen his position in the future government. The majority of the members of parliament refused to approve the state of siege. The mobilization and intervention of the masses has thus rendered more acute the internal crisis and division among the bourgeoisie. And this prospect will become accentuated.

There is even talk of a military coup to prevent Janio Quadros from taking office. So far, however, the head of the army, General Denys, has succeeded in keeping it away from a direct solution of the presidential problem. The army did not go in for support of Marshall Lott, Kubitschek's ex-Minister of War. That does not mean that it did so out of respect for democracy. The army wants to reserve for itself the role of supreme judge and arbiter in case the conflicts grow extremely acute. Furthermore, Denys fears that if he intervenes directly and takes part in the present crisis of the bourgeoisie, the army itself will be torn by factions and internal struggles — as happened in Argentina — and will lose its weight as the supreme political instrument of the Brazilian bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party will be faced by a crisis deepened by the calamitous failure of its support for Lott, which

contributed to isolating it from the masses. The Brazilian Trotskyists had previously proposed a workers' candidacy based on a united front of the trade unions, the peasant leagues, and the student organizations, with the support of the C.P. The workers' leaderships did not accept this way out.

The Trotskyists then proposed that the choice among three bourgeois candidates be rejected, that the vote be denied to the bourgeois candidates, deliberately annulling ballots by writing across them slogans against imperialism, the oligarchy, and the bourgeoisie, for a worker-peasant-student united front, for a workers' and peasants' government.

All the previous analyses of the Brazilian Trotskyists were roundly confirmed by the elections, including the prediction of the combined victory of Janio and Goulart and the difference between the two in voting support.

On the eve of the elections, *Frente Operaria*, in a lead article based on an intervention of the Latin American Bureau of the Fourth International, posed the tasks of the revolutionary movement in Brazil in the following terms, which remain completely valid:

The bourgeoisie has no solutions for the situation of the country. The next crises will render even more clear the need for the intervention of the mass movement, independent of bourgeois leaderships. The onward march of the revolution in Latin America will bring even more pressure in this direction. The defeat of nationalism, as can be foreseen, and of the Communist leaders, will on the one hand deepen the crisis among the petty-bourgeois nationalists, encouraging socialist tendencies that are already being adumbrated, and on the other hand deepen the crisis in the C.P., obliging the left to take new steps forward in the direction of pulling the party out of the field of class collaboration and conciliation with the bourgeoisie.

The revolutionary Marxist workers' vanguard must spur on this process, trying to guide it toward the building of an Anti-Imperialist United Front, of a Proletarian United Front, and a united front of the masses, including all the trade-union, peasant, and student organizations, to intervene in every one of the country's problems and especially in support of the peasants in their struggles and for radical agrarian reform.

Immediately after the elections, no matter who is elected, the wave of strikes and mass struggles will be renewed with even greater violence. It is necessary to take advantage of this new wave of strikes to advance toward a unified federation of labor, and toward putting into practice the worker-peasant alliance.

The crisis in the parties of the bourgeoisie will, in the coming months, have an influence on the masses. But the masses in their turn will be able to influence and in fact are influencing the left wings in these parties. It is not excluded that, in the midst of this crisis, left national sectors may appear that seek to a certain extent the support of the masses. In any case, the future of the working class and the peasants cannot be made dependent on them.

Relying on the most advanced political tendencies and in particular on the development of the Communist left, the revolutionary Marxists must fight with greater tenacity than ever to build a new leadership and a new organization for the masses, independent of the bourgeoisie, and with the revolutionary prospect that is common to all Latin America, including Brazil.

THE INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO FREE PABLO AND SANTEN

[See, on page 52, the Declaration of the International Secretariat on the case of our imprisoned comrades.]

From many countries, workers' leaders, left-wing figures, parliamentarians, intellectuals, and workers have written and cabled the Dutch authorities to express their solidarity with MICHEL RAPTIS (PABLO) and SAL SANTEN, well-known fighters in the workers' movement against capitalism and imperialism, to protest against the repression by which they are being victimized for having coöperated unconditionally with the Algerian people's struggle for liberation, and to demand their immediate release.

JEAN-PAUL SARTRE, SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR, the Communist writer JORGE AMADO, and FROTA MOREIRA, Brazilian ex-senator and member of the Executive Committee of the Partido Trabalhista, signed the following statement on September 2nd in São Paulo, Brazil:

Once more colonialism has struck at militants fighting for the freedom of the Algerian people. This time the "Red Hand," a fascist organization in the service of the "ultras" and tied up with the main police forces of the western world, has organized a Machiavellian provocation to bring about the arrest of Sal Santen and Michel Raptis, leaders of the Fourth International, who were developing in Holland an intensive activity of solidarity with Free Algeria.

Free men in the entire world must protest against such attempts, which put everyone's freedom in danger. These men, true to their revolutionary beliefs, are now paying by losing their freedom and the right and duty of those who still have faith in man to struggle unceasingly against colonialism.

In spite of possible differences with the political thought of these militants and with their organization, the Trotskyist Fourth International, what is at stake is the safeguarding of human dignity, of the right of men to struggle for their ideals, of the right of the Algerian people to count on active help by all left militants.

Therefore we appeal to intellectuals, to workers' leaders, and to students to set in motion a great wave of protest addressed to the Dutch government, that can put a complete stop to this infamous colonialist provocation.

In Great Britain, Labour Party M P JOHN BAIRD, after an admirable but unsuccessful attempt in Amsterdam to persuade the Dutch authorities at least to grant political status to the prisoners, returned home to set up a British defense committee for them. One of its first actions was to send the following protest:

H.H. The Minister of Justice
The Hague, Holland
Your Excellency,

On the 10th of June of this year, Sal Santen and Michel Raptis were arrested in connection with their aid to the freedom-fighting Algerian people.

Such an act is in contradiction to the best traditions of the Dutch people. We remember the many actions in Holland in support of Ger-

man Jews after the rise of Hitler in 1933. No one thought in those days that the people who fought Nazism would be thrown into prison and persecuted for fighting for freedom for Algeria.

Sal Santen lost his family in Hitler's gas chambers and Santen and Raptis were both active during the war in the struggle against German fascism. The fighters for Algerian freedom are fighting a similar battle today.

The struggle of the Algerian is very hard indeed. In five years 600,000 Algerians were killed, 1,500,000 were displaced from their homes, 150,000 were imprisoned, of whom 50,000 were Algerians living in France; 200,000 refugees are living in terrible conditions in Tunis and Morocco.

To those people Santen and Raptis have offered their unconditional aid. Whether we agree or not with the political views of these men, we protest with indignation that they are not criminals and should be immediately released.

We ask that all those people who have fought and suffered under Nazism and all who believe in liberty, in justice, and in human rights should support our international appeal.

Signatures:

JOHN BAIRD (M P)

JOHN SILVERMAN (M P)

KONRI ZILLIACUS (M P)

IAN MIKARDO (Member of National Executive, Labour Party)

This campaign in Great Britain was also joined by the noted historian ISAAC DEUTSCHER and by Z SONKOSI, one of the leaders of the Pan-African Congress of South Africa.

From Argentina, cables of protest were sent by the LA PLATA ENGINEERING STUDENTS' CENTRE; Attorneys SILVIO FRONDI, A R STORDEUR, and ENRIQUE BROQUEN (a Socialist leader); the civil engineer NICOLAS BESIO MORENO; GUILLERMO E COTTET, President of the Société Française and Secretary of the Alliance Française of Junin; LISANDRO VIALE, state deputy; GUSTAVO BEYHAUT, professor at the University of Buenos Aires; R VISCONTI, leader of the Partido Socialista Argentino; SUSANA PREMAT, a university leader. In the trade-union movement, many leaders and factory delegates also signed cables to the Dutch government, among them: CARLOS E GRANOLLERS (radio announcers), LUIS E BERCHERUCCI, HÉCTOR MENÉNDEZ, ANTONIO GARRIDO, and ALFREDO MANDOLA (metal-workers), and AURELIO RICO (meat-packers).

As we go to press, we learn that a letter of protest to the Dutch government was signed by the following professors of the National University at La Plata: CECILIA CASOGLIAD, HUGO R SATAS, EDUARDO DE LA FUENTE, A GACOBBE, GUSTAVO MARTÍN, A HECHENLEITNER, HÉCTOR A SOMENSON, E C WILLEMOES, ROBERTO C PISONI, and ROBERTO VAN DER BROECK. Another declaration demanding the release of Santen and Raptis was signed by ABEL ALEXIS LATENDORF, journalist, member of the National

Executive Committee of the Partido Socialista Argentino, GERARDO COUSILLAS, journalist, general secretary of the Federal District Socialist Federation, and MARCOS KAPLAN, attorney and leader of the Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria (Praxis). One hundred fifty persons signed another appeal at a public meeting of the Partido Obrero in Buenos Aires on September 3rd. From the province of Mendoza, a cable was sent by NELSON CÁCERES in the name of the Partido Obrero. Another was sent by the student leaders MARIO PORTNOY and JORGE FISCHBARG.

From the province of Córdoba, a text of protest was sent, signed by RAFAEL CEBALLOS, OSCAR LANFRE, and ROBERTO FERRERO, student leaders, and VÍCTOR ORELLANA, Peruvian student leader. The same text was signed by Dr SANTIAGO DEL CASTILLO, former Minister of the Interior, former governor of the province of Córdoba, and former Vice-Presidential candidate, and by RÓMULO PRETELL VARGAS, HÉCTOR PRETELL, JOSÉ ANANOS CASTILLO, ROGER ANCAJINA, ARMANDO MICHILOT, CARLOS A NEIRA, OWEN MOQUILLA, and CHÁVEZ, leaders of the Partido Aprista Peruano de Argentina.

From Brazil, in addition to the statement already quoted, CID FRANCO, Socialist Party deputy, made a speech in the São Paulo State Chamber of Deputies, denouncing the arrests and calling for protests against them. Texts of protest were signed by five São Paulo state deputies: LUCIANO LEPERA and ROCHA MÉNDEZ of the Partido Trabalhista, JETERO FARIA CARDOSO and ONOFRE GOSUEN of the Partido Socialista, as well as CID FRANCO himself. MILTON MARCONDES, São Paulo municipal councillor, also signed.

At the Congress of the STATE UNION OF STUDENTS OF SAO PAULO, representing 40,000 students, the 400 delegates voted unanimously in favor of an energetic protest against the repression against Pablo and Santen.

From Chile, a message to the Dutch government was sent by the C U T [Unified Workers' Federation]: SENATORS ALEJANDRO CHELÉN ROJAS, HUMBERTO MARTONES, GALVARINO PALACIOS (Socialists), and PAUL RETTIG GIASSEN (Radical); the writers and Socialist Party leaders OSCAR WAISS, MIGUEL SAIDEL, and CLODOMIRO ALMEYDA; C U T President CLOTARIO BLEST; JOEL CÁCERES, C U T leader and alderman of the Commune of San Miguel, Santiago; LUIS VITALE, C U T leader; WALDO GREZ, leader of the Clerks' Union; Attorneys ERICH SCHNAKE, WALTER BLANCO, TOMÁS CHADWICK (Socialists), and JAIME CONCHA, ORLANDO BUDNEVIČ, CAMILO LIZANA, PAUL MIRANDA, and CESÁREO ÁLVAREZ.

This campaign has just been joined by SALVADOR ALLENDE, Socialist Senator, President of the F R A P [united front of the Chilean SP and CP], and F R A P presidential candidate in the 1958 elections (which he lost to the current President, Alessandri, by only 30,000 votes).

In France, in addition to SARTRE, many other top writers and intellectuals joined the campaign, such as MAURICE NADEAU, noted critic and editor of *Les Lettres Nouvelles*; CLAUDE BOURDET, leader of the Parti Socialiste Unifié and director of *France-Observateur*; MICHEL LEIRIS, noted writer; the writers PIERRE NAVILLE and JEAN GUEHENNO; Catholic writer and editor J M DOMENACH; the noted mathematician L SCHWARTZ; Professor J J MAYOUX; and many others.

FRANCIS JEANSON, head of the "Jeanson network" for aid to the Algerian revolution, and at present a "fugitive from justice" after being sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment for his work in defense of Free Algeria, also expressed his total solidarity with Pablo and Santen.

In Italy, the campaign has been joined by FERNANDO SANTI, leader of the CGIL [main Italian labor federation]; the Socialist leader ANTONIO GIOLITTI, an editor of the review *Passato e Presente*; and many Milanese artists, intellectuals, trade-union leaders, etc.

In the United States, protest was made by FARRELL DOBBS, Presidential candidate of the Socialist Workers Party; the SWP also sent a strong letter to the Dutch authorities demanding the prisoners' release.

From Uruguay, a cable of protest to the Dutch government, asking the release of the prisoners, was sent by: Professor CLEMENTE RUGGIA, former Minister of Education and former Director of Secondary Schools; Architect LEOPOLDO AGORIO, former Rector of the University; Dr MARIO CASSINONI, Rector of the University; Architect AURELIO LUCCHINI, Vice-Rector of the University and Dean of the School of Architecture; University Councillors CARLOS REVERDITO, JOSÉ ALBERTI, and RUBEN DUFAU; University professors: Architects HÉCTOR IGLESIAS, JUSTINO SERRALTA, ÁLVAREZ LENZI, JORGE BISOGNIO, RICARDO SAXLUND, CÉSAR NOGUEIRA, CARLOS HAREFAU, and HUGO RODRÍGUEZ JUNANTENA; Doctors EDMUNDO SOARES and JOSÉ WILLIMAN JR; Historian EUGENIO PETIT MUNOZ; Agronomists WASHINGTON OSABA and LUIS PLOTIER; Architects OMAR DI GIORGIS, HÉCTOR MUINO, LUIS CLASCOAGA, ELENA AMESTOY, ARNALDO DIANO, CARLOS TOSAR, MARÍA GRECCO, WALDEMAR LÓPEZ, FRANCISCO CURZIO, and FELICIA GILBOA; Civil Engineer LYS DAGUERRE DE OLIVERA (president of the Comité pro Cuba); Dr ANIBAL ARTIGAS; Professors FEDERICO RODRÍGUEZ, LUIS SANGUINET, TERESA ROSSI, ROLANDO VIEIRA, J P MARTÍNEZ MAUTONE, ZULMA NOGARA, DARWIN DÍAZ, and DIEGO SUÁREZ.

The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party has authorized Socialist parliamentarians to sign the protest cable. As we go to press, Senator Dr JOSÉ PEDRO CARDOSO and Montevideo Municipal Councillor GUILLERMO CHIFFLET have already signed. ABNER COLLAZO, MARÍA DEL CARMEN PISANO, MARÍA A TRUJILLO, SUSANA T DE MUSTO, ALBA L DE MARTÍNEZ, and ANGEL CAFFERA (leader of the school-teachers) have also signed the protest.

In addition, many workers' leaders have sent their protest to the Dutch government, among them leaders of the meat-packers such as ARTIGAS SÁNCHEZ and CÉSAR BENTOS PEREIRA, president and secretary of the Packing-House Workers' Federation; LUIS COITO, JOSÉ ALFONSO, PEDRO BUZARA, JOSÉ GUTIÉRREZ, RUBEN INVERNIZZI, HÉCTOR HERRERA, PABLO VERDÚN MOREIRA, ALBERTO ABDALA, ALBERTO AGUIRRE, ARI VIDAL, OSCAR FOSSOLA, and MARTÍN NOGUEIRA.

Other protests flow in from students, intellectuals, and trade-unionists in Cyprus; 12 members of parliament in Ceylon; political and trade-union organizations, and one of the deputies to the (at present dissolved) parliament, in Indonesia; from the UNIVERSITIES RADICAL FEDERATION NATIONAL EXECUTIVE in New Zealand.

Answer the appeal of the International!

Express your solidarity with the defenders of the Algerian revolution now jailed by the allies of French imperialism!

Answer the urgent call of Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, and Jorge Amado, and join your voice in the world chorus of protests in defense of the leaders of the Fourth International!

Send copies of your resolutions, letters, telegrammes, and cables, to this magazine.

Help Free Pablo and Santen!

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF OUR TIME *in the Mirror of the Sino-Soviet Polemics*

By LIVIO MAITAN

Far from having been overcome after the meeting of the representatives of the various Communist Parties at Bucharest, the conflict between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist Party is developing and broadening. The forms that it has taken up till now are not the same as those that marked the conflict between Moscow and Belgrade ten years ago, and it still appears improbable that it will reach a quite open and violent rupture. Nevertheless, an objective logic of such polemics has already asserted itself: just as in the "Jugoslav affair," now in the "Chinese affair," from a starting-point of certain particular questions, the discussion quite quickly spread to a whole series of fundamental problems closely concerning not only the tactics but also the strategy and prospects of the Communist movement.

It will be recalled that the first symptoms of divergences were foreshadowed in the Summer of 1958 at an especially critical international conjuncture. But it was beginning with Khrushchev's trip to the United States that polemics developed more and more clearly to the point of reaching the articles by the Chinese on the occasion of the anniversary of Lenin's birth, and to the point of the clash at the Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions at Peking, where the Chinese trade unionists practically rejected the Khrushchev report on orientation. The third stage of the polemics — in the Summer of 1960 — was marked by a very brisk counter-attack by the Soviets; this, though it seems to have influenced several Communist Parties, did not drive the Chinese into renouncing their struggle (they limited themselves to an occasional reshaping of certain attitudes).

It is not without interest to summarize here the themes that have been and remain the subject-matter of the divergences in question.

THE ESSENTIAL THEMES OF THE DEBATE

1) QUESTION OF THE WAR AND PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

After having adopted at the XXth Congress the theses on the "non-inevitability" of war, the Soviets laid more and more stress on peaceful coexistence, and, especially in the period marked by "optimism" about Camp David, Khrushchev

went quite far in a sort of theorization of a possible and desirable compromise with U S imperialism, or, at least, with one of its tendencies.

In his 31 October 1959 speech on the international situation to the Supreme Soviet, he emphasized that

the Soviet Union and all the socialist countries have opened up to humanity the road of a social development without war, on the basis of a peaceful collaboration, [that] the conflict between the two systems must and can be solved by peaceful means, [that] coexistence is a real thing [...] an objective necessity arising from the current world situation, from the present stage of development of human society.

On the other hand, Khrushchev explained on the same occasion that the imperialists can really "make certain concessions," that there are "peaceful" tendencies even among American capitalists, and that "many well-known figures, and in the first place President Eisenhower [...] want to find the way to strengthen peace."¹ These "optimistic" theses were confirmed by Khrushchev himself in another report to the Supreme Soviet three months later.

The Chinese Communists did not reject the theses of the XXth Congress on war and peaceful coexistence. But they laid the stress in a completely different way. They insisted on the idea that war is part of capitalism's nature, that imperialism has not changed and cannot change its nature, and that, as long as capitalism exists, war remains possible.

The Chinese more particularly denied that there are "peaceful" tendencies in imperialism: U S imperialism, even after Camp David, had not changed its policy, and was staking, and is still staking, on war ("The ice of the cold war has never been broken," it was said in Peking).² It is absurd to let oneself be fooled by the idle chatter of Eisenhower, who, far from seeking

¹ In his January 1960 speech, Khrushchev explained more specifically what the ultra-warmongering and what the "pacifist" tendencies are in the United States. For the two speeches quoted, we rely on the Italian text, distributed by the press bureau of the Soviet Embassy in Rome.

² See a 27 May 1960 despatch of the Hsinhua News Agency. For the Chinese texts summarized in this article, see the same source, and particularly its despatches of the following days: 1, 21, 22, 23 April; 27 May; 7, 8, 16 June.

"coexistence," is the most qualified representative of imperialism, which is preparing for new military conflicts.

The Chinese furthermore constantly emphasized the need never to forget that Marxists cannot be opposed to every kind of war, but must distinguish between just and unjust wars.

2) QUESTION OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF A POSSIBLE WAR AND OF DISARMAMENT

Khrushchev did not explicitly share the viewpoint formerly expressed by some Soviet leaders or the leaders of certain Communist Parties that a Third World War might mean total destruction³ (he asserted several times that the war would mean the end of capitalism). But in spite of that he insisted and still constantly insists on the frightful extent of the destructions that would be brought about by a nuclear conflict and its "fatal consequences."⁴ He was, furthermore, among those who did not exclude the hypothesis that the United States might pull off a come-back in the field of the most powerful weapons and "sooner or later reach the level of the U S S R [January 1960 speech to the Supreme Soviet]."

The Chinese viewpoint is perceptibly different. According to them — as was the case after the 1914-18 and 1939-45 conflicts — war would mean a new and decisive advance of the revolution, and even "a rapid destruction of the imperialist monsters." The peoples ought to brace themselves for heavy sacrifices, but they would be recompensed because,

on the ruins of dead imperialism, the victorious peoples would create with extreme rapidity a civilization a thousand times higher than that of capitalism, and a marvelous future for themselves.

On a more confidential level, so to speak, the Chinese do not hesitate to assert that, in the worst of hypotheses, they might in a war lose half their population while three hundred million would still remain to build communist society. It was arguments of this sort that provoked Khrush-

³ The Polish delegate to the Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions explained that the war might destroy the earth in a few minutes (v Hsinhua News Agency despatch of 9 June 1960). Togliatti, for his part, wondered out loud in the following terms:

Let us suppose concretely that there should fall on our country 20 or 30 nuclear devices capable of causing total destruction and a desert; what socialism would one be able to build under those conditions? [V *l'Unità*, 24 July 1960.]

⁴ Khrushchev returned to this theme in his speech to the Bucharest Congress, while, more recently, the *Komunist* wrote that a war would mean the destruction of entire countries and that "the masses cannot pay no matter what price" to aid the transition to socialism (v *l'Unità*, 1 September 1960).

chev's reply at Bucharest: "I cannot say, Let us make war: half would die, the other half would survive. If I talked like that, they could put me in a straitjacket!"

As for disarmament, Khrushchev is a convinced supporter: he thinks that it would be really possible to bring it about. The fact that that has never been possible in the past does not form a decisive argument in the matter (v Gromyko's January 1960 speech to the Supreme Soviet). The Chinese — who consider a swindle the thesis that the resources rendered available by an eventual disarmament would be able to be used by everybody in favor of the underdeveloped peoples — declare that they are in agreement with the Soviet proposals, and have put forward proposals themselves. But they explain their attitude by saying:

The Soviet proposals are a test for the imperialist countries. By rejecting them, these countries will later unmask the fraudulent character of their peace [v 7 June 1960 Hsinhua despatch].

3) QUESTION OF THE ATTITUDE TOWARD THE COLONIAL REVOLUTION

Khrushchev and the C P of the U S S R have always proclaimed their support for the struggle of the colonial peoples. But in practice they have often sacrificed this support to the needs of their policy of détente.

The Chinese criticize such attitudes, explain that the Khrushchev line forms an obstacle to the struggle of the colonial masses, and that the armed struggles of the colonial peoples against imperialism are necessary and must be hailed as just wars. The divergence became concrete in a quite visible way in connection with Algeria. Khrushchev hailed de Gaulle's 16 September speech; the Chinese sharply criticized it; the Chinese recognized the Algerian government; the U S S R did so more tardily, and even then only *de facto*.

The Chinese, furthermore, are more and more critical of certain leaders of the colonial bourgeoisies (especially Nehru and Sukarno). The Soviets accuse the Chinese of not understanding the progressive role of the national bourgeoisie in colonial countries and the need for a national bourgeois-democratic stage in which problems of a socialist nature are not raised (v, for example, Zhukov's article in the 26 August *Pravda*).

4) QUESTION OF THE PEACEFUL AND PARLIAMENTARY ROAD TO SOCIALISM

The theses of the XXth Congress of the C P of the U S S R on the parliamentary and peaceful road to socialism are the object of open and quite closely argued polemics by the Chinese, who do

not forget to emphasize the need to destroy the bourgeois state apparatus and to replace it by the dictatorship of the proletariat. May we be permitted to have recourse for once to a rather long quotation? —

We must take part in parliamentary struggles [*The Red Flag* writes], but without any illusions about the bourgeois parliamentary system. Why? Because, as long as the state machine of the bourgeois warlords and bureaucrats remains unchanged, parliament will always be an ornament of the bourgeois dictatorship, even if the party of the working class possesses a parliamentary majority or becomes the strongest party in the parliament. As long as the state machine exists, the bourgeoisie is completely in a position, at any moment, according to its own interests, either to dissolve parliament if necessary, or to use various open or hidden tricks to transform a workers' party which is the strongest party in parliament into a minority or to obtain the result that it has fewer seats even if it has received more votes than previously. That is why it is hard to imagine that in a bourgeois dictatorship there can be changes as a result of votes in parliament and it is equally hard to imagine that it be possible for the proletariat to adopt in parliament measures likely to ensure the peaceful passing over to socialism as a result of having obtained a certain number of votes. Several experiences in capitalist countries over a long period have completely proved this, and the experiences undergone in different countries of Europe and Asia after the Second World War furnish new proofs.

The criticism of the "new roads" of the XXth Congress and of the different Communist Parties could not be clearer.

THE COMMUNES AND THE "UNINTERRUPTED REVOLUTION"

The polemics about all the foregoing themes has been for several months pretty open and generally known. But divergences have arisen and are arising also in other fields, whether political or ideological, even if the indications are not equally clear and if the reservations and criticisms are most often only implicit.

This concerns first of all the very question of the communes. The communes are considered by the Chinese — and quite rightly, too — as a turn of capital importance in their orientation of economic and social policy, especially in the

rural regions. Despite the rectifications that have been repeatedly made, and despite the obvious vacillations in connection with extending them to the cities, the Chinese continue to present the communes as an original contribution of the Chinese Revolution, as the specific form whereby the revolution moves up to a higher stage. The communes are supposed to have the effect either of giving a coup de grâce to capitalist survivals or of ensuring a spectacular increase in production — not to speak of the revolution of capital importance that they seem to have introduced into social life by freeing women from the yoke and routine of the family.

Now the Soviet Communists have — to say the least — maintained an absolutely discreet silence on this matter — which quite clearly means an implicit criticism. Otherwise, how would the Soviet Communists not have celebrated in their own way, if they entirely approved of it, an experiment that is so significant and so important — they who never miss a single opportunity to hail the advances and successes of brother parties? But it is sure that the Soviets privately formulated criticisms, and certain reflections thereof can be found in the official texts. They repeatedly stressed, for example, that it is not possible to pass from capitalism directly to communism, that a whole stage of building socialism is necessary. This theme was put forward by Khrushchev himself in his report to the XXIst Congress.⁵

It is highly probable that the Soviets had brought forward objections to certain theorizations of the Chinese — especially in the second half of 1956 — according to which the communes might be an anticipation of communist society⁶ (more recently it was stated that they are the best form of transition between socialism and communism).⁷ A noted economist, Strumilin, it seems, engaged in rather curious polemics: he set up a chart of what the commune of the future would really be, while criticizing certain possible future aspects of a commune that was not without analogy with the present communes of the Chinese, and specifying in any case that it was not a "problem of today or even of tomorrow."⁸

⁵ Khrushchev at the XXIst Congress denied the existence of divergences between the Soviets and the Chinese by saying: "You will not be able to see divergences any more than anyone can see his own ears." Obviously the divergences existed, despite the fact that at that moment they could not be seen, exactly in the same way that ears exist even if nobody can see his own.

⁶ Cfr article in our Autumn 1958 issue.

⁷ See 19 August Hsinhua despatch

⁸ V *Le Monde*, 30 August 1960, where Li Fu-Chen is quoted as saying: "The best form of transition from collective property to the property of the whole people, the best form of transition from capitalism to socialism."

But it is not this aspect of the problem that most worries the Soviet leaders, who, good empiricists that they are, would not worry excessively about theorizations that were really hazardous. What is more important for them is that the communes represent roughly an experiment in development in the rural regions that is quite different from both the Stalinist experiment of the '30s and from the present Khrushchev experiment.

