

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

The "Secret" Text:

Moscow Letter Charges Chinese Factionalism

•

Who Will Change the World?

by William F. Warde

*Documents of
the Revolutionary
Movement*



50
CENTS

Correspondence

William F. Warde:

Your article, "The American Civil War: Its Place in History," [contained in the last issue of the *International Socialist Review*], accomplished the fresh historical relation of the American Revolutionary War of 1775-1781. That such a relationship exists is of interest to this student of history.

However, the facts you use and the conclusions you draw make the article a most scandalous piece of historical writing.

First: whatever the motives of the Revolutionary War they definitely were not (although you claim these the most important) "to rid American society of its precapitalist encumbrances (Indian tribalism, feudalism, slavery)." This conclusion is utterly preposterous when you consider that many of the leaders of the revolution were "feudalistic" and held slaves; to wit — Thomas Jefferson and George Washington. They weren't fighting to abolish themselves, rather they, and the other colonists, were fighting for independence from England, with "precapitalist encumbrances" forming virtually no consideration.

The assertion that the Southern "slavocracy" controlled the country from 1800 to the Civil War indicates your biased desire to the theory by inserting or making up facts, rather than looking at the facts and then arriving at a theory. In fact, the South did have a great deal of power in Congress and occasionally in the Presidency, but never or rarely did it have outright control. The parties (predominately Whigs and Democrats) didn't split along sectional lines except in issues deeply affecting the South (e.g. tariff bills and the several compromises).

And when the vote did split sectionally, the best the South could do was tie the North in the Senate because it was outnumbered in the House of Representatives.

Furthermore, the strongest Southern President, Andrew Jackson, actually opposed South Carolina when it tried to assert its sovereignty; and Andrew Jackson was nobody's lackey!

To claim that the Civil War was a bourgeois (hence Northern) revolt is another distorted claim. The South plainly withdrew and revolted from the Union. The anti-slavery movement was vehemently supported by only a small minority of rabid abolitionists of whom Abraham Lincoln was not one. Industrialists and Northern financiers were not as happy as you say to see slavery go, they had a great deal of money tied up in the South and the slavery system.

When slavery was abolished it was done on moral, military and propaganda grounds (to gain England's sympathy); the bourgeois "revolution" had

little to do with the freeing of any slaves.

Again you claim that the capitalists (i.e. plutocrats) utterly controlled the government after the Civil War is a further distortion. That industry had power, often great power, is not denied. But they could be, and often were stopped. By 1872 the Radical Republicans were unpopular and more moderate minds began coming to power. The strength of the Democratic party increased so fast that from 1876 to the turn of the century it was competing on equal grounds with the Republicans.

In regard to your conclusion, there won't be another revolution because the proletariat has no one to revolt against. True, the chief industrialists still have influence in the government but it is matched or exceeded by that of the unions. One need only witness the anti-management bills of the nineteen thirties (e.g. the Wagner Act) to realize that "Rockefeller, Ford and Co." do not run the country. Besides, more and more of industry is being held by millions of small stockholders — including the workers. A revolution now would mean the proletariat revolting against itself.

I don't expect this criticism to be printed in your propaganda sheet, but at least I can let you know that some people who are aware of the rudiments of history and its compilation read your half-truths and distortions.

Whatever the merits of your movement you can't expect to recruit any intellectually honest people with such outrageous corruption of history.

Douglas Van Sant,
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

Dear Mr. Van Sant:

1. Of course the Southern planters did not fight British rule to abolish slavery. That is why a second American revolution was needed to rid the nation of this precapitalist mode of production. However, Washington, Jefferson and their associates did attack such precapitalist encumbrances as the Indian, royal and Crown proprietors' possession of the land and such feudal institutions as the state church, entail and primogeniture, etc.

2. Which class held supreme political power in the U.S. between 1800 and 1860? It is rarely disputed that from 1789 to 1800 the Federalists pushed through the program of the Northern monied men. The so-called "revolution of 1800," which is often described as the victory of the agrarian interests over the capitalists, of progress over reaction and democracy over plutocracy, really signified the passing of ultimate decision in Washington from the Northern bourgeoisie to the planters headed

by the Virginia Dynasty (Jefferson, Madison, Monroe).

From then on the U.S. was governed by a coalition of big property owners — but the planters were the senior partner. Their predominance was most conspicuous in the field of foreign policy since they determined the main lines of expansion (the Louisiana Purchase, the taking of Florida) and the kind of wars that were undertaken against England, Spain, the Indians, and later Mexico. During this early period the rule of the Southern planters was so galling that representatives of the New England rich twice contemplated leaving the Union (the Essex Junto, the Hartford Convention).

Andrew Jackson, himself a slaveowner and slave trader, was likewise primarily a representative of the planting interests, not of the decaying seaboard section, but of the aggressive, up-and-coming pioneer planters of the Southwest. His collision with the impatient slaveholders of South Carolina over nullification does not negate that role. It should not be overlooked that in the end Jackson yielded on the substance of the dispute and agreed to lower the tariff. The blackmail pressure of South Carolina paid off.

3. The Northern industrialists would have preferred to maintain the Union and their political sovereignty without upsetting the slave system and made every effort to do so from Lincoln's election to 1863. However, they were driven to abolish slavery in order to win the civil war and prevent the planters from regaining their lost power. Even if emancipation was proclaimed and legalized less from sympathy with the Negroes than in their own narrow class interests, this does not detract from the progressive historical importance of their deed.

4. Once they had shattered the slavocracy and cinched their hold on the country, most of the Radical Republican leaders became conservatized. Since they did have to contend with the claims of other social forces, the agents of the plutocrats in charge of the Republican administrations from 1865 to 1902 did not have everything their own way. But the representatives of "the robber barons" did decide the major policies and actions of the national government. This was the time Parrington pungently describes as "The Great Barbecue" when the capitalists feasted at the public expense and the rest of the people got the leavings from the banquet table.

This was not halted even when the Democrats under Cleveland displaced the Republicans in Washington. The period was rounded out by the victory of McKinley and Mark Hanna who took the country into war with Spain. This first imperialist venture demonstrated that the objectives of the ruling rich were the foremost consideration of the government in foreign affairs as well as at home.

William F. Warde

Who Will Change the World?

The New Left and the Views of C. Wright Mills

by William F. Warde

IN CAPITALS as distant as Warsaw and Tokyo, London and New York a significant new current of thought has been taking shape among intellectuals on the left. Despite the differences in their surroundings and in their immediate problems, they have been formulating convergent political conclusions.

These dissident intellectuals are increasingly critical of "orthodox Marxism," as they understand or, more often, misunderstand it. They doubt or deny that the industrial workers can be the main agency of social change. They question whether a disciplined revolutionary vanguard, guided by scientific socialism, is required to lead the people in their efforts to get rid of capitalist evils and build a better world.

They counterpose the following ideas to the teachings of Marxism:

(1) Both liberalism and Marxism belong to the nineteenth century and are equally outmoded. These ideologies have proved unable to explain the dominant forces and trends of the mid-twentieth century and must therefore give way to a more up-to-date method of thought capable of analyzing the social reality of our age.

(2) Intellectuals and students in the advanced countries, or peasants in the backward colonial areas, can displace the weak or defaulted workers as the leading revolutionary force.

(3) Some novel political formation of an amorphous, multiclass, or even superclass character, is more suited to contemporary conditions and needs than either the Social-Democratic organizations linked with the trade unions or the Leninist-type parties modeled on democratic centralism.

(4) In order to combat the highly centralized power elites in the modern superstates new forms of action must be developed in place of reliance on the old methods of working-class struggle.

These radicals may reject Marxism and materialism in favor of humanism and morality. But they are

honestly animated by revulsion against what they call the Establishment, the policies of the prevailing powers in the state or in the labor organizations.

They want an end to cold-war brinkmanship, the stalemate in international diplomacy, the precarious "balance of terror." They want decisive action, and are ready to do something themselves, to head off nuclear catastrophe and World War III. They oppose imperialist militarism and the McCarthyism which accompanies the garrison state. In the United States their spokesmen resent a liberalism which is fearful of being liberal without permission from the authorities, cowers before the Pentagon and State Department, and has to swear unending loyalty oaths on anti-Communist scriptures in order to remain respectable.

In England the New Left mocks the servility of the social-reformist Labor party leaders who aim to refurbish and administer capitalism instead of working to abolish it. Official Communism has lost its attractiveness for them after the collapse of the Stalinist mythology at the Twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist party and the brutal intervention of the Soviet power in Hungary in 1956.

On the other side they have been aroused by the uprisings of the colonial peoples in Asia, the Middle East and Africa. They identify themselves with the student demonstrations in South Korea, Japan and Turkey. They have participated in anti-H-bomb marches in England and elsewhere. They sympathize with the refusal of young French conscripts to serve in the "filthy war" against the Algerians. They have backed up the sit-ins in this country. Now these exciting events have been crowned by the achievements of the Cuban Revolution.

In response to these developments, individuals of diverse origins — left liberals, socialists and Laborites, disillusioned Communists, militant pacifists and young people just plunging into radical politics — have been evolving similar views. Members of the Zengakuren in

Japan and the New Left in England, ex-Stevensonians in the United States and ex-Stalinists in Warsaw and Belgrade recognize one another as kindred spirits.

This new generation of left intellectuals is grappling with great problems, trying to work out theoretical and programmatic positions and an orientation for themselves. They may lack experience in the class struggle and be confused about many matters. But they are not jaded or used up. They are ardent, eager for action, "against apathy." They aspire to clean up "the old crap" around them and make a fresh start.

They must be listened to. For out of their midst, as they mature in thought and action, will come invaluable adherents and new leaders for the revolutionary movements of tomorrow. In turn they might learn from ex-

changing views, not only with one another, but with socialists who are not compromised by the crimes of the past and have important things to tell them.

THE noted sociologist C. Wright Mills is becoming one of the chief mentors of this movement. In a "Letter to the New Left," published in the September-October 1960 *New Left Review*, he presents a line of argument on social and political problems persuasive to many young intellectuals.

Professor Mills first disposes of the dried-up dissidents of the previous generation, now at ease in the university faculties and foundations, who have proclaimed "an end of ideology." This pretentious pronouncement, he correctly observes, merely signalizes their end as progressive ideologists.

He sees their counterparts in the prudent Soviet intellectuals who confine criticism of their society to nonessentials and trim them to bureaucratic measure. No enlightened leadership can come from either set of smug conformists.

Left intellectuals must undertake a fearless, thoroughgoing criticism of the societies around them and the ideologies which justify them. "If there is to be a politics of the New Left, what needs to be analyzed is the *structure* of institutions, the *foundations* of policies," he emphasizes. "To be 'Left' means to connect up cultural with political criticism, and both with demands and programs. And it means all this inside *every* country of the world."

He regrets that some New Left writers still "cling so mightily to 'the working class' of the advanced capitalist societies as *the* historic agency, or even as the most important agency, in the face of the really impressive historical evidence that now stands against this expectation. Such a labor metaphysic, I think, is a legacy from Victorian Marxism that is now quite unrealistic."

To this "labor metaphysic" he opposes the alternative of "the cultural apparatus, the intellectuals — as a possible, immediate radical agency of change." Their potential power has been indicated by the militant student movements in the West and among the anti-bureaucratic students, professors and writers in Poland, Hungary and the Soviet Union.

"We've got to study these new generations of intellectuals around the world as real live agencies of historic change," he asserts. "We must learn from their practice and work out with them new forms of action."

Mills rightly stresses the importance of studying the moods, ideas and actions of these intellectuals who have already helped shake, and even topple, some rotten regimes. His own conclusions deserve no less serious consideration, not only because of his influence on their thinking, but because of his impact on public opinion in this country. Unlike most professors, he has not hesitated to speak boldly on sensitive issues. His latest books have been in their own way significant political deeds. He has used his learning and authority to defy the militarists, monopolists and their retinue of scholarly cold warriors and to defend the Cuban Revolution. In Amer-

**INTERNATIONAL
SOCIALIST
REVIEW**

Published quarterly by the International Socialist Review Publishing Association, 116 University Pl., New York 3, N. Y. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

Contents

CORRESPONDENCE	66
WHO WILL CHANGE THE WORLD? <i>by William F. Warde</i>	67
TEXT OF "SECRET" MOSCOW LETTER	80
CHILEAN TROTSKYISTS DEFEND THE CUBAN REVOLUTION	85
EDITORIAL COMMENT	87
THE STRUGGLE FOR WORLD SOCIALISM	89

Vol. 22 — No. 3 — Whole No. 156

Editor, Murry Weiss; *Managing Editor*, Bert Deck;
Business Manager, Karolyn Kerry; *Editorial Board*: Joseph Hansen, Shane Mage, Tim Wohlforth
Myra Tanner Weiss

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: U.S.A. and Latin America, \$1.25 a year (four issues); single copies, 35 cents; bundles, 25 cents a copy for five copies or more. Foreign and Canada, \$1.50 a year (four issues); single copies, 35 cents; bundles, 26 cents a copy for five copies or more.

ican intellectual circles today he occupies a place comparable to that of Sartre in Europe.

Mills' personal interventions on the questions of war and peace, revolution and reaction have been highly salutary. But the positions he takes and the proposals he makes in his advice to the New Left have a more dubious character. Let us examine them.

TO CLEAR the ground for fruitful debate, let us first state wherein we, as orthodox Marxists, find agreement with Mills and the New Left.

(1) The main enemy of the American people is the Big Money and the Big Brass.

(2) The imperialist war policies, symbolized by NATO, SEATO and the defunctive Baghdad Pact and resting upon the most reactionary political regimes, must be opposed.

(3) Their pernicious domestic consequences (the witch-hunt, thought control) must be combatted and broken.

(4) Every progressive cause must be supported, regardless of its initiators and official leadership.

(5) Stalinism and Social-Democratic reformism, the ideological defenses of two different types of bureaucratic domination, are bankrupt.

(6) They must be replaced by new leaders and new programs which are democratic, humanist and socialist and promote reason, freedom and the highest morality.

(7) Honest intellectuals, radical students, and insurgent peasants have great roles to play in the struggles against "the old crap" and the building of a better world.

(8) Uninhibited criticism of the basic social and political establishments in the West and the East are in order.

As is well known, both Stalinism and Social Democracy fear freedom of criticism, especially from the left, wherever they exercise sovereign power. This is in itself evidence of their anti-Marxist disposition since the dialectical method of thought demands that everything, including its own social foundations and theoretical premises, be submitted to the most searching criticism and the most rigorous tests.

This area of agreement between us and the New Left is broad enough for joint action against the common enemy on many vital issues and a friendly and frank exchange of opinions. This can assist the regroupment of individuals coming from different quarters who earnestly desire to abolish capitalism and the scourge of labor bureaucratism.

* * *

Having said this, it is necessary to make clear our major differences with these non-Marxists.

(1) We deny that the discreditment of Stalinism or Social Democracy demonstrates the failure of Marxism or requires repudiation of dialectical and historical materialism as the indispensable method of thought for analyzing social processes and solving political problems.

(2) The demotion of the working class to an auxiliary or absentee role in the preparation, execution and fulfillment of the social and political revolutions of our

time is factually misleading, theoretically unfounded and disastrous in political practice.

(3) The exaltation of intellectuals, college students (embryo intellectuals and professionals), or the youth into an independent social force which serves as the principal history-maker misrepresents their real auxiliary roles in the revolutionary events of our time.

(4) To assign political and social predominance to the peasants over the workers distorts the real relations and interactions between these two social classes in the unfolding of the revolutions in backward countries.

(5) The denial of the necessity for conscious and principled leadership by a vanguard combat party of the workers can only serve to disarm and derail the revolutionary movements and cause terrible deviations in the transition from the old order to socialism.

(6) Individualist and pacifist, purely parliamentary and propagandist methods of action are incapable of dislodging the monopolists and militarists from power. Serious struggle for power requires the all-sided mobilization of the masses with the industrial workers at their head.

The partisans of the New Left dispute or reject, in whole or in part, all these fundamental propositions of Marxism. Our discussion therefore will revolve around these six points.

MARXISM has failed—an electronic computer would be needed to calculate the number of times this judgment has been made over the past hundred years by different kinds of opponents. Yet every time this hardy school of thought has been pronounced ready for burial, it has asserted renewed vigor and won new multitudes of adherents. Today its world influence is at its height.

