

APR 6 '48

# INTERNATIONAL NEWS

VOL. IX NO. 2

CONTENTS

Labor donated

J  
U  
L  
Y  
  
1  
9  
4  
8

## THREE FORCES IN THE WORLD TODAY

## MARXIAN STRATEGY: A FIGHT ON TWO FRONTS

STACK 3

*Published by*

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS  
LEAGUE

*U. S. A.*

# A MARXIAN STRATEGY

## THE FIGHT ON TWO FRONTS

### HOW TO STRUGGLE AGAINST CAPITALISM

The problem of the strategical and tactical application of Marxian principles is far from simple. If it were otherwise the working class would long ago have trampled over the capitalist agents in our ranks and would have seized state power. In a mechanical sense it would seem that with the further decay and decomposition of capitalist society, the problems confronting the working class would become simplified. But facts have definitely proved that the contrary is true; the strategical and tactical questions have become far more complicated. One of the main factors for this complexity and the subsequent confusion is the series of revolutionary defeats of the past two decades. The class of and by itself, as an unorganized force, does not learn the lessons of these defeats, and especially of defeats of workers in other countries. Only with the welding together of a vanguard party of the class, capable of analyzing and explaining these defeats, and presenting a positive program against capitalism and for communism, can the class assimilate these lessons and utilize its powerful driving force to complete its historical mission.

The position and attitude of the revolutionary parties and the working class toward the capitalist state is one of the most important aspects of the whole question --- an aspect which history has proved a countless number of times, but which is now more confused than ever. The theoretical position of revolutionary Marxists is well known. This article confines itself to only one aspect of the question, namely, is it permissible for revolutionists to support one group of capitalists, or one capitalist state against another group of capitalists? Marxists categorically answer: NO! The reformists and centrists, both in theory and practice state the opposite. Their form of support differs, but like the Anarchists or Syndicalists in the Spanish Revolution, their support of the capitalist state becomes obvious to all but the blind.

The clearest example of this non-Marxian position as expressed by Centrism was presented by Leon Trotsky in Volume II, Number 2, of the Internal Bulletin of the Socialist Workers Party.

#### WHAT TROTSKY SAYS ON THE QUESTION

\*However, aside from the manner in which to appraise the expansionist policy of the U.S.S.R. itself, there remains the help which Moscow provides the imperialist policy of Berlin. Here, first of all, it is necessary to establish that under certain conditions --- up to a certain degree and in a certain form --- the support of this

or that imperialism would be inevitable even for a completely healthy workers state --- in virtue of the impossibility of breaking away from the chain of world imperialist relations. The Brest-Litovsk peace without the least doubt temporarily reinforced German imperialism against France and England. An isolated workers' state cannot fail to maneuver between the hostile imperialist camps. Maneuvering means temporarily supporting one of them against the other. To know exactly which one of the two camps it is more advantageous or less dangerous to support at a certain moment is not a question of principle but of practical calculation and foresight. The inevitable disadvantage which is engendered as a consequence of this constrained support for one bourgeois state against another is more than covered by the fact that the isolated workers' state is thus given the possibility of continuing its existence." (Our emphasis -- p.13)

In this paragraph Trotsky throws considerable light upon the degree of degeneration and the rate of speed in which his group is travelling away from Marxism. In one stroke of the pen Trotsky has negated Marx' and Lenin's basic concept of the state and the workers position toward the capitalist state.

If it is permissible to support one group of imperialists against another group of imperialists, as Trotsky claims, and if this "is not a question of principle but of practical calculation and foresight", then our argument with the Stalinists and their control of the Soviet Union, with their policy of supporting the "democratic" imperialists through the Peoples Front yesterday, and their support of Fascist Germany today, --- then this is not a principled dispute, but merely a question of practical calculation and foresight, a dispute with Stalinism that should be resolved within the framework of one party. But this is completely false. Trotsky's first error of support of one group of imperialists against another group of imperialists leads him inevitably to the next error, the revisionist position that this is not a principled question of Marxism.