It is well known that the post-Stalinists, in order to overcome the critical situation created by Stalinist practice in the Soviet villages, made a very broad turn by adopting an agricultural policy that might be defined, so to speak, as a new form of NEP under radically changed objective conditions. It is above all in staking on the stimulation of the individual interest of the peasant — which Stalinist collectivization had stifled without being, obviously, in a position to replace it by historically superior stimuli — that Khrushchev sketched out the new course in this field. The post-Stalinist reform in certain people's democracies (around the period 1956-58) had a basically analogous meaning, despite great differences in objective conditions from the viewpoint both of economics and of social structure. If Khrushchev's course corresponds to the attempt to use for productive purposes whatever remained of backwardness, of still looking to the past, in the Soviet peasantry — which was to a certain degree possible without major risks in view of the country's general structure and the extraordinary upsurge in industrialization — the Chinese course involves the attempt to overcome, already at this stage, the particularism and egotism which constitute the heavy historic burden of the peasants.

It is therefore comprehensible that Khrushchev should be worried when faced by so original an experiment that is being developed on a gigantic scale. If the Chinese communes attain their goal by really achieving the successes counted on by those who are promoting them, then there will be a striking confirmation of the fact that there is a way of socialist construction in the rural regions which is not the Soviet way, which is not that of Khrushchev. The practical example might be able to cause polemics to rebound also in the Soviet Union, where people will not fail to wonder about the possibility of following different paths, closer to those of China, which might no doubt be followed more easily in view of the higher level of the Soviet economy. It is obvious that in the people's democracies as well a whole series

of problems might be raised from a different angle.⁹

We may say in passing, for it is not the subject of this article, that it is the general orientation of the development of the Chinese economy for now several years, and not only the more recent orientation in the rural regions, which is marked by an undeniable originality. Actually the Chinese leaders seem to have taken into account most attentively the more negative experiences of the Stalinist line of the '30s, and — whether in the development of agriculture, or in the proportionality that they try to establish among the different branches of industry, or in the care they show for certain minimum needs of consumers — they are following a course which, due allowances being made, is closer to the conceptions of the Left Opposition than to those of Stalin and his theoreticians.

The capital importance of this differentiation, of the existence of a "Chinese way," appears in its full scope if one reflects on the influence that the Chinese example will be able to exert on the new countries, especially the underdeveloped ones, who will in the future tackle the construction of socialism. Although it is for the moment a matter only of an eventuality, it must all the more worry the Soviet leaders that some country in a quite specific and almost unique transitional stage¹⁰ has already demonstrated in practice its interest in the communes.

On the more theoretical level, in the last months and especially in the polemical articles accompanying the celebration of the anniversary of Lenin's birth, the Chinese Communists further insisted on their thesis about the uninterrupted revolution, on their very special interpretation of the formula "democratic dictatorship of the people," and on the criticism of the orientation of the Chinese leadership during the second revolution (1925-27).¹¹

Lenin [they wrote among other things] applied and brilliantly developed the Marxist idea of the uninterrupted revolution, considering it a basic principle of orientation of the proletarian revolution. Lenin explained that the proletariat must win the leadership of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and, without interruption, transform the bourgeois-democratic revolution into socialist revolution. Lenin later

⁹ It seems that in certain people's democracies (Bulgaria and East Germany) tendencies rather inclined to follow the path of the communes did in fact tend to appear at a given moment.

¹⁰ We allude to Sekou Touré's Guinea.

¹¹ On the "uninterrupted revolution," see our Autumn 1958 and Spring 1960 issues.

specified that the socialist revolution is not the final goal, and that it is necessary to advance still further to accomplish the transition to the higher level of communism. [...] Lenin specified: "The first [the democratic revolution] grows into the second [the socialist revolution]. The second solves in passing all the problems of the first. The struggle, the struggle alone, decides to what extent the second succeeds in rising higher than the first." [Report of Lu Ting-Yi, Hsinhua despatch of 23 April 1960.]

It is true that a little further on, with an offhand eclecticism, the writer of those lines praises his party for having combined the "doctrine of the uninterrupted revolution and the development of the revolution by stages." But this concerns an attempt at an a posteriori justification of past policy on which our magazine has already had the opportunity of expressing its opinion,¹² and whose reach is inevitably limited by the Chinese themselves, when, for example, they give the famous formula of the democratic dictatorship of the people an interpretation to which Trotsky would have had no major objection ("The people's democratic dictatorship is set up by the working class and based on the alliance of the workers and peasants" — editorial of the *People's Newspaper*, quoted in a 22 April 1960 Hsinhua despatch), or when they criticize the party's 1925-27 course in the following terms:

During this period the opportunism of Chen Du-Siu showed that the policy of the united front of the Communist Party with the Kuomintang was an abandonment of the principles and positions which those of a communist party ought to be. He advocated that the Communist Party must be reduced in principle to the level of the Kuomintang. The result was the defeat of the revolution. [*The Red Flag*, quoted in a 21 April 1960 Hsinhua despatch.]

Let us leave aside the unfortunate Chen Du-Siu, who was only applying the line imposed by Stalin and his Comintern (as the Chinese know very well, even if they still find it to their interest to take shelter behind so petty a falsification): the criticism that *The Red Flag* formulates here more than 30 years later is exactly the same that the Left Opposition formulated against Stalin at the time itself. It cannot be said that Max Reimann is wrong if he says that this business of the uninterrupted revolution reminds him of the

themes of Trotsky's polemics,¹³ any more than it can be denied that Khrushchev and his companions have good reason to be worried about what is going on in their powerful and dynamic ally!

THE KHRUSHCHEVIST BASIC PERSPECTIVE AND CHINESE CRITICISM

In an article appearing in *Pravda* on August 12th, the Soviet leader Ponomarev endeavored to specify the scope of the problems raised in the current polemics by explaining that the divergences on the war and coexistence in reality implied divergences also on a whole series of basic problems, both tactical and strategic. It could nowise be disputed that these assertions are well-founded.¹⁴

Indeed, the polemics between the Soviets and the Chinese, in spite of fundamentally ridiculous reserves and often Byzantine argumentation, have such burning interest because they bring into discussion the essential questions of the orientation of the communist movement at this stage. These questions can be reduced to the following three:

- 1) How is the historical transition from capitalism to socialism going to be carried out, or, by what ways will imperialism be totally defeated and will socialism be victorious on the world scale?
- 2) What is the role of the colonial revolution and what must be the dynamic of development of this revolution at the present stage?
- 3) By what ways will the proletariat of the capitalist countries be able to beat its adversary and conquer power?

Now the prospect of the Khrushchevist Soviet leadership is absolutely clear. In the new stage that we have entered as a consequence of the crisis of imperialism and the economic upsurge of the U S S R and the other workers' states, imperialism can be blocked in its race toward war. The nature of the new weapons is another factor operating in the same direction, given the fact that the interest of the peoples is more than ever to avoid a war of catastrophic consequences and that the old ruling classes, or at least a part of them, would not be able to decide to trigger off a war likely to be transformed into suicide.¹⁵ The historic

¹³ According to certain news information originating with *Neues Deutschland*, Reimann seems to have expressed himself in such terms during a speech in the Central Committee of the SED in August 1960.

¹⁴ Unfortunately we were unable to procure the integral text of this article, but on the basis of press reports its general significance appears quite clear.

¹⁵ V Khrushchev's speech at the Bucharest Congress, and a report of Togliatti, an ardent supporter of the Khrushchevist theses, to the C C of the Italian C P in July (*L'Unità*, 24 July 1960).

¹² Especially in the Spring 1960 issue already mentioned.

conflict between capitalism and socialism, therefore, must and can be solved in coexistence, above all on the basis of economic competition between the U S S R and the U S A.

It would be simplistic to say that Khrushchev and his supporters are completely unaware of the contribution of the struggle of the colonial peoples and the proletariat of the capitalist countries. But the main line of their policy consists in "competitive" coexistence: the economic development of the U S S R is the essential factor which in the last analysis will decide everything, while the other factors are assigned, upon the whole, the role of creating, if possible, more favorable conditions for the victory of the U S S R in the economic race.¹⁶

With this outlook, it is understandable that Khrushchev and the Khrushchevists are staking on every possibility of collaboration, were it only with sectors of capitalism, and that they are heading towards a prolonged collaboration with the colonial or semi-colonial bourgeoisies despite the reactionary role that these can play against the mass movement in their respective countries. This picture is completed by the perspective of the "peaceful," and indeed "parliamentary," road to socialism that the masses of the capitalist countries ought to accept as a consequence of Khrushchevist coexistence. Furthermore, if by this path they do not succeed in fact in winning power and the Communist Parties can at most only limit the action of their adversaries, that will not be so important, for the outcome of the game will be decided on another level.

The Chinese Communists visibly do not believe in such prospects, at least when they are pushed to their logical conclusions. They do not exclude coexistence between different social regimes, but they visibly do not accept the idea that the final defeat of imperialism could be ensured without war, without very violent clashes on the world scale. For them, war is not inevitable, but it seems to be still the more probable term of the alternative; in any case, the only way to avoid it is, if not wholly to destroy capitalism, to paralyze it more and more by the revolutionary struggles of the masses. For this purpose, the reënforcement of the F L N's struggle is for them more important than attempts at agreement with Gaullist France, and the struggle of the Japanese people is more important than Khrushchev's trip to the United States.

Of course, they do not express themselves with full clarity; but basically, while still taking military force into account, and especially that

¹⁶ This emerges also rather clearly from a key-article in *Kommunist*, n° 10, 1960.

of the U S S R, they insist more on the contribution of the revolutionary rise of the masses than on developments in purely military relationships, and, while still constantly emphasizing the importance of the economic upsurge of the workers' states, they are not staking on a final victory emerging above all from this factor¹⁷ — which means, in other words, that their viewpoint and that of the Soviet leaders are very different, if not squarely opposed.

That finds its logical translation in a different attitude toward the colonial revolution and concerning the roads to socialism in the capitalist countries. If primary importance is attributed to mass movements, they cannot be sacrificed to any extent to the needs of coexistence, and one is inevitably led to enter into conflict, especially with the national bourgeoisies of certain countries, who at this stage are playing the most harmful role by becoming more and more the means of transmitting imperialist — even "new-style" imperialist — influence in the colonial movement. On the other hand, no interest can be felt in joining in the idle chatter about the "peaceful and parliamentary" road — which is an illusory prospect that can only demobilize the masses, and one is on the contrary driven to recall certain first truths of the Marxist-Leninist concept of the state, which experiences, even the most recent ones, have regularly confirmed.

We have insisted here on what is the real bedrock of all these polemics between the Chinese and Soviet Communists, on what its essential logic is, even by partly putting aside the desire and consciousness of each. The arguments they bring forward are, in the last analysis, less important, especially if account is taken of the often indirect and veiled form imposed both by their bureaucratic education and by their interest in avoiding a political activation of the rank-and-file members.

Still, there is no doubt that the Chinese fashion of arguing is very discutible. Their documents often have a scholastic and schematic form, and quotation of texts often replaces analyses and demonstrations, which usually remain very summary. Their polemics against the revisionists, which aim sometimes at the Yugoslavs and sometimes at Khrushchev himself, are blended with crude deformations and even falsifications. Especially toward the Yugoslavs they adopt a terminology that very closely recalls the classic Stalinist style (with the traditional epithets of

¹⁷ For example, an article about Cuba in *The Red Flag* insists much more on the possibility of defending the island against an imperialist attack by a mobilization of the masses than on possible outside aid (v 1 September 1960 Hsinhua despatch).

"traitors," "agents of imperialism," etc) and do not even renounce virulent campaigns on the occasion of quite insignificant incidents that are very probably wholly invented.¹⁸ And lastly we have already emphasized in our magazine that they have not failed to revive Stalin's lamentable idea about the possibility of a new inter-imperialist world war in our time.¹⁹

It is all these sides of the Chinese polemics that have led some people to present the Chinese position as being Stalinist or neo-Stalinist. Let us leave aside here all that may be Stalinist — or more generally, bureaucratic — in the Chinese experience at this stage. If we consider the current discussion, we should be able to speak of "Stalinism" only by limiting ourselves to certain formal and superficial aspects and by arbitrarily exaggerating them. At bottom, the Chinese orientation is very far from Stalinism, just as it would be very difficult, for that matter, to find serious analogies with Stalinism concerning the economic line and the general policy in the rural regions — not to speak of all the ideological subjects to which we have already drawn our readers' attention.

But though such an analogy would be entirely false, the limits of the Chinese arguments remain, as perplexity also remains about their attitude concerning the eventual consequences of a nuclear war. In our opinion, they underestimate this problem in too offhand a way (it would suffice to read what the scientists who are expert in this matter are writing, to be convinced of this), thus laying themselves wide open to the criticism of their adversaries. Furthermore, among the very members of the Communist Parties it is exactly that attitude that most often arouses objections and reservations which the Khrushchevist bureaucrats hasten to exploit.

What is more, Mao and his collaborators seem seriously to minimize the forces left to imperialism when they present it as just "a paper tiger." It is exactly because, after all, imperialism still retains imposing forces and resources that the danger of a new war remains very concrete.²⁰

¹⁸ See, in the Hsinhua News Agency despatches and releases for the first ten days of September, their support of the polemics of the Albanians against an alleged attack by "Jugoslav bandits."

¹⁹ See, among other references, page 7 of the 1 April 1960 Hsinhua News Agency bulletin.

²⁰ In obvious polemics with the Chinese, the Soviets wrote that "imperialism is still, unfortunately, a powerful wild beast." [See already quoted article of *Kommunist*.] In a more recent (October) article, *The Red Flag* has tapered off the expression "paper tiger" by specifying that this expression has a strategic value but does not exclude on the tactical level a real temporary strength on the part of imperialism.

The Soviet Communists and their supporters argue with more subtlety and nuances, and apparently more dialectically: Khrushchev personally contributes his peasant common sense which is not unattractive to more naïve and less experienced people. Besides the argument of the destruction that a nuclear war would cause, they seem to state questions correctly when they say that it is necessary to take new situations into account and that it is absurd and childish to limit oneself to repeating what Lenin said fifty or Marx a hundred years ago, or when they attack possibly sectarian attitudes that deny the role of colonial movements under bourgeois or petty-bourgeois leadership.

But, in the first place, it is not a matter of proclaiming methodological criteria which are after all obvious; it is a matter of applying them concretely and showing how and to what degree certain of Lenin's conceptions should in fact be corrected. On this field, the Soviets remain very discreet and brief: just as, at the XXth Congress, they formulated in a few hasty sentences an allegedly new conception of the conquest of power, so now, without any really scientific organic analysis, they revise the conceptions on war and sketch out a prospect of passing over to socialism on a world scale within the limits of peaceful coexistence.

"Only madmen can wish for such a catastrophe as war — which Lenin termed barbarous and monstrous — to make socialism triumph in the world," *Kommunist* wrote.²¹ This seems correct, but it is, basically, very vulgar. It is one thing to observe that after the two world wars the revolution made historic advances and to put forward the hypothesis that still more decisive advances would be possible during or after a third world war, and quite another thing to wish for that war. The question is not to know whether war is desirable or not but whether the objective trends of *present-day* world reality are or are not driving toward war. The question is not to know whether it would be well to pass over to socialism in the world on the basis of predominantly economic competition, but whether that is concretely possible. Granted, war is barbarous and monstrous, and even absurd, if you will; but it is the internal logic of capitalism, which engenders all sorts of barbarisms and monstrosities, of which war is only one.

Let us take another example. What Zhukov writes in part of his article in the 28 August *Pravda* on the progressive role that can be played in the anti-imperialist struggle in the colonies even by bourgeoisies or petty bourgeoisies

²¹ Quoted by *Le Monde*, 19 September 1960.

is roughly correct. But the problems raised at the present stage are concrete in a different way. To what extent are certain national bourgeoisies still progressive, to what degree can the movement in certain countries go forward without directly attacking the new bourgeois or petty-bourgeois dominant strata? That is the problem that is raised in countries as important as India or Indonesia, and in practice the attitude of the Chinese toward Nehru and Sukarno is different from the Soviet attitude. Zhukov gives no clear theoretical or practical reply, but in fact he sticks to the prospect of a compromise with the colonial bourgeoisies, even the most conservative, and he accepts that the workers' movement in the colonial countries be relegated for a whole period to an essentially subordinate role.

If the Sino-Soviet polemics are examined from this viewpoint, reducing the formal sides to proper proportions, it is clear that the Chinese are providing answers that correspond much more to the objective necessities of the revolutionary process and to the needs and aspirations of the masses.

THE INTERVENTION OF KARDELJ

The Yugoslav Communists also wanted to make their voice heard in the debate that is developing. Once again it was Edvard Kardelj who was entrusted with the task of organically expressing their conceptions.

Let us say right away that the Yugoslavs have confirmed the fact that, on questions like war and the prospects of the international workers' movement, they have a dangerously opportunist orientation. If the Kardelj who theorizes about the contradictions within a society in transition or about the organisms of proletarian democracy or about the agrarian question in Yugoslavia is capable of expressing very valuable ideas, the Kardelj who discusses "socialism and war" gets lost in a painful confusion by giving us in substance a worsened variant of the Khrushchev theses.²²

Kardelj insists on the idea that war is not just simply a natural consequence of imperialism, but that it involves a question of correlation of forces: in that, he joins up with the Soviet point of view. He goes, however, very far in the polemics by putting forward a whole series of often absolutely astonishing arguments.²³

²² The Soviets are somewhat embarrassed by this fact and have tried to differentiate themselves, either by criticizing certain extreme assertions of Kardelj or by resorting to real sophism (see the reply to Kardelj published in *Pravda*, 2 September 1960).

²³ We are relying especially on the ample summary published by *Avanti!*, organ of the Italian Socialists, who,

It suffices for us to point out, for example, that, starting out from the fact that the Second World War was carried on by two coalitions, one capitalist and the other composed of capitalist countries and a workers' state, he draws the conclusion that in that war coexistence surmounted a particularly difficult test; that he attributes to Marx and Engels the idea that a socialist country can start an unjust war; that he asserts that the same Marx and Engels were for peace and against war especially because they thought that war hinders the development of progressive processes inside different countries. Even more than the Soviets, he polemicizes against the Chinese as if they thought that the revolution must triumph thanks to the bayonets of the workers' states; and he even presents us with the scarecrow of a "socialist Bonapartism" which would lead the workers' states to take the initiative in starting a war of invasion. It is obvious that it is easy for him to knock down these straw-men that he himself has conjured up.²⁴ Naturally the reference to Trotsky is not lacking — no fear — as it is not lacking in the polemics of the Khrushchevists²⁵: Trotsky is set up in opposition to Lenin and his outlook is once again deformed. Thus an old falsification is picked up again for the purpose of arbitrary polemics against adversaries who are the victims of new polemics, for neither Trotsky nor the Chinese were ever supporters of "socialist Bonapartism," of the theory that the revolution could be exported with the aid of Red Armies.

To the basic problems of the revolutionary process at the present stage, Kardelj gives a response similar to that of Khrushchev, whose opportunist orientation he even accentuates. He thinks that the passing over to socialism will be accomplished in coexistence, and that outside said coexistence there is no salvation. He accuses the Chinese of sectarianism in the question of the colonial countries, and it is well known that he does not share their ideas about the question of the "new" roads to socialism. On this occasion, he picks up in passing the Yugoslav themes about state capitalism accomplishing a progressive task in the economic development of backward countries, always forgetting that the question of the objective premises of socialism which are posed within capitalism itself is

being very close to the Yugoslavs on these questions, may be considered to reproduce their arguments quite faithfully.

²⁴ He does so, what is more, with passably vulgar arguments.

²⁵ See for example Khrushchev's 31 October 1959 speech and the already mentioned report of Togliatti in the article in *Kommunist*, n° 10, 1960.

entirely different both from the question of the political (class) leadership of any process and from the question of knowing how the proletariat will be able to replace the old ruling class in power.

But for Kardelj what seems to be most important is to know whether the revolution and socialism should be built by factors that operate inside each country or by violent pressure from outside. The answer is obviously clear: without the part played by factors inside each country, there cannot be genuine socialism; but, in the context of the world situation as it exists in the second half of the XXth century, it is more than ever absurd to be unaware that the internal factors are powerfully conditioned by the reality of the world process, in view of the fact that the struggle between capitalism and socialism is developing not only inside each country but also on the world arena. Anyone who would like to forget this factual element would automatically put himself outside reality, and, in the best of hypotheses, he would be replacing a scientific analysis of the real situation and trends by an illusory and sterile wishful thinking.

WHY DO THEY DO IT?

It remains only to point out the specific factors that influence each side, pushing it toward its respective orientation.

The Soviet leaders, in the new objective conditions, can no longer hold to a rigidly inspired conception of a maintenance of the status quo, as was the case in the Stalinist era. But they still want to do everything possible to avoid all imbalances and clashes, by simultaneously limiting the dynamic revolutionary intervention of the masses. Their instinct of self-preservation as a privileged social stratum causes them always to understand that the more the revolutionary process spreads throughout the world, the less chance they have of keeping power and escaping the settlement of accounts with the Soviet masses, who hope to suppress all privileges in the workers' state and to build a genuine proletarian democracy.

The prospect of peaceful coexistence, of economic competition, corresponds very well to these needs of the bureaucracy, which hopes in this way to avoid more and more powerful waves of the revolution and keep the maximum possible control over the development of the world situation, thanks also to the upsurge of the Soviet economy. Khrushchev is all the more engaged in this line in that he likes to present himself to the Russian people, so sorely tried by a still recent war, as the one who will be able to ensure

the détente and prevent them from being hurled into a new conflict. There is no doubt that his political fate is tied up with the results both of his internal reformism and of his line of foreign policy centred entirely around peaceful coexistence.

Their specific situation leads the Yugoslav leaders in the same direction. They cannot count on a real solidarity from the other workers' states, and for ten years have tried to hold out by exploiting a situation of equilibrium, even though it be precarious, created in Europe, and by trying to obtain advantages from both sides. They think that their situation in a war would become untenable, and that they run the risk of being quickly swept away by the storm. That is why they are such ardent supporters of coexistence, which they tried to theorize about even before Khrushchev. The fact that for years they were subjected to virulent attacks and threats by Stalin, who, if the international situation had permitted, would have chosen the path of direct violence to get rid of them, explains — without, however, justifying — how they can express their pseudo-theory of possible unjust wars even by socialist countries.

To interpret the attitude of the Chinese, the hypothesis has been put forward that they are inclined to bring on a military conflict because they consider it would have a favorable outcome, especially for themselves, who, starting out from a more backward level, would, among other things, have less to risk. We are not at all in agreement with such an interpretation, for in reality, from all points of view, they have no interest in deliberately provoking such a course of events. Even leaving aside the fact that basically a world-wide overthrow would be, for the survival of the Chinese bureaucracy, no less a danger than it would be for the Soviet bureaucracy, the Chinese more than anyone else can justly consider that time is working on their side. In a showdown at the present stage, they would find themselves, from the economic and military viewpoint, in a very clear state of inferiority: no doubt, proportions will be considerably changed, if not reversed, in 10 or 15 years.

Their present orientation is rather the following: they think that — since the crisis of imperialism is getting more and more grave and the East Wind is prevailing over the West Wind — this favorable situation must be exploited, something that the Khrushchev policy, according to them, would not do.

It is certain that their exclusion from summit diplomacy and their being kept out of the U N O

have played a certain role: they cannot accept being represented by intermediaries; they want in reality to play a more and more important part — and one proportionate to the real force of China — both in world politics and in the leadership of the anti-imperialist front. In particular they want to play a growing part not only in Asia but also in Africa and Latin America; and though the Soviet bureaucracy can at a given moment sketch out a compromise, even if only a precarious one, with Washington, in regard to Africa or South America, for example, this possibility absolutely does not exist for the Chinese, and their line consequently can be only one of very clear opposition both to the old colonialisms and to the new Yankee colonizers. Furthermore, for a whole series of evident objective conditions or special circumstances, they are in a much better position than the Soviets to establish liaisons with the colonial movements, and they have run into conflict with certain colonial bourgeoisies whose real nature and purposes they have in practice been driven to unmask. They can record all the more success in this field in that they seem in spite of everything to have learned well the lesson of certain past experiences.²⁶ In the final analysis, therefore, the present positions of the Chinese are the reflection of a profound reality, namely, the reality of the Asian revolution and of the colonial revolution in general, a revolution which cannot accept an attitude that is not that of an all-out struggle, which cannot be satisfied by idle talk about “coexistence” or “irreversible”

²⁶ The agreement of China with Guinea provides that Chinese specialists in Guinea may not have a higher standard of living than the Guinean citizens who are carrying out the same tasks. Evidently the Chinese have not forgotten the Yugoslav polemics against the Soviets on this subject, and in practice it is the Yugoslav point of view that they accept.

détente. For their part, the Chinese are also under the attack and constant threat of imperialism, which, among other things, still controls a part of their territory. Somehow or other they see, in the steady spread of revolutionary movements in the world, the concrete way to remove the threat and to improve their conditions, including on the economic plane.

In the debate developing in the Communist Parties, in the workers' movement in general, and even in the colonial peoples' movements,²⁷ which is destined to exert a very serious influence, especially among Communist cadres and militants, whom it will aid to political maturity, it has been stated on several sides that the Chinese have adopted the positions of the Trotskyists. We need not recall here our basic criticism of the Chinese leadership, which, in spite of all, remains bureaucratic and has a bureaucratic conception of the problems of the transition to socialism, beginning by that of the structure of the workers' state. We have already expressed elsewhere our reservations about their successive theorizations. Still, it is after all clear that at the present stage certain of the conceptions that have traditionally characterized our movement are penetrating on a large scale, by the intermediary of the Chinese, into the Communist movement, even though in a rather approximate and deformed way.

The dialectics of the historical process in its dynamics is such that even certain bureaucratic leaderships are obliged more and more openly to raise for themselves problems of the development of the revolution, and thus to draw near the conceptions of revolutionary Marxism.

22 September 1960

²⁷ It seems that the most direct support for certain Chinese positions is given by Sekou Touré.

THE LIBERATION OF WOMEN

By MICHEL PABLO

INTRODUCTORY NOTE BY THE AUTHOR

The following are only simple thoughts giving a general guiding line on the question of women, the family, and children, and are in no way an exhaustive study of the question. Hence it is inevitable that certain notions will perhaps seem schematic, disregarding the necessary nuances and supplementary detailed explanations.

There is much sensitiveness and much confusion about the questions here treated. Certain of them are taboos that one does not dare to touch, even in vanguard circles. And yet the history of human thought on these questions is rich in daring developments — as daring as the economic and cultural conditions of each epoch permitted.

The ideas of Plato on the social education of children are well known.

From the XVIIth century on, the question of women, the family, and children began seriously to concern advanced writers and thinkers. It is already possible to feel the approach of the twilight of the patriarchal family and the gradual transformation of that institution. Equally well known are the advanced ideas of the Encyclopedists on this matter, ideas that had immense influence on the legislation of the French Revolution in its first years.

In the XIXth century, side-by-side with the reactionary ideas of a Proudhon, what daring there is in the ideas of a Fourier, an Owen, a Flora Tristan, not to mention also Saint-Simon and the pleiad of feminist women, George Sand, Mme de Staël, et al. The Marxist movement, especially with Engels, takes up and further broadens the most revolutionary themes on these questions.

The apogee of this movement is marked by the legislation

In the article I had started to write on "The Eleventh Year of the Chinese Revolution" I had intended to deal, among other matters, with the question of the liberation of women in New China.

Circumstances will naturally prevent me from completing this article. I shall therefore have to be content with summarizing my thoughts in this letter.

The Chinese claim they have now really freed women, by delivering them from domestic barbarism and completely integrating them in social, economic, political, and cultural life.

This is no doubt about the great advantage of the communes, that they transfer women's household tasks to social organizations such as community restaurants, day-nurseries, schools, etc. Women who are freed from these duties can thus fully participate in social life as men do.

But when we speak of the Chinese case we must never forget that present Chinese society is still materially very backward, and politically ruled by a bureaucratic system. The first factor has, of course, a considerable influence on the quality and

of the first years of the Russian Revolution, before Stalinist degeneration set in.

Throughout this historical development, several ideas were put forward, discussed, and clarified: that of the "equality" of men and women, and the notion of the "couple" as a higher unit of complementary beings; that of "marriage for love," replacing forced marriage or marriage for interested motives imposed by the head of the patriarchal family or the father of the bourgeois family; that of voluntary motherhood and birth control; that of the social education of children.

These ideas have been reflected in action and even in legislation.

It suffices to compare the free unions, marriages, and family of a modern couple — especially of those to be met in revolutionary, intellectual, university, and artistic circles — with the traditional bourgeois family.