If Marxism has proved so deficient, how did it acquire and why does it maintain such pre-eminence? It will not help matters to say it is the official ideology of the Soviet Union and China. How did it become so? Only through assisting the victory of the social revolutions in those great countries.

The truth is that Marxism owes its exceptional authority, not primarily to state powers, but to the many proofs of its superiority in practice. Millions have been convinced by their experience of life that its ideas explain the modern world better than any rival doctrine and can help change it more efficiently.

Since the second world war, Marxism has spread most rapidly in the colonial countries. This has led some friendly critics to concede it may still be useful in backward areas that have not yet solved the problems of industrialization and mass consumption. But Marxism, they contend, is obsolete in rich and highly developed countries. As Mills says, it is essentially Victorian and is due to be displaced by a more up-to-date social theory.

This inverts the line of argument invoked in Russia against the Marxists before the 1917 Revolution. Then its opponents contended that Marxism suited only advanced capitalist countries and was out of place in back-

ward semifeudal countries which had not yet passed through their democratic revolutions. In reality the method and principles of historical materialism are applicable to all countries regardless of their level of social development, provided they are applied with full consideration of the facts in each case.

To be sure Marxism, like Darwinism, was an intellectual creation of the nineteenth century. But are scientific laws in either sociology or biology any less valid because they were discovered and formulated a while ago? Science does not start from scratch with every generation but builds upon accumulated knowledge and previously verified conclusions.

It is really insinuated that socialist theory has stood still since its birth while biology has advanced. After Darwin came Mendel, Morgan, Muller, Fisher and others who have added new insights to his original explanation of organic evolution.

But neither has Marxism stagnated since the *Communist Manifesto*, the publication of *Capital*, the founding of the First International and the other contributions of Marx and Engels. It has passed through the stages of Social Democracy, Bolshevism, and Trotskyism. It has found not only successive organizational expression but enriched programs in the Second and Third Internationals and today the Fourth International.

Marxism has proved as capable of growth, of assimilating new experiences and unanticipated events and drawing correct conclusions from them, as any other living branch of scientific knowledge. It has progressed, however, only to the extent that its followers have adhered to its original theoretical principles and further developed them.

Like every epoch-making tendency of thought, Marxism has often been debased, distorted, counterfeited. Many have paraded as Marxists while abandoning its principles. But such pretenders and falsifiers have, at every turn in the vicissitudes of the revolutionary workers movement over the past century, found themselves confronted by genuine defenders of scientific socialism who have redirected the movement onto its true course and safeguarded its future.

The test of Marxism and its worth does not lie in the continuity of its traditions or in its past accomplishments but in its continuing capacity to interpret evolving social phenomena. Has orthodox Marxism become so petrified and stultified, has it fallen so far behind the march of events, that it can no longer provide a reliable guide to the solution of mankind's most pressing and perplexing problems? Is it really so irrelevant to the highly industrialized, mature, bureaucratically centralized mass societies of today as the New Left oracles assert?

They are especially concerned with such questions as the nature of the Soviet Union and its bureaucracy, the imperialist and militarist features of U.S. monopoly capitalism, and the conflict between these two. Orthodox Marxists have analyzed these matters at length and given clear answers to them. Moreover, they have worked out precise programs of political action to deal with them. The New Left critics, on the other hand,

who so noisily proclaim the bankruptcy of Marxism, either have confused or ambiguous theoretical positions on these questions or vague and inadequate proposals for action.

"We are in quest of new and better answers," they say, "even though we have not yet found them." Very well. Let us, as part of this search, put our respective views to a test by comparing notes on "the revolt of the intellectuals." This is where the opponents of historical materialism profess to derive the most impressive evidence for their conclusions; these are the contemporary events on which they rest their case. Let us see which method, ours or theirs, can provide the most illuminating analysis and answers.

MARXISM has been found wanting, conclude the anti-Marxists, because the working class has shown itself incapable of leading humanity out of capitalism into socialism. This contention is hardly new. It has been rediscovered and repeated countless times since Marx and Engels recognized and explained the revolutionary mission of the world working class in the 1840's. And at every such juncture the authentic Marxists have had to refute the "new thinkers" who, in the name of "realism," turned away from the working class to some other source of social salvation: liberal capitalists, brilliant intellectuals or some bureaucratic elite.

Scientific socialism derives the paramount role of the industrial workers in the transformation of society before and after abolishing capitalism from their central position in modern economy. This is based on large-scale industry and a scientific technology. The antagonistic relations of production between the profiteers and the producers of wealth are an unremitting and irrepressible source of social struggle. As capitalism manifests its political, social and economic decadence in one country after another, these class conflicts intensify to the point where the workers feel impelled to throw off capitalist rule, nationalize the main sectors of the economy, and operate industry for the public benefit. Thus capitalism creates the instrument for its abolition in the very class it most exploits and oppresses.

This prognosis of social development projected by Marxism was first vindicated by the conquest of power by the workers in the 1917 Russian Revolution. This silenced the skeptics for a while. Four notable developments since then have caused them to lift their voices again. First came the bureaucratization of the Soviet regime under Stalin which signified the loss of political power by the Russian workers. Then came the failure of the workers of Western Europe to capture power after the second world war and their immobility in the fifteen years since. Third was the enormous role of the peasants in the Yugoslav and Chinese revolutions. Finally, these defaults are contrasted to the energy and initiative exhibited by students and intellectuals over the past two years.

"See," they say, "power slipped from the hands of the workers in Russia. They didn't take over when they had the chance in Western Europe. The peasants, not the workers, have been the major force in the success-

ful revolutions in Yugoslavia and China. Middle-class intellectuals and peasants led the way in Cuba. While all these other forces have been active, the workers have been sleeping at the switch. They're not going anywhere unless they're dragged forward by some more intelligent and energetic agency."

It must be acknowledged that the case of the anti-Marxists rests upon powerful facts which cannot be disregarded or dismissed offhand. Uncontrolled bureaucrats, and not the workers, govern the Soviet states. In Italy, France, Belgium, Greece in the 1944-1947 period, the Resistance movements led by Communist leaders helped the capitalists regain their rule where it was imperative to end it and quite possible to do so. While the mighty strike wave in the United States during 1946-47 preserved union strength in the basic industries, the workers did not change the national political setup in their favor. Then the prolonged arms-powered boom and the cold-war reaction softened, corrupted and broke the older generation of worker-militants and further depressed the ranks.

Do these phenomena mean that the workers "don't have what it takes" to go through with the socialist revolution? Or do they rather testify to something else: the bankruptcy of their official leaders?

In our opinion both the defeats and the ensuing defeatism of the working class are primarily attributable to the established heads of the labor movement — Socialist, Communist, Laborite or pro-Democratic — who did their utmost to demoralize and disorient the workers and deter them from conducting effective struggles against the masters of capitalism. Despite their differences on many matters, the Stalinist authorities and their opponents among the labor officialdom have been equally responsible for this state of affairs.

The error of the New Left, therefore, consists in identifying and confusing the betrayals of the labor bureaucracies with the disorientation these cause in the ranks. The setbacks due to faulty leadership are read as evidence of a congenital incapacity of the working class to fulfill its historical mission.

Despite these defaults, the need for resistance to capitalist reaction and the imperialist warmakers has remained acute. Accordingly, in some countries, students, intellectuals and peasants have stepped into the arena vacated by the existing leaderships and temporarily unoccupied by the worker-militants.

The New Left theorists overgeneralize from these exceptional circumstances of the postwar period and eternalize them. They fail to grasp the unstable and transitory causes for the lethargy of the laboring masses or to foresee the emergence of new conditions which can transform the mood and movements of labor into their opposite. Otherwise they would be unable to hang on to their prejudice that the working class has forever forfeited its role as the vanguard of progress and must yield priority to other social forces.

Mills is prudent enough to caution: "Of course we can't write off the working class." But he refuses to accord it any decisive or leading role in advance. Like the man from Missouri, he demands to be shown the

accomplished fact. But how is the fact best to be accomplished?

The sixties promise to show, far more than the previous decade, how much of a "Necessary Lever" for social change the industrial workers can be. Just as Mills' article appeared in *New Left Review*, the British Trades Union Congress and the Labor party conference swung to the left on such key issues as nuclear disarmament and nationalization. 1960 closed with an imposing four-week political general strike of the Belgian workers.

It is true that during the fifties the colonial areas were the center of the most important revolutionary actions in the world and their eruptions and achievements are far from ended. But the other side of this movement should not be overlooked. The cumulative effect of these reverses inflicted on international imperialism has helped set the stage for the rebirth of labor militancy in the West. The impact of Algeria on France, the Congo on Belgium, Africa on Great Britain and Cuba on the United States foreshadows this eventuality.

Just as the advances of the colonial revolutions can upset the equilibrium of class forces within the imperialist nations, so are the activities of the students, intellectuals and minorities within them the precursors and preconditions of working class resurgence.

The new generation of radical students and intellectuals have already announced their presence and made their influence felt on the scene. But the coming generation of young workers are still in the wings, awaiting the cue for entrance. They are destined to be the central figures in the drama, not only in the Western world but in the Soviet bloc.

The New Lefts mistake the prologue for the play. They applaud the supporting actors who have appeared in the first acts of the revolution of our time. But they have not waited until the hero has spoken and acted out his part.

Like all empiricists, they take a partial, superficial view of the historical process, limiting their gaze to what happens in a single country or during the preliminary phases of the revolutionary drama. They do not approach the elimination of the old order and the building of a new one as a world-wide task extending over a prolonged historical period. During this transitional time the working class, after scoring big triumphs, can be set back by adverse objective conditions or by its enemies and misleaders and then be helped to its feet and resume its role as the dynamo of social progress.

IN PLACE of the workers Mills and his cothinkers look to the rebellious "young intelligentsia" as the prime agent of change. However, the events from which they draw their conclusions are not so clear-cut as they suppose.

Every profound protest movement against the established order draws in diverse social elements and unfolds in an irregular manner. Now one, now another

dissident segment enters the struggle along a broad front.

It has often happened that other forces with intolerable grievances have risen up against the authorities before the industrial workers have cast off their inertia and gone into action. Over the past few years in the United States, for example, the Negroes have been battling segregation while organized labor has stood by. It has not only remained largely indifferent to the Negro demands for equality but has been slothful in defending its own immediate interests from attack.

Radicalized intellectuals are particularly prone to swing faster and farther to the left or to the right than the heavy battalions of labor. Their uprooted social status makes them much more mobile and responsive to shifts in the political atmosphere. The demonstrations and revolts of the students in South Korea, Japan and Turkey in 1960 had precedents in many countries, beginning with the Russian student protests against Czarist autocracy at the turn of this century.

These movements of the intellectuals are sensitive barometers to coming storms. "A rising wind stirs the topmost branches first." The winds of revolt heralded by the actions of the intellectuals betoken more profound processes at work among the masses and for this reason can be quickly transmitted into the depths of the people. Thus the student demonstrations in South Korea and Turkey drew enough backing from the army, workers and peasants to oust the existing regime, though not enough to revolutionize the country.

In Japan the student initiators of the struggle against the U.S. Military Treaty were seconded by the general strike of the unions. In England the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament started by middle-class intellectuals first attracted the youth, then the unions and the Labor party. In Belgium, on the other hand, the workers took the field in general strike against the government without benefit of any external impulse. They received enthusiastic support from the young socialists.

The sit-ins of the Southern Negro college students illuminate the complex interplay between the different segments of a single struggle. The student actions had been prepared and preceded by the mass bus boycotts in Montgomery, Tallahassee and elsewhere. The younger generation did not lead but followed their elders. Now their example is lending further impetus to the broad movement against Jim Crow. To be sure, the student sit-ins have been more militant, aggressive, and independent of the old-line leaders and thereby represented a more advanced stage of the integration struggle in the South.

The totality of these experiences does not lead to the sweeping conclusion that students and intellectuals are the predestined leaders of revolt, as the New Left analysts would have it. The reality of the local struggles is much more complex and contradictory than their simplified representations.

The initiatives of radical intellectuals, militant students, oppressed minorities and insurrectionary peasants often serve to stimulate action by the proletariat. The

demands and deeds of these other social layers are like catalysts speeding reactions in a heated situation. They proclaim and promote what the popular masses, with the workers at their head, follow up and carry through — provided the revolutionary movement doesn't stop short, fall back and prove abortive.

The leading exponents of scientific socialism, Marx, Plekhanov, Kautsky, Lenin and Trotsky — themselves intellectuals of middle-class origin — wrote extensively on the problems presented by the interactions between the young and mature intellectuals and the labor and socialist movements. They were familiar with the claim that some intellectual elite would have to guide or supplant the inert mass of working people. *The Holy Family*, one of the first fruits of the collaboration of Marx and Engels, written in 1844, was directed against "New Left" intellectuals of their day who counterposed the active, critical spirit incarnated in themselves to the passive unenlightened mass of workers. Bruno Bauer and his associates likewise contended that the masses always failed in their endeavors so that historical progress could be achieved only through critical-minded idealists.

From their first hour the Russian Marxists had to combat similar prejudices of the Populist intelligentsia. The Social Revolutionaries coupled their derogation of the industrial workers and idolization of the intellectuals with the belief that the peasants, comprising the vast bulk of the nation, would necessarily be the preponderant force in the revolution. When that revolution burst forth in February 1917, it was the women on the bread lines, not the workers in the factories, who took the first step in Petrograd. The workers, soldiers and peasants quickly swung into action and then, in the further course of events, the workers led the peasants to victory.

The social revolutions of our century have been filled with such chain reactions. These can be touched off by diverse stimuli and by quite unexpected combinations of circumstances and forces. But the matter is far from settled by noting which social force started the process. Still more important is the question: which class can be relied upon to shoulder the historical tasks of the revolution and carry through the struggle to the end against all upholders of the old order? In answering this question, what counts most is not who conditions the sequence of events but who determines its line of march and its ultimate outcome.

Marxism does not insist that any oppressed segment of society wait for the workers or their leadership to struggle on their own behalf against a reactionary ruling class and its regime. Such action is not only justifiable on its own merits but can quicken the momentum of the maturing mass revolt by energizing the workers and weakening their enemy. *What Marxism does teach is that the proletariat is the sole force capable of sustaining the revolution throughout its entire course, giving it a correct program and perspective, and carrying it through to the abolition of capitalism and the creation of socialism.* However important and imposing may be the parts played by other forces from the students

to the peasants at any given stage, these remain secondary to the role of the proletariat in the total process.

THIS central proposition of scientific socialism applies, not only to the capitalist countries and the colonies where the workers have yet to conquer power, but to the Soviet bloc where capitalism has been abolished.

The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 has provided an instructive example of this decisive role of the workers even where the intellectuals took highly prominent parts in the events. In Hungary the literary resistance to Stalinist totalitarianism and its crimes preceded the uprising of the masses by several years. The writers were the first to protest openly against the abominations of Rakosi's regime; the students took the first public actions against it. At first glance, then, Hungary would seem to offer perfect confirmation for Mills' thesis that "the intellectual apparatus was the prime agency of social change."

However, let us probe more deeply into the developments by calling upon two unimpeachable witnesses who participated in the revolution as leading members of the "intellectual apparatus." They were the noted Hungarian novelists, Tamas Aczel and Tibor Meray, both winners of the Kossuth Prize. Now in exile, they have written a history of the literary side of the resistance movement entitled *The Revolt of the Mind*.

Aczel and Meray relate how the intellectuals were pushed into articulate opposition not simply by their direct observations and experiences of the evils of Stalinism but by what they learned when they went in quest of literary and journalistic materials. The workers and peasants they talked with bared the horrifying truth about the real conditions of life and labor created by the Communist party's policies. The professors were re-educated by the queries of their students in the classrooms, students who in many cases came from worker or peasant families.

The attitude of the men of letters was transformed, their opposition fed, and their expressions shaped by the hostility of the masses to the upstart bureaucrats. Ashamed of their previous complicity, as moralizing persons by profession, the writers gave voice to the wrongs committed against the people: murders, tortures, frame-ups and imprisonment of innocent victims.