Trotsky has fallen into the age-old quick-sand of analyzing events and conditions mechanically instead of considering the dialectical process. All eclectic thinkers deal with the concept of a two-cornered struggle, of black or white, of yes or no. Such thinking inevitably lands them into the camp of either the ultraleft mechanical position of yes or no; or the reformist (and centrist) position of support of the "lesser evil" group of capitalists against the "big bad wolf" capitalists, a different form of yes or no, but equally false. Let us consider the class struggle from several different fields of activity and present the difference between opportunism (Stalinism, Trotskyism, Syndicalism, Kautskyism) and revolutionary Marxism.

#### 1 -- REVOLUTIONISTS' PARTICIPATION IN REACTIONARY TRADE UNIONS AND THE FIGHT ON TWO FRONTS

In every Trade union and strike struggle where the control of the union and the strike has been usurped from the rank and file and where the leadership is class collaborationist (Green, Lewis, Browder Thomas, etc.) the working class and its vanguard have one problem that has two aspects. They must fight on two fronts in order to win the strike, to make gains in the interests of the working class. Before the strike breaks out and after it is in progress, the strikers must fight the exploiters (and his open agents) and their agents within the ranks of labor (concealed, class collaborationist agents.) To give up the fight against the "leadership" during the strike "in order to unite 'our' forces" is to GIVE UP THE CLASS VICTORY OF THE STRIKE. In order to fight on two fronts, in this situation, it is necessary to use two types of strategy and different tactics at the same time.

The independent position of the working class in its unions and strike committees calls for a frontal offensive against the exploiters, and at the same time, a policy of marching separately and striking together with the class collaborationist leadership, as a stage in the process to remove the leadership when the strikers are strong enough and understand, and again restore rank and file control. Our Trotsky supporters will possibly say: But this is a trade union fight; Trotsky is talking about two different groups of imperialists. Some may even say that on this question they agree with the above concept. But either of their replies demands only one answer: When we are considering a workers organization such as a trade union, and it is here a three cornered struggle (workers; exploiters and their open agents; class collaborationist agents of the exploiters) --- then all the more reason to expect a three cornered struggle in relation to the workers' state and two groups of imperialists (be they "democratic" or fascist.) It is false to support the AGENTS of the exploiters in our own ranks, and it is equally false to support the exploiters directly.

#### 2- REVOLUTIONISTS' PARTICIPATION IN PARLIAMENTARY ACTION TOWARD THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

One does not have to give many examples in the field of participation in parliamentary action to reveal this same struggle: those who support one group of capitalists against those who carry on a three cornered fight. For revolutionists, participation in parliamentary activity is an AUXILIARY TACTIC to disrupt, to expose, to arouse the masses against the exploiters' corrupt state. But reformists and centrists and syndicalists (in Spain) all enter the government to SUPPORT ONE GROUP OF CAPITALISTS AGAINST ANOTHER. In Spain all the opportunists supported the Peoples Front (Anglo-French bloc) against the fascists (German-Italian bloc.)

In the United States the Trotskyites support BILLS OF THE CAPITALISTS: The Mahoney Bill in Minnesota, the Ludlow Amendment, the Ham and Egg Plan in California, the social-patriotic candidates of the American Labor Party in New York, etc. From the ultra-lefts

(Syndicalists in Spain) to the centrists (Trotskyites) to the reformists (Stalinists-Socialists, etc) the different false theories blend into common action --- of support of one group of capitalists against another group of capitalists, instead of POLICY OF INDEPENDENT WORKING CLASS ACTION, a three cornered fight.

### 3 - THE LABOR PARTY

Everyone knows that the Trotskyites are for building a labor party candidates, and most disgusting of all, the support of the social-patriotic program and candidates in the New York election of the American Labor Party. In some of their writings some of the outstanding Trotskyists writers admit that the Labor Party is and can only be a THRID CAPITALIST PARTY, that it is not a working class party in CONTENT and can never be one. This is the policy of supporting one group of capitalists against another group of capitalists. This is betrayal of the working class. (These are harsh words, but true ones.)