But these are only exceptions, limited in themselves and in a social context that is still steeped in anti-woman and reactionary prejudices.

It is certainly an illusion to believe that, on these questions which touch on the real civilization of man, there can be any solution until the roots of class society have been torn up and a totally different climate and ambience created.

But what is already possible is first of all a clear consciousness of the real problems, the drawing up of a transitional programme on these questions, and the greatest possible approximation to correct solutions in the circles — the couples and families — of the revolutionary vanguard.

quantity of the social services which take the place of women's household work: restaurants, day-nurseries and schools. The second factor implies a largely *administrative* and not real solution of the problem, oversimplified in the classical Stalinist style.

That is why, although we welcome the historical experience of the communes and the progressive character of the measures taken with respect to Chinese women compared to their previous state, we must follow this experience with a very critical attitude.

To relieve woman of the besotting tyranny of household duties and to give her a part equal to that of man in economic, political — in a word, social — life, undoubtedly represents a step forward towards her liberation. But what does that really mean?

Let us take the question of her participation in economic life. If a woman can earn her living in exactly the same way as a man in terms of working possibilities, vocational qualification, promotion, and remuneration, it means that the age-old chains which harnessed the slave woman

of the past to the cart of her husband, lover, or father — the only possessor of money, and exclusive supporter of the family — have been broken.

But in a socialist society the economic emancipation of women will not necessarily mean *equal* conditions of work with men; not at all. For women, because of their organic constitution, are not as suited as men for any type of work, in present conditions at least.

The way in which the Soviet state under Stalin economically "liberated" women by tying them down to tasks contrary to their specific constitution, was naturally grotesque and barbarous. It is to be feared that similar excesses might yet flourish in China.

Women are not *equal* to men in all aspects; they are *complementary*. Woman and man are the two complementary aspects of the human being. Absolute equality is a basically anti-dialectical notion. Absolute equality or identity does not exist in this world, where each being is, so to speak, a *unique unit*. Women have particular qualities and possibilities which men do not possess, and, naturally, vice versa. All discussions on the inferiority or superiority of women compared to men are therefore absurd. The starting-point of these discussions is wrong, for the complementary character of man and woman (the two aspects of the human being) is forgotten.

Here a remark is necessary: that in the present state of affairs women start out under a handicap as compared with men. Centuries of slavery, during which they have been considered as sexual objects, as procreators of children, and as a means for carrying out household tasks, have inevitably atrophied women physically and intellectually, broken down all their resilience, and deeply deformed their being. It will therefore require a whole period of time for them to develop and for their being to flourish in liberty, so as to show what they are capable of. We do not yet know woman, for conditions are still extremely unfavorable to her development, far more so than for man's.

Woman's liberation starts, it is true, by her economic liberation, but is that all? We now come to a question which has been neglected by all, including the communist movement at its best.

We must base our considerations on the fact that this society is always a *society of men* which has developed as such throughout a great number of centuries since the very remote age of matriarchy. It has created a deep-rooted mentality in man and in woman. As in a colonial society, so in the present society, even the most civilized, everything seems to voice the general opinion of the inferiority of woman. This opinion, with which

women themselves are deeply saturated, is expressed in various more or less subtle ways. A long period of socialism will be necessary to dissipate the miasmas of a society ruled by men and to give women their full place.

Present capitalist society, with its ever more unrestrained idolatry for money — the supreme value of a dying civilization — also encourages women to push to the utmost their disguise as mere frivolous and superficial sexual objects. The way modern women blindly follow the extravagant whims of absurd fashions in capitalist countries, is a distressing demonstration of this regression, rather than progression, of women.

As to the situation of women in the young workers' states, the necessary equilibrium has not yet been found among the various specific requirements of women concerning working conditions, behavior, intellectual development, and sexual morality, etc. We are again approaching problems which so far have scarcely been seriously discussed.

Man's society has glorified the essential procreating function of woman; that of bearing, nursing, and bringing up her young. But as for her private sex life freed of the yoke of maternity, nobody dares even think about it, so much is this field still considered to be man's exclusive "hunting-ground."

Absurd theories have been worked up to justify the myth of woman as, allegedly, organically uninterested in a full and free sex life equal to that sought by man. But one forgets, or pretends to forget, the specifically unfavorable conditions in which women are obliged to work out their sex life. All social pressure — traditions, religion, public opinion — tend to oppress a complete and free sex life on the part of women.

The sexual behavior of men, egotistic and often corrupted by prostitution, causes serious traumata in women as well as the constant fear of unsought motherhood.

But who could seriously argue that women have less imperative sexual needs than men? On the contrary, there are specifically feminine physiological factors which make women more fit to exercise their sexual functions more frequently and amply than men. But this question has always been put under a taboo with regard to women.

All liberties have been granted to men because of their so-called specific temperament. But the question of the oppression and exploitation of women is always disregarded. Yet a free and full sex life is a vital function of human beings, which has an enormous influence on their development and daily individual behavior. This is a overdue scientific truth that XIXth century men,

even the most advanced, preferred not to admit. Freud's contribution in this respect is really extraordinary and marks an epoch.

But Freudianism, as a capital scientific contribution to the study of individual rather than collective or social behavior, has not been very fortunate with Marxism. It has not been understood, assimilated, and developed as a real, important, and new contribution to the analysis of man's intimate life, independently of Freud's personal philosophy, his reactionary social elucubrations, and his mistakes even in the scientific field. Even the best men and women of the Second and Third International in the XXth century, Lenin included — Trotsky was the exception — were not able to appreciate and study thoroughly the really scientific and valid part of Freud's work. Later, under Stalinism and the general degeneration of the Marxist movement, Freud was even discredited. The Communist movement almost completely ignored the capital importance of a complete and free sex life both for the harmonious development and the normal, healthy, and euphoric behavior of men and women.

Even Engels's approach to the question of woman's sex life was very timid and reserved, in spite of the fact that the views expressed in his *Origin of the Family*, etc were particularly unconventional, bold, and really brilliant with regard to the question of women, the family, and the future relations between the two sexes. On this point he really belonged to his time, as Lenin did.

The Third International, before its degeneration, up until the death of Lenin, singled out only the question of the economic liberation of women. It too neglected the entirety of the specific problem of woman. A real communist movement ought to struggle for the complete liberation of women: that means, among other things, for their fundamental right to a full and free sex life.

Following this view, a real protection of women against the risks of undesired pregnancy is the sacred duty of all really civilized societies.

In present conditions of scientific development, this protection is often made possible only by abortion. Granted, this practice, if repeated, injures woman both physically and morally. But she is the only one who should take a decision on this point, and society should provide her with the best conditions possible for her liberation, including the practice of abortion in the case of an undesired pregnancy. Tomorrow, no doubt, science will provide us with simpler and harmless means to obtain the same result. We have already made progress in this field.

In any case society should make freely available to women all existing measures of birth control, as well as instruction on this subject. Naturally, this demand, of capital interest for millions of women, should be included in the programme of any communist movement worthy of its name, for the communist movement is the only really democratic, liberal, and progressive movement today.

Much has been said on the so-called essential function of woman: that of reproduction. Woman, it seems, is above all a Mother. Proceeding from a commonplace physiological observation, the apologists for the enslavement of women deliberately exalt this function. Of course, physiologically speaking, woman is a mother, as man is a father, and this reproducing function of humanity is fundamental in these terms.

But it absolutely does not mean that this function must be achieved by jeopardizing a total, full, and free life on the part of woman as well as of man.

Woman most often takes refuge in motherhood and particularly in repeated motherhood because of the lack of real participation in social life and because her relations with man, within the present limits of the family, very soon become unsatisfactory.

Society and men do their utmost to confine women to their "home" in their function of wives and mothers. Furthermore, as the initial sexual attraction between man and woman dies out and is replaced by the gloomy life of most existing married couples all over the world, motherhood and children furnish woman with a "solution": both an occupation and a protection. It is absolutely false to say that motherhood alone allows woman to flower and gives her the equilibrium which is best suited to her specific nature. As a matter of fact, woman, like man, can develop and find a certain equilibrium only in an active social life and a satisfying sex life. History supplies particularly eloquent and demonstrative examples on this subject.

All women who have distinguished themselves socially, politically, and culturally, and have had a relatively full and free sex life, have granted only a limited amount of attention to children and maternity, which represented to them, as they usually do to men, just one aspect among many in their interesting and active life, and not necessarily the principal one. Far from it. Moreover, all women belonging to the upper classes or to advanced cultural circles, with a satisfactory social and sex life, reserve for maternity and children only a limited place, subordinate to the enjoyment of such an existence.

In reality, the passion for motherhood and children more specifically pertains only to the infinite mass of women excluded from real social life and defeated in their sex life and their relations with man within the framework of the present family.

Let us take up only this last aspect of the problem: it is relatively simple to demonstrate that a woman who has really established a profound, rich, and satisfying relationship with a man, in a couple, has little interest in introducing a third party into this relationship in the form of children. Woman creates her own traditional environment — the "home," with children, in which she shuts herself up and wanes — only as a sort of escape and compensation for her failures in her social, sexual, and love life.

Of course the social position of woman has up till now been determined by the class structure of society. The family centred around the woman as wife and mother has well met the requirements of this society, which is both a class society and one ruled by men. Class society has found in the family the most conservative cell of its structure. Man has found in the family the most economical form for the organization of his individual life, with greater advantage than woman.

In the present conditions of class society and for the transitional phase from capitalism to socialism, the present monogamous family — centred, as I said before, upon the woman — is necessary because it has obvious advantages for both men and women. It is, first of all, the most economical form of organization of their material life. Secondly, it often holds out — falsely, it is true — the bright prospect of a haven of peace and protection, compared to a society hostile to man. We thus arrive at the broader question of the Family itself.

Class society has found it to be, as I said above, its most conservative cell.

The family keeps women away from social life, and the housekeeping and motherly occupations which derive from it degrade them from the rank of human beings capable of an ample and free development. The family, furthermore, develops the conservative, egotistic, and anti-social characteristics of men. And lastly, the family brings children up in an environment which is fundamentally unfavorable to their full development into well-balanced and free human beings. Children are generally brought up by ignorant and hysterical mothers who stifle, from the crucial period of infancy onward, the natural impulse human beings feel for beauty, heroism, and human brotherhood.

Mothers become ignorant and hysterical because of the inferior position they occupy in present

male-dominated class society, because of their detachment from an active and interesting social life, and the frequent failure of their sexual or love life, as well as because of the prostrating and stupefying effects of domestic chores and the burdens of maternity. The present material conditions, especially with regard to housing, aggravate the position women find themselves in to accomplish their tasks as mothers, that is to say, as educators of humanity.

A new-born child has the potentiality of an immense future; of course heredity bears upon each one. I shall come to that question presently. But the undetermined part is, in any case, with the exception of pathological cases, considerable in the new-born child. The influence of the family environment in which the initial critical phase of a human being's life is spent is highly determinant for its formation.

At this stage, mothers play a decisive part. All the degradation society inflicts upon women is turned against society by the function women accomplish as mothers. One could almost say: as the mothers are, so will the sons be — whence the enormous importance of the question of women, which concerns not half but the whole of mankind. Really to free women, to improve their quality, means to free and improve the quality of all mankind. It is not a matter of questioning the special affective atmosphere of the family, or more exactly what is called mother love. Nor is it one of denying the importance and even the need for a bond, a contact, between children and parents, especially the mother, during a certain period of time. What is in question from the viewpoint of creating a new mankind made up of well-balanced, strong, healthy, and altruistic beings, is the following point: Can the present family be entrusted with the education of children?

Let us study more closely all the aspects of this problem.

In comparison with the constant traumata that human beings undergo in present-day society — for all relations among men are most often antagonistic, based on power, and on economic, intellectual, or sexual exploitation, where each party tries to use the other to his own advantage — the family, with its special affectivity, can be a more comforting environment. But because it is really opposed to society and because of the conditions in which women and therefore mothers are placed, the "best" family, the most affective one, is far from imparting a really sound social education to children. The proper framework for the creation of renewed mankind is that of beauty, heroism, sacrifice, and love for others.

The family atmosphere, on the contrary, is impregnated with moral and material pettiness, cowardice, and individual and family egotism. But it is right from the beginning, from the most tender age, that it is necessary to prompt a child so that the potentialities of beauty, heroism, and human brotherhood will develop in him.

Instead of children being brought up in an atmosphere of misery, ugliness, exasperation, hysteria, intimidation, cowardice, ignorance, and selfishness, they must be allowed to flower into the splendor of man's real virtues and real destiny.

In the new worldwide socialist society, the first civilized society of mankind, there will be *eugenics* and a *social education for children*. By *eugenics* I mean this:

Men will voluntarily learn to leave the reproduction of mankind to those who are most fit physically and intellectually and not necessarily beget children themselves.

They will get rid of the bad habit of considering children also to be "private property" and will learn to love other people's children, the offspring of society, as if they were their own. In a further stage, when the general level, apart from rare exceptions, will be free from the bad aftermaths of a harmful heredity, *eugenics* may of course lose their importance. Besides — who knows? — the reproduction of mankind may at that time be carried out by completely new means.

A limited number of civilized groups have already succeeded in understanding the need for "family planning" and birth control. Why then should a really civilized society not understand and apply voluntarily a certain degree of *eugenics*?

By *social education of children* I mean this:

Infants will somehow be left under the care of collective education organized by specialists. I am absolutely certain that children can develop in a children's society, subtly controlled and flexibly guided by really competent specialists, in an infinitely better manner than in the eternal laps of kind and affectionate, but hysterical, frustrated, and ignorant mothers, and within the narrow and self-centred horizon of the present-day family. Should they be completely separated from their parents? I should not be able to give an answer to this question, which depends upon the future development of *pædagogical science* in this field. It seems to me that a bond should exist, although it must not reverse the trend and influence of *social education*.

At a more advanced stage of childhood, educated children and their parents should have affective relations as friends, companions, and comrades, but without bringing weight to bear upon their

mutual lives. *Affectivity* will evolve from its actual animalist stage to more profound and finer forms of human love, esteem, solidarity, and mutually enriching exchanges.

The general trend of all human relations, moreover, will be toward love for fellows-beings.

Today each of us is made uneasy, and even wounded, by others, so complex and antagonistic are mutual relations among men. Liberation in this field will consist in the elimination of antagonisms, complexes, and imbalances among men, and in the discovery by each of us that in every other person can be found a source of possible joy, a different and unique aspect, experience, or realization of a human being.

But let us return to children, women, and the family. Children must be born and exist for themselves and not just as objects for occupation, consolation, or revenge by their parents, frustrated and defeated mothers or fathers.

Woman can certainly not find a solution to her problems in the care of children, the household, the family. As in the case of man, a solution lies in an interesting and active social life and satisfying sexual and love life. But on what must the latter be based?

In society nowadays the relations between the sexes are warped and deformed. There can be no happy union of a couple unless it is of a well-balanced complementary nature from every point of view.

Naturally there must be, right from the start, a strong and mutual sexual attraction. But this element is the result of a number of organic, constitutional, psychical, and cultural factors. Its duration depends above all on the real affinity which a man and a woman can reach through the gradual discovery and understanding of each other's entire personality.

The most lasting relations are those established between two human beings each of whom has his own rich life, and who present, create, and develop multiple and deep affinities in their ways of understanding and acting on nature and society.

The initial sexual appeal is the fundamental basis of all relationships between a couple, but it is already complex in its nature and can last only provided it is accompanied by a number of other factors.

How is the couple formed?

In youth, sexual attraction is very strong and nearly blind. It must be accepted and enjoyed, as it is and as it happens. But this must not necessarily lead to "marriage," family, and children, i e, to a more lasting relationship which cannot be broken in the present state of affairs

without damaging the weaker parties: the woman and children. A more lasting bond, in the form of a family, should be established only after a complete and free sexual and love life, full of experiences, during youth, and not until man and woman have reached maturity as human beings.

A sexual and love relationship should not be turned into "marriage," family, and children, unless its deeper validity has been established after a period of free experience.

Usually, on the contrary, people get married young, with no experience of any kind, blindly, so to speak, under the impulse of sexual attraction, or, worse still, so as to "settle down" or rapidly enter into routine and illusory security — whence the rapid failure of most marriages, the gloomy if not hellish relationship soon established between man and woman, which they try to forget, embellish, or hide by means of their children. It is most often the woman who drives man to marriage, family, and children. She does so to find protection against her unfavorable social status and to compensate for her failures in sex and love. Only when young and beautiful can woman reign in an illusion of appreciation and freedom. She sees that she is then admired and desired, not because of her total personality, but because of the sexual appeal man feels for her. But in our present-day society age is a terrible handicap, especially for women, for they are soon depreciated. That explains their anxiety to "get married" and strengthen their bond by children, and their resignation to this role.

In future civilized society the rights of young people to a complete and free sexual and love life will be perfectly ensured, while creating the basis for solid and lasting couples. A society can already be conceived in which the fundamental value of a full and free sexual and love life for the equilibrium, happiness, and development of the human being is recognized, and in which a more or less durable monogamous couple takes the place of the type of family existing today. In such a society, children — the product of eugenics — receive a collective social education.

This stage is naturally very far ahead, for it presupposes a society that is very highly developed from the material and cultural viewpoint, a

society that has uprooted classes, property, money, differences between manual and intellectual labor, and all types of prejudices concerning women, countries, religion, etc, a society of men who are free, highly developed, and capable of healthily and fully enjoying life without harming others.

For the time being, we have to deal with a capitalist society and a society in transition to socialism which is still materially and culturally rather backward. We must therefore have a transitional programme for all these problems: for we cannot for a certain period do without the present type of family.

But it is possible and necessary: 1) to recognize the *entirety* of the woman question, in all its different aspects and all its complexity, and not just to limit the struggle to that of her economic liberation and equality; to recognize the right of woman to a complete and free sexual and love life, and to have society protect her legally against undesired childbirth; 2) to educate the members of the revolutionary party and advanced workers in a spirit that takes into account all that has been said about woman, the family, and children.

If it is a mistake to require this attitude on the part of all workers, it is just as wrong to neglect the education of members of the revolutionary party in this sense. The communist nature of the members of the revolutionary party must emerge not only from their political ideas but also from their personal behavior and their cultural and moral conceptions. The relations between men and women, relations with children, the behavior of each person within the present-day family, and the education of children — these are more important criteria than the profession of communist ideas for a really communist quality of a member of the revolutionary party.

Stalinism has produced an enormous regression of thought and practice on these questions, to the advantage of reactionary and petty-bourgeois conceptions and morals.

It is up to the Fourth International to work out a coherent line of thought concerning these questions, taking into account experience, science, and socialist prospects for future human society.

May 1960

PERMANENT REVOLUTION IN CUBA

By A ORTIZ

It is a formidable example of the vigor and strength of the Latin American revolution and of the colonial revolution, this Cuban revolution which, on the very borders of the fortified citadel of imperialism, is developing the broadest revolutionary mobilization of the masses and carrying to their conclusions the most radical measures against imperialism. Condemned at the Conference of Costa Rica, the leaders of this revolution were cheered by the Negroes and Puerto Ricans in Harlem: the Cuban revolution is polarizing forces in Latin America, and stimulating and giving drive to the most exploited sectors in the United States itself, in Harlem and in the South.

Cuba, with the base at Guantánamo, formed part of the U S military system. With its strong government, Cuba was part of the system of political and social balances laboriously constructed by imperialism on its borders after the oil expropriations in Mexico. With its sugar production subsidized, Cuba formed an integral part of sugar production in the U S South, whereby it satisfied the needs of the U S internal market without exposing the high-cost sugar production of the southern states to the jolts of competition in the world market.

It is this whole system that has been shaken and broken by the Cuban revolution.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FORCES OF THE REVOLUTION

After having been deeply shaken by the general strike and the fall of the Machado dictatorship and the Platt Amendment in 1933, imperialist domination could be reestablished only by a development of the forces of repression and a deep corruption in political circles, which permitted the emergence of an arbitrator, Batista, based on the forces of the army. The regimes of Grau San Martín and of Prío Socarras served only to demonstrate the failure of parliamentary democracy. The Stalinists got the workers' movement bogged down in class collaboration. Eduardo Chibas, heading up sectors of youth and university people, took the leadership of an intransigent struggle against the corruption of the Prío government. The powerlessness of this petty-bourgeois campaign was demonstrated on that day in 1950 when Chibas turned a revolver on himself during a television broadcast where he was making his campaign. For most of the petty-bourgeois sectors who were following him, his suicide sealed the break

with illusions about democratic paths to the "regeneration" of political life in Cuba. A few days later, Batista took power by a coup d'état, and, a few days after that, he was personally congratulated about it by Nelson Rockefeller.

Chibas's suicide and Batista's coup d'état marked the end of a stage in the political struggle in Cuba. The old political bureaucracy adapted itself, the old workers' vanguard, stupefied and powerless, dispersed. Against this adaptation and resignation, sectors of the youth, emerging from the Partido Ortodoxo, Chibas's party, renewed the revolutionary tradition of 1933, the "insurrectional thesis." Among them was Fidel Castro, who had been active as one of the most ardent supporters of Chibas.

The process of formation of a political force possessing a capacity for action was long and contradictory. While the old workers' vanguard that had not accepted collaboration with Mujal dispersed and became atomized in little groups or fell back on a trade-union activity which was — taking into account the conditions of the repression — of very small scope, these young petty-bourgeois hurled themselves into the revolutionary capacity of the working masses. They conceived of the struggle as the heroic action of small and determined minorities.

The 1953 attack on the Moncada Barracks, led by Fidel Castro, was a typical putschist action. A hundred of the attackers and their helpers were killed, assassinated: a score survived, among them Fidel himself and his brother Raul. But this coup de main and the courageous defense that they put up in Batista's courts, in a situation of the atomization of the oppositional forces and the absolute powerlessness of the big parties, drew attention to this little group. To a youth that had lost confidence in peaceful parliamentary-democratic paths, Fidel Castro's group was convincing, not by its programme (it said nothing, in its defense during the Moncada trial, that had not been said much more completely in the previous 30 years), but by its determination and its daring, because it had thrown itself into insurrectional action.

The landing from the *Granma* in December 1956, though it was once more a cast of the dice, in which half the expedition was exterminated, was carried out in a situation where a network of groups was already organized in Cuba. And

the action of this determined little group was, by its very audacity, to reach a junction with a revolutionary force, that of the peasants, and develop and organize their action.¹

This advance detachment of the urban petty bourgeoisie, who wanted to finish with the dictatorship and clean up the capitalist regime, and who had to base themselves on the most exploited peasants of Cuba, perhaps discovered there the deep roots of the regime of corruption that these peasants were combating and the immense social forces that could be mobilized in a revolutionary way. It was during the fight in the Sierra Maestra that this revolution took on the character of an agrarian revolution which it kept during its whole first stage.

The revolutionary path thus taken awoke and stimulated immense forces, unsuspected even by those who started on it, and these forces, by mobilizing, left a deep mark on the revolutionary process and even on the very team that had begun the action. The entry of mass forces developed the thought and programme of the revolution, as well as its social content.

The intervention of the masses of the workers was not important during the insurrectional stage. But it was a general strike that caused the failure of Batista's attempt, on the first of January 1959, to turn the power over to a military junta led by Candillo; it was this general strike which, according to Fidel Castro's own statement, gave the keys of Havana to the "rebels." And once the revolution had gone beyond its democratic and agrarian stage, when it was a question of confronting capitalist and imperialist forces, the role of the working class was to become predominant and decisive.

REVOLUTIONARY MEASURES

Greeted on their arrival in the cities by immense petty-bourgeois crowds who for the moment far exceeded the workers, hailed by imperialist public opinion which, faced by the accomplished fact, was looking for a new compromise, the revolutionary forces had a first clash with this "democratic" public opinion when they set up *revolutionary tribunals* and executed the civil war criminals. Behind this jacobinism lay, not so much clear objectives, as a force that was thus showing its determination not to compromise with the old regime and the legal forces of bourgeois democracy, and was proving intransigent and disposed to make radical changes.

¹ There is something more than a symbol in the fact that it was Crescencio Pérez, an old peasant fighter, who helped Fidel Castro to pass through the lines of Batista's army to reach the Sierra Maestra, and who provided him with his first liaisons with the peasants.

The dissolution of the old army and its replacement by the rebel army formed in the Sierra, in the insurrection, was another step along this road, as was also the replacement of the cadres of the state's administrative apparatus. By not reaching a compromise with the old forces, the leadership of the revolution was consistent with its declarations, and simultaneously maintained the separation between the two camps that was to render it, even when it became the government, open to the influence of the maturing of the mass revolutionary movement.

THE AGRARIAN REFORM

The agrarian reform was the first revolutionary measure that attacked the old economic structure and the old class privileges and opened the way to profound revolutionary economic and social changes. Cuban agrarian reform was not carried out, as in other under-developed countries, on a backward terrain under the domination of a conservative feudal class forming an obstacle even to the capitalist development of the country. Cuba, the world's leading exporter of sugar, exporter of tobacco, producer of coffee and livestock, has gone through a relatively big capitalist development in the rural regions. As for sugarcane, 161 refineries employ half a million workers in harvesting, in the factories, and on the widespread network of little railways that link the refineries to the main railways and ports. Tobacco, coffee, and stock-raising have similar characteristics in their exploitation. These are big capitalist enterprises that have set up the present structure of exploitation, replacing the hundreds of little firms (*trapiches*) which produced the sugar up to the beginning of the century. It was big US firms like the United Fruit Company (the one that defeated the Guatemalan revolution) which engaged in investments in the exploitation of sugar and other agricultural products, as well as a serious number of Cuban capitalists.

The agrarian reform begun by the Cuban revolution caused it to grapple directly with the strongest capitalist sectors in Cuba, the imperialist investors. By expropriating hundreds of thousands of acres, the revolution directly braved the capitalist regime such as it had developed in Cuba. The Cuban capitalists having lost their petty-bourgeois social base, their political power, and their repressive apparatus, it was US imperialism that remained the only capitalist force capable of taking up the defense of the privileges of the regime. Once Batista's puppet regime had been overthrown, imperialism appeared as *the* support and representative of the capitalist sys-

tem, as the only one with sufficient strength to take up its defense.

Yet the Cuban agrarian reform, such as it was decreed, is a capitalist agrarian reform. Great stretches of land were expropriated and given to the peasants — a real improvement for them — but there remained in the hands of the old proprietors the centre of it all: the refinery, the railway, and some 30 *caballerías* (990 acres) of land round the factory, i e, the best and best-irrigated land, closest to the refinery, most accessible to modern transport, that in which the most important investments had been made. According to the law, the old proprietor could keep an area running up to more than 100 *caballerías* (3,310 acres), whose productivity is more than 50% higher than the average. That is to say that the former owner kept the producing centre and the land favored by differential rent.

This created a first contradiction in the first great revolutionary measure of the new government: most of the sugar-cane land was transferred to the peasants who organized themselves to farm it; but the refining² of the sugar and part of the best land remain in the hands of the former owners, who in addition have the right, according to the law, to indemnization after 20 years for the expropriated land. If account is taken of the fact that it is the government that sells the sugar produced, on the international market, and assigns the quotas to each refinery, the role of the owner of the refinery continues to be the key to production. While he is of no use, he is an obstacle to any planning of agricultural production and to any attempt to develop the economy by basing it on the production that has undergone the greatest capitalist development. For its own development plans, the state sees that it is deprived of the main source of accumulation in the Cuban economy because this remains not only in private hands but in the hands of the capitalists whose lands have already, to a large extent, been expropriated, i e, to open enemies of the revolution.

This was one of the factors that prevented the "capitalist" nature of this agrarian reform from standing out. The agrarian reform, thus conceived, did not succeed in getting itself accepted by the capitalists. It was carried out, not *with* them, but *against* them, and by relying directly on the peasant masses, the rural workers, and the workers and poor petty bourgeois of the villages.

² The peasants and the sugar coöperatives sell their cane to the refining centre. Theoretically they have the right to have their sugar ground by paying the refinery and to sell it directly, but this is impractical because it is too cumbersome.

This agrarian reform was considered by capitalism and imperialism to be a declaration of war. That is to say that the agrarian reform went beyond the functioning of the capitalist regime and did not find in Cuba a bourgeois class capable of channeling it and profiting by it with sufficient force to reabsorb into capitalist functioning this transformation in the rural regions.