Their efforts at publicity and correction culminated in the debates at the Petoefi Circle in Budapest from March to October 1956 where party economists, historians, philosophers, journalists, scientists, poets spelled out the festering grievances. They raised demands for freedom of thought and speech, for a change in policies, and even in the government.

These meetings were attended by representatives of many circles of the city's population: university students, white-collar workers, intellectuals, army officers, and workers. In this way the writers, hitherto alienated from the people, reknit their ties with the genuine nation.

On the morning of October 23 the university students proclaimed the demands of the demonstrators;

by nightfall hundreds of thousands were out in the streets. By that time, say the authors, "leadership had slipped from the hands of the writers and had been taken over by students, workers and soldiers."

However, the transmission of leadership did not stop there. In the ensuing battles the industrial workers constituted the hard core of the forces fighting for national liberation and socialist democracy. They formed Workers Councils in the factories, cities and industrial centers to organize and lead the rebellion. These Councils could have become the foundation for a new workers government. They called four general strikes against the oppressors. If the students were the first to get into the fray, the workers were the last to leave the field of battle and lower the banner of resistance. When finally they had to yield under overwhelming odds, the Hungarian Revolution was lost.

These developments do demonstrate how intellectuals can inspire and detonate the workers movement. That much the New Left grasps. But they demonstrate with greater force how the workers come forward as the center of the revolution. Once they have been crushed, the intellectual movement is strangled. Victory for all elements depends upon the success of the proletarian strivings to conquer supreme power.

Comparable events took place that year in Poland in a somewhat different order and with a less unhappy ending. There the antibureaucratic struggle was begun, not by students, but by the workers of Posnan. A few months later it culminated with the October showdown between Gomulka and Khrushchev where the armed workers in the factories and the Polish army exacted big concessions from the Kremlin.

The first act in the East German uprising of June 1953 resembled that of Poland while its upshot duplicated that of Hungary. Set off by the strike of the

Special Offer To New Readers

A four-month trial subscription to *The Militant* for only 50 cents. Send this coupon with payment to: *The Militant*, 116 University Place, New York 3, N.Y.

Name

Street

City Zone State

building workers of East Berlin, it was crushed by Soviet tanks and troops.

These three interlinked instances of revolt in Eastern Europe show how much the order and degree of participation of the dissident forces can vary from country to country and from one stage to another. But all tended to converge toward the concentration of ultimate decision through the power and participation of the industrial workers.

THE New Lefts pin their hopes on the dissident intellectuals and students in the advanced or "overdeveloped" countries, they see the peasants as the leading mass force in the revolutions of the backward or underdeveloped areas. They either substitute an intellectual-peasant axis for the worker and peasant alliance or, where they admit the necessity for the latter, they give priority to the peasant masses.

The problem of the relation between the proletariat and the peasantry in the revolution against feudal hangovers and against native and foreign capitalism has a long history and an abundant literature. The different positions taken on this question formed one of the chief lines of division among the tendencies of the Russian "Left" before the 1917 Revolution. The Populists and Social Revolutionaries contended that the peasants would be the leading force in the coming revolution which would be democratic, not socialist, in character.

Beginning with Plekhanov, the Marxists asserted that even the democratic revolution against Czarism and landlordism would triumph as a workers revolution, or not at all. This view was further developed by Trotsky into his celebrated theory of the permanent revolution which stated that the Russian revolution could not solve its democratic problems, including agrarian reform, without placing the working class in power. Once it took power, the party of the working class would immediately be obliged to undertake the solution of socialist tasks by nationalizing industry, monopolizing foreign trade, planning the economy, etc.

This forecast was confirmed by the development of the Russian Revolution where the union of the workers and peasants directed by the Bolshevik party overthrew the landlord-capitalist regime and established the first workers state. This not only tackled the agrarian problem in a revolutionary manner but proceeded to reorganize the economy along socialist lines. The supremacy of the working class was so evident in these achievements that few were found to question it.

Since the end of the second world war the basic teachings of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky on the leading role of the workers have been challenged by referring to the experiences of the Yugoslav, Chinese, and now the Cuban revolutions. In these cases, the critics claim, the workers did not lead the peasants; the peasants led the workers — and both were led by middle-class intellectuals. Therefore, Marxism is incorrect, incomplete or outdated as a guide to revolutionary practice.

Did the peasants really supersede the workers in these recent revolutions? Both sides agree that a coalition of classes fought and won the revolution. But,

according to the anti-Marxists, the senior partner, the decisive element was the peasants.

It is true that the peasantry has heavily influenced the character and course of all three revolutions. This was inevitable in countries where a petty-bourgeois agrarian population predominated and which had not passed through any previous democratic transformation. The uprisings of the people travelled from the countryside to the city, from the hills, mountains and plains to the streets and factories of the capitals, whereas in Russia the revolution was from the beginning centered around the struggles between the workers and soldiers and the old regime in Petrograd and Moscow. The countryfolk made up the bulk of the armies that fought against the old regime and defended the new one.

But the political direction, the basic program, and above all the perspectives of these revolutions did not come from the peasantry as such nor reflect its outlook. The dynamism and the direction of the revolution were derived from a city class, from the socialist interests and aspirations of the industrial workers. If that was not clear in the earlier stages of the struggles, it has been made manifest by the march of the revolution which, beginning as national-democratic movements, passed beyond these limited aims and flowed into socialist channels. The programs of social reconstruction undertaken in Yugoslavia, China and Cuba, based upon collectivized property and production, correspond to the basic interests and outlook of the workers, not of any petty-bourgeois forces.

In all three countries the requirements of the revolutionary workers have not received as clear, correct or comprehensive an expression as they could or should either in theory or practice because of the deficiencies of the parties at their head. In Yugoslavia and China the Stalinist training of the official leaderships has damaged and distorted the revolution and its regime. In Cuba the nonsocialist and non-Marxist background of the July 26th leaders prevented them from foreseeing and preparing in time all the necessary tasks and stages in the unfolding of their revolution. They themselves have acknowledged this and are now trying to make up for this deficiency. But all these political handicaps, which were not present in the Russian Revolution, do not detract from the fundamental fact that the type of industrialization, planning and collectivization characteristic of these countries today are proletarian, not peasant, in origin, principle, and evolution.

For example, the vast shifts in agrarian relations from individual land-ownership through the co-operatives to the communes which have taken place over the past ten years in China would be unthinkable and impossible under a peasant government devoted to the preservation and promotion of petty private holdings. Whatever one's judgment on the methods used, only a workers state based on nationalized property could have carried through such colossal transformations on the land.

"Marxism," Trotsky wrote, "never ascribed an absolute and immutable character to its estimation of the peasantry as a nonsocialist class. Marx said long ago that

the peasant is capable of judgment as well as prejudice. The very nature of the peasantry is altered under altered conditions. The regime of the dictatorship of the proletariat discovered great possibilities for influencing the peasantry and for re-educating it." (*Stalin*, p. 429.)

How does Cuba fit into this dialectical attitude of Marxism toward the peasantry? In *Listen Yankee* C. Wright Mills correctly designates the Castro government as "a revolutionary dictatorship of the workers and peasants." Anyone who has seen the armed militia march and drill can grasp the force of this.

This worker-peasant regime was born in the Cuban countryside. But it has been growing to maturity and acquiring its definitive characteristics under the influence of the interests and aspirations of the industrial workers, not only within the country but from abroad. The achievements of China, Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, which derive in the final analysis from the 1917 Russian workers revolution, serve as living models for the Cubans as well as sources of direct support.

Unlike China and Yugoslavia, in rural Cuba there are more wage-workers than small peasant-owners. Under the leadership of the July 26th Movement, these two forces, with sympathy and support from the urban workers, succeeded in casting off imperialist servitude and their own capitalist exploiters.

They did this in two main stages. The program for the Cuban revolution originally enunciated by Castro was restricted to democratic aims. After overthrowing Batista, this democratic political movement mounted to higher ground, growing over into its proletarian socialist phase which is still in progress. This process of revolutionizing Cuba has been accelerated, not only by the needs of the *campesinos* and the demands of the workers, but by the menace of U.S. imperialism and the counterrevolution on the one side and the example and aid of the Soviet bloc on the other. Thus the internal and external dynamics on the class struggle have given the Cuban Revolution a more and more pronounced and profound anticapitalist course and orientation.

Correctly and comprehensively interpreted, the Cuban events have exemplified the validity of the theory and program of the permanent revolution associated in our time with Trotsky's name. This has been recognized by a qualified observer, Professor Paul A. Baran of Stanford University, who has not hitherto been known as an adherent of Trotskyism.

In his "Reflections on the Cuban Revolution," reprinted from the *Monthly Review*, Baran has summarized the course of the Cuban Revolution as follows: ". . . Cuba's Great Revolution followed the pattern of a 'permanent revolution,' passing rapidly from one stage of revolutionary struggle to the next, compressing more than a century of historical development into the narrow span of less than a year, and solving within weeks problems which elsewhere and earlier have occupied entire decades. Having started as a national, anti-imperialist, political revolution it had immediately to cope with the desperate animosity and bitter resistance of American imperialism, and was thus forced within a few months to enter the next phase and to turn into a social revolu-

tion. And the social revolution, by its very nature, could not but begin immediately to assume a proletarian, socialist character . . .

"It was the firm, unwavering reaction to American challenges, the courageous and uncompromising prosecution of the anti-imperialist struggle which ripened, hot-house fashion, the fledgling Cuban Revolution and pushed it in the direction of economic planning and socialism.

"All this was not 'realization of an idea' or execution of a previously conceived plan. Quite on the contrary, the Revolution groped its way from step to step, moving in response to the challenges and necessities of the historical situation, teaching the leadership and the masses the categorical imperatives of its own development, overcoming all obstacles to its progress, and destroying in the process its enemies as well as its false friends, the counterrevolutionaries as well as the traitors and the weaklings. By its experience it confirmed, however, a number of most important tenets of the theory of economic and social development. It demonstrated once more that in the present age all genuine efforts at liberation and economic and social advancement of colonial and dependent countries grow necessarily into political revolutions and that these political revolutions equally necessarily transcend themselves and evolve into social revolutions with a socialist content. It corroborated also the fundamental proposition that in our time all social revolutions are no longer intra-national revolutions, the fate of which is decided by class struggle *within* nations, but turn immediately into *inter*-national revolutions the outcome of which is determined by the class struggle on the international arena, by the relative strength of the world's socialist and imperialist camps."

If the "socialist camp" is interpreted along Marxist lines as the sum-total of all the international forces struggling against capitalism, and not in the Stalinist sense of restricting it to the Soviet bloc of states, this appraisal of the development and class nature of the Cuban Revolution is in full accord with the facts — and, what is no less pertinent, with the principles of Marxism. As the July 26th leaders are themselves saying: "Our revolution has been evolving in obedience to the laws of class struggle discovered and expounded by Marx. Why blame us for that?"

THE restless members of the New Left keep casting about for new forms of action to release the energies of the people. This is essential, they say, to create a new revolutionary consciousness corresponding to the new conditions of the class struggle in the "acquisitive" and "affluent" mass society of today.

They are not too sure or clear just what these methods should be. As the ex-Communist E. P. Thompson, one of the more left of the New Left spokesmen, wrote in *New Left Review*, November-December 1960: "We have no hankering after some enforced ideological conformity." Indeed, it would be difficult for so heterogeneous a group to arrive at a uniform opinion, forced or unforced, on this or any other question. The New Lefts

comprise motley tendencies varying from pure pacifism and socialist reformism to "vestigial Bolshevism" and ultraradicalism.

They are not even agreed among themselves on their attitude toward the revolutionary capacities of the workers. Thus Thompson takes exception to Mills' disqualification of the workers and dependence upon the intellectuals as the chief agency of change. Since Thompson belongs to the British Labor party, he can hardly dismiss its working-class base so cavalierly as a sociology professor in the more politically undeveloped United States.

"It is possible," he writes, "that when Wright Mills offers the intellectual 'as a possible, immediate, radical agency of change' he is thinking of them, not as the leading agents of revolution, but as the force which may precipitate a new consciousness and initiate much broader processes. In this case I am much closer to agreement with him [As we would be too—W.F.W.], since it seems to me to be a crucial role of socialist intellectuals to do exactly this; and this in fact is what is happening all around the world today. But while socialist intellectuals may 'trigger off' these processes, they will only defeat and isolate themselves if they assume the *hubris* of 'main agents,' since the kind of socialism we want is one which is impossible without the participation of the whole people at every level."

Disregarding the ambiguity of the phrase "the whole people," this would be all right if these New Left intellectuals consistently aligned themselves with the worker ranks in the fight against the Laborite right wing and the union bureaucrats. Unfortunately, they fear or fail to carry through in practice their verbal recognition of the decisive power of the working people. That accounts in large measure for their hostility to the Trotskyist Socialist Labor League which acts the way it talks.

The antiproletarian orientation of the New Left radicals inclines them to reject tested methods of working-class action and organization in favor of improvisations which appear to promise quicker results. There has been no lack of these over the past few years which have witnessed a wide and bewildering profusion of actions against the "Establishment." In the capitalist countries these extend from mass meetings, marches and individual civil disobedience protests against nuclear war through street demonstrations and strikes in Japan, South Korea and Turkey to armed uprising in Cuba.

These actions cannot all be thrown into one sack and tied up together. Pacifist protests based on the individual conscience and purely literary propaganda divorced from the movements of the masses differ widely from strikes by organized workers and armed uprisings of the popular masses. In their search for panaceas, however, many New Lefts lump these anti-theoretical methods together without bothering to note the contradictions between them.

How can consistent pacifist individualism be reconciled with the Cuban Revolution? Is it any wonder the militant pacifists of *Liberation* magazine are split on this question? To overthrow a tyranny arms in hand by welding rural workers and peasants into a fighting force

around a program of social demands and political democracy, and then to defend the conquests of the revolution with a people's militia, is far more Bolshevik and fistic than pacifistic.

Pacifist protests have been useful in breaking public apathy to the dangers of nuclear war but they have done nothing to remove the imperialist power which holds the H-bomb in its hands — and over our heads. Demonstrations against the war danger have been most effective where they have been linked with and backed up by the labor movement, as in Japan and England. In Japan the strikes of the unions and the subsequent electoral campaign of the Socialist party boosted the protest against the U.S. Military Treaty started by the students. In England the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, whose leaders have sought to remain above partisan and class politics, has gained real power to the extent that its aims have been taken up by the unions and the Labor party.

A year ago street demonstrations of the students, backed up by the army, overturned the governments of Syngman Rhee and Menderes. Now, a year later, it is obvious that the regimes that replaced them to the satisfaction of Washington have done little to solve the economic and social problems of South Korea and Turkey. Demonstrations calling for the ousting of the Chang government by students, unemployed and workers have been breaking out all over South Korea this spring. Unless these countries follow the Cuban road, they will go backward instead of forward.

The techniques of struggle necessarily differ from one country to another and from one stage of the revolutionary movement to the next. For example, the methods of guerrilla warfare used in Cuba may be applied to certain other Latin-American countries with similar geographical features and social conditions, as Che Guevara indicates. But they cannot be mechanically transferred to advanced countries with powerfully organized capitalist and working classes. After all, we should remember that John Brown and his heroic band at Harper's Ferry failed to overthrow the slave power by guerilla attacks over a century ago. Quite different methods got rid of the slave power then and will be required to overcome the far more strongly entrenched power of monopoly capital today.

The sit-in techniques devised by the Southern students are dictated and justified by the fact that they must struggle for equal rights as a minority in the South and in the nation and must therefore carry on their offensive in defensive ways. But, as their enemies become more threatening and belligerent, sterner measures must be taken, as the defense guards organized by the North Carolina Negroes led by Robert Williams show.

The youth among the New Lefts are impatient; they are looking for short cuts. They mistakenly believe they can reach their goal faster by bypassing the labor organizations on the pretext that these won't budge or can't be budged.

This is to shirk the main job and court disillusion and disaster. There can be no substitute for arousing and enlisting the mass power of the workers. This can

be exerted in many forms, according to the needs of the situation. It can be political. The formation of a Labor party in Canada is a great step forward. Or it can be industrial, like the slogan: "Stop Work on H-Bombs. Stop Work on Rocket Bases" proposed by the Socialist Labor League in England. Or it can combine the two, as the Belgian workers did in their recent general strike.