### 4 - CLASS GAINS VERSUS REFORMS

In the field of the most elementary aspects of the class struggle, the day to day struggle, we find the most complicated and least understood aspect of the class struggle. Again we find all non-Marxian tendencies carrying on a two-cornered fight: the support of reform versus reaction, instead of the fight for CLASS GAINS ( independent working class action) against reforms (class collaborationist crumbs handed down from the top to placate, to stem the tide, to warp, to control the working class movement), as well as the struggle against the reactionaries (who advocate the club and the gun to control labor instead of the sugar-coated words and crumbs from the masters' table?) In the day-to-day struggle, it is not only the material crumbs obtained, and the laws the exploiters place on the books that are decisive; these are by-products of the CLASS STRUGGLE. Reforms are by-products of the class struggle TOWARD THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER, and to the degree that the class struggle is intensified (versus class collaboration on the one hand and reaction on the other) in the three cornered fight, the more crumbs as bribery (due to fear) will the exploiters hand down.

### 5 - THE DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS OF THE WORKERS AND MASSES VERSUS BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY

Here, too, in one of the most elementary spheres of the class struggle, the difference between class struggle and class collaboration is revealed. Those who advocate in one form or another, in any form, the support of one group of capitalists or one group of imperialists (as Trotsky does) inevitably fall into the swamp of defending capitalist democracy (not against fascism) but against the working class and its march toward power.

To defend the democratic rights of the working class and the

oppressed masses there must be a systematic constant STRUGGLE AGAINST BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY AS WELL AS AGAINST FASCISM. In other words, to defend our class rights we must struggle against capitalism in both its bourgeois democratic and fascist form.

Now so with the Trotskyites. They agree to support "even rotten bourgeois democracy" in Spain (the Peoples Front CNT-Caballeor government), in China, the Cardenas government in Mexico, the social-patriotic American Labor Party in New York, etc. Instead of fighting on two fronts ( a three cornered struggle) the Trotskyites think in terms of supporting one group of capitalists against another --- the old and rotten policy of the "lesser evil."

### 6 -- IMPERIALISM AND THE COLONIAL BOURGEOISIE

Trotsky and other centrists, as well as reformists like Stalin have completely warped the Lenin concept of the right of self-determination, the colonial question and the national question. In all phases of these questions the Trotskyites, since they agree you can support one group of IMPERIALISTS against another group of IMPERIALISTS, can naturally support the national bourgeoisie, the colonial bourgeoisie, the small capitalist nations "against" the large imperialists.

### 7 -- THE SUPPORT OF CAPITALISM AGAINST THE WORKING CLASS

In reality the concept of Trotsky -- to support one group of capitalists against another -- is a trick sentence and has no meaning unless broken down and analyzed. We are not only against the concept of supporting one group of imperialists against another; that is only part of the problem and not the most important part, even though it is fundamentally false. The other, more important aspect, of the same problem that is concealed within this formula is the relation of this position to the working class.

The support of one group of capitalists ("against" another group of capitalists) in reality means the SUPPORT OF CAPITALISM AGAINST THE WORKING CLASS. What is true in relation to capitalism as a whole, the support of capitalism against the working class, is also true in the trade union field. The support of the capitalist agents in our ranks is the support of capitalism. It is likewise true in the national and colonial sphere. The support of the colonial bourgeoisie is the support of capitalism against the proletariat and colonial masses.

The Marxists' position is not the support of Chiang-Kai-Shek, not the support of Cardenas, not the support of Ghandi, not the support of Haille Selssie, but instead the support of the proletariat and colonial masses against IMPERIALISM and against the AGENTS OF IMPERIALISM IN BACKWARD COUNTRIES. In the present decay stage, the exploiters of the backward countries can only be agents of one group of capitalists or another group of capitalists.

To SUPPORT the colonial exploiters, and to MARCH SEPARATELY AND STRIKE TOGETHER against imperialism with the colonial bourgeoisie are two different lines of march. To support Kerensky was the opposite of Lenin's line to march separately and strike together against Kornilov.

#### INDEPENDENT WORKING CLASS ACTION

There is a world of difference between the support of one imperialist power and the fact that an imperialist power takes advantage of weakness or difficulties, and thereby gains objectives for its own ends. For example, the Anglo-American antagonism was utilized by Italy in the Ethiopian invasion. The refusal of the United States to support the British oil embargo (together with the Stalinist sell-out) enabled Italy to gain its objective. But this was not United States support of Italy.