It was not the measures taken to carry out this agrarian reform which made of it the beginning of an irreversible process in the Cuban economy, which led to the expropriation of the major part of big capitalist property; it was the social forces that were driving it and the extreme weakness of capitalism that was unable to absorb these measures.

The peasants who received the land and organized into coöperatives obtained a real improvement in their lot. The coöperatives enabled them to have access to technical guidance provided by the Instituto Nacional de la Reforma Agraria, ensured them of regular income, almost a salary, and opened up collective improvements in medical care, food, and housing.³

This real improvement in the lot of the peasants, who, together with the unemployed, formed the most backward sector of the Cuban masses, is the deepest root planted by the agrarian reform in Cuba, with the result that the former owners have no illusions about being able to reverse the process without a defeat of the revolution as a whole.

THE ALLIANCE WITH THE WORKERS' STATES

The field in which, more than in the agrarian reform, the Cuban revolution demonstrated its scope and its daring, before the expropriation of the imperialist companies, was, as the Latin American Bureau of the Fourth International pointed out at the time, that of its *foreign policy*. The difficulties and the clashes with imperialism that took place after the agrarian reform, the support given by the United States to Cuban counter-revolutionary forces, sabotage, bombardments, the explosion of *La Coubre* in the port of Havana — these things stirred up new interventions by the masses. This time, the mobilization and intervention of the proletariat at the side of the peasants and the poor petty bourgeoisie were fundamental. The C T C, the trade-unions, have been playing an increasing role, and the worker and peasant militias are the expression

³ The "people's stores," marketing organizations set up by the I N R A, provide more varied foodstuffs and the possibility of selling the articles produced locally by the peasants, the fishermen's coöperatives, etc.

of the revolutionary mobilization against imperialism and counter-revolution.

Impelled by this force and this revolutionary mobilization, pushed to a daily more open confrontation with the capitalist forces and imperialism, the Cuban government sought to rely on the workers' states, and on forces other than itself within the colonial and semi-colonial revolution. Earlier, Fidel Castro had unsuccessfully sought an agreement with the United States during his trip there at the beginning of his government, and with the Latin American bourgeoisies at the Conference of the 21 in Buenos Aires. Then, driven by the contradictions with imperialism and by the revolutionary mobilization of the Cuban masses, he sought for support on the side of the workers' states, and this tended to produce a delimitation, not only with imperialism, but also with the Latin American bourgeoisies already frightened by the spur that the Cuban revolution was giving to the revolutionary movements in their own countries.

The alliance with the workers' states and breaking through the diplomatic and economic encirclement imposed by imperialism may be placed among the most important achievements of the Cuban revolution. They shattered the myth of imperialist power and domination, of Latin America as a "private hunting-grounds" of Yankee imperialism; they opened up to the Latin American revolution the field of alliance with and economic support from the workers' states and with the African and Asiatic revolution.

The astute and audacious policy in the sale of sugar, successfully carried out, partly offset the weight of Yankee imperialism's measures of economic pressure. Without withdrawing from the International Sugar Agreement, the Cuban government was in a position to countercheck these pressures. Cuba sold about three million tons on the U S market at prices about 80% higher than the world-market price. This tonnage formed more than half Cuba's normal exports. But, as exports are subject to quotas, Cuba did not harvest or export all the sugar that it could have exported. If the United States stopped buying from Cuba, it could sell all this sugar on the world market at low prices, upsetting that market (and also the U S domestic market, where the sugar-beet enterprises could produce only at high costs). On the other hand, the exporting countries cannot all guarantee permanent export surpluses. Mexico in these last years has swung between an export of 200,000 tons and no export surplus at all. Puerto Rico — where, last year, U S investments endeavored, in view of the Cuban agrarian reform, to step

up production — is harvesting about 300,000 tons. In general, sugar consumption is increasing in the backward regions in process of development, and in the workers' states. In the advanced capitalist states, the increase is only proportionate to population increase. The U S S R was able to shift from being an exporter in 1959 to being an importer in 1960.

It is on these elements that the Cuban government based its offensive policy, winning additional markets.⁴

The breaking of the oil blockade, the obtaining of Soviet credits, the furnishing by the U S S R and the other workers' states of machine-tools for the beginnings of industrialization, open up new prospects for the Latin American revolution, which, in Bolivia and other countries, has been marking time for years now at the same level, exposed to imperialism's blockade and blackmail. But above all it was Soviet military aid that shattered all the theories of the "geopoliticians" of the type of Haya de la Torre, Figueroes, and other petty-bourgeois leaders who find, in the geographical situation of Latin America as a neighbor of the United States, the justification for their impotence and their capitulation to imperialism.

THE CONFISCATIONS OF THE IMPERIALIST ENTERPRISES

It was during the struggle against imperialism, for the support of the agrarian reform, that the revolutionary movement of the Cuban masses increased its intervention and its strength, and consciously realized the real reasons for its situation, its misery and exploitation. At the same time that the middle sectors of the petty bourgeoisie were lessening their active support and abandoning the streets (when they were not becoming openly hostile), the working masses were becoming the most offensive, coherent, and active sector of the revolution. The struggle against the military threat, the mobilization against aggressions and the counter-revolution, became transformed into a struggle against the economic power of the imperialist enterprises. Now these imperialist enterprises are the backbone of capitalism in Cuba. There are no great industrial enterprises. Few factories employ

⁴ This year the harvest was prolonged in order to produce a higher tonnage available for export, and on this basis, Cuba was able to present itself at the International Sugar Board with sufficient justification to get itself assigned additional quotas to make up for the deficits of other exporters. The diminution of 700,000 tons in the U S market was partly (if the lower prices of the international market are taken into account) offset by an increase in exports elsewhere.

more than 100 workers. Cuba exported sugar and tobacco; imported rice and wheat (both of which can perfectly well be grown on the island) and all sorts of foodstuffs, textiles, household articles, etc. The big enterprises are: the railways, electricity, telephone systems, oil refineries, nickel mines, banks, hotels and tourist enterprises, and the Guantánamo naval base,⁵ all directly in the hands of US trusts and the US government, and the sugar, stock-raising, tobacco, and other enterprises, mostly in the hands of US companies. That is why in Cuba the struggle against imperialism became identified with and rapidly developed into an anti-capitalist struggle.

Apart from the railways, the Nicaro mines (and even these are being occupied by the government), and the Guantánamo naval base, all the others have been confiscated. That means that the bulk of the great capitalist enterprises in Cuba are in the hands of the government and that for the first time it controls the elements for a plan of economic development. The 46 sugar enterprises confiscated from US companies open the way to beginning to solve the key problem of agrarian production and planning, a precondition to any real success of the agrarian reform.⁶

In fact, maintenance of private ownership in most of the industrial and public service enterprises in Cuba was rendering illusory any plan of economic development by the government. In face of the mobilization of the masses, the expropriations, and the controls imposed by the government, private capitalists were not reinvesting their profits, and thus the relative possibilities of the Cuban economy were being squandered. The expropriations put in the state's hands some of the main sources of accumulation and open up possibilities for a *planning of economic development*. With this planning based on control of internal possibilities⁷ by the government, the planned economy will be better able to take advantage of possibilities of aid from the U S S R and the other workers' states, especially in setting up industries.

The revolution, the mobilization of the masses, the agrarian reform, and the expropriations

— these have broken the capitalist order and the old equilibrium, and the productive forces can find their new equilibrium and their development only in the nationalization of *all* the big enterprises and in the planning of the economy on the basis of support by the industry of the workers' states and the management of production by the working masses.

THE MASSES AND THE LEADERSHIP OF THE REVOLUTION

The exploited masses as a whole have mobilized in Cuba. The capitalist structure reached by the Cuban economy was built on a superexploitation of the worker and peasant masses. The *small peasants*, who formed the first circles in which the insurrection developed, had been relegated to the least productive land, where sugar-cane, tobacco, and livestock could not be developed. The *sugar workers* had work, on an average, only for three months out of the year; the rest of the time they had to keep alive with what they had earned during the harvest. Industry, weak and already stagnant for several years, could not absorb the available manpower. Each year 60,000 young men came on to the labor market, which had no possibility of absorbing them. At the moment of the triumph of the revolution, there were 700,000 unemployed. Out of a population of less than seven million, it can be understood what this figure represents.

It was this situation that gave to a political revolution a social character, which turned a little putschist group into the leaders of hundreds of thousands of toilers. The decisiveness and intransigence of this group were nurtured, not only by a "moralizing" mystique, but by deeplying social causes, by a profound disequilibrium that shook up these university students and hurled them, in disregard of democratic paths, into insurrection.

It is because of this profound social disequilibrium that, once the masses had mobilized, no compromise, no intermediary equilibrium, could be lasting. *It is the intervention of the masses which is preventing a capitalist solution of the crisis, which is pushing the contradictions of the regime to their ultimate consequences.* No problem of the masses can be solved if the revolution stops half way; none of the problems mentioned above has been solved up to now. There are certain improvements, but no solution. That is the objective reason for the intransigence, audacity, and decisiveness of the Cuban revolution.

Those who see only Fidel Castro and consider the masses to be only an echo are surprised at

⁵ The naval base employs 3,500 Cuban workers in addition to North Americans and Jamaicans.

⁶ Together with the 12 sugar centres which were already in the government's hands (for having belonged to former supporters of Batista or for tax reasons), these centres expropriated from the Yankees (generally the most important ones) furnish about half Cuban sugar production.

⁷ To do this, it will be necessary to advance to the expropriation of *all* the sugar centres, and of the railways, as well as of the Guantánamo naval base, where the nucleus of skilled manpower in naval and metal-working industries is to be found.

the "stupidity" and lack of "foresight" of the State Department, which drove the Cuban leaders to take more and more radical measures in reaction to the attacks and hostility of imperialism. The dynamic element giving drive to these transformations is these revolutionarily mobilized masses. It is Yankee imperialism that has found itself forced to reply aggressively to these revolutionary developments that are daily ripening on its very borders.

In Cuba itself, the polarization is ever clearer. In the first stage of the insurrection and the victory, the government, before it took social measures, was drawing along behind it various layers of the petty bourgeoisie and even of the bourgeoisie. The permanent development of the revolution, the more decisive intervention of the government, were accompanied by the desertion of a great part of the capitalist elements. Even the middle strata of the urban petty bourgeoisie began to withdraw to the degree that the revolution, the alliance with the workers' states, and anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist measures deepened.

The old bourgeois parties having lost their rank-and-file following and their cohesion, it was the Church that headed up the resistance to the revolution's forward march by trying to base itself on those petty-bourgeois strata who were the most privileged and the most hostile to revolution. This battle, which has not yet reached its culminating point, will require a new development of the revolution's thought and ideology.

It is the urban and rural working class, the peasantry of the coöperatives and the small peasants, and the poor petty bourgeoisie of the cities, that are supporting and giving drive to the revolution.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MASS ORGANIZATIONS

In the whole first stage, when the petty bourgeoisie formed the basic nucleus of the mobilization, the mass movement found expression in great concentrations and demonstrations in support of Fidel Castro's leadership. The leading staff derived its strength from these gigantic mobilizations, but the capacity for resolutions and initiatives remained in the hands of the government, based on the organized forces of the rebel army and the cadres of the 26 July Movement, the political organization of the revolutionary forces.

As the movement grew more mature, side-by-side with these forms of intervention, the workers' and peasants' movement was developing its own forms: *the trade unions and CTC* (hindered during the whole first period by the remains

of the old Mujal bureaucracy); *the peasant coöperatives*, whose leadership is elected and subject to recall by the members at any moment; and, lastly, *the organization of the worker, peasant, student, and white-collar-worker militia*. The 26 July Movement, whose cadres have been absorbed by the government, the army, and the trade unions, has not taken on new life as a mass party. Political life, political discussions, and political leadership fall on the trade unions, the coöperatives, the cadres of the rebel army, and the multiple state organizations (INRA, ministries, banks, etc).

There is in fact a parallel process going on: to the degree that the intervention of the masses ceases to be by mass-meetings and simple support, and that the movement is getting channelized into organizations and is intervening through its trade unions, militia, and coöperatives, the old political apparatus of the insurrection, based on the action of the petty bourgeoisie, is becoming inadequate and entering into conflict with the new forces.

Behind this dual process lie the basic contradiction in the development of the Cuban revolution and the elements of its most serious internal crisis, infinitely more serious than the crises with Urrutia, Díaz Lanz, and other capitalist elements.

RESISTANCE OF THE LEADERSHIP

The attempts at a capitalist agrarian reform, the non-expropriation of the native capitalists — not even, so far, those of the sugar enterprises — the maintenance of the old state apparatus, the imposition on the new army, recruited in an insurrection and a civil war, of the traditional discipline and political interdicts, have been the elements of a capitalist leadership that still remains amid all the revolutionary steps forward. The masses reject the return to the old forms of "representative" bourgeois democracy, but the revolution has not yet begun a new form of state and governmental organization. The government imposed by the revolution bases itself on an uncontrolled state apparatus, and the conscious policy of Fidel Castro's staff is to keep all capacity for taking decisions and initiatives within this apparatus, while maintaining a paternalistic leadership of the masses.

This reflects definitively the lack of confidence in the revolutionary initiative of the masses, the remains of the old putschist conception, of a capitalist conception which today is taking refuge in the state apparatus and in the petty-bourgeois cadres of the government and the rebel army. The action taken by Fidel Castro himself to dissolve left groupings like "Acción y Sabotaje" inside

the 26 July Movement, the attempt to form a "single party of the Cuban revolution" putting all forces under the centralized leadership of the government, the attacks made against the Trotskyist fraction by the Stalinists, with the support of some official newspapers, at the time of the Congress of Latin American Youth — these are just so many attempts to go against the current of this development and growing maturity of the workers' movement and to maintain an uncontrolled state apparatus.

THE TRADE UNIONS

It is in the leadership of the trade-union movement that this situation has found its clearest expression. It is there that the workers' forces in the revolution are ripening. After a first stage when the Mujalist bureaucrats were replaced by the cadres of the clandestine struggle against Batista, by those who in the cities organized terrorism and tried to organize the workers, the tendency of the working class is to give itself a leadership that has been selected and recognized during these 20 months of vigorous revolutionary action. New cadres are developing within the masses, and, since the working class puts all its faith and energies in the revolution, it tends to intervene with its own organizations and its own directives, going past the stage of a diffuse movement and of leaderships placed by the rebels at the head of the unions. The government is trying to control this movement and limit its scope. Using the masses' support of Fidel Castro and of revolutionary measures, it is trying to avoid a tendency struggle, as well as independent maturity on the part of the workers' movement. The Minister of Labor openly intervenes in place of or against the leadership of the CTC, and an underground struggle, which has not been called to the attention of the masses, brought about the change of the CTC leadership elected at its congress.

THE NEEDS OF THE NEXT STAGE

The expropriations, the planning of the economy, the struggle against imperialism and native bourgeois reaction, the development of the revolution by the expansion of the creative power of the people — these require in Cuba the development of the management of the nationalized economy by the workers and by the toilers in general, and the development of a state and government based on the trade unions, the coöperatives, the militia, and other forms of people's organizations.

Not having a regime that ensures direct repre-

sentation of the different sectors in the state apparatus and the government, the interests of these sectors cannot be normally expressed or find overall satisfaction, and will tend to find expression through frictions, clashes, and struggles such are those going on today in the trade-union apparatus and at several échelons of the state apparatus and the rebel army. It is only an organization of a soviet type that can solve these contradictions and prevent their ripening into explosions in the future. The trend toward a single party only accentuates the dangers.

Stalinism, incapable of taking part in the revolutionary process,⁸ is today trying to win influence as the agent, in the trade unions and in other fields, of this conservative bureaucratic action of the control of revolutionary forces which the government is attempting.

Nevertheless, the process of uninterrupted struggle, which has ended up in immense forward strides of the Cuban revolution, clashes more every day with this attempt at bureaucratic control over the revolution. The empirical leadership can become transformed into an obstacle if a *revolutionary Marxist* vanguard does not develop and if the working class, through its various organizations, does not step up its leading political intervention by means of a *workers' party based on the trade unions*, which must be the real party of the Cuban revolution at this stage.

The Cuban Trotskyists, the Fourth International, are supporting the revolution and its progressive measures with all their strength; at the same time they form the vanguard force which is fighting to develop the forces that can ensure the continuity of the revolutionary process up till its culmination in a proletarian socialist revolution. These forces are objectively developing in Cuba, and the Trotskyists, whose very action is fought against by the Stalinists and the conservative forces of the capitalist apparatus still existing, are tending to link up with the most living and dynamic sectors, the leadership-in-formation of the Cuban revolution.

1 October 1960

⁸ The Stalinist party, the PSP — whose policy of class collaboration (which in the past led it to support Batista and Mujal) and whose tepid programme have been totally overwhelmed by the revolution and its measures — is today adapting itself to the temporary needs of the government staff, by basing itself on the solidarity of the workers' states, its sole political capital. Its alliance with the government corresponds to their common resistance to leaving initiatives to the masses, and it was with this justification that the PSP has picked up again the Stalinist banner of anti-Trotskyism.

GERMAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

from the Godesberg (1959) to the Dortmund (1960) Congress

By A GERBEL

The decision to revise the programme of the German Social-Democratic Party, taken at the Godesberg Congress, only legalized inside the party a political praxis which had been applied ever since the adoption of the previous programme of action. The events at the Godesberg Congress made it clear that it was only the beginning of a transition period towards further adaptations to the policy of the ruling class represented by the Adenauer government. The SPD will continue along this road till the day that "the national interests of the German people" will "make necessary" a common attitude of all parties in internal and international politics, i.e., till the capitalist forces accept the desires of the SPD leaders and allow them to participate, *partially or totally co-responsible*, in the conduct of the affairs of bourgeois society, after such a long period of obedient "opposition."

FOR A "UNITED FRONT" WITH THE BOURGEOISIE IN FOREIGN POLICY

The leaders of the SPD state that the failure of the summit conference in Paris meant the beginning of a "national crisis" in which the parties of bourgeois democracy inside the Federal Republic have the duty to push into the background everything which separated them in order to arrive at a common front in foreign policy. This appeal in favor of a common foreign policy is only a first step towards a common internal policy, i.e., a "great coalition" (between the SPD and Adenauer's CDU). "To arrive at the greatest possible measure of common positions in the solution of the problems posed," was the "slogan" launched by Herbert Wahner in his big parliamentary speech in which he explicitly declared himself also in support of the military policy of the German Federal Republic.

This offer of lackey services to the Adenauer government happened at a time when in the United States voices were heard which drew some conclusions from the blind alley into which American foreign policy had manoeuvred itself, voices which started also to criticize the policy of the Eisenhower administration and its military provocations. These voices refused for example to put the blame for the failure of the summit conference exclusively on the U S S R government.

But together with Adenauer, Wehner declared during the debate on foreign policy in the Bundestag, obviously against his own intimate knowledge and convictions, that only the "Communists" were responsible for the failure of the Paris conference.

Adenauer and his government have in the field of foreign policy a line in common with the representatives of the "strong hand" orientation towards the workers' states. Adenauer wants to continue the Foster Dulles line of "roll back" over the grave of his dead friend. It is significant for the SPD's present course that it is ready to follow even these irresponsible representatives of the international bourgeoisie!

Less than a year ago, the same Wehner had clearly stated that Adenauer and his policy (together with Ulbricht) represented the greatest obstacle on the road to German reunification, that central objective of "German foreign policy" (Wehner dixit). At that time, the SPD group in the Bundestag presented to the party and to German public opinion the so-called "Deutschland-plan" (German plan) of the SPD, which, although it did not contain proposals for a socialist reunification of the country, had some dynamic progressive possibilities, especially because it put forward the demand of maintaining the integrity of nationalized property in Eastern Germany and because it supported the Rapaeki Plan in that period of relative international détente, thereby liberating forces which undermined the rigid Adenauer policy. But the SPD leadership afterward buried this plan in the interest of its desire for a common policy with the CDU, explaining that it was correct only in a period of détente and not in a period of tension, when the SPD "naturally" had to work out a policy which takes into consideration the "common interests of the German people."

Capitalism has not made it easy for the SPD leaders to pursue this course of capitulation in the field of programmatical and foreign policy. When, in its Godesberg programme, it threw overboard all remnants of a reformist Social-Democratic conception of society, the bourgeoisie and its press did not react with respect and gratitude, but by heaping contempt and ridicule on it. This brought strong pressure on the SPD leadership, already in full retreat, to retreat still

further, and tried to blackmail it into new concessions. In order to prove its "good faith" to the bourgeoisie, the party sank back into complete passivity whenever it was confronted with good occasions for a political fight. Such favorable occasions as were offered for activizing the working class against the reactionary social and political line of the federal government were not exploited; wherever the workers reacted in a spontaneous way against this line, the S P D tried to dampen these initiatives.

A COMPLETELY PASSIVE "OPPOSITION"

There was for instance the government decision on rent increases, which represented a sharp attack against the standard of living of the masses. It was accepted without resistance. No fight was launched against the policy of subsidizing agriculture, which is paid for by the consumers through rising living costs. The Adenauer government planned to reform the system of social security, which would lead to a sharp decline of services for the sick, while at the same time forcing wage-earners who fell ill to contribute to the expenses for doctors and medicine. A wave of indignation swept through the factories and expressed itself in spontaneous common actions (petitions, resolutions, strike threats, short sit-down strikes, and street demonstrations) by Socialist, Catholic, and unorganized workers. But the Social-Democratic leadership did not push this movement forward, and let it die for lack of centralization.

Even Adenauer's party became frightened by this wave of protest and put pressure on the C D U Minister of Labor, in order to soften the measures contained in the proposed bill to which the workers objected. The danger existed that the C D U would enter into sharp conflict with that fraction of the working class which still votes for it. As at the same time neither the S P D nor the leadership of the trade unions led or pushed forward this movement of protest on the extra-parliamentary field, but rather tried to break it down, the impression was even created that some corrections introduced into the new bill, which make the reform of the social security system a little less hard on the workers, are the results of a "better understanding" on the part of the C D U itself, and not of the extra-parliamentary pressure developed by the workers.

The leadership of the S P D also started to influence the leaders of the trade unions to abstain from causing too sharp a conflict in the question of reducing the working hours (fight for the 40-hour week), at least not before the 1961 elec-

tions, in order not to frighten the petty-bourgeois voters.

The S P D has likewise made no attempt to mobilize the masses against the danger of a new "martial law bill," which, contrary to the Constitution, would give the state apparatus the legal means to break any active opposition through police repression, i e, a new edition of the notorious "law for the defense of the Republic" from the time of the Weimar Republic, which was used almost exclusively against the left. The S P D leaders limit themselves to parliamentary opposition against this proposed bill, and try to arrive at a parliamentary compromise. This bill would seriously threaten the democratic rights of the working class, and the S P D leadership might one day have to pay a heavy price for its passivity in this question.

This passivity of the opposition allowed Adenauer even to bring off an extraordinary "coup" by creating a private television network, against the advice of his own party, and without any form of parliamentary control. This measure brings Adenauer to the brink of an open break with the Constitution; but the labor movement did not even appeal to the masses to protest against the autocratic ambitions of the old chancellor.

Because the S P D policy systematically prevents transforming into a political and social movement of protest the elements of discontent which are numerous among the masses, notwithstanding the economic "boom," it contributes essentially to the fact that this "boom" is acting in a disintegrating way upon the class consciousness of the workers, thereby causing resignation and passivity to spread further and further inside the working class.

But it is precisely this growing passivity of the masses which the S P D bureaucracy uses in its turn in order to legalize inside the labor movement its policy of offering lackey services to the capitalist forces.

Neither the Godesberg Congress nor the S P D capitulation to Adenauer in the field of foreign policy have caused great emotion inside the working class. The great mass of the party members have accepted this change of party policy almost without resistance. There were only a few sharp discussions in some isolated spots, and even these discussions did not shake the party. The working-class members of the party react in a passive way. They more and more abstain from participating in party activities. This leads towards a paralysis of the whole S P D organization, and strengthens the petty-bourgeois tendencies and forces which today dominate the party units.

RESISTANCE FROM THE YOUTH

The S P D leadership, however, expects some resistance from the youth. They do not think that the youth will be able to launch a full-scale opposition against the decisions and the day-to-day policies of the party, but they believe that it will not accept the new line, and that thereby the discrepancies between the S P D line and the more leftist line of the youth organizations will be publicly revealed. The party leadership, therefore, is starting to bring strong pressure on the leaders of the youth organizations, threatening them with measures which would undermine the very existence of some of them. Wherever these threats do not quickly bring the expected results, the S P D leaders do not hesitate even to split the youth organizations, as they split the Socialist Student Federation.

Why does the S P D leadership — and especially Herbert Wehner, with the typically bureaucratic methods which he “imported” into the Social-Democracy from the C P apparatus — act in such a brutal way against young socialists? Above all because they fear that independent initiatives by these organizations, and even platonically socialist declarations of faith, could neutralize the S P D efforts to seduce the petty-bourgeois voters of the C D U.

It is very significant that it is precisely Wehner who is doing this dirty job. The liberal petty-bourgeois politicians in the S P D, who politically accept the new line without mental reservations, do not think themselves capable of imposing it upon the membership. They prefer to leave that job to the “apparatchniki,” behind whose backs they then express their abhorrence for their methods.

A GAMBLE ON AN IMPROBABLE ELECTORAL VICTORY

Each of these rightward steps of the Social-Democratic leadership is exclusively directed toward the next elections. They hope to win the petty-bourgeois and unpolitical voters through “cleverness” and adaptation, to break through the “forty-percent ceiling” of Social-Democratic votes, and to be able thereafter either to form the government themselves, or to force upon the C D U a coalition with the S P D. The S P D has formed a list of candidate-ministers, headed by Willy Brandt, mayor of West Berlin, a former centrist, member of the London Bureau in the thirties. In this way, they hope to woo even bourgeois voters.

Willy Brandt is considered, inside the German labor movement, as the representative of the “Ber-

lin, front-line city” policy, which is only in some details different from the Adenauer policy. Besides, he is the type of the ambitious young careerist inside the S P D who after a long and impatient period of opposition now feel that the time is ripe for “taking power.” Of course, when they talk about the importance of concentrating on “taking power,” they do not at all mean the power of the working class, but only personal power for themselves inside bourgeois society.

It is clear that Willy Brandt is not — even in the eyes of the S P D leadership — the most capable candidate for Chancellor of the Federal Republic. They only hope that his mediocrity, which he tries to hide by superficial oratory, will be just what allows him to influence the group of unpolitical voters. They think that it is unnecessary to take into account the feelings of the workers, as they say that the working class “votes for us anyway.” They also hope to get some comfort or even support from certain American politicians.

For American imperialism, Willy Brandt is a guarantee that no fundamental changes will be made in German foreign policy in case of a Social-Democratic electoral victory. It could not happen that he should become enthusiastic about “experiments,” as it happened to the right-wing Social-Democratic Carlo Schmidt at the time of discussions about the Rapacki Plan. At the same time, Willy Brandt is more flexible in questions of detail than Adenauer is, and therefore he might be less of a nuisance than Adenauer in the new world situation.

The S P D has not yet decided on its electoral platform. But Willy Brandt has already demanded that he himself and not the party should decide the contents of that programme. He has already refused to execute party decisions. If he is considered able to bring “the party team” (shadow cabinet) to “power,” then he should be thought able also to decide upon “the road to power.” This means that the coming party congress at Dortmund will decide the electoral platform only in a formal manner. It will be a platform dictated to the party by Willy Brandt, a platform in the spirit of the “Berlin, front-line city” policy.

The opposition toward this platform will be even weaker than the opposition against the revised party programme at Godesberg. No draft resolutions have yet been published which could give any indications about the way in which the party leadership would try to break the resistance of the membership. It is certain that in the period ahead the passivity of the working-class rank and file will further increase. Even during the election campaign, which in general means higher activity, especially by the working-class party members,

one cannot this time count upon a lessening of that passivity.

But the election *results* could be of decisive influence upon the formal unity or differentiation of the German Social-Democracy. This will depend not only upon the Marxist forces, who are still present inside the S P D, but above all upon the

rank-and-file workers, who will have to decide whether they accept remaining the passive objects of a more and more rotten party leadership, or whether they are willing, in their present class situation, to set out upon a road which will in the end lead to the building of a new working-class leadership.