The specific means worked out for the occasion are not so important as the general strategic concept of Marxism that without conscious and organized intervention by the working class the struggle for peace, security and equality, a wider democracy and socialism cannot attain its ends.

THE New Lefts are dissatisfied with both the Communist and the Social-Democratic parties. They want a new kind of party which will be democratic, humanistic, socialist. Unfortunately they do not know how to go about building such a party. They stand irresolute before that task because they fear to break clearly and completely with the ideas and practices of the old organizations and to set aside their prejudices against Leninism and Trotskyism.

Some fall back upon the hope of reforming the Socialist or Communist parties or pressuring their leaderships into taking power away from the capitalists. They expect the objective requirements of the heightening class struggle to push these parties forward and change them into unwilling instruments of revolutionary action.

Others deny the necessity of a disciplined vanguard altogether as organizer and leader of the socialist revolution. They are anarchists without labeling themselves as such.

Whatever their differences on the nature, need and role of the revolutionary party, the New Lefts unite in rejecting Lenin's concept of creating a democratically centralized workers' organization around a Marxist program. This seems to them sectarian, totalitarian, or unsuited to their national traditions.

The dispensers of this not-so-new revelation that the working masses need no party with a Marxist leadership and program for a successful revolution try to buttress their position nowadays by citing the Cuban experience. Whatever else Cuba may or may not show, it certainly has demonstrated the key role that an audacious and disciplined leadership can play in organizing and consummating a revolutionary victory over foreign imperialism and native capitalism.

But, the New Lefts retort, this leadership was not Marxist in its ideology or inspiration. This is so. Yet Fidel Castro and his co-workers found themselves obliged to act, if they were to remain true to the objectives of the revolution, in obedience to the imperatives of the class struggle charted out by scientific socialism. They might have avoided some costly errors if they had been equipped beforehand with a thorough Marxist understanding. But so far they have surely done the best they could with what they had — and this has been enough to astound the world.

However, the Cuban revolution is far from over. Its militants inside and outside the July 26th Movement have still to forge the revolutionary party which can

lead the struggle for socialism to the end. This task is not only before the Cuban Trotskyists but on the agenda of the official leaders of the revolution — and we hope that in the further course of events they can work out a satisfactory solution to this great problem.

In their enthusiasm over Cuba the proponents of the proposition that any old party will do in a pinch overlook the weightier lessons of the failures of the revolutionary movements in a series of countries since 1945 (and before!) for lack of a party and leadership adequate to the needs of the struggle. The policies of the Communist parties at the end of the war prevented the workers from taking power in France, Belgium, Italy and Greece. In the same period the Labor party, despite its nationalizations and improved social services, failed to dispossess the British monopolists whose Tory agents are now back in power. The political support given by the Communist parties to the national bour-

26 Year Index

of

NEW INTERNATIONAL

(July 1934-Feb. 1940)

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

(May 1940-Spring 1956)

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

(Summer 1956-Fall 1960)

**Material indexed by subject and author
62 Pages**

Enclosed \$4 for Index and two-year ISR sub.....

Enclosed \$3 for Index and one-year ISR sub.....

Enclosed \$2 for Index alone

Name

Address

City Zone State

**Mail all orders to ISR Index,
116 University Place, N.Y.C. 3**

geosie in colonial countries from Indonesia to Iraq has kept the workers and peasants movements in those countries from fulfillment. Finally, the worker uprisings against the Stalinist autocracies in East Germany in 1953, Poland and Hungary in 1956 did not attain their objectives partly because a qualified revolutionary leadership was absent.

Even if it should be conceded that, thanks to an unrepeatable conjuncture of favorable circumstances, it proved feasible to drive imperialism from the island of Cuba, is it realistic to suppose that the job can be done that way in the United States? This is the stronghold of world capitalism. To place the working people at the head of the nation, it will be necessary to oppose and beat three highly centralized complexes of power: the plutocrats, the militarists, and the trade-union bureaucrats.

Can so prodigious a task be accomplished without an equally centralized, disciplined mass party of the workers, farmers and Negroes guided by socialist objectives? To defeat the established power of big business a greater power must be arrayed against it. That can come only from the working class and its allies. To help organize that power is what the Socialist Workers party aims to do.

The leaders of the New Left are mostly middle-class intellectuals, not merely by social origin (no person can help his social upbringing, although he can try to rise above and beyond it) but by political and theoretical decision. Many look upon the workers as little better than "cheerful idiots," doped and duped by their huckster environment.

The working class of the West is undeniably a product of capitalist conditioning and, as such, far from impeccable. The workers have exhibited serious weaknesses in their acquiescence to capitalist standards and servitude. But they have likewise shown immense strengths in their resistance to them. These contradictory characteristics can be seen in the development of our own industrial workers. Until the 1930's they were incapable of organizing themselves in basic industry — and then they took the open shops by storm.

They have not taken a comparable giant step forward since. But, in our opinion, it would be as gross a mistake to discount the capacities of the American workers for independent political action in the future as it was to low-rate their capacities for independent organization in steel, auto and other industries before the CIO. If Canadian labor can organize a new party, can their brothers below the border be far behind?

The creative potential of the American working class has scarcely been tapped. A new radical mood and movement can make it spring quickly to life.

Consider, for precedent, the people of Cuba. Visitors who saw them under the heel of Batista regarded them as slavish, craven, corrupt, hopelessly and helplessly backward. Now the revolution has liberated their energies, opened their eyes, straightened their backs, enlightened their minds, aroused their civic and class courage. They are a transformed nation!

The working people of the United States ninety miles

away are not made of inferior stuff. And when the time is right, they will prove it. Serious fighters against capitalism must foresee and prepare for that great awakening.

Not long ago the Southern Negroes were considered by many even of their own race incapable of fighting for equality on their own account. Who will say so now? The Africans, too, used to be classified and dismissed as cheerful but ignorant and impotent people. Their rising throughout the continent is refuting that myth.

The New Lefts discuss the problem of alienation endlessly. Their own disdain for the capacities of the working people is a sign of the alienation of intellectuals from the central source of power and progress. That is why they, too, need affiliation with the Marxist revolutionary party. It can be the means for overcoming this unwholesome estrangement by uniting workers and radical intellectuals in the common effort to build a Socialist America.

THE question of the correct relations between radical intellectuals and students and the labor movement is not a purely theoretical one. It has been raised in close connection with practical policy in a number of countries.

In the leadership of Zengakuren, the student organization of Japan, there are two contending factions in addition to the Stalinists. These belong to the Communist League, a split off from the Communist party, and the Revolutionary Communist League, the Trotskyists. Ultraleft members of the Communist League have been proceeding on the premise that it is possible to electrify the masses and wear out the capitalist government by their own direct assault without the force of the workers' organizations behind them and with them. The Trotskyist students oppose this conception of a solitary duel between the students and the capitalist power as adventuristic. They have urged instead an alliance with the organized workers in a concerted campaign of political and mass action directed at the replacement of the capitalist regime with a workers and farmers government.

In England the middle-class intellectuals at the head of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament deny the desirability of bringing the unions or the Labor party into the forefront of the antiwar movement. They counterpose pacifist and nonclass methods to proletarian forms of struggle. The Trotskyist participants are foremost in advocating the involvement of the workers in the fight for peace by political and industrial action.

Because of the backwardness of labor's political development, this same problem has been posed in a peculiar form in the United States. There is no labor or mass socialist party here yet. Nevertheless, radical intellectuals must take political positions. The national election last year put everyone who supports democracy, peace, Negro rights and socialism to a crucial test.

C. Wright Mills claims to have gone beyond liberalism and Marxism. Yet he has not in fact shaken off either the allegiances or the illusions of liberalism. He is against the right-wing liberals who are staking out posts on Kennedy's New Frontier. But he remains with those

irresolute liberals of the left who cannot swallow Kennedy but fear to vote for Dobbs, the only candidate who opposed the warmongers and witch-hunters and defended the Cuban Revolution.

Instead of going beyond Marxism, Mills is still behind it. In this respect his current political position continues the tradition of left liberalism in this country. John Dewey, for example, wavered between support for liberal Democrats like Al Smith in 1928 and Roosevelt in 1940 and proposals for a hybrid third party. In 1932 he opposed the old-line capitalist parties as well as the Socialist and Communist parties. He proposed a new Progressive party to reform capitalism on the grounds that the United States was essentially a middle-class country and the industrial workers could not and should not take the lead in national politics. But he cast his vote for Norman Thomas. Mills has not yet proceeded in practical politics even so far as John Dewey at that time.

When people announce that they are setting sail beyond Marxism, it is essential to see whether they are really moving onto advanced revolutionary ground — or circling by some unforeseen detour back toward reconciliation with the powers-that-be. It happens that Mills is calling upon us to repudiate scientific socialism, the class struggle, and the leading role of the working class just as the West German Social Democracy and its imitators in Europe and England are abandoning them in profession as well as in practice. Shouldn't the New Left radicals ask themselves: why this ideological kinship or coincidence with the most reactionary elements in European Socialism whom we otherwise abhor?

The two tendencies are not the same despite their common front against historical materialism and the class-struggle methods of Marxism. Mills is headed in a different direction. He is separating himself from the monopolists and militarists while the right-wing Socialist leaders are further integrating themselves within capitalism. But Mills has not yet consistently developed his criticisms of capitalism and drawn all the necessary practical conclusions from them.

In the field of political reality he and his disciples remain suspended in space, without a party and without a political agency to realize their aims. Such an awkward position cannot be sustained for long. The national and international class struggle has imperatives that cannot be ignored.

* * *

The most pernicious aspect of his present views has apparently not dawned upon Mills. He is against bureaucratism, domination and direction by an elite, as a plague of modern society. Yet he proposes to give the intellectual apparatus, a special elite, the principal role in elevating mankind.

Isn't this a highly bureaucratic, antidemocratic notion? All the Lords Bountiful of the present and enlightened absolutists of the past have promised to make the masses happier and better on one condition: that the administration of affairs be left to them. Marxism broke with all such arrogant aristocratic and bureaucratic schemes.

It proclaimed: "The emancipation of the workers can only be the work of the workers themselves," and not the gift of false saviors.

By placing the intellectual apparatus above the working people, Mills unwittingly aligns himself with all those from the union bureaucrats to the Stalinist autocrats who likewise distrust the capacities of the workers to rule themselves and reconstruct society.

The historical task of cleaning away "the old crap" and transforming the world along socialist lines cannot be accomplished by the single act of revolution or its victory in one country. It is an uninterrupted process, requiring a transitional period extending over an entire epoch and embracing all countries during which people change themselves while they are changing society.

In a recent communication James P. Cannon posed the question this way: if the workers are unable to carry through this historical task, it has to be assigned to some elite. But then we come to the embarrassing questions: Will this uncontrolled elite be benevolent? Will it extend freedom, purely from goodness of heart and nobility of intentions? Or will it curtail freedom until it is stamped out entirely?

Experience so far in the history of civilized humanity, and of this century in particular, speaks for the latter alternative — if the workers are unable to take control of public affairs and keep it.

We, orthodox Marxists, maintain that the record of the international working class, and the achievements to date of the American workers, testify to their prospective capacities for abolishing the evils of class society and creating free and equal relations among men. If they cannot, no other power on earth can or will do so.

That is the issue at stake in our dispute with the anti-Marxists. It is no small matter.

"The age of complacency and apathy is ending," exults Mills. "We are beginning to move again." This is good news. But we have the right to know: what are we moving from, where are we going to, and how are we going to get there?

Marxism gives firm answers to these vital questions. Humanity is too slowly but surely moving from capitalism to socialism, from imperialism to independence, from the rule of the plutocrats and labor bureaucrats to the democratic rule of the working people, from war to peace, from foul reaction to unlimited progress. The indispensable means to these ends are scientific socialism as a theoretical guide and method, the revolutionary party as the political instrument, the working class as the prime agency of social transformation, backed by the peasants, and assisted by the intellectuals and all other victims of capitalist conditions.

These views are consistent and definite. The ideas of the New Lefts are hazy, ambiguous and misleading. "We are looking for the truth," they say. They will not attain it unless they introduce more consistency into their ideas, fill out the gaping holes in their positions — and follow through in practice. Without clear and precise revolutionary ideas neither intellectuals or workers can conduct the most effective struggle against the enemies of progress.

Text of "Secret" Moscow Letter

A confidential letter about the dispute with Mao, said to have been sent by Khrushchev to various Communist leaders, has aroused wide speculation

Isaac Deutscher, the well-known specialist in Soviet affairs, recently declared that a "new and momentous quarrel has broken between Russia and China, and Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev has been directing a hurricane fire of accusations against Mao Tse-tung." Deutscher based this conclusion on a purported confidential letter "sent out from Khrushchev's offices in Moscow to the headquarters of several foreign Communist parties."

Deutscher's article, published in the July 2 London *Times* and the July 5 *Washington Post*, led to wide speculation over the authenticity of the document and, should it prove to be genuine, what it might signify about relations between the two leading powers of the Soviet bloc.

For instance, Joseph Barry, Paris correspondent of the *New York Post*, said July 12: "If an anonymous document circulating confidentially among members of the French party actually comes from the Kremlin, then Soviet Russia's relations with Communist China are as crucial, if not critical, as they are with the U.S."

As to the authenticity of the document, Barry had only this to say: "The text of this extraordinary document has lately been published in a dissident French Communist periodical *La Voie Communiste*. The editors treat its authorship with more caution than Deutscher, simply stating in a foreword that it appeared as an anonymous pamphlet shortly before the recent national congress of the French Communist party and was passed from hand to hand among some of the delegates. However they do say it has all the typographical and stylistic earmarks of other such Soviet and Eastern European publications intended for confidential inner-party consumption."

I.F. Stone believes that it was written by the Kremlin and then "leaked" to the press. He writes in his *Weekly*, July 10: "The Russians have become as adept as ourselves in the technique of the calculated leak." Stone gives his impression of the real meaning of some of the key points, and then asks: "But why should we be dependent on leaks from Moscow to know what the Chinese are thinking?"

C. L. Sulzberger, European correspondent of the *New York Times*, tends to view the letter as a forgery. "One of the oddest cold war battlefronts is that

of the forgers who, sometimes for reasons of propaganda, sometimes for reasons of personal profit are unloading fake documents on a puzzled world," he writes in the July 19 *Times*. According to Sulzberger, the Central Intelligence Agency "has uncovered some thirty-two such false papers in which Communist psychological warriors sought to embarrass the United States by disseminating lies." On the other side, he continues, a regular "factory" for producing "phony documents was established in Paris by Russian refugees to embarrass the U.S.S.R. and enrich the authors."

As for the current letter, "The anti-Communist expert of 'Le Figaro,' Paris' distinguished morning journal labeled it a Yugoslav fabrication and the British suspect it as a phony."

Sulzberger himself ends up declaring that the document "may or may not be counterfeit."

Two features of the document probably account for the ambivalent attitude of the experts as to its authenticity: (1) The key programmatic differences discussed in the letter are well known to be in dispute between Moscow and Peking. Countless indications of this have been evident the past few years. (2) That Khrushchev would utilize a "confidential letter" of this kind to discuss the differences seems unlikely unless he deliberately intended to "leak" it to the press, as I.F. Stone surmises, as a preliminary step to bringing the undercover dispute into the open.

We have no way of verifying whether the text is authentic or a forgery, but we would like to make the following observations:

For the Ideological Unity of the World Communist Movement

I

A Conference of the representatives of the Communist and Workers parties, having met in Moscow in November, 1960, on the occasion of the commemoration of the forty-third anniversary of the great socialist October Revolution, the aforementioned conference of the eighty-one parties debated the great international problems of the hour.

At the close of its work, the conference adopted a declaration, affirming, before the peoples of the world, the

(1) The existence of a sharp ideological dispute between Peking and Moscow in no wise signifies a diplomatic break between the two countries or a rupture in their united front against the pressure of imperialism. The dispute itself can end up, under favorable circumstances, by considerably strengthening the unity of the two leading powers of the Soviet bloc.

(2) This favorable outcome would be facilitated if all the issues that have led to strained political relations were brought out frankly for public discussion among all the supporters and defenders of the system of planned economies. The value of handling disputes in this way was proved repeatedly in the days of Lenin and Trotsky when proletarian democracy was the norm.