The Brest-Litovsk example Trotsky gives is absolutely wrong. Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not support German imperialism (as for example, against Kerensky who supported the Anglo-French bloc). Lenin's policy which prevailed, was based on the line of independent working class action against ALL imperialism. Instead of an advance the Russian workers had to RETREAT at the point of the German gun at their head. Momentarily the Germans gained. But if the Brest Litovsk treaty had had the policy of support of German imperialism, instead of the policy of defeatism, the October Revolution would have passed out of history at its inception.

The I.W.W. (Yesterday) and the C.I.O. (today) carry on organizational drives that objectively help, in a limited sense, the A.F.L. Because the bosses fear the industrial unions and the "radicals", they placate the organizational drive by quickly signing up with the reactionary A.F. of L. leaders. No one could claim that because the boss signed up with the A.F. of L. this meant that the I.W.W. or the C.I.O. were SUPPORTING THE A.F. of L. There are countless other such examples.

#### 8 -- SUPPORT ONE GROUP OF IMPERIALISTS, AS TROTSKY ADVOCATES?

Yes, there are maneuvers and maneuvers, but the support of a group of imperialists versus another group (and to pawn this off as a "practical calculation" and not a principle) is just the kind of maneuver that has nothing in common with Marxism. It is opportunism.

True, the proletariat and its vanguard must utilize the friction in the camp of the enemy. We must take advantage of the struggle between bourgeois democracy and fascism, etc. But one CANNOT take advantage of the friction in the exploiters camp BY SUPPORTING ONE GROUP AGAINST ANOTHER.

The class cannot support one group of exploiters against the other through its trade unions, through its political party, or

through its Soviet States. The organizational instruments of the class must carry out an INDEPENDENT working class line AGAINST CAPITALISM (Both "democratic" and fascist) to defend and advance the INTERESTS OF THE WORKING CLASS.

The utilization of the friction in the exploiters camp by the working class and its organizations can be had only on the basis of the political and organizational independence of the revolutionary Marxian organization, and through clear-cut independent working class action. This calls for maneuvering, such as united fronts, such as a fight on two fronts in the trade unions, such as the strategy of marching separately and striking together.

It is no accident that Trotsky can write on revolutionary defeatism and call for defeatism in Germany and for "political opposition" in France (if the Soviet Union is on the side of France in the imperialist war.) It is no accident that Trotsky can call for opposition to British Imperialism in the Mexican oil dispute, but at the same time keep as silent as the grave on the role of American imperialism.

#### 9 - LENIN, KERENSKY, KORNILOV

One should read and reread not Trotsky's version, but Lenin's own material and the historical facts on the Lenin-Kerensky-Kornilov struggle in Russia. Here is the best historical example of the question we have been discussing: the three cornered struggle.

The reason it is the best historical example is because it was the first major success of the Marxian line OF INDEPENDENT WORKING CLASS ACTION AGAINST CAPITALISM (against its bourgeois democratic form, Kerensky, and against its reactionary form, Kornilov.

Yesterday Stalin started out to revise Marxism as a centrist and now ends as a social-patriot and reformist of the worst type. Following him Trotsky is revising Marxism as a centrist, but here, too, a centrist fastly moving to the right. Centrism is not so easily transformed into its crystal-pure form in a writing room. It is more rapidly transformed in the heat, the red heat of participation in the class events.

#### 10 - A CLASS-AGAINST-CLASS LINE

We have pointed out that these opportunists in their eclectic reasoning ignore the three-cornered strategical struggle (Lenin-Kerensky-Kornilov) and instead become victims of capitalism because they SUPPORT one group of capitalists against the other. These different aspects of the class struggle presented above reveal the Marxian LINE as against the opportunist line. But we must, before concluding, point out that the three cornered fight is the STRATEGICAL APPLICATION OF A LINE, the line of class struggle. This line deals with two FUNDAMENTAL contradictory forces - the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, but not just TWO antagonists. For determining the LINE, the Marxian

principles, an understanding of the two FUNDAMENTAL forces, is essential. But for determining the strategy and tactics of the class struggle, we must also take into account the antagonists, the division of labor within the capitalist camp, the three cornered struggle.