THIRTY QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

about the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

By ERNEST GERMAIN

II¹

Question 12: Did Lenin express this opinion about the danger of a bureaucratic deformation of the Soviet state only in an occasional way?

Answer: No. Lenin's warnings on this subject formed the genuine Leitmotiv of the last years of his political activity. They became more and more pressing as he had to give up the daily leadership of the party and the state. One gets the impression that, moved by tragic forebodings, Lenin did his possible and impossible to mobilize the party cadres against this danger — in vain, alas, as history was to show. Only the Left Opposition and, later, the Unified Oppositions, followed his counsels.

Thus, during the discussions against the "Workers' Opposition" (Shliapnikov, Sapronov, Kollontai, et al) at the IXth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, and just after the IXth Congress, Lenin constantly returns to the problem of bureaucratism, and admits that the ultra-leftist opposition was partly right. Speaking to the Moscow Province Party Conference, he asserts:

The task of the soviet power consists of completely destroying the old apparatus and giving the power to the soviets. But in our programme we already admit that bureaucratism has reappeared, that the economic foundations of a really socialist society do not yet exist. [...] It is understandable that the bureaucratism that has arisen in soviet institutions must exert a *dissolving influence also on the party organizations*, for the party tops are the tops of the soviet apparatus. [Pp 616-7 of volume XXX of the *Complete Works*, German edition, 1930.]

Farther on in the same speech, Lenin emphasizes that in the assertions of the Workers' Opposition, there are "many healthy, necessary, and inevitable things" (ibidem, p 617). He adds that the struggle against the bureaucracy by the aid of the Worker and Peasant Inspection (directed by Stalin) is very difficult, because it

¹ The first part of this study appeared in our Summer issue. The last question treated there concerned Lenin's warnings about the risks of a graver and graver bureaucratic deformation in case that control from below should not be reinforced in all spheres of the Soviet economy and society.

is itself a bureaucratized institution, it exists only as a "pious hope."

In 1921, during the trade-union discussion at the Xth Congress of the Russian CP, Lenin corrects Trotsky when the latter speaks of the USSR as a "workers' state"; he specifies that the Soviet Republic is a "bureaucratically deformed workers' state."

In his report to the XIIth Party Congress, on 27 March 1922, Lenin declares:

If we consider Moscow — 4,700 communists in responsible posts — and if we consider this bureaucratic machine, this mountain, then who is leading and who is led? I strongly doubt that it can be said that communists are leading this mountain. To tell the truth, it is not they who are leading. It is they who are led. [P 962 of *Œuvres Choisies*, volume II.]

In the same report, Lenin furthermore asserts that the state apparatus is "frankly bad."

On 23 January 1923, he returns to the same subject in a proposal made to the XIIth Party Congress:

I do not deny that the question of our state apparatus and its improvement is very difficult: it is far from being solved, and it is at the same time an eminently pressing question.

Our state apparatus, except for the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, is to a large degree a survival from the past, which has undergone the minimum of serious modifications. It is only slightly embellished on the surface, it remains the real type of our old state apparatus [ibidem, p 1026].

In his last article "It Were Better to Do Less But Better," written 2 March 1923, the same idea returns like a genuine obsession:

Things are going so badly with our state apparatus, not to say that they are detestable, that we must first of all seriously reflect how to fight against its defects, which, let us not forget, go back to the past [...].

Our new Worker and Peasant Inspection, we hope, will leave far behind it that quality which the French call pruderie, and that we might call ridiculous affectation

or ridiculous ostentation, and which plays to the highest degree into the hands of our whole bureaucracy, of both our soviet and party institutions, for, be it said in parentheses, *the bureaucracy exists among us not only in the soviet but also in the party institutions.* [Ibidem, p 1031, 1038. Our emphasis.]

In volume XXXVI of the *Complete Works*, where there have just been collected writings not published in the previous "complete" edition of Lenin's *Works*, dozens of examples of this obsession are to be found:

With us, everything has sunk into the noisome bureaucratic swamp of the "administrations." To fight every day against that, much intelligence, authority, and force are needed. The administrations? Filth! The decrees? Filth! [Letter to Tsiurupa, 21 Feb 1922, vol XXXVI, p 578.]

The State Bank is now just a bureaucratic game of paper-shuffling. That's the truth, if it's the truth you want to know, and not the sugar-and-honey patter of the communist bureaucrats [. . .]. [To the President of the State Bank, 28 Feb 1922, vol XXXVI, p 579.]

Not to fear to reveal errors and incompetence; to give broad popularity and make publicity, with all our strength, around any worker on the spot who distinguishes himself even a little, to set him up as an example — the more such work is undertaken, and the more we plunge into living practice, turning our attention and that of our readers away from *this infected atmosphere of the Moscow bureaucrats and intellectuals*, then the more improvements we shall see. [Letter to Ossinski, 12 Feb 1922, vol XXXVI, p 590.]

I see things this way: a few dozen workers who would enter the Central Committee would be better able than anyone else to undertake to check, improve, and rearrange our apparatus. [. . .] The workers who will form part of the Central Committee must in my opinion not be recruited particularly from among those who have put in a long period of work in the soviets (among the workers that I am speaking of in this passage of my letter, I am also everywhere including the peasants), because in these workers there have already been created certain traditions and prejudices, which are precisely what it would be necessary to fight against.

Among these worker members of the

Central Committee the principal place should be held *by workers located below this stratum which for five years now has been joining the ranks of soviet functionaries, by workers who belong rather to the ranks of simple workers and peasants.* [Letter to the Congress (third codicil to the "Testament"), 26 Dec 1922, vol XXXVI, pp 609-10.]

If these passages are reread (and we could quote still dozens of others!), is it impossible not to conclude: on the eve of his death, Lenin was obsessed by thoughts about the bureaucratic deformation and degeneration of the state and party apparatuses.

Question 13: Did the party leadership follow these counsels of Lenin, did it react to his warnings?

Answer: No. It concealed the text of his Testament from the party (except the delegates to the XIIIth Congress), and even publicly denied its existence. On a motion by Trotsky, it voted in 1923 a motion putting the fight against the bureaucracy on the agenda and asserting that workers' democracy could be broadened. But when Trotsky in 1923 published *The New Course*, in which he took up again — sometimes even textually — Lenin's appeal for a "renewal of the apparatus," the party leadership reacted violently, *identifying itself with the bureaucracy.* Instead of joining Trotsky in this struggle against the bureaucracy in the name of Lenin, it joined the bureaucracy "against Trotskyism," thus trampling underfoot Lenin's warnings, destroying the last vestiges of workers' democracy, and ending up in the Bonapartist dictatorship of the bureaucracy which an attempt is being made today to present under the euphemistic label of "the personality cult." This choice of the party leadership was *decisive.* For though the bureaucracy's power in 1923 Russia stemmed without any doubt from objective conditions (the revolution isolated in one backward country; the weight of the capitalist past and surroundings; the lack of culture and technical skills among the laboring masses; the limited number and insufficient specific weight of the proletariat in the population, etc) and was in this sense inevitable, the attitude of the subjective factor — the party leadership and cadres — in this respect was not inevitable. The party could have reacted against this state of affairs by broadening the democratic bases of power, by having a growing number of rank-and-file workers participate in the exercise of power, by deepening the freedom of discussion and criticism in the party and in the soviets, by carrying out an economic policy that speeded up

industrialization and increased the weight of the workers in the country. This was the orientation that Lenin was calling for with all his remaining strength. This was the orientation that Trotsky and the Left Opposition were calling for thereafter. It was because it did not understand the danger of bureaucratic degeneration, or understood it too late, that the leadership of the Russian C P was transformed from an obstacle to this degeneration into its principal vehicle. Most of the party leaders, what is more, paid with their lives for this tragic error.

Question 14: Does The History of the C P of the U S S R reestablish the historical truth on the subject of Lenin's Testament?

Answer: In the 1938 *Short Course*, Lenin's Testament is completely passed over in silence. In the new *History*, it is quoted on pages 387-8, but in a singularly mutilated and falsified way.

Thus the *History* passes over in silence all the praises uttered by Lenin concerning the Bolsheviks he mentions in his Testament (Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Piatakov) and keeps only the criticisms. It suppresses Lenin's opinion that Trotsky is "the most gifted" member of the Central Committee. It suppresses Lenin's opinion that Bukharin and Piatakov were "the most markedly competent among the younger members." It suppresses Lenin's opinion that "Bukharin is a most outstanding theoretician and of great value [who] quite rightly enjoys the affection of the entire party."

To these omissions two falsifications are to be added. According to the *History*, Lenin warned the party against Trotsky's "non-Bolshevism"; in reality Lenin wrote that Trotsky's *non-Bolshevik past must not be brought up* any more than the errors committed by Zinoviev and Kamenev on the eve of the October Revolution. According to the *History*, Lenin warned the party against "Trotsky's very dangerous relapses into Menshevism." Of this, there is not one word in the entire Testament.

These omissions and falsifications are all the more grotesque in that the Testament has been published in the U S S R and each reader can realize, by comparing the two texts, how much the editor-bureaucrats continue "to fool the people" like vulgar "bourgeois politicians," to revive Lenin's formula.

Question 15: Why was the Left Opposition formed?

Answer: The *History of the C P of the U S S R* asserts that the Left Opposition dates from October 1923:

Profiting by the fact that the head of the

party, Lenin, was gravely ill and not in a position to fight, Trotsky renewed the struggle against the Leninist Central Committee and the party. He believed that the difficulties created in the country would be able to aid his project: to take the leadership of the party and adopt a line which, in the last analysis, would have led to the restoration of capitalism.

At the beginning of October 1923, Trotsky sent a letter to the Central Committee in which, in substance, he slandered the activity of this organism. [. . .] Shortly after Trotsky's letter, the Central Committee received the "Declaration of the 46," signed by the Trotskyists, the Detsists, and elements which, already before this time, had belonged to the groups of the "Left Communists" and the "Workers' Opposition." The declaration was also signed by some members of the C C. The "46" asserted in a slanderous way that the apparatus had taken the place of the party, and they were trying to make the communists rise up against the leading apparatus [vol I, p 392].

If an accusation of the place taken by the apparatus in the party and the state meant "Menshevism" and working "in the last analysis" for the restoration of capitalism, then the person most guilty of such a deviation was Lenin himself, who, in the third codicil of his Testament, also calls for "the renewal of the apparatus." We have seen with what violence Lenin attacked "bureaucratic rottenness." The oppositional platform of the "46" repeated Lenin's formulæ less vigorously, but all called for concrete measures to permit a reestablishment of workers' democracy in the party and in the soviets. We find the justification of these demands in the above-mentioned attacks by Lenin.

The *History* goes on to set up a crude amalgam by asserting that the opposition basically expressed the demands of the Mensheviks, the S-Rs, and the new bourgeoisie, who wanted to appear openly on the scene in conformity [!] with the N E P [vol I, p 393].

As for the assertion that Trotsky wanted "in the last analysis" to reestablish capitalism, it is curious that his then contemporaries did not notice it, since they left him for years in leading functions of the state and party. What we have here are slanders without any foundation, miserable vestiges of the Stalinist slanders which had to be suppressed as a result of the condemnation of the "personality cult."

The tragicomic aspect of this whole fake thesis

is that the majority of the members of that famous October 1923 Central Committee, which allegedly personified the Leninist virtues... was later liquidated by Stalin as counter-revolutionary. The authors of the *History* then find themselves faced by the impossible task of having to condemn both this majority and the opposition; they prefer not to mention the composition of this Central Committee, which would be too embarrassing for them.

Question 15: What was the economic policy proposed by the Left Opposition, beginning with 1923?

Answer: It is enough just to raise this question in order to realize to what extent the slander that the opposition "basically," "objectively," "in the last analysis," expressed the "pressure" of the "class enemy," the kulaks and Nepmen, is untenable and easy to unmask. The fact is that the Left Opposition, right from its formation, called for a policy of speeded-up industrialization, of stepped-up struggle against the kulaks, of a more pronounced class struggle both in the cities (by strengthening the economic and political position of the workers) and in the rural regions (by relying on the poor peasants and aiding the development of producers' coöperatives).

E H Carr, who is nevertheless hostile on the whole toward Trotsky and approves the "established facts," describes the proposals of the opposition in the following way: an overall economic plan plus credits to heavy industry. (*A History of Soviet Russia*, vol IV, "The Interregnum," pp 91-92.) And it would suffice to take any Communist publication of the period to realize this. Thus in the *Pravda* of 1, 3, and 4 January 1924 there appears the text of a long debate between Rykov, speaking for the majority of the Central Committee, and the spokesmen for the opposition (Ossinsky, Preobashensky, Piatakov, and I N Smirnov). The draft resolution of the opposition attributes the economic crisis from which the U S S R was suffering at that moment "to the lack of a plan unifying the labor of all the sectors of the state economy." And this draft resolution insists on the fact that it is the development of industry that is the key to economic upsurge, and rejects the idea of the supremacy of the market in favor of the idea of an economic plan. It must be added simply that Mikoyan, spokesman for the Stalinist fraction, attacked the "Trotskyist" idea of a single development plan for industry as "the height of utopia." (Carr, *ibidem*, p. 128.)

Quotations could be continued. But what is the use? It would be enough to reproduce any Russian communist periodical whatever of the years 1923 to 1927, to perceive that the opposi-

tion did indeed make a systematic campaign in favor of a plan for speeded-up industrialization, in favor of a stepped-up fight against the kulaks. It is true that for this reason the bureaucracy in power keeps all these texts well hidden. But for the same reason Stalin carefully prevented the public from having access to the 1917-18 documents which permit showing the real roles of Trotsky, the Old Bolsheviks, and— of himself, before, during, and after the October Revolution. Now these texts are being published today. It will not require very much time before the Soviet youth learns the truth about the struggles around positions, in the documents of the period, and despite the lies of the *History of the C P of the U S S R*.

Question 17: Is it true that the opposition "launched adventurist slogans" in favor of the increase in agricultural taxes and in the prices of consumers' goods in its proposals for the industrialization of the country?

Answer: Here we see how the accumulation of forgeries ends up in dazzling contradictions! On page 393 of volume I, the *History* asserts that the opposition's proposals only supported the Nepmen; but on page 390 Trotsky is accused of having extolled "the development of industry by the exploitation of the peasants." "To exploit" the kulak is a strange way of supporting him. The same accusation becomes still clearer on page 16 of volume II:

The Trotskyist proposals to increase the agricultural taxes hitting the peasants, and to increase the sales price of industrial products were particularly dangerous. [...] The policy of capitulation [!] of the Trotskyists and Zinovievists would have led in practice to the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet country.

How a policy that increases the taxes that the peasants must pay is simultaneously a policy of "capitulation" to these peasants or to the bourgeois elements among these peasants (whom Trotsky proposed to tax specially; we shall return to this) is a mystery that only bureaucratic logic can explain.

What really happened? As early as 1923, Trotsky had already revealed the phenomenon of the "scissors": the prices of farm products were falling, under the pressure of a more rapid revival of production in agriculture than in industry; the prices of industrial products were rising, under the pressure of a demand for these products that was greater than their supply. It is therefore not true that Trotsky was in favor of an increase in the prices of industrial products; on the contrary, he hoped that, thanks to a more rapid de-

velopment of industry, industrial prices might rise less rapidly than farm prices, or even come down. This was the surest means of maintaining the alliance between the workers and the peasants.

But the peasantry was not a united class. As early as 1923, Trotsky and the Left Opposition drew the party's attention to the fact that a growing proportion of the wheat sold to the cities was being sold only by the kulaks, who were beginning to concentrate the whole farm surplus in their own hands. And, profiting by the freedom of trade, the Nepmen, the private traders and traffickers of the cities, were also concentrating a good part of accumulation funds in their own hands. Preobashensky estimated this private accumulation during the years 1923 to 1925 at some 500 million gold rubles. The opposition proposed that a good part of these two surpluses, *which was in the hands of exploiting strata of society*, be mopped up by an appropriate tax and price policy. The funds thus obtained were to be used to speed up industrialization and especially to improve the situation of the poor peasants.

This policy was not adopted. For five years the party leadership denied the dangers pointed out by Trotsky and the opposition. Bukharin and Stalin asserted that there was no contradiction between private accumulation and the interests of the economic development of the state. They asserted that the opposition "exaggerated" the danger of the kulaks. And in fact they accused the Opposition's proposals of running the risk of precipitating a break of "the alliance between the workers and the peasants."

But events were to give dramatic proof that Trotsky and the opposition were right. As the *History* itself observes on page 33 of volume II, during the winter of 1927-28 "the kulaks, who possessed great reserves of grain, refused to sell [this wheat] to the state at the prices set by the Soviet authorities" — just as the Opposition had been predicting for years.² On page 54 this

² Bukharin, speaking at the VIIIth session of the enlarged Executive Committee of the Communist International in the name of the C C against the Opposition (according to the minutes, he was "greeted by lively applause. The delegates sang the *Internationale*"), stated especially:

What was the strongest argument of our opposition against the Central Committee? (I am thinking of 1925.) It was saying then: The contradictions are increasing immeasurably, and the Central Committee is not in a position to understand it. It was saying then: The kulaks, who have cornered almost all the surplus of grains, are organizing against us a "grain strike." [...] Now the results say the contrary. [*International Correspondence*, 14 Jan 1927, 7th year, n° 6, p 92.]

One year later, "the results" completely confirmed this prognosis of the opposition, and the *History* in volume II describes the same phenomenon in the same terms: strike in grain deliveries by the kulaks.

argument is repeated even more forcefully. The reaction of the Stalinist fraction was no less violent: it (p 33) "confiscated the grain" of the kulaks! In other terms, after having accused Trotsky of having wanted "to destroy the alliance between the workers and the peasants" by taxing the kulaks more, the Stalinist fraction was forced simply to expropriate them — which caused a terrible civil war and a fall in agricultural production that was a catastrophe whose effects still continue to be felt even today.

If the opinion of the opposition had been followed, increasing parts of the kulaks' "surplus" would have been seized as early as 1923. Industrialization would have been speeded up beginning with the same year. The effort concentrated on the years from 1928 to 1934 could have been spread over the period from 1924 to 1934; the sacrifices imposed as a result on the Soviet people would have been infinitely less onerous, the losses and waste much more limited, and the results much more impressive than those obtained by the tardy but feverish industrialization decided on by Stalin.

All this the Soviet youth will observe for itself by studying and comparing the documents of the period. All the falsifications of the *History of the C P of the U S S R* will not much longer hide this dazzling truth.

Question 18: The *History* asserts that at the heart of the disagreements about principles between the party and the Trotskyist-Zinovievist bloc was

the question of the possibility of the victory of socialism in the U S S R [...] The Trotskyist-Zinovievist anti-party bloc obstinately denied the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single country, the U S S R [...] they were] open capitulators, hostile to the conquests of the October socialist revolution [vol II, pp 15-16].

Is this true?

Answer: It is true that the question of *victoriously completing* the building of socialism in a single country was one of the main theoretical questions debated between the Left Opposition and the Stalinist fraction in the Central Committee during 1923-27. But, contrary to what is insinuated by the authors of the *History*, this question *did not turn* on the problem of industrializing the U S S R, of drawing up Five-Year Plans, of developing the productive forces. It could not turn on these problems, because it was the opposition and not the majority fraction which was the first to draw up projects in this sense, against

the resistance and sarcasms uttered by the Stalinist fraction.

The real problem, therefore, was not that of the *launching* of industrialization, of the *beginning* of the building of socialism, but that of *completing* this construction in a single country. Basically, therefore, it was, at least apparently, a quarrel about definitions.

If socialist society is defined as a society in which the means of production are essentially collective property, then naturally it is possible to complete this process in a big country (although in the U S S R, it is not yet so today: the kolkhozes still possess numerous means of production; they have even just obtained the ownership of farm machines; and the private peasants still possess a good part of the livestock and millions of acres of land).

But this definition, "invented" by Stalin, nowise corresponds to the Marxist-Leninist tradition. It can be justified only by the help of some rare quotations from Lenin, torn out of their contexts, where Lenin uses the term "socialism" as a synonym of "socialist revolution" (especially the famous 1915 article on the "United States of Europe," invoked thousands of times in this connection by Stalinist authors). There exist on the contrary very numerous passages where Marx and Lenin define socialist society as a society where all classes have disappeared, where the state, for the same reason, has also disappeared, where the level of development of the productive forces and of labor productivity is far superior to that of the most advanced capitalist countries, etc. In this classic meaning of the term, the U S S R is far from having "completed the construction of socialism" today, not to mention the years 1936, when this "completion" was officially "proclaimed" (thereby discrediting socialism, which was identified, in the eyes of the working masses of many countries, with living standards lower than those in the most advanced capitalist countries).

Let us quote just a few passages from Lenin in support of this classic definition of the formula "to complete the building of socialism":

For the victory of socialism, it is not enough to overthrow capitalism; the differences between proletariat and peasantry must also be done away with. [Speech to the IIIrd Pan-Russian Congress of the Trade Unions, *Complete Works*, vol XXV, p 175 of 1936 German edition.]

Did anyone among the Bolsheviks ever deny that the revolution can be definitively victorious only when it has included all countries, or at the very least some of the most advanced countries? [*Complete Works*,

vol XVI, p 195 of the Russian edition.]

The social revolution in a single country can lead to a definitive victory only on two conditions: on the condition that it be backed up in time by the social revolution in one or several advanced countries. The second condition is an agreement of the proletariat, which establishes its dictatorship and takes the state power into its own hands, with the majority of the peasant population [. . .]. [*Complete Works*, vol XVIII, pp 137-38 of the Russian edition.]

Stalin himself was still writing in 1924 in his book *Lenin and Leninism*:

To overthrow the bourgeoisie, the efforts of a single country are enough. But for the definitive victory of socialism, for the organization of socialist production, the efforts of one country, and especially of an agrarian country like Russia, are not enough. For that the efforts of the workers of a certain number of very developed countries are needed [pp 40-41].

Even in the first edition of his *Questions of Leninism*, we find the same formula again! Let us add that if today the problem of the completion of socialism takes on a certain realistic aspect (in a still rather distant future, it is true), this is 1) because the isolation of the Russian Revolution has been broken by the great Chinese Revolution and the creation of numerous deformed (or degenerated) workers' states in Europe and Asia; 2) because the U S S R, unlike what it was in 1923-28, has become one of the most advanced industrial powers, ranking second in the world.

The question may be raised as to why the debate on this obscure point of Marxist theory, a debate which is after all a purely academic one, turning on a question of definition, has occupied such a place in the history of the Bolshevik party. Some people have asserted that, by opposing the theory of "socialism in a single country," Trotsky "was setting the international spread of the revolution up in opposition to the industrialization of the U S S R." We have already shown that this interpretation of the fraction struggle in the Russian party is false, because the opposition simultaneously *called for* speeded-up industrialization and *fought against* the "theory of the possibility of completing the building of socialism in a single country."

These terms, therefore, have to be reversed. If for a part of the leaders of the Russian C P the problem of this "possibility" took on so much importance, that was because it already objectively reflected the nationalist, petty-bourgeois, deformation of their thought, which wanted to *subordinate*

the development of the international revolution to the (alleged) interests of the building of socialism in the U S S R. This led the Stalinist fraction, first into catastrophic political errors, especially in the 1925-27 Chinese revolution, and in 1930-33 Germany that ended up in Hitler's coming to power, and later into an openly counter-revolutionary policy in France, Spain, etc from 1934 to 1938, and in France, Italy, etc from 1944 to 1948. And that ideology only expressed the special social interests of a given social formation, the Soviet bureaucracy.

For it is clear that objectively, far from "aiding" the economic upsurge of the U S S R or of ensuring it a period of "respite" before an imperialist aggression, this counter-revolutionary policy of the Stalinist fraction brought immense harm to the U S S R. It permitted Hitler to reunite the concentrated forces of all Europe against the Soviet Union, just as the *History* recognizes on page 109 of volume II. A policy that ends up in such a disastrous result is *contrary* to the interests of the U S S R. It is in conformity only with the interests of the bureaucratic caste.

Question 19: "In the matter of foreign policy, the Trotskyists and the Zinovievists denied [!] the need to defend the U S S R against imperialist intervention," the *History* writes (vol II, p 16). Is this true?

Answer: Once again this is a case of just plain slander. Trotsky fought till his life's last breath for the Marxist principle of the defense of the U S S R, a workers' state even though degenerated, against imperialism. All his writings bear witness to this. The last political battle that he waged — see his book, *In Defense of Marxism* — was concerned with precisely this question. The Trotskyist Fourth International has right down to this day remained faithful to this same Marxist principle. History will testify in any case that the Trotskyists knew how to remain faithful to principles and rigorously to set aside all "political subjectivism"; for they remained attached to the defense of the U S S R in spite (and at the very moment) of the worst excesses the Soviet bureaucracy committed against them (assassinations of old Oppositionists in the U S S R; assassinations and kidnappings in Spain and elsewhere; the assassination of Trotsky; assassinations committed during and just after the Second World War).

Question 20: Was the Left Opposition in favor of setting up a second soviet party?

Answer: Up until 1934, the Left Opposition defended the viewpoint that it was useless to create a new party, that it was necessary to struggle to straighten out the Russian C P, the

Communist International, and all the Communist Parties, deformed by the Stalinist leadership. The opposition struggled first as a tendency; and then as a fraction, because it was obliged to by bureaucratic repression. In a healthy democratic party whose policy is correct, tendency formations are of a short-lived nature; so it was in the Bolshevik Party in Lenin's period. When fractions appeared, it was the indication that something was objectively wrong. Lenin thus interpreted things even in the period of the Shliapnikov fraction ("Workers' Opposition"), which he nevertheless fought against. Stalin did not want to admit it. He replaced the Marxist-Leninist conception of the revolutionary party as an *association of equals* by the bureaucratic and conservative conception according to which any tendency in disagreement with the majority of the Central Committee was automatically and necessarily an "objective agency of the class enemy." The practical application of this conception was in fact to prevent any democratic discussion in the party.

Now both theory and experience teach that it is absurd to suppose that the majorities in leading organisms succeed automatically and on every occasion in adopting a correct position. The problems faced by a revolutionary party — and a fortiori by a revolutionary party holding power in a workers' state — are often *new problems* whose solution is hardly to be ensured by reference to the classics or to situations in the past. Only a frank and democratic discussion, a confrontation of new and successive experiences, permit finally finding this solution. On more than one occasion, Marx and Lenin — to take only these two examples — found themselves put in a minority in the leading organisms of the parties to which they belonged. To choke off discussion and tendency struggle is to render definitively more difficult the process by which the revolutionary party adapts itself to constantly changing reality, in order to react in the way most in conformity with the interests of the proletariat.

Nor is it possible to defend the thesis according to which this discussion ought to be permitted only within central committees and leading organisms. As a matter of fact, any practice of this nature tips the scales in favor of the majority of the Central Committee and the party apparatus. Now if it be admitted that this majority can be mistaken, to prevent a democratic discussion in the ranks is to make it more difficult to correct any errors that have been committed — which can bring about disastrous consequences for the party, the working class, and the workers' state, as the example of the Stalinist agricultural policy shows us.

A democratic discussion therefore presupposes that the various tendencies in the Central Committee be able, before congresses, freely to make their positions known to the ranks, in platforms and in written and oral debates around these platforms. In other terms, it presupposes the freedom to organize tendencies. But if fractions are forbidden, any tendency struggle can be choked off by accusing a minority tendency of transforming itself into a fraction. And if the right to form various soviet parties is suppressed, fraction or tendency struggles can be stifled by asserting that the minority is "objectively" transforming itself into a second party. In practice, furthermore, when political divergences on which history has not yet said its last word become too acute and show themselves for too long a time, it is preferable, from the viewpoint of the party's interests themselves, to allow a minority to organize itself separately than to paralyze the party's life to a great extent by an endless struggle. It is from the clash between the platforms of different soviet parties that the correct position will finally emerge.

The Stalinists — and the Khrushchevists — justify their opposition to the right to form various soviet parties, the right to form fractions and the right to tendencies, by equally specious objective and subjective arguments.

The objective argument is that, when there are no class oppositions, the existence of various parties is not justified. This argument presupposes first of all that there are no conflicts of class interests in the U S S R, and next that each class historically expresses its interests in a single party. Both assertions are false. There are in the U S S R two social classes — the working class and the peasantry — whose historical and immediate interests are often different. And next, history teaches us that various social classes have internally sufficiently different interests of strata, groups, and sections to justify the existence of several parties for long periods of time.