(3) An open discussion of this kind would destroy the market for "cold war" forgeries that are designed to stir up bad relations among the Soviet countries. It is the atmosphere of rumors and speculations about differences that are known to exist which creates the market for the poison-pen artists. People read everything available in hope of getting more facts and learning what the true situation is. This murky atmosphere could be cleared away by the simple measure of giving truth the floor.

Since all the chancelleries of the world, and all the editorial writers of the big dailies have the text of the highly controversial document on their desks, we see no reason why socialists and all those interested in programmatic issues should not be able to read it too. We have therefore translated the text as published by *La Verite des Travailleurs*, a Paris Trotskyist newspaper.

unity of opinion of its participants on the questions examined.

It meant to give to its final Declaration the import of a program for the World Communist Movement, and proclaimed the unanimity of the representatives of the eighty-one parties represented, on this document.

The Declaration, reprinted in all languages, has been circulated by all the Communist and Workers parties, in the form of booklets, of special pages of their newspapers, of "supplements" to their ideological reviews, etc.

The leaders of all the Communist and Workers parties have widely popularized

the Declaration in all the bodies of their parties.

The national conferences or congresses which have been held or are going to be held, have placed and will place the Declaration of the Eighty-one at the center of their work.

They have all insisted and will insist on the fact that:

"To defend resolutely the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism, to allow no action capable of undermining this unity; these are the obligatory conditions for victory in the struggle for national independence, democracy and peace, for the success of the objectives of the socialist revolution, of the building of socialism and of communism. To transgress these principles would result in the weakening of the forces of communism."

In recognizing the leading role of the party which first opened the road to socialism, the Moscow Conference was naturally inspired, on all ideological problems and in particular on the respect for Leninist principles of organization, by the work and decisions of the historic Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, which marked a decisive stage in the development of the world communist movement.

In considering the unanimous vote of the delegates on the final resolution, we had the right to think that the militants who could still contest the correctness of certain resolutions of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union would find themselves to be merely in the minority.

For such a minority, the Leninist rules teach that there exist only two possible attitudes:

a) Submit to the democratic rule of the majority, and apply without reserve or reticence the decisions taken, after having tried to have its own point of view win out in the discussion;

b) violate the Leninist principles and betray the democratic rules by attempting, through factional procedures, to continue to propagate or defend its minority point of view, in spite of the condemnation of this point of view by the majority.

The Moscow Conference, which certainly spelled out, with the unanimous agreement of its participants, that "to transgress upon these principles would be to work toward the weakening of the forces of communism," nevertheless left the door open to further discussions. It did so in the following terms:

"In case of need, the workers and communist parties hold conferences in which they meet in order to examine current problems, to exchange their experiences and become aware of their respective opinions and positions, to reach a unanimous point of view through consultation, and to unify their actions in the struggle for their common goals.

"When, in one or another party, questions arise concerning the activity of a brother party, its leadership addresses itself directly to the leadership of the corresponding party; in case of need, meetings and consultations will take place."

Adopted by the unanimous vote of the representatives of Eighty-one Workers and Communist parties, who themselves were mandated democratically by the statutory bodies of their parties, this procedure consequently has the force of law for any communist who respects the principles of Marxism-Leninism and who cares about the progress and unity of the world communist movement.

Every leadership of a Workers or Communist party which ratified the vote of its own representatives at the Eighty-one party conference is bound to respect it and to apply its principles, if it respects the Leninist norms of party life.

We have the right to consider that any leadership which attempted to call into question the content of this Declaration, through clandestine and factional methods contradicting the process of consultations and reciprocal exchanges defined by the Declaration, would act counter to the interests of its own party and would injure the progress of the world communist movement.

Any attempt by the leadership of a Workers or Communist party secretly to propagate its disagreements with the Declaration, for which its own representatives had voted, within the ranks of a brother party, could be considered as meddling in the internal affairs of another party and as an attempt to undermine the ideological unity of the world communist movement. It would also be a categorical violation of Marxist-Leninist principles and a demonstration of hostility toward those parties which are faithful to the principles for which they voted without any secret reservations.

Any leadership of a Communist or Workers party which would respect, verbally, the terms and principles of the Declaration of the Eighty-one Communist and Workers parties, but at the same time would permit, in reality, the emissaries of the leadership of another brother party to propagate divergent theses in its ranks, would commit a hostile act towards the world communist movement and its duplicity would place it among the adversaries of the ideological unity of this movement.

Is such behavior possible on the part of the leadership of one of the parties represented at the Moscow Conference, after its representatives had voted, unanimously with the others, in favor of the terms of the final Declaration, in November 1960?

However regrettable be the observation, such behavior is not only possible, but it has become an actuality,

notably in the ranks of the French Communist party.

II

The differences expressed by the leadership of the Chinese Communist party against the theses of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, which nevertheless were approved by the near unanimity of the other Communist and Workers parties, are not spontaneously born.

They result from the deformations stemming from the very circumstances in which the Chinese Communist party was born and has developed.

In the period in which most of the other Communist parties were only engaged in activities where propaganda and agitation, political, parliamentary and trade union battles occupied the essential place, the Chinese Communist party was fighting a war, was an army, was developing in struggle a military strategy whose extensions were a precious contribution to the world communist movement, everywhere where arms had to speak.

When the people's power was installed in China, the principal fighters of the Chinese Communist party, cadres and militants, were soldiers and officers, accustomed to the life of encampments, to military discipline, to incessant displacements, and still influenced by the Long March.

The militants and subordinate cadres of this valiant Chinese Communist party did not receive from their leadership all the help which they had a right to expect from it to facilitate their transition from the prolonged state of war to peaceful construction, with the psychological evolution that this change of objectives and of forms of struggle imposed.

It is from this that was born a sectarianism that found nourishment in the fact that fascist elements, openly supported by American imperialism, continued to occupy a part of the Chinese territory (Formosa) under the dictatorship of the military chief of the crushed Chinese bourgeoisie, Chiang Kai-shek.

The Chinese Communist party did not know, as did the Communists of the USSR after the forced peace of Brest-Litovsk which robbed them of a part of their territory, how to classify problems in their order of real importance, and placed Formosa at the center of all its preoccupations, without concerning itself about the evolution of the international situation.

When the interest of the socialist forces of the entire world, and of the exploited peoples of the capitalist countries made a bold policy of peaceful co-existence with the countries hostile to socialism more necessary than ever, every Soviet initiative in the direction of cooperation was labeled by the leadership of the Chinese Communist party as a betrayal, as an agreement with the occupiers of Formosa, or as a sacri-

fice of the interests of People's China to those of the USSR.

The Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union has only crystallized a fundamental difference which existed since the taking of power by the Chinese Communist party.

The latter, although it had defeated the principal enemy, liberated the entire national soil except Formosa, and was entering into a period of peace and the construction of socialism, was already proposing military theses such as preventive war against the enemy menacing the socialist conquests.

In a speech which was circulated and studied as a fundamental theoretical document by all the Chinese Communist militants, comrade Mao Tse-tung, commemorating on the first of July, 1949, the twenty-eighth anniversary of the Chinese Communist party, by the use of beautiful but old Chinese tales, forecast preventive war.

To the comrades who insisted on the necessity for People's China to organize, despite fetters and obstacles, foreign trade with the capitalist countries, comrade Mao Tse-tung replied:

"It should be realized that no one except the imperialists and their lackeys, the reactionary clique of Chiang Kai-shek, prevents us from engaging in commercial activity with foreign countries, and entering into diplomatic relations with them. When we will have succeeded in mustering all the forces inside and outside the country to annihilate the Chinese and foreign reactionaries, then there will be commercial activity and it will be possible to establish diplomatic relations with foreign countries on a basis of equality, of reciprocal advantages and of mutual respect for territorial sovereignty."

It should be taken into account that in the three years preceding the establishment of the People's Republic in China, the People's Army of Liberation had crushed, in a pitiless war, five-million, five-hundred and ninety-thousand soldiers of the reactionary Kuomintang. One can understand that in 1949-50 the leadership of the Chinese Communist party had had to take into consideration the state of mind of its soldier-militants, still impregnated with these terrible years, and therefore had to maintain such positions. It is more difficult to excuse the fact that twelve years after the victory of the People's Army of Liberation, the positions have remained identical, while the evolution of the international situation, the supremacy of the Soviet Union in atomic energy, her superiority in the field of intercontinental missiles, her peaceful victories, had altered the fundamental realities.

What was an explainable deformation becomes a sectarian stubbornness; what was a simple difference of opinion becomes a rupture of the ideological unity of the socialist camp and of the world communist movement.

The surface occupied on the earth by

the Chinese People's Republic, the enormous reservoir of inhabitants that she contains, the considerable influence that her establishment as a People's nation has been able to exert and still exerts on the dependent or ex-dependent peoples, notably in the Middle-East and in Africa — all these factors have also given rise, in the minds of certain leaders of the Chinese Communist party, to feelings of superiority, inciting them to the demand to occupy a separate place, proportionate to the objective factors that we have cited, in the socialist camp and in the world communist movement.

Forgetting that the worth of a party is not measured only in the number of its members, and that the importance of any of the People's Democracies is not only the result of the number of its inhabitants, the leadership of the Chinese Communist party has conceived, without daring to express it in a categorical manner, a kind of project to divide world communism into two zones of influence, according to which the USSR would be responsible for or "the inspirer" of the policy of the socialist countries of the so-called Western lands and People's China of the socialist countries of the so-called Eastern lands.

This idea of a kind of "double leadership," of a revolutionary center for the Easterners and the Westerners, or, if we go to the end, for the whites and for the colored, because there is a slight trace of racism in any nationalist deviation, this idea did not contribute to the lessening of differences.

It is thus that after the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the USSR, and principally in the course of the last three years, profound disagreements have been expressed, which it became impossible to hide because the press of the Chinese Communist party took it upon itself to reveal them to world opinion.

The international bourgeois press did not deprive itself of the chance to make the most profitable use of these revelations, in the service of the politics that it is paid to defend.

No communist concerned with the triumph of world socialism can note these facts without deploring the attitude of the leadership of the Chinese Communist party.

III

In two texts that they had translated and printed in several languages and then sent to the leading organisms of the majority of Workers and Communist parties, requesting certain leaderships to diffuse them among their members, the members of the leadership of the Chinese Communist party underlined the principal divergences which separate them from the Communist party of the Soviet Union.

These texts: "Concerning Imperialism, Source of Modern War," and "Long Live Leninism," affirmed in particular:

a) Since the end of the second world war there has been no change of any

sort in the nature of imperialism. Consequently, the danger of war is as permanent as ever, and war is inevitable.

b) Coexistence can only be the result of a struggle. Consequently it is necessary to impose coexistence on the capitalist countries by fighting against their two interchangeable tactics: the tactic of war and the tactic of peace.

c) The struggle for peace and the struggle for socialism are two different struggles. Consequently the struggle for peace must be carried out together with non-communist forces through compromises, while the struggle for socialism belongs to revolutionary forces alone.

d) The "barbaric and cannibalistic" imperialisms arm themselves more and more in order to preserve the exploitation of their peoples and crush their attempts to struggle for liberation. Consequently we must guide and support just revolutionary wars as the sole path to the emancipation of the proletariat.

These documents, which have been reproduced by several bourgeois papers and particularly, in France, by *Le Monde*, which had drawn upon the theoretical organ of the Chinese Communist party, *The Red Flag*, systematically contradicted the theses worked out by the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, concerning:

a) The changes that have taken place in the nature of world imperialism

b) the growing possibilities for peaceful coexistence between socialist and capitalist countries

c) the march to socialism through broad regroupments of peoples for the maintenance of peace

d) the recognition that war is no longer inevitable

e) the possibility for certain Workers and Communist parties to lead the proletariat to power by peaceful means.

If these theses, attacked in such public fashion by the leadership of the Chinese Communist party, were merely the expression of the opinion of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, no one would have thought to complain of a divergence expressed according to the normal rules for the exchange of ideas among brother parties.

But the leadership of the Chinese Communist party made public its divergences, not merely with the theses of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, but also with the immense majority, the quasi-unanimity of Workers and Communist parties of the entire world who, since the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union and the common declaration of 1957, had approved these positions which result from a correct analysis of the international situation.

After the Conference of Moscow, in which the delegates of the Chinese Communist party, representing the leadership that comrade Mao Tse-tung, unlike the leaders of the other brother parties, had not judged it necessary to assume himself, voted for the resolution, the situation changed.

Repudiating the vote of their own delegates, repudiating sometimes their own vote when it was these delegates themselves who continued to express divergent views, the leadership of the Chinese Communist party passed over to a new form of struggle in defense of theses that had been condemned after a democratic discussion and vote.

As the lessons of all past deviations and rejections of democratic decisions made foreseeable, in order to persist in the advocacy of theses condemned by the quasi-unanimity of the world communist movement, the members of the leadership of the Chinese Communist party resorted to unfriendly, factional, and even hostile procedures.

They at first sought support from certain leaderships of brother parties subject to their influence through geographical proximity or natural affinities, in particular the Workers or Communist parties of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Korea, and Indonesia.

There was to be found in Europe a single party, the party most marked by the dogmatic deformations of the period of false Stalinist leadership, that would support the divergent views of the Communist party: the Albanian party.

The comrades of the leadership of the Communist party of People's Albania nevertheless do not have a situation comparable to that of China, nor do they have such a past of military combats. They entered into opposition to the Communist party of the Soviet Union for two reasons:

a) the frank criticism of the errors of Stalin

b) the attempted *rapprochement* with Tito which aimed at bringing the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia back into the socialist camp.

It is not necessary to bring into consideration the dimensions of Albania, its economic situation which makes it a dependency of the socialist camp, nor the conditions which differentiate it from People's China.

The leaders of the Albanian party, in a sort of act of defiance which involved no real risks for them, decided on the morrow of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union to reject the correct criticism that had been made of the activities of Joseph Stalin during a certain period of his life.

They showed what aims were concealed by these so-called political disagreements by continuing the cult, not only of Stalin, but also of Hoxha, by continuing the selection of the cadres of party and state not according to merit and experience but by ties of family, origin, or friendship with members of the leading circle. As the cult of personality has inevitable political consequences, they persecuted and even condemned meritorious militants who, basing themselves on the principles of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, dared

to express several criticisms in the regular assemblies of the party.

Renewing the methods of a period fortunately bygone, they did not hesitate to slap the label "Titoist spy" onto comrades who troubled them, while at the same time they themselves were multiplying their dispatch of spies into the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia and provoking incidents of steadily increasing gravity on the Albanian-Yugoslavian frontier.

By a great stretch, it might, in this context, appear understandable that the Albanian brother party, deceived by ill-aware leaders fearing a reduction in aid from the socialist countries that they mistrust, should have sought material and economic support from the Chinese People's Republic.

What is much less comprehensible is that a great party like the Chinese Communist party should have chosen such an "ally" in Europe and linked its cause to that of the leaders of the Albanian party, giving them a dangerous importance and espousing their excessive and dangerous quarrel with the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia.

Did the leadership of the Chinese Communist party limit itself to "blocking" with the very rare leaderships of Workers or Communist parties who, for one or another reason, decided to support it in its divergent views? No. It attempted to reach beyond the leaderships of brother parties who rejected its efforts to subvert them, and sought secretly to gain support in the ranks of these brother parties in order to distribute among them, despite their leaderships, its propaganda materials against the letter and the spirit of the Declaration of Eighty-one Workers and Communist parties.

IV

It is known that a certain number of members of the leadership of the French Communist party disapproved the report of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, presented by comrade Khrushchev to the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union.

Although many other leaders of neighboring Communist parties, like those of the Italian and British parties, accepted and discussed the report dealing with the grave and sometimes criminal errors, consequences in practise of the deformation of principle represented by the cult of his person, of Joseph Stalin, the leadership of the French Communist party — which had been informed like all the others — began by contesting the authenticity of this report, even when the newspaper *Le Monde* published a translation which no one could believe was a forgery.

The leadership of the French Communist party, incidentally, never termed the text published by *Le Monde* a "forgery" fabricated by the enemy, but saw to it that it was referred to only

as the "report attributed to comrade Khrushchev."