It is not the ultra-left who talks about class against class and then retreats to a vacuum, who can understand the relation of the two classes, the exploiters and the exploited. In their concept of a pure class struggle they reach Buddhist bliss. Nor is it the "realists", those who "understand" the "mass movements", the opportunists, those who SUPPORT ONE GROUP OF CAPITALISTS AGAINST THE WORKING CLASS under the guise of supporting one group against the other group of CAPITALISTS, who can understand the class struggle. They, too, these centrists and reformists negate the class struggle, the fundamental LINE OF opposites. That is why we say that the centrists and reformists and ultra-lefts (opportunists) supplement each other.

The working class must understand that the capitalist mode of production and its contradictions are the material factors of the class struggle from which springs the Marxian principle of the class struggle and its position of not support to any group of exploiters, their state, and their agents, but rather the policy of independent working class action on an anti-capitalist, pro-communist LINE.

November 16, 1939

(Note: This article appeared in the INTERNATIONAL NEWS of January, 1940.)

## THREE FORCES IN THE WORLD TODAY

There are many different concepts in society today for a solution of the economic difficulties confronting man. We hear about the middle road, about the third strategy, and about many other similar concepts. But few, if any, of these concepts take in or understand the question of the three forces in society today. When we speak of three forces we are dealing with the basic moving dynamics of class conflict from which all other "forces" flow or are subordinated as secondary "forces".

### MANY TENDENCIES IN SOCIETY

In order to clear up the question of the relation of tendencies to the way we use the term "force" in social conflict, we will deal with some of the main tendencies in United States society. Also in order to lay a basis for the relation of the problem of tendencies to the three main forces later in the article. If we start from the right and proceed to the left we will have a graph along the following order. We have not listed all tendencies. We have only listed enough tendencies to give a general idea of the factors involved.

### TENDENCIES:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 - Right (Fascists) Capitalist Force                             | Fascists.<br>Open Capitalist Dictatorship<br>American varieties of<br>fascists.<br>Mac Arthur Clique.<br>Reactionary Southern Democrats<br>Reactionary Republicans |
| 2 - Centre and Left Capitalist Forces<br>(Bourgeois - Democratic) | Truman gang.<br>Stassen clique<br>Eisenhower clique<br>Ickes-Roosevelt lefts.<br>Dewey clique  |
| (Bourgeois Reformers )  | Wallace lefts<br>Green-AFL<br>Lewis-Miners<br>Murray-CIO   |
| (Social Reformers )   | Farmer Parties.<br>Stalinists<br>Socialists<br>S.L.P.  |
| (Centrism )   | Trotsky-Cannon.<br>Trotsky-Shachtman   |

(Ultra-Lefts )

3- Revolutionary Marxism, Independent  
Working Class ActionRevolutionary Marxian  
parties and groups  
Working Class

## SOME FACTS ABOUT THE TENDENCIES

We have not listed in their detailed order the different tendencies from right to left. For example, we have listed the Wallace Group, Green, Lewis and Murray under bourgeois reformers, and although we list Wallace at the top of the list, it would seem as though he is the right wing. However, we all know that among the bourgeois reformers listed, Wallace is the left and John L. Lewis is the right. That is true today. These bourgeois reformers will change places at different stages of economic crisis. For example, in 1936 when the CIO was formed, when the masses moved toward industrial unions (and many with a class struggle policy) John L. Lewis was with this crowd --to the left of the others. During the war we know that Lewis flirted with the Fascists. Because they do belong to the second force, the center and left capitalist force, better known as BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY, THEY TAKE ON THESE UPS AND DOWNS!

The main difference between the bourgeois reformers and the social reformers is that whereas the bourgeois reformers openly declare their loyalty to capitalism, they attempt to reform, to correct and to modify capitalism, the social reformers declare their opposition to capitalism. In one form or another the social reformers are mainly Marxist in words and capitalists in deed. However, among this group are such as the anarchists who oppose Marxism, but who (as the Spanish Revolution clearly proved) are nothing but right wing social reformists. (Note: We are not referring to the Durutti Group of the anarchists. This was a revolutionary workers' group.)