As for the subjective argument, it insists on the difficult situation of the Soviet state, surrounded by enemies, a besieged fortress, with a working class that is in a considerable minority. This argument had a certain value, but only for an acute period of civil war, during which a certain limitation of soviet democracy may be inevitable. But is it not striking that at the height of the Civil War, there were not only constantly tendency struggles in the Bolshevik party, but even various soviet parties (particularly the Left Social-Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks, the Anarchists, and the Bund) legalized for considerable periods, whereas in the U S S R of today, which is neither disarmed, nor surrounded,

nor supported only by a proletariat in the minority, but which is the second-ranking military and industrial power in the world, the masses have neither freedom to form soviet parties, nor fraction rights, nor tendency rights?

The *History of the C P of the U S S R* asserts (vol II, p 20) that the Left Opposition "openly violated the Soviet laws" by organizing public demonstrations at the time of the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution. In fact, nothing in the Soviet Constitution of that period forbade the organization of either soviet parties or public meetings or street demonstrations. These traditional democratic rights of the workers have never been formally revoked. The cynical assertion of the *History* reveals the gulf that separates Soviet legality from the practice of the bureaucracy.

Question 21: Why was the Left Opposition expelled from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Answer: The Left Opposition was expelled because its members refused to repudiate their convictions. This emerges clearly from the resolution of the XVth Congress of the C P of the Soviet Union which asserted particularly:

The Congress calls for the ideological and organic disarming of the Opposition, asks their withdrawal of the views expressed above as anti-Leninist and Menshevik, and the acceptance of the obligation to defend everywhere the conceptions and decisions of the party, of party congresses, of party conferences, and of the party C C.

Rykov, in his speech winding up the XVth Congress, speaking in the name of the C C majority, had furthermore specified:

In regard to each of the active participants in the opposition, *to the degree that he will renounce his ideological errors*, the party, in accepting him back, must work out measures and conditions that will exclude the possibility of a renewal of what has been going on during these last two years. [*International Correspondence*, 1927, n° 12, p. 1991.]

The *History*, furthermore, repeats substantially the same idea (vol II, p 31). In the name of the opposition, Kamenev had replied in advance to this impermissible demand (Trotsky and Zinoviev, the two main spokesmen of the opposition, had been expelled from the party on the eve of the XVth Congress and had not been able to speak there). He had declared:

[We decide] to submit to all the decisions

of the party congress, however harsh they may be for us [Interruption: "That's formal!"], and carry them out.

By so acting, we are acting in a Bolshevik way; but if — to this complete and unconditional submission to all the decisions of the party congress, to the complete renunciation and liquidation of any fractional struggle in all its forms and the dissolution of fractional organizations — to all that we further add a renunciation of our points of view, that, in our opinion, would not be Bolshevik. If there occurred on our part a renunciation of the opinions that we were still advocating a week or two ago, that would be hypocrisy, and you would not accord it any credence. [*International Correspondence*, 1927, n° 128, p. 1965.]

Here two different organizational conceptions confront each other: that of *democratic centralism*, which makes obligatory *the carrying out, the application, and the public defense* of the decisions taken by the majority, but which leaves minorities the right to keep their own opinions and defend them inside the party, and to bring the majority decisions into question again after a certain test by events, in periods of discussion decided on by the leading organisms (especially the periods preceding national congresses and conferences); and the conception of *bureaucratic centralism* which obliges minorities "to disarm ideologically," to abandon the defense of their ideas inside the party as well, to give up any attempt at revision of the majority decisions, and which as a result prevents any correction of errors committed by the majority. It is needless to say that the whole Leninist practice is contrary to bureaucratic centralism, and that Lenin never required Bolsheviks who were not in agreement with him on this or that question to give up their ideas in order to remain in the party.

This affair, as is known, had a tragic continuation. Contrary to his own declaration, which we have just reproduced, Kamenev and his tendency friends, at the end of the XVth Congress, made a declaration renouncing their ideas. And as might have been expected — as the opposition had foreseen and Kamenev himself had announced — the party leaders soon began to accuse the capitulating oppositionals of "duplicity," "hypocrisy," etc (*History*, vol II, p 32, et al). *But why then had they required such public self-abasement* except to break these men morally and start them on the road that would lead to their lying "confessions" at the Moscow Trials?

III. MARXIST EXPLANATION OF THE "PERSONALITY CULT," I E, OF THE PERIOD OF STALINIST DICTATORSHIP

Question 22: How was Soviet agriculture collectivized and what were the results of this particular form of collectivization?

Answer: Soviet agriculture was collectivized by force and against the resistance of the great majority of both the rich and middle peasants. Its results were disastrous: a systematic slaughter of livestock and a disastrous drop in agricultural production. It was followed by a crisis in the provisioning of the Soviet cities (and toilers) which, as even Khrushchev confesses, has not yet been solved 25 years later.

According to the statistical collection, *The National Economy of the U S S R*, published by the Soviet government (Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1957), horned cattle in 1928 (within the present borders of the U S S R) amounted to 66.8 million units. In 1930 it had fallen to 50.6 million, in 1931 to 42.5 million, in 1932 to 38.2 million, and in 1934 to 33.5 million: *half the cattle had disappeared in the space of five years!* The evolution in grain production was no less catastrophic. It took till 1937 to catch up with the 1927 production level, and the 1937 per capita level has not yet been equaled even in 1960.

In view of these unquestionable facts, certain assertions of the *History* take on a really odious character. Thus it is asserted (vol II, p 40) that the formation of kolkhozes lagged behind (!) "the sweep of the movement of the peasant masses" toward collectivization, and the masses of poor and middle peasants are explicitly mentioned. Now these poor and middle peasants formed 85% of the Soviet peasantry. If this mass had really rushed with enthusiasm toward the kolkhozes, how is the tragic fact to be explained that, on the way, they killed off half the Soviet livestock so as not to have to turn it over to producers' coöperatives?

On pages 44-45 and 51 of volume II, the authors of the *History* claim that the integral collectivization of Soviet agriculture was "prepared" by the party and the state by a series of economic measures that permitted the creation of an adequate technical and agrotechnical basis for the great kolkhozian enterprises. In reality, we have seen how the leaders of the ruling fraction of the C P had refused to listen to the warnings of the Left Opposition, had refused to prepare the *gradual collectivization of agriculture*, and had, beginning with 1928, taken action precisely under the effect of panic, without adequate preparation. Worse still: the traction-power

destroyed by the mass slaughter of horses was greater than the traction-power of tractors up until the middle of the '50s! And despite a broad extension of the tilled areas, production scarcely increased (except for plants destined for industry) — which proves that productivity had not risen but fallen.

Farther on, indeed, the authors of the *History* admit that “errors and excesses” were committed in collectivization, and that “many peasants, yielding to the provocations of the kulaks, had slaughtered cows, hogs, sheep, and poultry [vol II, p 59].” But, let us repeat, if it was *more than the half* of Soviet livestock that was slaughtered, it was not a matter merely of “many peasants,” but of a large part (half, almost half, or over half) of the peasantry which was hostile to collectivization *and which was obliged by force to enter the kolkhozes*. And if this is the way it was, how can any credence still be given to the assertion of the authors of the *History* (vol II, p 51), according to which “the passing over to integral collectivization marks a radical turn of the basic peasant masses toward socialism”?

Question 23: Why were the errors in Stalinist agricultural policy not corrected for 25 years?

Answer: Drawing up the balance-sheet of the First Five-Year Plan, the *History* emphasizes not only the unquestionable and impressive springs forward of industrial production, but also “the radical improvement in the material situation of the toilers” in the city as in the country (vol II, p 84). It asserts farther on (p 1006) that, beginning with 1934, the problem of provisioning the cities with wheat was entirely solved.

New 21 years later, in 1955, Khrushchev abruptly confessed that this problem of provisioning was still not solved, and two years later he took Malenkov to task for having asserted the contrary in 1952. That is to say how slight and baseless is the assertion of the authors of the *History*.

In reality, the Stalinist agricultural policy brought on a crisis in food supplies to the Soviet people which lasted from 1928 till 1955-56, i e, for 27 years, which imposed terrible sacrifices on the people, sacrifices that could have been avoided. It is obviously impossible to explain a *social* phenomenon of such scope by a simple psychological fact (“the personality cult”). As Marxists, we take as our starting-point the conception that *social phenomena* (i e, involving millions of individuals) must find a *social explanation*, i e, can be explained only by special aspects of the relations mutually connecting social classes or strata.

The fact that it was impossible for the CP of the USSR to change this erroneous policy for

more than a quarter of a century, despite its disastrous consequences for the country, the working class, and the alliance between the workers and the peasants, peremptorily demonstrates that something was rotten in that party, that there was no longer either democratic centralism or freedom of discussion, either at the top or in the ranks. The thesis according to which this party had undergone a process of *bureaucratic degeneration*, a thesis defended by the Left Opposition from 1927 on, is thus confirmed.

But this bureaucratic degeneration of a workers' party ruling a workers' state cannot remain a purely political phenomenon. It must have precise social roots. These must be exposed. That is what we shall do farther on.

Question 24: How was Hitler able to take power?

Answer: Hitler's arrival at power is the determinant fact of world history of the '30s. It had terrible effects, first on the German working class, then on the European working class, and finally on the Soviet people and state themselves, whom it cost 20 million dead and incalculable devastations.

Now, following the authors of the 1938 *Short Course*, the authors of the *History* (vol II, p 89) are satisfied to observe that, despite the “revolutionary awakening” of the German working class, which “was demonstrated with particular force,” the bourgeoisie “decided to give the power to the Hitlerites.” Full stop; that's all. But in a country torn by class struggle, the “decision” of one of the sides facing each other is not generally sufficient to seize victory. It is necessary also for the correlation of forces to be favorable to it, or for the policy followed by the other side to allow it to get its own way. Now in Germany the power of the working class was such that it was possible to impose a fascist dictatorship on the country, to destroy all the workers' organizations, only as a result of division and passivity in the working class.

Unquestionably the Social-Democratic leaders bear a heavy responsibility for this state of affairs. That was emphasized in the 1938 *Short Course* (p 285); it was omitted in the 1959 *History*. But what about the Communist Party? The 1938 *Short Course* mentioned that it had received six million votes. The *History* modestly omits this significant fact, no doubt lest the question be raised: Why was this impressive force unable to bar the road to fascism?

The facts provide us with the sad answer to this question. The Communist leaders of the period, including Stalin, had completely underestimated the seriousness of the fascist danger. They had believed that the “Hitlerite adventure”

would be only a brief interlude before the conquest of power by the German C P. They had not understood at all the disastrous effects of a fascist victory, both on the German working class and on the situation in Europe. Despite the rise of the fascist danger, they had in practice sabotaged the policy of united action by the working class, by asserting that the Social-Democracy was the "main danger," by taking up Stalin's idiotic thesis that "Social-Democracy and fascism are twins," the theory of social-fascism.³ Trotsky and the international Trotskyist movement cautioned the Russian, German, and international Communists against this false policy. They called for setting up a Communist-Socialist united front, from top to bottom, to drive back the fascist offensive, and then, with their forces thus cemented, to set out on the assault of capitalism. And even when Hitler was named chancellor and the workers' organizations still had some months' respite, no attempt was undertaken to organize an anti-fascist uprising.⁴

Question 25: What happened in the U S S R between the assassination of Kirov and the resignation of Zhejov as head of the G P U?

Answer: According to the *History*, between 1 December 1934 and 1 Decembre 1936, in the C P of the U S S R, only one event occurred that deserves mention: the verification of the party membership cards (vol II, pp 103-4). As the assassin of Kirov, first secretary of the C P at Leningrad, had a party membership card, it was decided to verify these cards in order to expel unworthy elements. The mistake was made, however, of expelling also passive elements. It is incredible but true: that is all that the *History* [sic] of the C P of the U S S R has to say of the somewhat tumultuous events of these years.

The 1938 *Short Course* was already a little more explicit. It asserts (p 308) that the assassination of Kirov had been perpetrated "by that band of Trotskyists and Zinovievists joined together." It goes on to state that this "band" had sold itself "to the fascist espionage services." It then describes with complacency (p 308) the three Moscow Trials where "these scoundrels" (the members of the famous Leninist Central Committee!) had confessed to preparing the assassination "of all [!] the other leaders of the party and the government." Finally it is explained why these "cast-offs of the human race" (p 327) were executed, after having perpetrated "heinous crimes for twenty years."

³ See a recent — and tardy — criticism of this policy by Palmiro Togliatti, examined in our Winter 1959-60 issue.

⁴ See Leon Trotsky's *Œuvres Choisies*, volume III, largely devoted to these problems.

Of all that, no trace remains in the 1959 *History*. The only thing it keeps is the verification of the party membership cards.

But to learn the full and complete truth about the events that were then occurring in the U S S R, we possess today a witness of some weight: I N Khrushchev, First Secretary of the C P of the U S S R, declared the following in his famous "secret" report to the XXth Congress:

It has been established that, out of the 139 members or alternates elected to the party C C at the XVIIth Congress, 98 persons, i e 70 %, were arrested and shot (most of them in 1937-38), [. . .] It was this same fate that was suffered by not only the C C members but also the majority of the delegates to the XVIIth Congress of the party. Out of the 1956 delegates with voice or vote, 1,108 were arrested under the indictment of counter-revolutionary crimes, i e, more than half. That fact itself shows how fantastic and contrary to common sense were the accusations of counter-revolutionary crimes, made against, we now see, the majority of the participants in the XVIIth Congress (1934). [. . .] That was the result of abuses of power by Stalin, who was beginning to resort to mass terror against the party cadres.

In another "secret" speech, Khrushchev estimated at "several million" the number of Communists and honest workers who were liquidated during the period from 1935 to 1938. But this whole succession of tragedies and crimes on a colossal scale, which ended up in the *physical liquidation of the major part of the Communist cadres in the U S S R* — all that, for the authors of the *History of the C P of the U S S R*, is reduced to — the verification of membership cards!

It is true that farther on — without any connection with the Kirov affair, the persecutions of the oppositionals, or the Moscow Trials — the *History* mentions "the mass repression against the politically defeated ideological enemies," which also made victims "of numerous [!] communists and honest citizens," and "persecutions and deaths" of which Zhejov and Beria were the authors. But this is a matter only of two or three sentences in a passage on "the personality cult" itself — it is hard to believe it, but that's the way it is! — fitted into a long development concerning — "the strengthening of Soviet democracy" and "greater democracy in the party"! (Vol II, pp 124-27).

Question 26: Does the "personality cult of Stalin" furnish a sufficient explanation for all these baffling phenomena?

Answer: One after another, we have examined three "errors" of Stalin that brought on the most baleful consequences for the Soviet state and working class, as also for the world proletariat: forced collectivization, with the destitution and semi-famine that followed it; the policy of social-fascism, with the arrival of Hitler in power, the destruction of the workers' movement in a large part of Europe, and the invasion of the U S S R, the probability of which, furthermore, Stalin did not want to admit in spite of many warnings (vol II, p 163): and the physical destruction of a good part of the cadres of the Soviet C P by a "mass terror."

All these phenomena are explained by the authors of the *History* by the "personality cult," which "slowed down the development of Soviet society but which could not stop it, and did not modify the socialist nature of the Soviet structure."

It is absolutely unsatisfactory from the Marxist viewpoint to explain social phenomena of such scope by a single incident of individual psychopathology. As we have already pointed out, social phenomena can have only a *social explanation*. The only valid Marxist explanation of the Stalinist phenomenon is that a *bureaucratic stratum having privileges to defend* — but enjoying these privileges on the basis of the mode of production created by the October Revolution — usurped political power in the U S S R and politically expropriated the proletariat.

This Marxist thesis, defended by Leon Trotsky and the Fourth International, permits explaining both the contradictory aspects of Soviet reality of the last 30 years: the magnificent industrial and cultural upsurge, which testifies to the existence of a mode of production superior to that of capitalism; and the terrible crimes committed against the interests of the Soviet and international proletariat by this selfsame Soviet bureaucracy. To assert that "socialism has triumphed" in the U S S R, or to assert that a "state capitalism" reigns there — these do not permit explaining the two faces of the Soviet medallion.

Question 27: Is the Soviet bureaucracy a new class?

Answer: No. It does not have its own roots in the process of production or in the economic life of the country; it has no particular historical role to play. What we have here is a parasitical excrescence that has appeared on the Soviet proletariat, the workers' state, at a particular period of its history, owing to quite special historical phenomena; the isolation of the first workers' state, its maintenance in spite of the temporary ebb of the world revolution, but its maintenance

in a country that was poor and bled white, suffering from an enormous economic and cultural backwardness. And so, to wipe out bureaucratic degeneration in the U S S R, it is not necessary to have a *social revolution*, it is not necessary to overthrow the mode of production or the social order; a *political revolution* is sufficient, a change in the form of government, reestablishing political freedoms for the Soviet proletarians, internal democracy in the party, the soviets, and the state.

Question 28: Do the events that have occurred in the U S S R since Stalin's death not demonstrate that the bureaucracy is not a social stratum having its own interests and privileges to defend?

Answer: Giuseppe Boffa, special correspondent of *l'Unità* in Moscow from 1953 to 1957, and intelligent spokesman for the Khrushchev theses, writes in *The Big Turn — from Stalin to Khrushchev*:

The accusation of Trotskyist and Social-Democratic — and later Yugoslav — origin, which considers that the "Stalinist bureaucracy" has become a "new class" falls of its own weight. It could never alter the production relationship in its own favor. No essential principle of communism was ever threatened. It is the nature of bureaucratic elements to tend to become differentiated and stratified, and to become separated from the people. But this tendency cannot be in accordance with the structure of Soviet society; it enters into open conflict with it. This is confirmed by the history of these last years. The anti-bureaucratic action being carried out today by the Soviet Union through speeches and publications has the very accent of a "class struggle." This method has been criticized with some reason, for it overmagnified the target. It well demonstrates, however, the intolerance of this people toward anything which, from near or far, seems to attack its principles. Lenin had remarked that the struggle against bureaucratic phenomena stretched out over dozens of years; socialist society contains the conditions for their final defeat. [Page 113 of the French edition, published by François Maspéro.]

We have deliberately quoted this long text by an *official* ideologist of the Communist Parties in order to strip bare the deformations, contradictions, and boomerangs that it contains.

We have just reminded our readers that Leon Trotsky and the Trotskyist movement have never considered the Soviet bureaucracy to be a new class; to be fair, it must also be added that nei-

ther have the Yugoslav Communists ever adopted such a position, except during the brief period during which Milovan Djilas exerted a predominant ideological influence over them. As for the Social-Democrats, eternal adversaries of the October Revolution and the Soviet Union, it is a pure amalgam to mix their positions up with those of communist tendencies like the Trotskyists or the Titists.

In the passage of Boffa that we have just quoted, it is admitted that "the anti-bureaucratic action" being carried on today in the U S S R takes on the very accent of a "class struggle," or, more exactly, of a *social struggle*. The assertion that it is "the Soviet Union" (i e, the state itself) that is carrying out this action is contradicted in the following sentence, since it is there asserted that "this method has been criticized with some reason." In reality, it is the state which criticized, and definite social strata (youth, progressive intellectuals, workers) who vigorously carried on this "anti-bureaucratic action." But if these strata have in fact been carrying on the anti-bureaucratic action as a *social struggle*, how could one continue to dispute the fact that it is indeed a matter of a social phenomenon, i e, of the appearance of a stratum of privileged people?

Taking up Lenin's position on the problem of bureaucracy, Boffa rightly stresses that the founder of the Soviet state emphasized the fact that the problem is complex and of long duration. But he carefully refrains from picking up the quotations reproduced here, which confirm that Lenin nowise excluded the possibility of a bureaucratic degeneration of the U S S R. Need we recall that even Stalin, as late as 1925, nowise excluded this possibility?

The fact that the Soviet bureaucracy has never been able "to alter the production relationships in its own favor" seems true but in fact is based on a misunderstanding. The bureaucracy had no interest in "altering" the existing production relationships, for the good reason that these scarcely prevented the flowering and extension of its privileges. Those privileges are, roughly, limited to the sphere of distribution. To ensure itself these privileges, the bureaucracy has to have supreme control over the whole social product. It is in this arbitrary and parasitical control of the Soviet social surplus product by a well-delimited stratum of people, that, in the last analysis, the root of bureaucratic degeneration lies. This root has not been extirpated since Stalin's death or since the XXth Congress.

Even if it has been somewhat lessened, social inequality in the U S S R continues to be extraordinary for a country which claims to be socialist. Directors of trusts, and other highly placed bur-

caucrators, earn easily 10 to 20 times as much as a medium-skilled worker (not to speak of the worst-paid strata — women street-sweepers, business clerks, etc — whose salary is exceeded by sometimes 30 times). The management of the enterprises and the economy is strictly reserved for the members of the privileged stratum. There is neither genuine workers' co-management nor the semblance of democratic workers' control. The laboring masses have no way of bringing their collective weight to bear on central decisions about planning and economic policy. The most they can do is to protest against the effects of this policy on their immediate living standards, and thus bring a certain pressure on the government.

The arrival of the Khrushchev era has nowise modified the basic features of this regime. The only democratization that has taken place has been *at the top of the bureaucracy*, for which the Central Committee has become a genuine small parliament. True, many reforms of the Khrushchev period have improved the masses' living and working conditions; but these were conceded to the masses under growing pressure from 1953 to 1956 — a pressure which found its logical conclusion in the Polish and Hungarian revolutions, which Khrushchev tried at any cost to avoid in the U S S R. These reforms no more certify the disappearance of the bureaucratic regime in the U S S R than the reforms wrenched from capitalism in the West since the rise of the labor movement certify the disappearance of capitalism.

And when Boffa asserts that no essential principle of communism was ever threatened, he contradicts what he himself said a few pages earlier where he recalls that, contrary to Lenin's teachings, the high salaries for "specialists" were extended to party and state functionaries, thus violating the "rule of the Paris Commune." Now Lenin explicitly stated — following Marx, what is more — that these high salaries constituted the main source of a possible "demoralization" of the soviet power, its bureaucratic degeneration. That is therefore precisely what it is about in the Soviet Union since the victory of Stalin.

Question 29: Since foreign policy is the natural prolongation of internal policy, does that also in its turn certify a bureaucratic degeneration in the U S S R?

Answer: No doubt about it. Without going back to phenomena from before World War II (defeat of the Chinese revolution, Hitler's arrival at power, policy of a Popular Front in France and Spain, etc), we can draw the proofs thereof from the (quite brief) developments in the second

volume of the *History of the CP of the USSR* concerning the Soviet Union's postwar international policy.

Thus the *History* does mention the conquest of power by the Yugoslav CP and the Chinese CP, but it takes care not to mention, in the case of these two — the only two victorious social revolutions that took place during and after World War II — that it was Stalin, it was the Soviet CP, that advised Tito and Mao Tse-Tung *against* taking power. Is it not bizarre that a pure workers' state, that a "socialist" government, sets the brakes against the development of communism in the world?

When the authors of the *History* take up the first postwar phase (vol II, pp 230-31), they do mention the strengthening of the French and Italian Communist Parties, the aggravation of the class struggle. But suddenly they are talking about the offensive of the bourgeoisie and the threat of fascist and cryptofascist regimes! This raises the question: Why did these Communist Parties, profiting by the terrible weakness of capitalism in their respective countries, which the *History* admits, not first try to use the offensive arm? The answer is well known: at the moment when capitalism was the most weakened, the French, Italian, and Belgian CPs, throwing Lenin's teaching overboard, entered bourgeois coalition governments, collaborated in rebuilding the bourgeois state apparatus (Maurice Thorez: "A single state, a single army, a single police."), held back strikes, and drove with all their strength for the reconstruction of the capitalist economy. It was only when this criminal policy had sufficiently strengthened previously weak capitalism that the bourgeoisie was able to go over to the offensive, beginning in 1947-48, for the masses had been demoralized and disappointed by the reformist policy followed by the CPs.

Can such a policy, which was nevertheless dictated by Moscow, be the emanation of a really communist government?

And lastly, beginning with the XXth Congress, the CP of the USSR has been with increasing violence extolling the revisionist policy called "peaceful coexistence" — a policy which supposes that the war can be avoided without the destruction of capitalism, that capitalism can collapse without a proletarian revolution, that the world victory of socialism can be the more or less automatic, more or less direct, result of the strengthening of the Soviet economy. Such

a thesis disarms the toilers, sows passivity and skepticism about the revolutionary possibilities of the world proletariat, and in practice thwarts authentic revolutions that have burst out in spite of the policy of the CPs, such as the Algerian revolution.

In another quarter, unquestionably, the Soviet government carried on a victorious war against Nazi imperialism, the existence of the Soviet Union permitted the destruction of capitalism (from above, without revolution) in the countries of Eastern Europe, and it aided the development of the colonial revolution. But these two contradictory aspects of Soviet international policy are only the reflection of the contradictory nature of the bureaucracy: it is attached to the new forms of property and the mode of production created by the October Revolution, while being a *conservative force* that exploits these new forms for its own selfish interests. This dual aspect of the bureaucracy we find again here in its international policy.

Question 30: Is the Soviet Union a classless society, a socialist society?

Answer: The authors of the *History of the CP of the USSR* assert (vol II, p. 113) that the exploiting classes have been suppressed in the USSR. This assertion is correct. But that does not prevent two distinct classes from continuing to exist in the country: the working class and the peasant class, whose interests, without being permanently in opposition, often clash, and in a violent way. The survival of these two classes is due in the last analysis to the insufficient degree of development of the productive forces. The survival of production for the market, of money, of wages — this has definitively the same roots. As Marxists we understand that the survival of the state is also due to this cause. The assertion that the survival of the state would be due to the need to organize the economy or to defend the country (vol II, p 129) is untenable from the Marxist viewpoint, for these functions can be more adequately fulfilled in a classless society, by other forms of social organization.

Consequently, the USSR has not yet built socialism (the classless society), but still finds itself *in a transitional phase from capitalism to socialism*. And as the productive forces develop and the cultural level rises, the masses will sweep away the bureaucratic regime that is an obstacle to the optimum upsurge of society.

Three Declarations and an Open Letter of the International Secretariat of the Fourth International

I

FOR THE RELEASE of MICHEL RAPTIS (PABLO) and SAL SANTEN, LEADERS of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

The imprisonment in Holland of Comrades Michel Raptis (Pablo) and Sal Santen, respectively secretary and member of the Secretariat of the Fourth International, has marked the beginning of a new wave of repression set in motion by French imperialism, its allies, and its agents of the "Red Hand," against the vanguard of the workers, youth, and intellectuals which in Europe is supporting and aiding the cause of the Algerian revolution. There are also to be counted today among these repressive measures: the trial of the Jeanson network, the prosecution and indictments of the signers of the Declaration of the 121, the new executions of the courageous militants of the Algerian revolution, etc.

The Dutch police, acting for the account and the common interests of imperialism, has tried to present the repression against the Trotskyist leaders as a problem of criminal law. But the accusations are already showing, and the trial will further show, that what is in question is the unconditional support given by the Fourth International to the Algerian revolution since its beginning. What is in question is the action of support and solidarity, the international and revolutionary activity, carried on by Comrades Pablo and Santen for the triumph of the Algerian revolution.

This cause is supported today by the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, themselves engaged in struggle against imperialist repression. It is supported by growing currents in France itself, as is shown by the attitude of the military absentees, the students, and the hundreds of intellectuals and artists who have so far signed the Declaration of the 121. It is a cause that has been taken up by the vanguard of workers and intellectuals in various European countries.

In face of the betrayal or paralysis of the traditional workers' currents, the Fourth International has maintained the honor of the communist workers' movement; it has maintained its own revolutionary and internationalist traditions, supporting the Algerian revolution with all its strength, by being active in vanguard circles and among the masses for the development of a concrete action in all French circles for the triumph of the Algerian revolution.

It is against this developing movement, against this activity of the Fourth International, that French imperialism and its German and Dutch imperialist allies are aiming their blows.

This repression is not an expression of their strength,

but of their powerlessness to find a military solution to the colonialist war of Algeria. At this moment the Algerian revolution is winning allies among the African peoples, it is winning the solidarity of the workers' states. And — what is of immense importance — it is winning the militant solidarity of thousands of the French youth, of a movement that is growing daily in all French circles.