Parallel to this, comrades Maurice Thorez and Jacques Duclos, having convinced the other members of the Political Bureau of the French Communist party without having consulted beforehand with the members of the Central Committee, appealed to the Secretariat of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, requesting it to deny the authenticity of the document circulated by the bourgeois press, particularly by the newspaper *Le Monde*.

The leadership of the Communist party of the Soviet Union pointed out that an accurate text, which had been discussed by the Soviet militants and which the Central Committees of other Communist parties had also discussed without questioning its authenticity, could not be denounced as a forgery.

Faced with this refusal to deny the text, the Political Bureau of the French Communist party then turned to its Central Committee, pointing out to it that the circulation of the famous report on Stalin would do more harm than good, that it would, particularly, diminish the prestige and authority of the leadership of the French Communist party, and that since each member of the Central Committee had personally defended all the positions and actions of Stalin that were now condemned, there was a grave danger that the unity of the ranks of the party would be ruptured. They also invoked the weapons that oppositional militants in the party and adversaries would receive from the report on Stalin to be used against the Central Committee, and concluded that the report should be attenuated, even if it could not be formally contested.

After having accepted the communique of the Political Bureau which had, on June 18, 1956, denied that all the negative aspects of Soviet politics could have resulted from the cult of Stalin, the session of the Central Committee of the French Communist party on June 22 named a delegation composed of comrades Etienne Fajon, Waldeck Rochet, and Marcel Servin. It left Paris on June 25, with the mission of asking the Secretariat of the Communist party of the Soviet Union to help out those brother parties placed in difficulties by certain aspects of the report on Stalin.

Arguing from the proximity of its Fourteenth National Congress and from the needs of the struggle on the national scale, the delegation asked the Secretariat of the Communist party of the Soviet Union to draw up a document which would attenuate the report in question and, without contesting its authenticity, would assist the Central Committee of the French Communist party in its effort to maintain the unity of the ranks of the party.

On the Soviet side comrades N.S. Khrushchev, P.N. Pospelov, and B.N. Ponomarev took part in the discussions of June 28 and 30, 1956. At their close

a resolution was published which, in part, satisfied the request of the leadership of the French Communist party.

This document of the Secretariat of the Communist party of the Soviet Union was presented, in *L'Humanité* of July 3, 1956 and in various publications of the French Communist party, as "a resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU."

It was abundantly utilized in reports and articles in such a way as to justify the position of the leadership of the Communist party. In the leading circles of the party, where it was impossible to contest the other criminal aspects of the activity of Joseph Stalin during the last period of his life, it was decided to explain that this concerned only the Communist party of the Soviet Union and the peoples of the USSR, that it was an internal problem of the USSR whose external discussion could only be harmful to the other Communist parties and helpful to their anti-Soviet enemies.

Nevertheless, even in this attenuated document there remained enough criticisms of the past period that certain members of the leadership of the French Communist party conceived a rancor against the new leadership of the Communist party of the Soviet Union.

They tried to minimize the results obtained thanks to the righting of the situation of the Party, and notably, the profound repercussions of this courageous self-criticism among the Soviet people. The documents of the Communist party of the Soviet Union relating to the banishment of the cult of personality and the re-establishment of Leninist organizational principles were published parsimoniously and often tardily, although every declaration of Stalin had, previously, been rapidly and profusely circulated.

It is on these elements of the leadership of the French Communist party that the leaders of the Chinese Communist party decided to base themselves, in order to propagate their divergent views. It has become necessary to state that their maneuvers have all too often been facilitated.

A comparison between the articles published before 1953 and those subsequent to 1956 can allow us to become aware that, although it maintains its position of supporting and approving the initiatives and realizations of the Soviet Union and its Communist party, the leadership of the French Communist party shows a certain "moderation" and, sometimes, serious reservations.

On the pretext of preserving the unity of the ranks of the French Communist party, censorship has been exercised on documents and news reports, something that never took place during the lifetime of Stalin.

On the same pretext, the divergence of views between the Chinese Communist party and the Communist party of the Soviet Union, supported by the immense majority of the other Workers and Communist parties, was passed

over in silence and even disputed. It would nevertheless have been sufficient to reproduce several articles from the Chinese Communist press to convince all the French Communist militants, that in these differences the Chinese Communist leaders are not in the right.

In parallel fashion, the demonstrations tainted by anti-Sovietism that have taken place in People's Albania were passed over in silence.

This kind of neutrality in one direction could not have been considered a hostile stand, if it had not for some time been accompanied by factional activities. It is scarcely credible that these activities could have escaped the vigilance of the leadership of the French Communist party.

This fact is so much the more astonishing in that the elements on which the leadership of the Chinese Communist party through its emissaries, bases itself, or attempts to base itself, are generally hostile to the leadership of the French Communist party, particularly on its position concerning the role of the French Communist party in regard to the Algerian War.

Because there are incontestably a sizable number of militants who deplore a certain passivity shown by their leaders in regard to that war, it must be recognized that the attempts to constitute a sort of "Chinese faction" in the ranks of the French Communist party are a far greater danger to the ideological unity of that party than could be the denunciation of the errors of Stalin to the Soviet Communists.

V

After the sharpness of the accusations of opportunism and even of national chauvinism raised against the representatives of the French Communist party at the Moscow Conference of November 1960 by the representatives of the Chinese Communist party it might appear paradoxical that certain French communist leaders permit, without reacting against it, the development of a "Chinese faction" in their party.

Comrade Jeannette Vermeersch admitted, before a meeting of the cadres of the South-Seine Federation of the French Communist party, that the Chinese delegates had gone so far as to call the leaders of the French party "lackeys of imperialism." Can she be ignorant of the fact that documents, printed at Peking for the Foreign Language Publishing House, are circulating in that Federation?

Comrade Etienne Fajon admitted, before the cadres of the West-Seine Federation, that the representatives of the French Communist party had been charged with opportunism by the delegates of the Chinese party. Is he ignorant of the fact that factional meetings are being held at Courbevoise (Seine) to distribute Chinese documents and notably the booklet entitled "Long Live Leninism"?

Comrade Jacques Duclos, before the

militants of the Northeast-Seine Federation, referred to the singular alliance between the Chinese and Albanian leaders. Can he be ignorant of the fact that in March 25, 1961, at St.-Denis, the very active comrade . . . gave a lecture on the glories of the New Albania and the very considerable socialist successes that it is supposed to have achieved, and that this lecture was presided over by comrade Auguste Gillet, mayor of this important working-class municipality and member of the Central Financial Control Commission of the French Communist party?

Likewise, it appears scarcely credible that the leadership of the French Communist party should be unaware of the ties of certain employes of the Central Committee or of its press organs.

Comrade . . ., an editor of *New Democracy*, the monthly magazine of the French Communist party, had a perfect right to take a long study trip to People's China for that review, which published his very favorable impressions. But his trips to Berne, to the "consular" representatives of People's China installed in Switzerland, are less "public." Can they be ignored?

It is perfectly natural for the wife of comrade . . ., teacher and communist municipal councilor at A . . ., to study the Chinese language. But are the ties of this simple municipal councilor, this local officer of a teachers union, with important "chargés d'affaires" of People's China equally natural?

Is it by simple nostalgia for his past missions in Malaya, Indonesia, or Indochina that comrade . . ., called . . ., adds to his permanent responsibilities with the *Editions Sociales* those of liaison agent with representatives of the Chinese Communist party outside of the normal channels of the French Communist party?

How can it be that in analyzing the errors or fundamental deviations committed by the review *Economics and Politics* no one had the curiosity to inquire whether the trips to Berne of certain of its editors were without any relationship to the incriminated deviations?

Comrades . . . might rightfully wonder that no questions have ever been put to them, and so might that comrade who for the past several months benefiting from an exceptional quantity of advertising by firms of People's China, has felt no need to see the advertisers from the other Popular democracies in order to "vary" the back cover of *New Democracy* a bit.

It is not habitual for members of the French Communist party long to keep international relationships outside of the organs of the party and the party congress. Comrade . . . can be an exception, like comrade . . ., and no one is astonished, etc., etc.

If some of the leaders of the French Communist party have a tendency to reason along the same lines as the lead-

(Continued on page 99)

Chilean Trotskyists Defend the Cuban Revolution

No party that considers itself Marxist or revolutionary can evade the responsibility of categorically defining the character of the Cuban state. Our POR — which has given full support to the Cuban Revolution since Batista's downfall — has been debating for some time a theoretical problem which, in its elucidation, leads to important practical slogans of action: What is the character of the Cuban state? To all of us it is evident that *Cuba ceased being a capitalist state* after the expropriation of last October. What is essential now is to *specify* the content of the new type of state which has appeared.

We place emphasis on the word *specify* because various Marxist tendencies have characterized the Cuban state in various ways. For some it is a workers state *sui generis*, for others a transitional workers state, or workers state without qualification. We leave aside the bourgeois political currents that speak of a socialist or communist state with ulterior motives; our aim is to achieve a genuine materialist dialectical analysis.

We Trotskyists believe that *Cuba is a workers state* for the following reasons:

(1) Because more than eighty per cent of the country's basic means of production and exchange has been expropriated, without payment, from imperialism and the national capitalists, passing into the hands of the state, a step that corresponds objectively with the historic interests of the workers and peasants.

(2) Because the bourgeois-democratic tasks have now been carried out (expulsion of imperialism and enforcement of the agrarian reform) while at the same time the parallel undertaking of socialist tasks has fully begun (collective exploitation of the land, expropriation of factories, monopoly of domestic and foreign trade, a single state bank).

(3) Because in Cuba the planning of economy under socialist norms has now been initiated.

(4) Because the bourgeois state apparatus with all its superstructure has been destroyed. The army and police in the service of the bosses and imperialism in the capitalist pattern no longer exist; the courts of bourgeois justice have been liquidated and replaced by people's tribunals; the bourgeois parliament has disappeared; the educational system has undergone substantial transformation and the harmful propaganda of the Church is no longer brought to young minds. Everything indicates, in short, that the Revolution in its dynamics has taken the road to socialism in Cuba.

Here the question arises, what characteristics does this workers state have? We believe that the Cuban Workers State does not yet have the features of a classic workers state like Russia after the 1917 Revolution led by Lenin and Trotsky. In Cuba decisive elements of this classic workers state are still lacking: soviets or workers councils which

controlled and administered all the economic, social and political expressions of the nation. On the other hand, neither is Cuba a degenerated workers state such as Russia later became under the domination of the Stalinist bureaucracy. "Degenerated" implies that it was once well generated.

In Cuba on the downfall of Batista, a workers government based on soviets — as in the Russia of 1917 — was not inaugurated; instead a different process took place in which the capitalist state was liquidated without the establishment of workers organs of power or workers councils to administer the country's economy. Even the Technical Advisers Councils and commissions of production launched at the beginning of 1961 were not generated from below but designated from above and do not yet exercise the functions of workers councils administering the means of production and exchange on a national scale.

In view of these considerations, we believe that Cuba is a deformed workers state. A state that was born with deformations, fundamentally because of the absence of a revolutionary Marxist party. We earnestly hope that these will disappear through the energy and initiative of the heroic Cuban masses. However we must not let our hopes deceive us as to reality, still less bring us to practice tail-endism for fear of upsetting things, as is the case with some capitulationist currents. The best way to help the Cuban Revolution is not to close our eyes to its defects but to indicate them courageously in order to impede the advance of reaction and to find the socialist road to overcoming them.

To resort to analogies — always dangerous — we could say that the Cuba of today bears similitude in character to the deformed workers state which the Chinese Revolution acquired from the beginning. The parallel with the Yugoslav Revolution comes still closer. The difference is that in Cuba no caste or bureaucratic layer of any importance has yet developed. The comparison refers to workers states that have appeared with certain deformations from birth.

In the same way that we acknowledge some defects, we just as firmly characterize the government of Cuba as a *Workers and Peasants Government*. We make a distinction between the state and the government. The state is the nation in its totality and the government is the political leadership of this state. In accordance with the definition made by Trotsky of such governments, we recognize the government of Fidel Castro as a workers and peasants government. When Cuba comes to the administration of the economy through workers councils the time will have arrived to say that it has become a workers and peasants government based on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Cuba is the first workers state and the first workers and peasants government to be established in our Latin-American continent. This happening is of extraordinary importance in the process of the Latin-American revolution. We might say that the Cuban Revolution is promoting a situa-

This resolution on Cuba has been translated from the June issue (No. 57) of the Chilean newspaper *Frente Obrero*, official organ of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario. The POR belongs to the International Committee of the Fourth International. For our editorial comment on this resolution turn to page 87.

tion in Latin America similar to that touched off by the Chinese Revolution on the Asian continent during the fifties.

We Trotskyists, without the least hesitation, stand for the *unconditional support of the conquests of the Cuban workers state*. Just as we are for the defense of the socialist conquests of Russia, China, Yugoslavia, the People's Democracies, North Korea and Viet Nam, so we are also for the *defense of Cuba*.

We support the Cuban government, but critically. We support it in all its socialist measures and in its defense against imperialist invasion. But critically so long as workers councils have not been established and it has not differentiated itself from the foreign policies of Stalinism.

We believe that the best guarantee for the Cuban Revolution domestically is to proceed rapidly to the creation of workers councils which would administer the entire economic, social and political life of the country, which would have worker ministers from the CTC and peasant ministers from the INRA subject to election and recall by the ranks through standing trade-union plenary bodies serving as true worker parliaments. We believe that no leader should receive more pay than a skilled worker. And that the provincial and city governments should be placed in the hands of workers and peasants councils of the CTC and INRA.

One of the most serious dangers which the Cuban Revolution faces is the growing control being acquired by the CP. Its subordination to the Stalinist line of "peaceful co-existence" and its conception of socialism in one country can isolate the Cuban Revolution from the rest of the Latin-American peoples and initiate a dangerous process of bureaucratization. Indications of this are apparent in the corps of foreign experts brought to Cuba and in declarations of Cuban Communist leaders to the effect that other Latin-American countries are in no position to imitate Cuba and must follow a peaceful, parliamentary road. Thus every attempt to form Marxist revolutionary parties or to reorganize the July 26 Movement or the Directorio Revolucionario in a socialist direction must be supported in order to avoid political monopoly by the Cuban CP.

The Cuban Revolution poses new and important problems that enrich the theory of revolution. In Cuba, for the first time in history, a social revolution occurred without the intervention of a workers party. Not only without a Marxist revolutionary party but without the participation of even a Communist party. In the revolutions in China, Yugoslavia, etc., the CP, forced by exceptional circumstances, intervened, although deforming the process. But in Cuba not even this happened. The Revolution was made without a workers party, with a non-Marxist petty-bourgeois party, the July 26 Movement. This may "frighten" more than one bad Marxist who may see in the Cuban Revolution the negation of revolutionary theory. Stalinism faces the problem of endangering its prestige if it recognizes that the Cuban Revolution liquidated capitalism without the leadership of the CP. For us Trotskyists the Cuban Revolution does not invalidate the theory of the Permanent Revolution; on the contrary, it confirms and enriches it: First, because to carry out national liberation and the agrarian reform, the social revolution inevitably had to be carried out. Second, because reality has shown that under exceptional conditions, like those in Cuba, the destruction of capitalism can be achieved under non-Marxist leadership. This is the exception and not the rule. But it is one thing to take power and liquidate capitalism without a Marxist orientation; it is something else again to maintain power and construct a genuine socialist state in transition to communism without a revolutionary workers party. We believe that the latter is not possible, at least not without entailing the danger of falling into all sorts of deformations. Still more important, in undertaking socialist measures, the present government of Cuba found itself obliged to turn to the whole arsenal of Marxism, because there is no other theory of service in the march toward socialism. In short, without a revolutionary party there is no guaranty of reaching communism.

The experience of the urban reform constitutes an im-

portant contribution of the Cuban Revolution to the revolutionary program. The impact which this measure has made among the people obliges us to incorporate this slogan in our transitional program.

The Cuban Revolution in the same way has underscored the role of the peasantry in the Latin-American revolutionary process. This current, initiated with the massive participation of the peasantry in the Bolivian and Guatemalan revolutions acquired more exact definition in the Cuban Revolution. Here we saw with greater clarity that the revolution can proceed from the field to the city, and this phenomenon can be repeated in a series of Latin-American countries. This in no wise signifies denial of the decisive weight which the proletariat holds in deciding the final triumph of the revolution. Finally, the Cuban Revolution offers a major contribution in revolutionary military strategy — the possibility of developing guerrilla warfare in the Latin-American continent.