Although the social reformers in words are opposed to capitalism while the bourgeois reformers are for capitalism, there are many concrete cases when the bourgeois reformers are to the left of the (some groups) social reformers. For example, when the Stalinists signed the Hitler-Stalin pact the Stalinist social reformers were to the right of practically every group of bourgeois reformers. For example, when the Labor party under MacDonald shot down Indian nationalists, or when the present Labor government in England works with the Arabs for oil against the Jewish nationalist state, they are to the right of most American Bourgeois reformers and some centre capitalist forces.

When John L. Lewis flirted with the Fascists during the war he was far to the right of the centre capitalist wings, even though he was a bourgeois reformer, a left capitalist force due to his position as head of a powerful miners union.

## BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY AND SOCIAL REFORMISM

The different tendencies of Social reformism, either those who give lip service to Marxism, or those who don't (anarchists) present in one form or another emotional programs for the workers; programs, however, that negate the interest of the workers. On this premise, on the premise of what we call the revisionism of Marxism or the denial of Marxism, they become appendages of the liberal, left capitalist forces in class struggle development.

## WALLACE AND THE STALINISTS

The capitalist press from Mrs. Roosevelt to Dorothy Thompson, to Truman, to Stassen, to Taft, and to all the other reactionaries would have us believe that Wallace is a stooge and prisoner of the Communist (Stalinists) Party. This is far from the truth. This is a capitalist lie. This is capitalist propaganda. Theoretically and ideologically Wallace is the leader. The Communist (Stalinist) Party have given up Marxism and are following a left capitalist politician, and a very clever one at that. Wallace is as safe and sound for the United States as Mac Donald was for England, or Noske was for Germany, or Kerensky for Russia, or Bevin for England today. He is even to the right of them. But conditions have not moved that far left in America--yet. True, the Stalinists have an iron-clad organizational structure below Wallace; but everywhere Wallace is organizing his own dual liberal structure, and above all Wallace determines line, policy and all that goes with it. This role of the Stalinists, in one form or the other, is the typical role of ALL SOCIAL REFORMERS.

## THE LABOR PARTY AND THE BOURGEOIS DEMOCRATS.

Whereas most of the social reformers, such as the left socialists and above all the centrists such as the Trotskyites, are too clever to be caught in the awkward positions that Moscow (sacrifices) gets the local communists in, the fact remains that in their own way and with proper "face saving" devices, they too, in content, but not in form, play the same role. By their support of the LABOR PARTIES (in opposition) they become the tail to the kite of social reformism and in turn to bourgeois democracy.

There are many other principle questions of Marxism on which the Centrists falter shifting them over into the camp of the labor party, and in turn in support of bourgeois democracy in deeds, even though they oppose bourgeois democracy in words. These questions we deal with in our press from time to time.

## BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY PAVES THE WAY FOR FASCISM

In listing the three forces, we have listed bourgeois democracy as the middle force--between Lenin's dictatorship against the exploiters and workers' democracy on the one hand, and fascism or an open capitalist dictatorship on the other. Stalinism in no way

represents Marxism, except as a revision of Lenin's teaching, a revision of Marxism.

So long as a nation is strong (such as the United States) and its wealth is used internationally to prop up decay capitalism, that long can fascism be held in check. But as soon as the decay eats into the vital units of production of the means of production (more than production for consumption) than the open class war between fascism and communism (not Stalinism) takes place. The bourgeois democrats play a middle of the road position in this struggle. The bourgeois reformers, the social reformers and the centrists and ultra-lefts, in their turn and in their own way also play a middle of the road position--as history has already testified in countless examples.

In the head of the intense class struggle for the seizure of power between communism (not Stalinism) and fascism in a country deep in capitalist decay, the bourgeois democrats inevitably, historically and with malice and forethought, support the fascists against the communists in deeds, while in words they condemn the fascists. The social reformers and centrists trailing this camp become the cruel victims of historical fate. Most of the rank and file are sincere and mean well, but not understanding their leadership's policy they are duped.