This repression must be faced up to by mobilizing all forces in defense of those who have fallen into the hands of the forces of repression because they are holding aloft the banner of the liberation of the Algerian people, of the liberation of all peoples. The defendants in the Jeanson trial, the 121, the leaders of the Fourth International imprisoned in Amsterdam — all are in their turn the accusers of a regime of crime and oppression against which the people of the world are rising up.

Hundreds of intellectuals, legislators, workers' leaders, and political leaders, of Europe, Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the United States, are already forming a current of support, of solidarity, with the imprisoned Trotskyist leaders. Well-known intellectuals who support the cause of the Algerians, the cause of the military absentees, are today supporting these leaders of the Fourth International whose imprisonment marked the beginning of a general repression.

Worker-militant, youth, and intellectual comrades:

In a few weeks, in Amsterdam, in the Dutch courts, a new stage of the anti-colonialist struggle, of the fight for the Algerian revolution, will begin.

Contribute to it your strength, your solidarity.

Show Dutch justice and imperialism in all its expressions that these militants are part of a movement that nobody can stop or defeat.

Let us unite all anti-colonial forces, let us carry on the battle on every front, let us transform every trial against left-wing militants into a condemnation-trial of colonialism and of the colonialist war against the Algerian people.

Call out to the Dutch judges and to public opinion, showing the political nature of these so-called "common criminal" trials.

*Solidarity with Comrades Raptis (Pablo) and Santen!
Solidarity with the Fourth International faced by repression!*

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

3 October 1960

II

LET US DEFEAT THE IMPERIALIST BLOCKADE AND AGGRESSION AGAINST CUBA!

The Fourth International hails the latest and very great advances of the Cuban revolution, which, by nationalizing hundreds of great enterprises, has struck an enormous blow against capitalism as well as imperialism and has opened the way to workers', socialist, planning of the Cuban economy.

Imperialism in desperation wants by any means whatever to break the powerful revolutionary drive of the Cuban workers and people. To defend its own interests and the capitalist system in Cuba, the United States has decreed an economic blockade against the island, is organizing armed attacks and provocative naval manoeuvres, and is preparing military invasion in order to drown the revolution in blood.

The Cuban people are on a war footing against imperialism. To defend their anti-capitalist conquests, the Cuban workers and peasants have mobilized their militia and are prepared to throw the invaders back into the sea with the same revolutionary ardor with which they carried out the agrarian reform and nationalized the big enterprises.

Together with the Cuban people, the masses of Latin America stand vigilant.

If the Yankee imperialists and their Latin American agents have not yet dared to invade Cuba, it is in fear of the gigantic mobilization of the masses which its aggression would set loose in Latin America, where they run the risk of seeing mobilizations and insurrections spring up from the Río Grande to Tierra del Fuego.

But the needs of imperialism drive it increasingly to intervene in Cuba. Both presidential candidates have said so. Imperialism cannot impassively stand by while an anti-capitalist revolution is developing that sets an example which all the Latin American masses are passionately watching.

The indirect threat of Soviet missiles is a serious support for Cuba. But the fundamental, most decisive, and surest guarantee for the Cuban revolution in 1960, as it was for the Russian Revolution in 1917, is the mobilization of the masses of the world in its defense, and the internal development of the revolution building a workers' and peasants' government.

The latest and great advances of the revolution in Cuba must be completed by the setting up of committees of workers and peasants who administer the economy, plan development, and govern the country, from one end of the island to the other. The Cuban government must base itself on these people's organs of government and on the development of the armed militia that would transform

Cuba into a people in arms. Planning of the nationalized economy and its administration by the toilers themselves, together with trade and exchange of every sort with the U.S.S.R., China, and the other workers' states, will consolidate in Cuba a workers' and peasants' government that no force in the world can upset.

The Fourth International calls on the masses of Latin America and of the world to organize the defense of the Cuban revolution.

It calls on the workers' of all countries to break the blockade set up by imperialism against Cuba. Longshoremen's and seamen's unions must organize the shipments necessary for Cuba. The trade-union organizations of Latin America must intervene and re-export from their countries the goods destined for Cuba which imperialism is not allowing to reach it. They must refuse to unload in other ports the same North American goods that the United States refuses to send to Cuba. The trade-union organizations and workers' parties of Latin America must organize in their countries protest strikes and boycotts at the imperialist firms which are today blockading Cuba.

The Fourth International calls on Socialist and Communist workers' parties, on labor, peasant, student, and anti-imperialist organizations throughout the world, to organize mass meetings, demonstrations, and committees in defense of revolutionary Cuba. In all countries, the already commenced mobilization of the masses through their organizations must hold back the aggressive hand of imperialism against the Cuban revolution.

The Fourth International calls on the North American workers to repudiate the treacherous attitude of their leaders allied to imperialism, and to support their Cuban brothers, breaking the blockade and preventing the aggression against Cuba.

Forty-three years ago, the solidarity of the world proletariat and the heroic fight of the Soviet masses saved the October Revolution and opened to humanity the era of socialism.

Today, a mobilization of solidarity by the world masses and the revolutionary fight of the Cuban masses will defeat imperialist aggression against the Cuban revolution, vanguard of the colonial revolution in the world, and will ensure its workers' and socialist development.

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

7 November 1960

III

ON CEYLON

Many organs of the international press have published news and comments on the political situation in Ceylon, sometimes making incorrect statements, and have also speculated in regard to the attitude taken by the LSSP, Ceylonese Section of the Fourth International.

The International Secretariat notes that after the March

20th elections — which did not result in a clear parliamentary majority — the LSSP stated that it was ready to ensure its support to the SLFP with a view to avoiding the return to power of the capitalist and pro-imperialist reactionary UNP. The IS also notes that the LSSP, for such a purpose, signed a non-contest agreement and a

mutual-support agreement with the SLFP and the CP after the parliament had been dissolved. As soon as the results of the new (July 20th) elections were known, the LSSP declared that

it will cooperate with the SLFP government as an independent party in every activity which carries the country forward along progressive lines. The LSSP will assist the SLFP government to defeat and overcome any and every sabotaging effort of big capital and the foreign imperialists. The LSSP will in particular assist the SLFP government in every anti-capitalist step it takes.

As regards the speech from the throne, the party's MPs voted for it after having characterized their positions by presenting amendments and criticized the refusal by the government to nationalize plantations.

While taking into account the arguments of the Ceylonese comrades and taking into consideration the fact that their policy can be characterized, to a large extent, as a policy of critical support, the IS on its part has not failed to express to the LSSP its disagreement in regard to both its recent electoral policy and its policy towards

the SLFP after the March and July elections. The IS particularly believes that the no-contest agreement, extended up to a mutual-support agreement, involves the danger of creating illusions about the nature of the SLFP among the great masses and that an attitude of support to a government such as that of Mrs Bandaranaike should only be critical and hence limited to the progressive measures actually proposed and adopted.

In the specific case of the speech from the throne, the IS thinks that the very moderate character of the government programme and its attitude against nationalization of plantations — a fundamental question for a country like Ceylon — is such as to involve a negative vote by the LSSP MPs.

A discussion on the Ceylonese situation and the policy to adopt has been opened in view of the next conference of the LSSP and of the World Congress of the International.

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

10 September 1960



AN OPEN LETTER

to the Leadership and Members of the Chinese Communist Party

Comrades:

Several leaders, organizations, and official publications of your party have lately brought up for discussion some of the central theses which have for long guided the activities of the Communist Parties and the governments of the workers' states.

Nobody can ignore or minimize the immense importance of this discussion and the positions put forth by you: it is the central problem of the strategy, tactics, and the very conception of the communist movement and its role that are involved in this discussion. The Soviet CP leadership itself has understood this and has declared through Ponomarev that the position adopted by each Communist Party on the principle of peaceful coexistence determines its attitude toward many other problems, such as its line on foreign policy, on internal policy, and also the tactic to follow for strengthening the positions of socialism.

The Fourth International, which since its foundation has been fighting inside the communist movement and the workers' movement against such conceptions as those you are opposing, stands on your side in the fight against the opportunist conceptions — which are contrary to Leninist thought and criteria — of the leadership of the CP of the USSR and of most of the leaderships of the Communist Parties all over the world. Those are the conceptions that brought the workers' movement to serious defeats in some European countries, in several developments in the colonial revolution, that rendered mighty Communist Parties sterile, that made the struggle for socialism more difficult when the historical conditions were more favorable.

This discussion is necessary and not to be evaded. It is necessary to examine the problems of the strategy and tactics of the communist movement, of the workers' states, and of the Communist Parties against imperialism and in regard to world revolution, by coming back to the criteria of Lenin and of revolutionary Marxism. The

workers' movement, the communist movement, the alliance of the workers' states, can only gain from this discussion aiming at defining a true communist position about the great problems of the revolution in this period.

We are not surprised that it is the Chinese Communists — who are living through so rich an experience of revolutionary struggle, of struggle against imperialism and the feudal regimes in Asia, for economic construction and for the mobilization of the creative forces of the masses through experiments such as the communes, so full of new possibilities — who are the ones who are today opposing bureaucratic counter-revolutionary conceptions which for a long time have reached the status of incontrovertible truths among the leaderships of the Communist Parties and the workers' states.

WHAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THE DISCUSSION?

Up till now, however, the discussion has been ambiguous, addressed to third persons. An attempt is made to present it as a discussion against the Yugoslav leadership. But it is not the policy of the Yugoslav leadership that is fundamentally being discussed.

The idea of peaceful coexistence, the illusion about the possibility of reaching general disarmament, the policy of support to the bourgeoisies of backward countries, the idealization of the possibilities of imperialism — all these are fundamental points in the policy of the Soviet bureaucracy, of the leadership of almost all the workers' states and Communist Parties. The Yugoslav leadership also, in most cases, proceeds with such an arsenal of ideas elaborated by Stalin and his successors.

The idea of peaceful coexistence, which is being discussed in the communist movement as contrary to Lenin's thought, as an idea that deceives the masses about the real character of imperialism, has been and still is the keystone of the Soviet bureaucracy's foreign policy. This means that the Soviet bureaucracy has long since given

up, since the defeat of the 1925-1927 Chinese revolution, the idea of basing itself on the revolutionary mobilization of the masses, on world revolution. Basing itself on its military and economic power, on the leaderless pressure of the colonial revolution, on pressure by the Communist Parties, it tries to negotiate with imperialism, to reach agreements, to avoid abrupt changes.

The Communist Parties became groups for exerting pressure on their respective bourgeoisies, on imperialism. The revolutions headed by Communist Parties, like yours and the Yugoslav, were made in spite of the Soviet bureaucracy, and developing forces against it, which in 1945 was negotiating with Chiang Kai-Shek, abandoning your fight to its fate. The revolution of the Vietminh, the revolutionary war of Korea, received from you help much larger than from the Kremlin.

It was the policy of peaceful coexistence that at Yalta divided the world into spheres of influence, that led the Italian and French Communist Parties to hand over the power and arms to their weakened bourgeoisies, that brought the Greek revolution to defeat.

Both the theory and policy of peaceful coexistence helped capitalism to recapture positions, to control the mass Communist Parties in Europe, to render the Communist Parties in most countries powerless; this theory and policy isolated the Communist Parties from the new rise of the colonial revolution, which nevertheless received a great impulse from your victory; therefore today more than ever this theory and policy cannot be supported in the revolutionary process and in the development of the workers' states themselves.

Each forward step of the world revolution, whether in Cuba, the Congo, Laos, Turkey, or Japan, as before in Iraq, Lebanon, and Guatemala, alerts the military apparatus of imperialism, its regional treaties and alliances, its atomic fleets, its atomic bases on the Soviet Union's borders. The "spirit of Geneva" and later the "spirit of Camp David," and all the spirits of coexistence and conciliation, fall one after another. The successes of the Chinese economy, of Soviet science and technics, do not contribute to coexistence, but to accentuating the existing contradictions.

The Soviet Union itself, together with China, had to use the threat, the ultimatum, of atomic bombing or of sending volunteers in the Suez crisis, against the imperialist aggression in the Middle East, against the imperialist military intervention in Lebanon and Jordan, in defense of the Iraqi revolution, and in the case of Cuba, and the Congo. It was not gestures of pacification that restrained imperialism in decisive moments.

It is not only against the idea of peaceful coexistence that you have expressed your opposition. The fight for disarmament, which is tied up with it, is also the product of a conception alien to Marxism, borrowed from the arsenal of the pacifist petty bourgeoisie, against which Lenin fought so hard.

For years now the so-called "fight for peace," the illusion of obtaining general disarmament, has led the masses astray and disarmed them in their real mobilization against war, putting them under the leadership of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, pacifists of all sorts engaged in convincing the world and imperialism about the horrors of an atomic war, just as others had engaged in convincing imperialism before the First and Second World Wars. The Communist movement, instead of organizing the mobilization of the masses against war, against imperialism, was condemned to powerlessness by being used as the activists in such a campaign of signatures and communiqués. The example in England, of the mobilization against war and for unilateral disarmament, the sole effective form of disarmament, its vast repercussions on the British workers' movement

as reflected by the hard-won triumph of the wing led by Cousins in the recent Trade Unions Congress, the movements against the A-bomb in Japan, show how peoples who have been sufficiently awakened can mobilize against atomic war and its promoters, going as far as revolutionary actions.

There are deep inherent causes that impel the capitalist regime, in its imperialist stage, to follow its present arms race. In order to reach disarmament, peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition, it is not just some "war-mongers" that have to be eliminated. It is the imperialist regime itself which arms for a fight for its own existence against the workers' states and against the rise of the world revolution. The arms economy has paradoxically provided a market that has prevented the capitalist economy from suffering a serious crisis. The struggle for disarmament conceals the real situation and nature of imperialism, and, as pointed out by some of you, deceives the masses about the true revolutionary methods that are capable of placing imperialism in such a situation that it would be impossible for it to go forward to its atomic massacre, about the real struggle for overthrowing imperialism and capitalism.

The policy carried out by the Kremlin's leadership toward the bourgeoisie of underdeveloped countries is a part of such a policy of coexistence with imperialism, aiming at replacing the revolutionary mobilization of the masses and the revolution by pressure on imperialism and on the various bourgeoisies.

In many instances the bourgeois leadership of colonial movements is seeking economic, diplomatic, and technical support from the workers' states, with a view both to resisting imperialist pressure and to consolidating their regimes in face of the masses. It is absolutely permissible for the Soviet Union to trade with and grant credits to such bourgeoisies, or take advantage of the contradictions between the colonial bourgeoisies and imperialism in its own diplomatic skirmishes. The leadership of the Soviet bureaucracy, however, has traded not only in cotton, machinery, oil, or credits; it has traded also in Communist Parties.

The Egyptian Communist militants are in prison; the Syrian Communist Party was dissolved; Kerala was a lamentable defeat; Khrushchev covered up the aggressiveness of the Nehru government against the Chinese revolution, by presenting himself as a neutral party between that government and yours. The Iraqi Communist Party was reduced to a powerless condition amid a mass movement that it could have led, while the Iraqi revolution stagnates, its forces neutralized between the diplomatic alliance with Moscow and the economic power of the large oil companies, when it could have been the beginning of a new, socialist, stage of the Arab revolution.

The Algerian Communist Party has got itself completely isolated from the revolution of the Algerian masses, and is practically reduced to a powerless condition. The French Communist Party has been incapable of organizing and leading the struggle against the war in Algeria, and brought the French masses to the defeat signified by de Gaulle's rise to power, owing to its policy of seeking alliances and compromises with the "democratic" bourgeois parties. The Indonesian Communist Party, which gave unconditional support to Sukarno, is now being persecuted and threatened with illegality by the selfsame Sukarno government.

The Communist Parties of Latin America are used for Moscow's diplomatic or commercial requirements and alternatively support bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders. The Communist Party of Argentina voted for Frondizi, who afterwards declared it illegal; the Brazilian Communist Party voted for Kubitschek, who keeps it illegal, and is now supporting Lott, an open enemy of commun-

ism, of its relegalization, and of diplomatic relations with Moscow. In Colombia the Communist Party supported Lleras Camargo, an agent of imperialism, in the elections; in Venezuela it is supporting Larrazabal; in Bolivia, Paz Estenssoro; everywhere the Communist Parties move under the banner of bourgeois nationalism or other much less well-defined banners, as was the case in the past in Batista's Cuba.

The political line of support for the bourgeoisie has brought a number of revolutionary movements to defeats. Ever since the time when such a line caused the defeat of the 1925-27 Chinese revolution, Leon Trotsky and the Left Opposition rose up against the subordination of the Communist Party to Chiang Kai-Shek's bourgeois leadership. Your own revolution triumphed by carrying out socialist tasks at the same time as the unfinished tasks of the democratic revolution. That revolution, that you have called "uninterrupted revolution," is a complete modification of the Stalinist theory of a bourgeois revolution separated, by time and by the classes who lead it, from the socialist revolution.

The dynamics that is the propulsive force of the revolution in Algeria, Cuba, Central Africa, and Latin America, is also that of the "uninterrupted revolution," of the "permanent revolution," and contrasts with the crashing failures in Kerala, Iraq, and Indonesia.

Peaceful coexistence with the capitalist world, coexistence with the bourgeoisie in each country, cannot stand up to the progress of the colonial revolution. It is these new mass movements which — even leaving aside the isolated Communist Parties, reduced to small groups — revive the idea of a socialist alternative in order to pull their countries out of their backwardness by a revolutionary struggle against the political and economic power of imperialism and capitalism.

Your own revolution, even in its success, had to rely on the revolutionary mobilization of the masses of Korea, the Vietnam, and the various neighboring peoples, who prevented imperialism from establishing its war front in Asia. On the other hand, the various Nehrus and Sukarnos have become the agents of a new policy aimed at isolating and harassing the Chinese revolution in Asia.

WHAT ARE THE ROOTS OF THESE ANTI-LENINIST POSITIONS?

What is the origin of these monstrous deformations of Marxist thought, that have led the world workers' movement to defeats, that have led astray a large part of the workers' vanguard?

They are the theoretical and political expression of a bureaucratic dictatorship imposed on the U.S.S.R. and on the Communist Parties all over the world. They are the expression of the bureaucratic caste which in the U.S.S.R. liquidated Lenin's old Bolshevik Party, that persecuted and assassinated the Bolshevik-Leninist old guard, that emptied the Communist International of its revolutionary content and used it as an instrument of its foreign policy before dissolving it. That is where Lenin's traditions and conceptions, that you are vindicating today, were swept away.

It was not the interests of the Soviet Union, whose fate is tied up to that of the world revolution, that caused the development of the theories of peaceful coexistence, of socialism in one country, of support by the bourgeois leaderships in the colonial revolution, of disarmament, of agreements with imperialism. It was the interests of the bureaucratic caste which came to power in the Soviet Union by taking advantage of the situation created by the defeats of the world revolution, by the isolation of the first workers' state, by the huge effort expended by the Soviet masses to make their revolution triumph with-

out any economic and revolutionary support from outside.

Today Kardelj finds similarities between your positions and those defended by Trotsky in that period. Trotsky fought against that degeneration of Marxist thought headed by Stalin, defended the Leninist theses about the world revolution, fought against the subordination of the Chinese Communist Party to the Kuo-ming-tang, and against the degeneration of the substance and revolutionary role of the Communist International.

Today the first workers' state is no longer isolated, the relationship of forces is evolving against imperialism. The role of the bourgeoisie in the colonial revolution has appeared clear in a thousand instances. The colonial revolution progresses, leaving aside the Communist Parties transformed into pressure groups. The defeats and the isolation that formed the context in which the Stalinist theses could be imposed on the Communist movement have disappeared and have been replaced by a great advance of the revolution, by great progress on the part of the workers' states.

These are the deep reasons why, in the workers' states, in the colonial revolutionary movement, there are developing demands for an ideological and programmatic rearmament, demands for going back to the criteria of Marxism-Leninism. This is the objective basis of this new discussion that you have initiated. This discussion is an objective necessity for the communist and revolutionary movement; it cannot be checked or concealed.

Your own leadership has shared these positions, has shared the heavy responsibilities of their application. The People's Republic of China and the Chinese Communist Party are not lacking in bureaucratic privileges. But we know, comrades, the highly dynamic elements that keep your revolution marching on. Eleven years of development and many more of revolution, the huge mobilization of masses for economic construction, the new experiment of the communes, the permanent mobilization against aggression or in support of the Asian revolution — all these factors have developed, in China and in your own party, new requirements, new concerns, new generations who find inadequate the old Stalinist arsenal, which in your own activity you had to leave aside at each revolutionary step forward. The enormous revolutionary resources and the great possibilities that you have in your hands, doubtless have an influence on yourselves, on the whole of the world communist movement. Your successes and the tempo of development have an influence on the consciousness of communists. The successes of the Chinese revolution liquidate the subjective bases of Stalinism in your own rank and file as they earlier liquidated the objective ones.

And it is not only in the Chinese Communist Party that this is happening. The Soviet Union itself is affected by deep changes. The successes and scientific progress have been accompanied by the collapse of Stalin's myth, by changes in the most hated aspects of the regime. The XXth Congress, the Polish and Hungarian revolutions, the successes of the Yugoslav economy with the development of workers' control — all these are expressions of an objective change. Your raising of these questions, your concern about getting back on the Leninist road in the fundamental problems, correspond in these countries to an objective necessity of the communist movement, whose conceptions contrast with the new necessities of socialist development.

The hard opposition which your positions run up against in the leaderships of those workers' states is not the expression of the worker and communist masses but only of the fear of an open discussion, which might, in the next few years, spur the development of revolutionary Marxist tendencies that may escape from bureaucratic

control. The resistance which you will encounter, comrades, is the bureaucratic resistance of those sectors for which the reestablishment of workers' democracy in the Communist movement is equivalent to the end of their privileges. It is not a discussion about principles and programmes which you will have to face outside and inside your own party. Your position will clash with the conservative forces in Soviet society, in the workers' states, in the Communist Parties, in your own state and party, entrenched against a real renovation of the Communist movement.

The only way to fight against these positions, these conceptions alien to Marxism, is that of fighting their social bases, the monstrous bureaucratic degeneration or deformation of the workers' states (including yours), of the Communist Parties all over the world.

The only road through which true revolutionary positions can open their way in the movement of the Communist masses, in the workers' states, in the world revolutionary movement, is that of intervention, of free expression, by the social forces who are driving both for a change in these present positions and for the liquidation of the bureaucratic privileges that provided them with a basis, by those social forces who objectively and to a large extent subjectively are driving for the renovation of the Communist movement, of its tactics, strategy, and organization. These are the workers, the students, the intellectuals, the peasants, the cadres constructing the new economy, the new science, the new society. It is necessary to open the way for them to express their ideas freely; the renovation, the development of communist thought depends on them. Have confidence in them, in the workers, in the new cadres building the workers' states.

This must start from your own example, by promoting such renovation among the Chinese communist masses, with the same boldness and decision with which you faced economic construction, the communes, and the armed confrontation of imperialism. Your own bureaucratic methods in the Communist Party and in the government will be an obstacle to advancing your positions, to your really reaching the communist masses all over the world. The freedom of tendencies in your own party is a very important basis for the development of communist thought. Full soviet democracy, the freedom of existence for various soviet parties, with the right to have different platforms about economic, social, and international policy, about the organization of the workers' power and the state, on the basis of loyalty to the social system — this is the only way to develop all the creative force of the masses, not only in the economic effort, but in directing the new society. This is the only way to stop and eliminate bureaucratic privileges, which are the social basis of the anti-Leninist conceptions against which you are fighting.

Comrades,

There may be some who will try to limit and check this discussion with the excuse that imperialism will take advantage of it. Imperialism and the Social-Democratic leaders have for years now been laying their hopes on the outbreak of a fight between People's China and the USSR. This is a demonstration of their political powerlessness. An open discussion will strengthen the alliance among the Communist Parties. Your positions will find a great echo among the new Soviet generations. Khrushchev himself had to take initiatives at the Summit Conference, about Cuba and the Congo, that objectively weaken his position.

It is not imperialism which will benefit by revolutionary-Marxist renovation of the Communist movement, but the Communist militants of the capitalist world, who are condemned to sterility if not to betrayal of the revolutionary

and internationalist cause, and the revolutionary movements of Asia, Latin America, and Africa. These movements have empirically launched themselves on a revolutionary road, outside or against the Communist Parties. This colonial revolution is faced by a capitalist or socialist alternative. If the Communist movement maintains its policy for peaceful coexistence, for collaboration with the bourgeoisie, for the illusions that capitalism is capable of reforming itself, it will disarm the socialist tendencies and encourage the capitalist alternative. If the Communist movement clarifies the real role of imperialism and adopts revolutionary tactics, the strategy of workers' and peasants' power, it will encourage and spur on the colonial revolution to culminate in the struggle against capitalism, the struggle for socialism.

The Communist movement, by once more taking the road to revolutionary Marxism, to Leninism, the instruments of socialist revolution, has the whole world of the colonial revolution to win. These colonial revolutionary movements, very close to the workers' states, allied to them, are nevertheless resistant to Communism in the version given by Stalinism, with its monstrous bureaucratic deformations, its deformations of thought, its crimes.

It is this discussion that can open the way to the elimination of the bureaucratic command of the Communist Parties, their monolithism, their subordination to the Kremlin, and pave the road to the regeneration of the communist movement, to a communist international which can really be the Marxist-Leninist party of the world revolution.

Comrades,

The International Secretariat of the Fourth International welcomes this discussion that you have reopened in the whole of the Communist movement, a discussion which is full of possibilities and prospects for the world revolution. It exhorts you to develop these positions consistently, to put your enormous resources and possibilities at the service of the fight not only against anti-Leninist conceptions but also against the causes which originated them.

The International Secretariat invites you to discuss openly and frankly, with no false addresses, without appealing to ideological terrorism, in a clear manner understandable by the whole of the communist movement. It invites you to open the road of discussion, of free expression of positions, to all communist militants, to all communist organizations, including the Yugoslav Communist League and the Fourth International. Let the members of the Communist Parties, or tendencies, be free to express themselves on positions on which they differ from their leaders. Your party must start giving an example of this.

- Soviet democracy. Legalization of the existence of parties which accept the social bases and the principle of workers' power, with different platforms on other problems.
- Workers' management of industry and free management of the administrative committees of the people's communes.
- A world congress of all the Communist Parties and other communist tendencies to discuss democratically all these problems.

Comrade Communists of the Soviet Union and of the Entire World!

A discussion of the greatest importance and scope has been opened. It is up to you to take part in it. Prevent it from being confined to mere administrative resolutions.

For the revolutionary-Marxist renovation of the communist movement.

For the return to the criteria of Lenin.

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

October 1960

Draft Manifesto Proposed by the Youth Organizations of the Partidos Obreros (Trotskyist) of Argentina, Chile, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay to the First Latin American Youth Congress

To the working class, peasants, students, employees, and intellectuals, to all the exploited and oppressed sectors of society —

COMRADES:

The First Latin American Youth Congress, meeting in Havana, the epicentre of the Latin American revolution, warmly and enthusiastically salutes the exploited and oppressed sectors of Latin America and of all the world for the heroic struggle they are carrying on for the national and social liberation of all peoples.

From within this enthusiastic and vigorous ambience created by a revolution on the march, based on the militia of workers, peasants, students, women, and soldiers, who with strength and optimism are challenging the most powerful imperialism in history, we especially salute the Negro population of South Africa and the Congo who have secured for Africa a vanguard place of historical importance in the colonial revolution, through their unequal and yet victorious struggle for the national and social liberation of the colored people.

We salute the Algerian revolution, we salute free and independent Algeria, which, at the risk of its own physical extermination, has inflicted an irreversible defeat on French imperialism.

We salute the triumph of the workers, peasants, and students of Japan, whose struggle has struck a decisive blow at world imperialism. We salute the peoples of Korea and Turkey, who by their fight against dictatorships, are ripening the conditions for the expulsion of imperialism, and are joining the colonial revolution.

We salute the workers, peasants, and exploited sectors of Bolivia, who are furnishing a wonderful example of revolutionary vigor by carrying on for eight years a permanent struggle for the defense and extension of the conquests of their revolution; we especially salute the Bolivian Trade-Union Confederation for its recent resolution deciding to send its workers' and peasants' militia in support of and solidarity with the Cuban revolution.