The Cuban Revolution has unquestionably opened a new stage in the class struggle. It has signified not only the breaking up of the inter-American system imposed by imperialism but has had impact in the United States itself, influencing the Negroes and Mexican workers who labor there. In our continent it has inspired a rise in the labor movement and has accelerated the crisis of leadership among the nationalist movements under bourgeois guidance.

These currents (Peronism, Varguism, Accion Democratica, APRA, etc.) which were supported by the masses following the second world war, clearly demonstrated the incapacity of the national bourgeoisie to carry the anti-imperialist struggle to its ultimate conclusion. The Cuban Revolution demonstrated to the hilt that national liberation and the agrarian reform can be achieved only through social revolution. It is false to propose to struggle first for national liberation and then after that is accomplished to begin the social revolution. To advocate a series of steps like a stairway means beyond dispute to turn away from the revolution and to initiate alliances with bourgeois sectors. The Revolution thus confirms the theory of the Permanent Revolution as applied and tested for the first time on Latin-American soil.

The most important conclusion — for those like us who wish to construct Marxist revolutionary parties on a mass scale — is that the Cuban Revolution, instead of strengthening the bourgeois nationalist movements, disintegrates them, for it frees new forces, frees class and revolutionary forces. It sets off processes of differentiation among the various centrist political formations. It has already occasioned a rupture in Accion Democratica and the formation of the MIR in Venezuela, a split in APRA and the founding of the Rebel APRA in Peru, creation of a powerful movement of Peasant Leagues in the north of Brazil, growing left wings in the Socialist parties, in the Bolivian MNR, in the movement that brought Velasco Ibarra to power (today headed by Araujo) in Ecuador, serious attempts to organize a new workers and peasants party in Mexico, frequent shifts among the Communist parties, etc.

In short, we believe that the vanguard of the workers and peasants and impoverished petty bourgeoisie is at present moving through class-struggle currents (at bottom strong revolutionary tendencies) from which it will emerge in the near future as the only layer capable of struggling effectively for national liberation and agrarian reform through social revolution. *These developing militant currents tend to form movements that break out of the molds of the old centrist formations, in the final analysis fostering revolutionary currents that want to carry things through once and for all "a la Cubana."* Today whoever believes that the vanguard will again pass through the experience of bourgeois movements like Peronism, Varguism, etc., is condemned to be a mere spectator of Latin-American revolutionary events. Still worse, anyone who hopes to vindicate the strategy of the ancient theory of national liberation is actually converted into a conscious traitor to the Latin-American Revolution.

The new forces liberated by the impact of the Cuban

Revolution paved the way for regroupment of various revolutionary groups, of independent militant sectors and of left tendencies while splits occur among the centrist formations mentioned above. The task of the Trotskyists, consequently, is to encourage and to develop all these militant and intuitively revolutionary currents, at the same time backing every anti-imperialist mobilization.

The current and future class-struggle situation in the continent offers wide openings for a broad campaign in favor of the unity of the peoples through Socialist Workers States of Latin America as a way of continuously concretizing this slogan.

The POR calls for vigorous struggle in Chile in defense of the Cuban Revolution. A united front should be constituted at once among the currents that stand for *nonintervention, for the self-determination of peoples*. The Com-

mittee for Solidarity with and Defense of the Cuban Revolution should take the initiative and ask its affiliated organizations to form rank-and-file committees and brigades to defend their Cuban brothers. The CUT and its affiliated unions should draw a balance sheet on the *general strike* in support of Cuba in order to determine timely measures in the event of another imperialist attack on the Pearl of the Antilles. On the Latin-American level, an early *Latin-American Trade Union Congress* is urgently needed. The POR similarly suggests as a concrete measure the organization of a *Latin-American Conference of all the political currents that support the Cuban Revolution* in order to work out a broad political anti-imperialist united front throughout Latin America and take the necessary measures to accelerate the revolution in each country as the only way to really defend the glorious Cuban Revolution.

Editorial Comment . .

The Cuban Revolution has proved to be of consummate interest to the radical movement throughout the world. Partly this is due to the heroic and dramatic way in which the tiny island republic has met the relentless economic, diplomatic and military efforts of the United States, the most formidable power on earth, to smash the new government and uproot its achievements. But it is also due to the fact that this revolution is sensed to be of extraordinary import. Its freshness and spontaneity bespeak a new generation and new forces on the march and a great new chapter in history. Indeed it takes but little study to come to the realization that one of the greatest social upheavals mankind is destined to face — the continental-scale Latin-American revolution — has already begun. Cuba is the opening scene.

To defend the Cuban revolution is to defend the beginning of the Latin-American revolution. This implies at once that the foremost means of defense is to foster extension of what has been begun in Cuba; that is, to assure the normal development of this new economic and social order so that its immediate benefits and the great perspectives it opens become available to all the peoples of Latin America and, for that matter, the entire hemisphere. From this point of view, Cuba appears as an example demanding the closest attention and study. To thoroughgoing revolutionists, of course, analysis is part of the process of determining in principle what attitude to take on all the key questions.

Thus the immensely practical task of defending the Cuban revolution insistently points to theory, for the lessons that can be drawn from the Cuban experience receive due weight, appreciation and correct political application only if they are tied in with the main body of revolutionary theory, the great arsenal of generalized experience assembled over the years by countless fighters and some of humanity's most lucid minds.

Despite the apparent simplicity of its actions, the Cuban revolution presents some unusually knotty theoretical problems. These have given rise to a variety

of proposed solutions and many nuances of opinion. Some of these, of course, reflect inadequacies among the theoreticians. Aside from this, however, the Cuban revolution does present genuinely new developments that are not easily assessed.

The Cuban leaders themselves have made no major contributions as yet to the theory of their own revolution. They have firmly maintained that they are primarily practical men of action who have much to learn about theory. This is a responsible attitude that actually reveals respect for theory. It is evident that the best of them, although already familiar with Marxist views like every cultured person in the world of today, are renewing their acquaintance with the writings of such figures as Lenin, now bringing to their studies rich experiences gained in the school of revolution itself. Eventually we can expect important contributions from them

as part of the collective efforts at a rounded Marxist theoretical appreciation of the Cuban revolution.

Among the various Trotskyist currents in the world, the Cuban revolution has brought jubilation, primarily for what it has revealed about the decay of imperialism and the strength of the revolutionary-socialist potential, but also for its fresh validation of the theory of the Permanent Revolution. The main course of the Cuban revolution was projected by Trotsky as early as 1905!

The Latin-American Trotskyists especially have reason to rejoice over the Cuban revolution. Indicative of their reaction is the resolution of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario of Chile printed above. As can be seen, they are unqualified supporters of Cuba as an example for other Latin-American countries.

Their study of the Cuban events has led them to stress the importance of the



peasantry as a revolutionary ally of the proletariat, the organization of guerrilla action and the interlinking of the slogans of agrarian and urban reform. Of special interest is the assessment they make of the impact of the Cuban revolution on the various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalist movements in Latin America and the encouraging possibilities now opening for the regroupment of revolutionary-minded fighters.

We agree with the main conclusion of the resolution that Cuba became a workers state with the overturn of capitalist property relations in the key sectors of the economy in August-October 1960. However, we have differences with various formulations and positions, some of which are important enough, we think, to specify.

For instance, we think that the use of "deformed" to indicate the kind of workers state is not a happy choice. The adjective was first used in connection with the extension of Soviet property relations to Eastern Europe and then applied to Yugoslavia and China. The qualification was never completely satisfactory, particularly in the cases of Yugoslavia and China where powerful independent revolutions occurred, but it did serve to indicate that the leadership had been schooled in Stalinism and that it fostered the growth of a privileged bureaucratic layer from the very beginning, not to speak of its predilection for bureaucratic political practices.

In Cuba the revolution bypassed Stalinism, bringing to power a much more revolutionary-minded leadership which, whatever its mistakes, has demonstrated its capacity to develop in the revolutionary-socialist direction in the very process of revolution. The inclinations of this leadership are clearly democratic, not antidemocratic. To call Cuba a "deformed" workers state implies the imposition of a systematized bureaucratic structure not much different from that which would occur under a Stalinist leadership. But this has not occurred and it remains to be seen whether it will. The final outcome will depend on world forces not under the control of the Cuban leaders. In the struggle to prevent the bureaucratization of the Cuban revolution, it appears to us that the Castro leadership stands on the side of proletarian democracy. It would seem more accurate, if somewhat clumsier, to use a descriptive phrase such as that employed by the Socialist Workers party, a workers state "lacking as yet the forms of democratic proletarian rule." The content of this phrase, we think, comes close to the meaning which the POR invests in the word "deformed." It has the advantage of indicating that the question is still open.

The possibility that the Cuban Popular Socialist party (Communist party) can take over the revolution and thereby bureaucratize it seems to us over-

estimated. We recognize that some of the old-time Communist leaders do represent a certain danger, since in accordance with their school they are inclined to abuse government posts and utilize them for factional advantage, not hesitating at the worst bureaucratic practices. The material aid from the Soviet countries on which Cuba is, for the time being, completely dependent gives such figures undue weight. It is even possible that the Castro leadership as a whole, out of gratitude to the Soviet Union or what they conceive to be political necessity, may make unwarranted concessions in this direction.

However, the main fact in the Cuban revolution is still operative — in toppling Batista, it bypassed Stalinism. The men who led the revolution to victory are not Stalinists but revolutionists dedicated to the highest of emancipating goals. They are the figures revered by the Cuban masses and rightly so. The Stalinist current by itself cannot alter this even if it were foolhardy enough to attempt it.

In addition, the Communist party is subject to revolutionary pressures. No matter how case-hardened some of its leaders prove to be, the rank and file are certainly responsive to the course taken by the Cuban revolution and to the guidance provided by the main leaders of that revolution. The inclination to break from the Stalinist heritage, already set in motion by such events as Khrushchev's revelations at the Twentieth Congress has been greatly reinforced by everything that has happened in Cuba.

As for the experts from the Soviet countries, they are certainly to be welcomed. Their skills as a whole constitute a necessary part of the material aid. This is not a one-way process, it should be noted. The delegations of Cubans sent to the Soviet countries are imbued with revolutionary fervor. The big receptions given these delegations are a measure of their great popularity among the Soviet masses and an indication of the completely favorable repercussions the Cuban revolution has had among all the Soviet bloc countries.

The fear of Stalinism, which certainly has historic justification, leads the POR to advocate strengthening the July 26 Movement and the Directorio Revolucionario as counterweights to the Communist party. To us it seems that the larger problem is to organize a mass revolutionary-socialist party to strengthen the political defense of the revolution. But this requires the subordination of factional differences.

The appearance of a mass revolutionary-socialist party in Cuba would obviously be a most favorable development. In correspondence with the norms of democratic centralism, every tendency should be included with full right to participate in the internal life of the party. If the rights of all tendencies are respected, on what valid grounds could

the present Communist party be excluded?

As for the Cuban Trotskyists, we would take it for granted that they would hail such a development and participate in it as completely loyal party builders.

The Castro leadership would naturally be elected to head the party. They have demonstrated their fitness and capacity to such a degree that we think every Cuban revolutionist would give them a vote of confidence. Their taking the initiative to form a mass revolutionary-socialist party would in itself constitute fresh evidence of their ability to lead the Cuban revolution.

From what has been said, it should be obvious that our inclination is to be much less critical of the Castro government than the POR. We think that the top leaders have done pretty well, most remarkable of all being the way they have evolved from their original petty-bourgeois positions toward socialism. This has become a historic example that Marxists can utilize from now on. In Cuba it was proved that a petty-bourgeois position, even with the most honest and sincere intentions, is not enough — if you are genuinely concerned about the welfare of the people and the fate of the nation it is necessary to go beyond bourgeois democracy to socialism!

Workers councils have not yet been set up, it is true. We agree with the POR that their appearance would bring the Cuban revolution into close similarity with the Russian revolution as it existed in the days of Lenin and Trotsky. That this would enormously facilitate the defense of the Cuban revolution is obvious and we would very much like to see it occur. But we think — and in this we may have a disagreement with the POR — that Cuba is evolving in this direction.

We are not inclined to specify the exact form which we think proletarian democracy should take in Cuba. First of all, this is a question for the Cubans to decide. Secondly, with all the ingenuity they have displayed up to this point, they may well come up with new forms. We await with the keenest interest the working out of the socialist constitution to which Fidel Castro has referred in public speeches.

The workers councils which appeared for the first time in the 1905 Revolution in Russia under Trotsky's leadership were unforeseen, let us recall. They were a product of the revolution itself. The Cuban revolution which has given us so much that is new may also give us something new here too.

We should like to close by expressing our solidarity with the Latin-American Trotskyists. The Cuban revolution has opened up great new perspectives for them. As the first point on the agenda, we are completely united with them in doing everything in our power to defend the Cuban revolution, this magnificent opening of the mighty Latin-American revolution.

The World Struggle for Socialism

(Resolution Adopted by the Socialist Workers Party National Convention, June 1961)

The most pressing task facing humanity is to emerge from the anarchy of capitalism to the planned order of socialism, completing the process begun with the 1917 Russian Revolution. The overhead cost of delaying this task for four decades has included depressions, cultural stagnation, fascism and slaughters on a global scale. To these has now been added the hazard of a war of nuclear destruction which could wipe out all the higher forms of life.

The working masses in various parts of the world, under the impulse of intolerable pressures, have repeatedly initiated struggles pointing in the socialist direction. These have resulted in the conquest of state power in a number of countries and in the establishment of powerful working-class organizations in others. What has prevented a decisive victory over international capitalism has been inadequate and even false leadership. The need to construct a leadership commensurate to the world-historical task, the keynote of the founding document of the Fourth International in 1938, has gained in acuteness in the succeeding twenty-three years.

The central feature of such a leadership is understanding of the profundity of the issues at stake and the most resolute determination to bring them to a favorable outcome. An additional requisite, which at certain points can prove decisive, is accurate judgment in the field of tactics and strategy. This involves more than gifted insight. Tactics and strategy must be based on objective conditions; that is, changes in the ebb and flow of the class struggle which are summed up in the relative

strengths of the socialist revolution and the capitalist counterrevolution.

I

Four Major Stages

Since the turn of the century, the struggle for socialism has passed through four major stages:

(a) **1900-1917.** A preparatory period that witnessed the development and testing of the theory of permanent revolution, which opened to view the actual pattern of the world socialist revolution, and the role of the revolutionary party, which offers the proletariat the most effective political weapon. High peaks in the class struggle were the 1905 Revolution in Russia, 1910 Revolution in Mexico, and 1911 Revolution in China. These initiated the epoch of proletarian uprisings, agrarian revolt and nationalist anticolonial rebellions in which we now live. The appearance of workers councils in the 1905 Revolution demonstrated that the inherent tendency of socialist revolution is toward the deepening and expansion of democracy on a new class basis and new correlation of social forces.

(b) **1917-1923.** The first big breakthrough. The triumph of the October 1917 Revolution and the consolidation of the Soviet Republic marked the beginning of the end for capitalism. Of the many great lessons, the most significant was the demonstration of the importance of revolutionary leadership. As against the victory of the Russian Revolution under Lenin and Trotsky, defeats occurred in the rest of Europe. The Social Democracy was thrust into power by the 1918 Revolution in Germany; but its leaders rejected the mandate to

take the road to socialism and instead helped re-stabilize capitalism. They betrayed the interests of the world working class. The task of reconstructing a leadership capable of profiting from the experiences of 1900-1918 was begun by the Bolsheviks with the organization of the Third International in 1919. However, the breathing spell given by the Social-Democratic betrayal enabled world capitalism to recover sufficiently to isolate the Russian revolution and prevent its extension for a time.

(c) **1923-1943.** The prolonged isolation of the Russian revolution led to its degeneration, the Stalinization of the Communist parties and the dissolution of the Third International in 1943. Uninterrupted major defeats of the workers movements promoted the spread of reaction, especially in its malignant fascist form in Europe. The defeats in Great Britain in 1926; China, 1927; Germany, 1933; Austria, 1934; Spain, 1937; France, 1938; culminated in the launching of the second world war and the attempt by German imperialism to crush the first workers state.