#### A. FOURTH FORCE

In considering the possibility of a fourth force, not a fourth strategy or tactic, we must also state a few facts about the system under which we live. Since we live under capitalism, since capitalism dominates the world and determines the policies in basic and broad outline, even in a carry over economy such as feudalism and remoter economic carryovers, it is essential to understand the dynamics of its political parties.

Now matter how many political parties in a capitalist country, and we may add that with capitalist decay the number of parties and the factions increase, it is essential to understand that basically these capitalist parties will make a line of demarcation between bourgeois democracy and open dictatorship, between fascism and bourgeois democracy as Roosevelt and the Stalinists expressed it. A civil war will break out in this or that country between these two forms, between the capitalist open dictatorship (fascists etc) and the democrats.

"If" this struggle would have taken place in a DEVELOPING STAGE OF CAPITALISM, it would have been primarily a struggle between the dictatorship and the capitalist democrats. But if the struggle develops in the DECAY STAGE (and that is what we have today) it is primarily a struggle between COMMUNISM AND FASCISM, even though the democratic capitalist will be in power and will have at the moment the greatest armed force.

That is the reason we criticized Leon Trotsky and his followers for labeling the Spanish Revolution a struggle between democracy and fascism. We correctly labeled it a struggle between communism and fascism with democracy paving the way for fascism. Our published documents in the INTERNATIONAL NEWS of that period will give ample evidence to this assertion.

Can Stalinism, which holds state power in Russia and the Balkan countries, play an independent "FOURTH POSITION" or can Socialism in its state power in different parts of Europe play an independent "FOURTH POSITION"? No. Categorically no. History has given ample evidence to the revolutionary Marxists upholding their theoretical position that these revisionists of Marxism cannot play an independent role. Once they revise Marxism, which equates independent working class action, they are doomed to becoming the tail end of supporting the bourgeois democrats. They don't support bourgeois democracy from the right or center; they support bourgeois democracy from the left in words and in ACTION they support bourgeois democracy from every angle possible, from right, center and left. On the premise of revisionism or denial of revolutionary Marxism there can be no independent working class action.

Let us restate the problem of why there are only three forces in society: In the first place there is no position in between the dictatorship of the working class (any form of workers' rule) and therefore, the so called workers parties are either supporting left bourgeois policies or are representing the dictatorship of the proletariat. History will prove that the Socialists, Stalinists, Anarchists, all who have had power in one form or another represent revisions of Marxism, and rule not in the workers' interests but negate it.

Furthermore, history has proven that under decay capitalist rule the countless factions and parties and amalgams represent only two distinct forces, either bourgeois democracy in one or another degree of disintegration or the open naked dictatorship of the capitalists (be it fascists, white terror, or any other form of military or monopolist rule.)

Either the so called workers parties establish the dictatorship of the proletariat (with its leninist democratic form) or they will rule as labor, workers, socialist, stalinist, etc., governments in the capitalist interest and against the worker's interest.

There is one "seeming" exception to this above premise. The Soviet Union and the Stalinist regime. That is due to the usurpation of power by the Stalinists in Russia. It was not Stalin's policy that gained power or held power. It was Lenin's policy. It was revolutionary Marxism. Stalinism represents a degeneration of this previous position. As yet they have not been able to overturn the basic economic foundation that the October revolution under Lenin and Trotsky brought forth. But their internal and world policy is



opportunist, is revisionist and does not represent the independent action of the workers and revolutionary Marxism. They too can only play a role for the middle, for bourgeois democracy, even though they represent in form the most ruthless dictatorship OVER the workers the world has yet seen. A crude analogy could be the comparison to the gangsters in the American trade union movement. As dictators even Hitler or Stalin have nothing on them. But POLITICALLY these gangsters can ONLY play a role in support of bourgeois democracy vs the working class, except when and where fascism or other forms of open dictatorship are ready to take power. In other words, they can either support capitalist dictatorship or capitalist democracy, depending upon who is in power. The important lesson to learn is that as dictators, under capitalist democracy they support bourgeois democracy against proletarian democracy. So too do the Stalinists on a world scale, even though they are despotic.

The revolutionary Marxists, the working class and their allies are the only ones who can play a third role, who represent a third force and present an independent position against the different forms of bourgeois rule.

May 30 - 43

Hugo