We salute the people of Chile, who in the recent coal strike have shown that they are keeping their morale and fighting spirits high despite the tragedy brought by the recent cataclysm, from which they have suffered most, owing to the incompetence, negligence, incapability, and contempt for human values shown by their bourgeoisie.

We salute the peoples of Puerto Rico, Haiti, the Guianas, Guatemala, Panama, Santo Domingo, Nicaragua, and Paraguay, and reassert our determination to carry on to the very end the struggle for their liberation. We salute the workers and peasants of Peru and Argentina, who are vigorously facing the combined offensive of their national bourgeoisies and oligarchies in alliance with imperialism, and we send them our solidarity.

We warmly and enthusiastically salute the conquests, advances, and triumphs of the Soviet masses, of People's China, and of the workers' states, objectively allies of our revolution.

We salute the comrades delegated to this Conference who are now imprisoned in Argentina, and express our determination to fight to free them from bourgeois jails.

We warmly salute the exploited women who in Latin America and in all the world have moved up to vanguard posts in the revolution by forming women's brigades in the workers' and peasants' militia.

We pay homage to all the militants in the world killed in the fight against exploitation and privileges, for the destruction of the outlived structures which oppose and hinder the progress and development of mankind.

WORKER AND YOUTH COMRADES OF LATIN AMERICA:

We have met at this First Latin American Youth Congress in a moment of exceptional historical importance. We are witnessing a process of deep economic, social, and political transformation. In the present stage such a deep structural transformation is being carried out through the dynamic, combative, direct intervention of the exploited masses. This intervention is fundamentally responsible for the great instability and the deep crisis. It is in these conditions that our first Congress is being held.

The fundamental duty of this Congress, its specific task, is to discuss thoroughly the revolutionary crisis of Latin America and the entire world and to decide that the youth must participate in this struggle and play a vanguard role in the fight which the exploited masses are carrying on against imperialism and capitalism. As youth we have the responsibility and the duty of leading this struggle to overthrow imperialism and capitalism. Youth can find no solution to its specific problems within the limits of this rotten society. We shall find the only real solution by boldly, dynamically, and resolutely joining in the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist struggle of the exploited peoples all over the world.

The world has entered a new stage, the most dynamic and revolutionary stage so far known by mankind, "the stage of the violent rush of the masses towards the means for controlling their own fate." The development of the productive forces paves the way to unsuspected progress for mankind; human ingenuity and science are showing themselves to be capable of freeing and controlling such extraordinary forces as to permit man to set out on the conquest of space. While such feats are being undertaken, however, in Latin America and all over the world three fourths of the population live in inhuman living conditions, without the right to own the land they till, with miserable housing, bad clothing, starving or underfed, subject to the effects of earthquakes or floods, on the edge of the chasm of a nuclear war.

The ruling classes in Latin America and in the colonial world, prisoners of their own contradictions, are incapable of providing such a development and entrench themselves in defense of their petty class interests and of the old outlived feudo-bourgeois structures which oppose and hinder such a development. Powerless, they write in an irreversible crisis, keep the masses in a state of starvation and superexploitation, revise their apparatus of repression, on both the national and international scale, and prepare a counter-revolutionary war.

But while the ruling classes are impotently writhing, selling out, entering into alliances with imperialism and becoming its pawns, in Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the whole world we see an increasing consciousness, de-

termination, and readiness of the masses to fight to conquer power and solve the problems of development of their countries through a planned economy. The masses prove to be capable of achieving what the ruling classes could not. In Cuba, Bolivia, Algeria, the Congo, Korea, and Turkey the oppressed and exploited sectors of society are setting out to solve the problems which should have been solved by their ruling classes and combine these tasks with their own specific aims. The armed workers and peasants here in Cuba have in only one year made such substantial progress in agrarian reform and in expelling imperialism as the native ruling class was not able to accomplish in a century. People's China, in only eleven years, with the mobilized force of her workers and peasants, with her youth, by the conquest of power and the establishment of a planned economy, is overcoming the destitution and backwardness inherited from centuries of imperialist domination, and advances along the road to becoming the most formidable power in history. The Cuban people, relying on the strength of their workers', peasants', and students' militia, which defeated Batista's army on the very doorstep of imperialism, is now taking possession of the properties owned by imperialism and its national allies.

People's China is showing with unquestionable persuasiveness how to advance along the road of progress, and her youth is in the forefront. The First Latin American Youth Congress reasserts its will and determination to keep up its vanguard role on the road which still lies before us.

WORKER AND YOUTH COMRADES OF LATIN AMERICA:

The whole of Latin America, whatever the peculiarities of its countries may be, is facing the same problem of imperialist domination: economic and social backwardness, crisis of growth, need to carry out a radical agrarian reform, industrialization, expulsion of imperialism, nationalization of foreign trade, and economic planning with workers' control. To accomplish these tasks it can rely on the enormous force of more than 200 million peasants, students, and exploited people. It is necessary to unite these forces against the common enemy and for the common aims of all the workers' and people's organizations of Latin America. The First Latin American Youth Congress calls on all these organizations to form a great LATIN AMERICAN ANTI-IMPERIALIST UNITED FRONT and decides to appoint a PROMOTING COMMITTEE for this front.

In this struggle for a radical agrarian reform, for the expulsion of imperialism, for industrialization, for national and social conquests, the working class has played and is still playing a leading role. This First Latin American Youth Congress calls on the Latin American working class to form a Proletarian United Front to lead the anti-imperialist struggle on the basis of a worker-peasant alliance and to deepen the revolution by establishing immediately an All-Latin-America Trade-Union Organization, as proposed by the Cuban Trade-Union Federation and voted by the Chilean United Federation of Workers, the Bolivian Trade-Union Confederation, and the Trade-Union Confederations of Venezuela and Ecuador. The first Latin American Youth Congress urges an immediate answer to this appeal.

This Congress calls on the working class organized in trade unions to form, in the countries where it does not yet exist, a SINGLE UNITED TRADE-UNION ORGANIZATION.

Sectors of young students, in Cuba and in other Latin American countries, play a great role in this process. The students quickly bridge the gap that separates them from the workers' movement and are fighting, in one single front with the masses, to solve the economic, political, and social problems of Latin America. Like all the youth,

students have, besides their own specific problems, the fundamental responsibility of answering the imperative demand of this epoch: to fill, shoulder to shoulder with the workers and peasants, the advanced posts in the revolution. The First Latin American Youth Congress calls on the students to establish in each country a broad National Students' Association and to unify these organizations in a great Central Latin American Students' Association. The problems of teaching, education, and culture are not problems peculiar to the students; they are general problems of society as a whole. The crisis of Latin American culture is the crisis of the feudal-bourgeois society of Latin America, the crisis of world capitalism. The workers and peasants are the power, the motive force, and the leadership which will have to overcome this crisis. This fact is recognized by this Congress which urges the students to fight for the integration of students in the workers' and peasants' unions, and to advocate the need for student-and-worker control of teaching, education and culture.

WORKER AND YOUTH COMRADES OF LATIN AMERICA:

The example of Cuba also shows that world imperialism is not willing to remain impassive in face of the determination of the peoples to conquer their right to freedom and self-determination; it answers with economic and even military aggression. Imperialism proposes to strangle the colonial revolution economically. The colonial revolution must throttle and defeat imperialism economically. The Congress appeals to the working class and to the youth to answer the US boycott of Cuba's economy by struggling to promote the establishment of a Latin American Raw-Materials Pool. Latin America must absorb Cuba's production and furnish Cuba with what she requires, under the control of organizations of the workers, youth, and the people. The Congress proposes that Venezuela and Mexico furnish Cuba with her oil requirements, with workers' control established on the production and marketing activities of the nationalized enterprises; such enterprises as those in Venezuela which are in the hands of imperialism and its national allies must be nationalized. The Congress calls for a boycott of imperialism. The workers should refuse to unload imperialist goods, and to load even one ounce of sugar meant for the U.S.A. These are the measures that will permit advancing toward the constitution of a Federation of Socialist Republics of Workers' and Peasants' Councils in Latin America. But the defense of Cuba requires something more. We shall carry on the real fight against imperialism to the extent to which we destroy the bases of its domination, which relies on semi-feudal structures.

These are the structures which we must destroy. We appeal to the peasants, the motive force of the revolution in Latin America, to rise, organize themselves in unions, occupy the land, and defend it, as the Cuban peasants are doing, by forming peasant militia, occupying and distributing the land of the big landlords, organizing rural communes with their own management and administration, and allying themselves with the working class in their fight for expropriating imperialism, establishing the peasants' communes joined with the workers' councils in the factories and city districts. We urge the peasants to form their own militia in Latin America. The Latin American bourgeoisies — relying on their respective armies, or subjected to them — defend the existing structures by imposing states of siege and martial law, and by installing real dictatorships such as those of Trujillo, Somoza, et al. The First Latin American Youth Congress appeals to the working class and to the students to follow the example of Cuba, by defeating and breaking up the bourgeois and imperialist armies, by forming workers' and students' militia under the control of the trade unions, and by fol-

lowing the example of the Bolivian Trade-Union Confederation by furnishing such militia for the defense of Cuba.

COMRADE WORKERS:

The Soviet Union, People's China, the workers' states, and the whole of the colonial revolution have expressed their sympathy with our Latin American revolution. Their existence and presence is a fundamental factor which has so far prevented imperialism from launching an attack. Imperialism, however, cannot tolerate the existence of the danger represented by our revolution and is preparing counter-revolutionary aggression. Imperialism cannot compete militarily or economically with the workers' states, and therefore will attempt to attack us. The First Latin American Youth Congress calls on the working class, the people's and students' organizations, and the youth to take a stand for and organize the unconditional defense of the workers' states and to demand the diplomatic recognition of People's China and her admittance to the U.N.O. In face of the manoeuvres in the Organization of American States which are preparing aggression against Cuba, the Congress calls for organizing a great Latin American Conference of Workers' and People's Organizations for the defence of the Cuban revolution and for the expulsion of imperialism, for the formation of the Latin American brigade of armed workers, peasants, and students for the abrogation of the Río de Janeiro and Bogotá pacts, against the South Atlantic Pact, against all pacts that tie the Latin American masses to imperialism.

WORKER AND YOUTH COMRADES OF THE UNITED STATES:

Our struggle for national and social liberation is a part of your own struggle against exploitation by the same capitalist trusts. Our revolution and our fate are closely tied up with your fate. We are aware that you are not participating in the plans for aggression, war, and world plunder, of the bourgeoisie of your country. We are aware that you have carried on great struggles for keeping and extending your gains. We know that the North American people is stifling in the atmosphere of corruption, decadence, and degeneration of capitalist society. We are aware that you, like us, are longing for a world of peace, harmony, and progress, and that your conscious sectors reject the racial discrimination which has poisoned the rest of the American people by setting them against 21 million Negroes who live in your country and who are as much exploited as you are. We are aware that you are bearing the weight of the crisis of capitalism and its war plans. We know that, above the chauvinism of the capitalist leaderships, you feel a vibrant spirit of fraternity and international proletarian solidarity. For these reasons this First Latin American Youth Congress urges you to establish leaderships in the AFL-CIO who give the answer to this historical necessity of an international alliance of the masses by joining your struggle to ours. We urge you to deepen your struggle against our common exploiter to establish a true workers' democracy in a planned economy with workers' management and a workers' government.

NEGRO AND NEGRO YOUTH COMRADES OF THE UNITED STATES:

The First Latin American Youth Congress salutes you. You are the extension of the African and world colonial revolution in the very heart of metropolitan imperialism. On your organization, on your combative action, on the development of your political consciousness the future

political maturity of the North American proletariat as a whole largely depends.

The bourgeoisie has poisoned the North American proletariat by setting people against people. In order that you may win your own political, civil, and social equality, it is essential that you replace the fight of people against people by that of class against class.

WORKER AND YOUTH COMRADES OF LATIN AMERICA

The First Latin American Youth Congress observes with rejoicing and enthusiasm the great progress made in the last few months in the struggle against imperialist domination. Imperialism has been forced to retreat and shows its tremendous weakness. It shows itself for what it is: a giant with clay feet, whose base begins to disintegrate under the blows of the masses all over the world. There are now optimum conditions for pushing forward, consolidating, and deepening our conquests on the road to the building of a new society. But imperialism will not surrender without fighting. It is ready to use all the strength of its repressive apparatus to save its system of exploitation, and threatens to bring mankind to the disaster of a nuclear war. The First Latin American Youth Congress urges organization of the struggle for disarmament, for the destruction of nuclear weapons, and for the peaceful use of nuclear energy under the control of the trade unions and of the workers' and people's organizations of the entire world. For this, it calls for the organization of a world conference of these organizations. Here, in Cuba, the Congress vigorously reasserts its determination to liquidate the aggressive military bases of imperialism by expelling it from Guantánamo (Cuba), Ezeiza (Argentina), Fernando de Noronha (Brazil).

The First Latin American Youth Congress resolves to invite all the participating organizations to fight for this programme and appeals to the trade-union organizations, to the basic structures where the workers and peasants of Latin America are carrying on their struggle, to constitute the fundamental basis for the political intervention of the Latin American population, and to call a world congress of political, trade-union, student, and cultural organizations to organize the world-wide struggle against imperialism, for a planned economy under the control and management of workers and peasants.

Long live the Cuban revolution!

Long live the United Trade-Union Organization of Latin America!

Long live the Proletarian United Front of Latin America!

Long live the United Trade-Union Organization of Latin America!

Long live the workers', peasants', and students' militia!

Long live the alliance between the workers and the peasants!

Long live the alliance of the workers' states with the colonial and Latin American revolution!

Long live the unification of Latin America in a Federation of Socialist Republics of Workers' and Peasants' Councils of Latin America!

For the YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS of the

POR OF ARGENTINA: *Angel Fanjul*

POR OF CHILE: *Hernán Pardo*

POR OF MEXICO: *Felipe Galbán*

POR OF URUGUAY: *Luis Naguil*

POR OF PERU: *Manuel Zegarra*

26 July 1960

This draft Manifesto was also approved by the Youth Organizations of the POR of BRAZIL and BOLIVIA, which have not been able to send delegates to this Congress.

OUR POSITION ON WAR AS NURTURING REVOLUTION

By LEON TROTSKY

PREFATORY NOTE

In the current quarter we have arrived, with an undiminished sense of irreparable loss, at the twentieth anniversary of the assassination of our great theoretical leader, Leon Trotsky. It occurs at a moment when, behind all the Byzantine indirectness, false antitheses, and confused formulations of the current Soviet-Chinese polemics about the Khrushchevist theory of "peaceful coexistence" and its manifold repercussions on Communist policy, the question of the "inevitability" of nuclear world war takes on particular importance, especially since the Chinese — though deserving our critical support on most of the matters in

dispute (see "Problems and Prospects of Our Time in the Mirror of the Sino-Soviet Polemics," page 11) — have expressed a most offhand, not to say adventurist, attitude toward war. Hence, on the occasion of this tragic anniversary, we can perhaps best pay tribute to our fallen leader by recalling, on this life-and-death subject, some thoughtful words that this unparalleled theoretician uttered during his closing speech at the Thirteenth Session of the Hearing of the Preliminary Commission of Inquiry (John Dewey, Chairman), quoted from *The Case of Leon Trotsky* (pp. 512-14, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1937).

The second fantastic theory which is put into circulation by the friends of the G P U declares that in view of my general position, I am presumably politically interested in expediting war. The usual line of argument is as follows: Trotsky is for the international revolution. It is well known that war often produces revolution. Ergo, Trotsky must be interested in expediting war.

People who believe this, or who ascribe such ideas to me, have a very feeble conception of revolution, war, and their interdependence.

War has in fact often expedited revolution. But precisely for that reason, it has often led to abortive results. War sharpens social contradictions and mass discontent. But that is insufficient for the *triumph* of the proletarian revolution. Without a revolutionary party rooted in the masses, the revolutionary situation leads to the most cruel defeats. The task is not to "expedite" war — for this, unfortunately, the imperialists of all countries are working, not unsuccessfully. The task is to utilize the time which the imperialists still leave to the working masses for the building of a revolutionary party and revolutionary trade unions.

It is in the vital interest of the proletarian revolution that the outbreak of war be delayed as long as possible, that the maximum possible time be gained for preparation. The more firm, the more courageous, the more revolutionary the conduct of the toilers, the more the imperialists will hesitate, the more surely will it be possible

to postpone war, the greater will be the chances that the revolution will occur *prior* to war and perhaps make war itself *impossible*.

It is precisely because the Fourth International stands for the international revolution that it is one of the factors working *against* war; for — I repeat — the only check to a new world war is the fear, among the propertied classes, of revolution.

War, we are told, creates a revolutionary situation. But have we had a lack of revolutionary situations in the period from 1917 until today? Let us glance briefly at the post-war period:

A revolutionary situation in Germany, 1918-19.

A revolutionary situation in Austria and Hungary at the same time.

A revolutionary situation in Germany in 1923 (the Ruhr occupation).

A revolutionary situation in China, 1925-1927, which was not immediately preceded by a war.

Profound revolutionary convulsions in Poland in 1926.

A revolutionary situation in Germany, 1931-33

A revolution in Spain, 1931-1937.

A pre-revolutionary situation in France, beginning in 1934.

A pre-revolutionary situation in Belgium at present [1937].

Despite the superabundance of revolutionary situations, the toiling masses have not carried off any revolutionary victory in any of the enu-

merated cases. What is lacking? A party capable of utilizing the revolutionary situation.

The Social-Democracy has sufficiently demonstrated in Germany that it is hostile to the revolution. It now demonstrates this anew in France (Léon Blum). The Comintern, for its part, having usurped the authority of the October Revolution, disorganizes the revolutionary movement in all countries. The Comintern has, in reality, regardless of its intentions, become the best assistant of fascism and reaction in general.

Precisely for this reason there rises before the proletariat the iron necessity of building new parties and a new International which correspond to the character of our epoch — an epoch of great social convulsions and permanent war danger.

If, in the event of new war, the masses are not headed by a bold, courageous, consistent revolutionary party, tested through experience and enjoying the confidence of the masses, a new revolutionary situation would throw society back. A war may, under such circumstances, terminate not with a victorious revolution, but with

the crumbling of our whole civilization. One would have to be pathetically blind not to see this danger.

War and revolution are the gravest and most tragic phenomena in human history. You cannot joke with them. They do not tolerate dilettantism. We must understand clearly the interrelationship of war and revolution. We must understand no less clearly the interrelationship of the *objective* revolutionary factors, which cannot be induced at will, and the *subjective* factor of the revolution — the conscious vanguard of the proletariat, its party. It is necessary to prepare this party with the utmost energy.

Can one admit for a moment that the so-called "Trotskyites," the extreme left wing, hounded and persecuted by all other tendencies, would devote their forces to contemptible adventures, sabotage and war provocation, instead of building a new revolutionary party capable of meeting the revolutionary situation well armed? Only the cynical contempt of Stalin and his school for world public opinion, together with Stalin's primitive police cunning, are capable of creating such a monstrous and nonsensical accusation!

News of the World Workers' Movement and of the International

France

INTERVENTION OF INTELLECTUALS SPURS RESISTANCE TO ALGERIAN WAR

The unending French crisis continues to revolve essentially around the war in Algeria.

The spectacular "Jeanson network" trial proved a boomerang that discredited the government as much as it honored the accused. The courageous Declaration of the 121, recognizing the right to refusal of military service in the Algerian war, set all French intellectual circles astir. The de Gaulle government expressed its petty spite by disciplinary actions against any government employee who had signed, by arrests of the principal "instigators," and threats of further arrests and disciplinary actions.

One of the characteristics of France is that intellectuals carry weight. Thus the Jeanson trial and the Declaration of the 121 have produced an advance in the situation in France on the Algerian question: everyone has had to take a stand on the basis of *action* — the parties, the trade-union organizations, the cardinals themselves, etc.

Naturally, the Declaration of the 121 has stimulated the rage of the alleged representatives of French culture, most of them talentless old fogies. But it has also disturbed the routine of the "lefts," who hastened, on the initiative of the leaders of the National Federation of Education, to bring out a manifesto whose purpose was to stop the current of signatures toward the 121. This is not surprising on the part of those who are really what Trotsky one day termed "old maids of both sexes." But the situation in France on the matter of Algeria is so tense that this text, written to stop a pro-FLN current, serves in the more backward circles as a first involuntary step toward firmer positions.

Nor is this all: the National Union of French Students (UNEF), which before the summer vacation had reestablished relations with the organization of Algerian students, the "dissolved" UGEMA, decided to make a public demonstration in favor of peace in Algeria. It appealed to all organizations to join in with its decision. It is unquestionable that this decision, for some people, aimed only at making a demonstration of counter-pressure on the authorities in face of the pressure of the ultras. But however that may be, a great street demonstration would have had an exceptional importance: it would have been the first real demonstration against the de Gaulle regime; it would have been the *beginning of a trial of strength*.

Now the leadership of the French CP immediately looked anything but pleased, under the pretext that "the working class and its party" cannot be just "make-weight forces" — an argument that the French CP leadership hardly thinks of when it is a matter of making a "national front" against German rearmament. The opposition of the CP leadership is comprehensible in that, though it knows that it can keep control over local demonstrations, it knows also that a central demonstration, in which the "121" participate, could not thus easily be politically boxed in and would threaten to go beyond the aims of the CP leadership.

As a result of an imbroglio of negotiations and communiqués, the UNEF obtained permission to hold a

meeting in the big hall of the Mutualité. The "Front Ouvrier" and CFTC unions joined in. The CGT, on the contrary, backed by the CP, dissociated itself; two days after having refused to launch the slogan of paying no attention to the prohibition of the demonstration, it reproached the students for holding a meeting that had been authorized! In fact, Thorez clearly showed the depth of his policy of "peaceful coexistence" with de Gaulle.

The meeting at the Mutualité was more than a success. In the streets, more than 10,000 people — especially young people — who had been unable to get in, engaged in demonstrations, and violent fights with the police took place. The ultras had managed to get together only a very small number of people.

Thus, for the first time in six years, the struggle against the war in Algeria was beginning to make a clear picture.

The powder-puff treatment given by the military court to the ringleaders in the January 1960 uprising in Algiers, contrasts scandalously with the rigorous treatment given the defendants at the "Jeanson network" trial. Yet the "ultras," knowing that their possible field of action is limited, and that there is great war weariness among the Europeans in Algeria, are cautious, not daring to move without the army.

The declaration of Sartre poses the problem and prospects in terms which we approve without reservations:

[...] the left is powerless and it will remain so if it refuses to unite its forces with the only force which is seriously struggling today against the common enemy of Algerian and French liberty, and this force is the FLN [...].

[...] the Frenchmen who are helping the FLN are not only impelled by generous sentiments in relation to an oppressed people, they do not only place themselves in the service of a foreign cause; they are struggling for themselves, for their liberty and for their future [...] they are gaining support from many more people, from a sympathy, either active or passive, which is growing steadily. They are in the vanguard of a movement which will perhaps awaken the left, foundering in miserable cautiousness, and prepare the way for the inevitable trial of strength with the army which has been postponed since May 1958.

[...] the moment is drawing near when every man will have to face up to his responsibility. At this point, those most occupied in political action are still hesitating, out of misplaced respect for formal legality, about crossing certain boundaries. It is the youth, on the other hand, supported by the intellectuals, who, as in Korea, in Turkey, in Japan, are beginning to expose the frauds of which they are the victims. Hence the exceptional importance of this trial. For the first time, despite all the obstacles,

Algerians and Frenchmen, fraternally united by a common struggle, find themselves together in the dock.

[...] the Frenchmen there represent the future of France, and the ephemeral government which claims to judge them represents, already, nothing.

Danger lies in the fact that the initiative remains with the Bonapartist government and that it may not hesitate to unleash ruthless repression.

Battle commences therefore in conditions that will entail a heavy price for victory. But no fear need be entertained of the results. Firstly, because, on the international plane, the colonial revolution is invincible and those who today are resolutely opposing the Algerian war have on their side the great forces of the colonial revolution. Secondly, because now that this movement has conquered the vanguard of the student youth, it will gradually involve the

whole youth of the country, and these, for whom the older political currents have no meaning, will be able to serve as a catalyst in the workers' movement. Thus they will activate the struggle to create a new tendency where the only possible programme is that of revolutionary Marxism, that of the Fourth International.

French Trotskyists, without for one instant abandoning work within the CP where are to be found the most advanced workers of the most important French workers' movement, will not fail to give, to the action of the vanguard of the intellectuals and the young people, all the support it deserves, with a view to popularizing their initiative among the workers, overcome misleading policies, and arouse the activity of the class for genuine mass action to stop the war, and support the struggle of the Algerian revolution until its triumph and the overthrow of the de Gaulle government.



India

UNIFICATION OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISTS

At the end of June a fusion took place between the Revolutionary Communist Party of India, and the Revolutionary Workers Party of India, the united organization taking the name of the former.

The prime importance of this measure is that it marks an important stage in the unification of the revolutionary Marxist forces on the sub-continent at the beginning of a new period marked by the exhaustion of the bourgeois leadership and the start of a period of acute social crisis. It is therefore an important stage on the way to the creation of a revolutionary leadership of the Indian masses.

The congress, which lasted six days, adopted statutes, discussed a political report on the international and national situation, and a report of the agrarian situation, and took a stand in favor of the unification of the trade-union movement.

The congress elected a Central Committee of 19 members. Comrade Shri Sudhindra Nath Kumar was elected party secretary. The congress called for the release of Comrade Shri Panalal Das Gupta, leader of the party, and of all political prisoners.

The International hails this progressive step.



New Zealand

TROTSKYISTS FORM BRANCH OF AUSTRALIAN SECTION

A group of New Zealand Trotskyists have formed a branch of the Australian section of the FI with the hope of building an independent section in the future. All members are well-integrated in the mass labor movement, in student circles, and in the movement for racial equality between the Maori and Pakeha (whites). Trotskyism is finding a wide audience in the New Zealand left, particularly among the youth.

The New Zealand Labour Movement has a long history of militancy, displayed in the 1951 wharf strike that lasted nearly 6 months and resulted in a violent struggle between

dockers and the Tory government. The Maori population, though less oppressed than colored minorities elsewhere, still represents a great but latent powerful force for socialism.

Trotskyism in New Zealand, though a new arrival, has great possibilities. It should be noted that Stalinism is especially weak and offers little resistance to the dynamic ideas of Trotskyism. The New Zealand Trotskyists, through the Australian section, send fraternal greetings to the IS and to all the sections.

TO APPEAR IN PAMPHLET FORM

THIRTY QUESTIONS AND THIRTY ANSWERS about the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*

By ERNEST GERMAIN

Since the XXth Congress, the crisis within the Communist Parties all over the world has never ceased, sometimes simmering, sometimes boiling when the fuel of new revelations or disputes is added. Rank-and-file Communist militants are repeatedly asking the question, "But what happened? What are the real facts?" The current Sino-Soviet polemics have just started a new outburst of such questions.

Many of the answers, clear, principled, and mercilessly documented, are given by Comrade Ernest Germain in his "Thirty Questions and Thirty Answers about the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*," the concluding installment of which appears in this issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. We are now preparing to publish this as a pamphlet.

In this compact and convenient format, it will provide a most useful weapon, especially for those comrades whose party tasks bring them into daily discussion with honest but misled Communist Party rank-and-filers who are trying to find the truth amid the obscurantist lies of Stalinist and the deforming half-truths of Khrushchev "explanations."

The format will be uniform with the two pamphlets of Comrade Michel Pablo: *The Fourth International: What It Is; What It Aims At*; and *The Arab Revolution*. Order early.

SOME PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

OTHER THEORETICAL ORGANS

Quatrième Internationale (French)

Die Internationale (German)

Revista Marxista Latinoamericana (Spanish)

RECENT BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Léon Trotsky: *Écrits, 1928-1940, tomes I, II, et III*

Léon Trotsky: *Les Bolcheviks contre Staline*

Michel Pablo: *La Guerre qui vient (Capitalisme ou Socialisme)*

Michel Pablo: *Dictature du prolétariat, démocratie, socialisme*

Michel Pablo: *The Fourth International — What It Is; What It Aims At*

Michel Pablo: *The Arab Revolution*

Ernest Germain: *Les Problèmes économiques de l'URSS*

Orders to: Pierre Frank, 64 rue de Richelieu, Paris 2