(d) **1943-1961.** The new revival of the international revolution, a period still continuing. The Soviet victory at Stalingrad in 1943 marked the turning point which led to the defeat of German imperialism, an event of immense significance. The Yugoslav Revolution, leading to the rupture with Stalin in 1948, signaled the end for Stalinism. The downfall of Mussolini in 1943 and the reentry of the Italian proletariat on the political arena marked the revival of revolutionary forces in Western Europe. This promising beginning was set

back by betrayals in Greece, Italy, France and Belgium which saved capitalist rule in Western Europe in the face of a mighty upsurge of the colonial revolution in India, Indochina and Indonesia. The postwar overturn of capitalist property relations throughout Eastern Europe, made possible by the Soviet advance to Berlin, broke the wall which imperialism had erected around the Russian revolution. The victory of the Chinese Revolution in 1949, coupled with the setback of American imperialism in Korea in 1952, definitively altered the world relation of forces in favor of socialism. This was followed by the sweep of colonial rebellion throughout the Middle East and Africa. A new point was reached in Latin America with the victory of the Cuban Revolution and the subsequent establishment of the first workers state in the Western Hemisphere. Workers and students demonstrations in Japan in 1960 and the Belgian general strike as the year closed indicated renewal of proletarian struggle in the imperialist countries.

II

Three Sectors of the World

Where do we stand today? What is the present relation of forces? What are the greatest deterrents to the further progress of the socialist revolution? What has to be done to overcome them?

From the standpoint of socio-economic and political development, the contemporary world is divided into three distinct spheres: the imperialist strongholds, embracing the highly industrialized countries from Japan to West Germany under the leadership of the main capitalist power, the United States; the workers states from East Germany to China where the leadership of the Soviet Union still holds, more or less, on all the main questions; and the colonial countries extending from Asia through Africa to Latin America.

In these main sectors, the levels of development and therewith the principal immediate tasks of the revolutionary forces vary considerably.

The peoples of the Soviet zone have passed beyond capitalism but remain dominated by privileged, uncontrolled bureaucracies formed in

the Stalinist school. The central task facing these peoples is to develop their economies and culture, end bureaucratic rule and establish the equalitarian social relations and democratic rule and establish the equalitarian social relations and democratic political structure of a healthy workers state. Planned economy has proved its superiority over capitalist anarchy beyond all dispute so far as the bulk of mankind is concerned. The re-institution of the proletarian democratic forms fostered under Lenin and Trotsky would enable economic planning to reveal enormously greater powers in each country and would facilitate harmonious co-ordination of the economies of all the workers states. By ending the dictatorial rule of the bureaucratic caste and giving the world a new example of proletarian democracy in action, the workers would add immeasurably to the defensive strength of their states and encourage the rest of the world to hasten in transcending capitalism.

In colonial countries still stagnating in precapitalist, meagerly developed, or lopsided capitalist conditions, the principal task is to throw off the political and economic chains of the foreign imperialists and indigenous oligarchies and set up workers and peasants governments. These can carry through the long overdue tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution (agrarian reform, national unification and sovereignty, democratization of the armed forces, elimination of illiteracy, more advantageous relations with the world market, etc.) while moving forward, as far and as fast as circumstances permit, to end capitalist relations, change the state structure and grapple with the problems of the transition to socialism (industrialization, economic planning, etc.) as in China and Cuba.

The workers in the imperialist countries have to end the rule of monopoly capitalism, take over the means of production, create democratic workers regimes which will eliminate the threat of nuclear destruction, plan the national economies in collaboration with other countries, and move toward a socialist federation that will enable all mankind in short order to unite its

productive forces in a planned economic community of nations.

III

Interacting Processes

The strategic necessity of the world revolution at its present juncture is to combine into one mighty movement these three titanic historical processes: the anticapitalist struggles of the workers in the highly industrialized imperialist centers, the anti-imperialist movements of the colonial peoples, and the antibureaucratic movements of workers, peasants and intellectuals in the Soviet countries.

These three processes unfold at extremely irregular rates. While one leaps ahead, the others hold back or fail to mesh into the momentum of the pacemaker. A most graphic example of this uneven development is the fact that the Cuban workers and peasants moved ahead to establish a workers state ninety miles from Florida while the American workers have not yet broken from the Democratic machine to organize their own mass political party.

But at all times the three processes interact upon one another promoting or retarding each other's further development. For example, the extension of the Soviet zone into Eastern Europe and the victory of the Chinese Revolution, which smashed the isolation of the Soviet Union on two borders, had among their effects a great increase in the self-confidence of the Soviet masses. Demands for immediate improvements in living conditions compelled the bureaucrats to make significant concessions. The post-Stalin "thaw" in turn stimulated the East German, Polish and Hungarian uprisings against the tyrannical practices of the Kremlin's agents.

The contradictory conditions in the Soviet sector exert contradictory influences upon the masses in the other two sectors. Among the colonial peoples, the Soviet and Chinese successes appear as models which they too can achieve. Moscow and Peking thus serve as sources of support and powerful inspiration. In the West, on the other hand, the crimes of Stalinism and its totalitarian practices depress and discourage the workers, slowing them in settling accounts

with their own capitalists for fear of falling into worse evils. The political apathy of the workers in the West, in turn, gives the imperialists a freer hand in waging cold war, thus dampening the struggle of the workers in the Soviet zone for proletarian democracy.

In both the West and the colonial areas, Stalinism, operating through the intervention and influence of the Communist parties, plays a direct role in holding back the progress of the international revolution. In the United States, for example, the Communist party has buried its members in the Democratic party where they serve as doorbell-ringers for figures of the Stevenson stripe. It has consistently abstained from political action that would injure the Democratic party and has opposed socialist candidates. In Cuba the powerful Communist party even went so far as to support Batista. It opposed the revolutionaries of the July 26 Movement in their struggle for power, and the Cuban Revolution succeeded only because the Cuban peasants and workers finally bypassed the Communist party. The role of Stalinism is glaringly clear in the contrast between Cuba and Italy. If a handful of students around Fidel Castro were able to lead a mass struggle to power through sheer energy, self-sacrifice and devotion to the principle of militant struggle, what couldn't the Italian Communist party, with its millions of members, accomplish by displaying one-tenth the revolutionary determination of the Cubans?

The nationalist movements have similar contradictory effects. They have won big concessions from imperialism and helped inspire progressive struggles in the imperialist centers, as we see, for instance, among the Negro people in the United States. By their anti-imperialist tendencies, which threaten to unleash uncontrollable revolutionary forces, they have compelled support from Moscow and Peking. This has aided the struggle for freedom; but the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalists by their opposition to proletarian democratic tendencies have also strengthened the antidemocratic ruling castes in the Soviet Union and China. While these movements have

been able to win national sovereignty in a number of countries, they have sown fresh illusions in the imperialist-dominated United Nations as an instrument of peace. The disaster to which such illusions can lead is shown in the tragic case of Patrice Lumumba. In general, the nationalist movements, in breaking out of imperialist political bondage, have sought to confine the struggle for freedom to narrow bourgeois channels, blocking the thoroughgoing measures required to lift the colonial areas out of their centuries-old stagnation at the maximum possible rate. Nevertheless, under mass revolutionary pressure, particularly in combination with imperialist attack, some of these movements can take extremely radical steps. This has been shown in Mexico, Bolivia, Egypt, Algeria and other places. In Cuba, American imperialism became involved in a process of blows and counterblows that ended not only with the nationalization of American capitalist holdings but Cuban as well.

IV

The Main Determinants

The current world situation is determined by four major factors: the decline of the imperialist camp; the growing strength of the Soviet bloc; the irresistible spread of the colonial revolution; and, last but by no means least, the relative immobility of the labor movement in the centers of imperialism.

On net balance the struggle on a world scale since World War II has been proceeding in favor of the workers and their allies. They have been gaining ground and making headway at the expense of the imperialists. The relation of forces remains advantageous to their cause.

This is most dramatically demonstrated in the loss of prestige and power suffered since 1945 by the mightiest member of the imperialist coalition. After the defeat of the Axis powers, U.S. imperialism emerged paramount in economic, military and diplomatic strength. To most people, it appeared then that the U.S. would retain this pre-eminent place unchallenged for an indefinite period. Some Wall Street propagandists boasted of a Pax Americana that would endure like the Roman empire for a thousand years.

Fifteen years later, however, its pretensions to economic, political and moral supervision of the world are being questioned from Korea to Cuba.

This decline in the relative power of U.S. imperialism has been accompanied, and in part produced, by the growing ascendancy of the Soviet bloc. This has been manifested in many domains. The economic superiority of the U.S. is being overcome, more rapidly than expected, by the progress of planned economy in the workers states. The rate of economic growth in the Soviet Union not only remains higher than that of the U.S., but the internal contradictions of the capitalist system have prevented American economy from even running at full capacity (production is currently around only seventy-five per cent) while cyclical "recessions" and automation have steadily swelled the army of permanently unemployed workers. In the military field, the Soviet Union rapidly cancelled the American lead in production of nuclear weapons and is now years ahead in rocket and missile capacity. In education, the Soviet Union leads the world by far in production of engineers, doctors, physicists, chemists, mathematicians, etc. It is thus rapidly moving into position to take the world lead in basic research and discoveries in these fields. In the diplomatic arena, since the death of Stalin, the Soviet Union has displayed growing boldness and flexibility, scoring gains among the "neutral" countries through aid programs and through exposures of Washington's aggressive policies. The diplomatic hegemony of the U.S. is being contested even in Latin America, long regarded by Wall Street as a closed preserve.

However, the decisive contest against capitalism and for socialism will not take place between these rival blocs of state powers. The differences between the capitalist and workers states are of great importance and can easily appear paramount in the cold war. Nevertheless they are only components of a far greater and more explosive struggle — the economic, social and political contest on a world scale between the upholders of the old order and the billions of people who stand to gain through socialism. It is in this international class struggle that the fate

of mankind will be finally determined — whether we are to plunge into the abyss of atomic war or open up the new civilization of world-wide socialism. In this arena the situation is highly complex and the outcome not yet certain.

The abolition of capitalism all the way from Eastern Europe to China and the growing strength of the planned economies have forced imperialism to retreat and repeatedly postpone a decisive showdown in war. Even more, the advances of the colonial revolution, which since the Chinese Revolution has spread steadily from East Asia into the Middle East on to Africa and has even leaped the Atlantic to Cuba, have further weakened the grip of the imperialist system, strengthened the anticapitalist camp and heightened the self-confidence of the oppressed masses in the industrially underdeveloped countries.

But these successes have not been matched in the imperialist centers. There the picture has been and remains quite different. Instead of moving in unison with their allies elsewhere in the world, the workers have been inert in the main. This immobility was generated by the betrayals of the Communist and Social-Democratic leaders at the end of the war and fostered by the prolonged boom and absence of an effective alternative leadership which has yet to be created.

In Great Britain, for example, the Labour party won power in 1945. But instead of establishing socialist institutions in the world's first capitalist country, Attlee, Bevin and the rest, while granting considerable concessions to the workers, utilized office to shore up capitalism and give it a new lease on life. Instead of opening up a great new socialist advance for all of humanity, the Labour party officialdom made possible the conversion of Britain into a military beachhead for American imperialism in its projected war against the Soviet Union. This betrayal of their socialist aspirations had a depressing effect on the British workers from which they have not yet recovered. In the United States the greatest strike wave in the history of the country occurred at the close of the war. The labor officials succeeded in

containing the movement within narrow channels. This, in conjunction with their constant blocking of all rank-and-file initiative toward formation of a labor party and their servile role in the Democratic party machine, helped pave the way for McCarthyism. The witch-hunt atmosphere and erosion of democracy in the fifties, coupled with the prolonged prosperity, greatly blunted the class struggle in the United States, making it possible for imperialism to carry on with relative impunity a policy of the most dangerous "brinkmanship" in foreign affairs.

The confinement of revolutionary advances to the less developed parts of the world, together with the pronounced political lag in the West, has set its stamp upon our entire period. This negative feature, the most important element in the current reality, involves the citadels of imperialist power as well as the proletarian forces that must be mobilized to take them. The key to the world situation is here. Not until the workers in the industrially advanced countries dominate the political arena with all their mighty social weight will the struggle for socialism be won.

The chief problem is how to loosen the deadlock, break the stalemate, by overcoming the passivity of the workers in this decisive sector of the international class struggle. Until this is done, there can be no decisive change, no qualitative transformation in the world-wide relation of forces, no great new period of historical advancement opened up, no scoring of an irreversible victory for socialism, no guarantee that atomic war will not convert our planet into a radioactive desert.

V

The Accumulation of Forces

Objective forces are accumulating for a major breakthrough in the class struggle in the West. Some run deep below the surface without drawing much public attention; others make spectacular headlines. As they gather, they can coalesce at a certain point and set off the chain reaction unleashing the pent-up energy of the industrial workers in the great industrial and metropolitan centers.

The most basic force is the economic decline of capitalism. The pros-

perity that has instilled passivity in the workers is not normal. Much of it has been based on repairing the damage of World War II, on shoring up reactionary regimes and battered or decrepit capitalist sectors, and on preparing for World War III. An economy that must depend on such means to assure jobs, including production of nuclear weapons, intercontinental missiles, poison gases and deadly bacteria, is basically unhealthy. The workers, deep down, sense this and are uneasy over it. Despite the long prosperity, the working class still feels economically insecure. Unemployment, both the acute kind due to cutbacks and the chronic kind due to automation, involves more and more workers. Inflation continually undermines wage gains so that it becomes an unending battle simply to maintain living standards. A comparable situation exists in regard to working conditions. To this add the hazards of sickness and old age, especially in a country like the United States which, for all its wealth, has notoriously inadequate social benefits. How such slowly accumulating economic pressures can lead to an explosive situation was graphically illustrated in the case of Belgium at the end of 1960 when a proposed capitalist program of increased austerity for the working class touched off a strike wave of such extent and intensity that it shook the government.

In the United States, where no labor party exists, the working class finds that its economic interests tend more and more toward decision, in important issues, on the political arena where it lacks its own representatives and defenders. This constantly raises the question of independent political action. The struggle of minority groups for economic and social equality likewise tends to take a political direction and to ally itself with the labor movement. Once the impulsion toward formation of a labor party takes hold, as it already has across the border in Canada, it can develop at extraordinary tempo and go very far. In Britain, where a powerful labor party exists, the absence of independent policies and the lack of militancy in fighting for the economic and social interests of the working class foster radicalization of

the party, tending to push the left-wing tendencies to the fore. The same holds for the mass Communist and Social-Democratic parties of Western Europe.

The upheavals in the colonial world have a direct economic effect on the imperialist centers. The flow of super profits is slowed down, the lucrative foreign holdings are placed under national control and even nationalized. This not only weakens the monopolists but narrows their field of safe investment and increases the tendency of the old capitalist powers to choke on the surfeit of accumulated capital. New dislocations are thus added to the contradictions capitalism faces at home.

The unending succession of revolts also has a cumulative psychological effect on the working class in the imperialist centers. The incessant cry that it is all due to "communist conspiracies" loses plausibility. The suspicion grows that the imperialist propagandists are lying and that whatever the truth may be about "communism," there must be good reason for people in the colonial areas to feel and act the way they obviously do.

In addition, the action of the masses in the colonial countries sets example after example of militancy. This begins to sink in. It is reinforced by exposure and ridicule of imperialism, by explosions of revulsion like the stoning of Nixon, and by direct appeals for sympathy and support that touch the deepest chords of human solidarity among the workers. The truth begins to cut its way into popular consciousness.

This altered relation between the colonies and the imperialist centers is one of the prominent features of the "new reality." The sharpest reversal occurred in the case of Japan. The colonial area in which she was most deeply entrenched — North China — not only won its freedom, it became a component of a planned economy. An American who has felt the impact of tiny Cuba's rebellion on the United States has a basis for visualizing how developments in huge China reverberate in neighboring Japan.

In Europe, imperialist France has been hammered by unending colonial rebellions since the end of World

War II. The stubborn heroism of the Indochinese and Algerians has not been lost on the French workers. The climate in France, despite the seeming passivity, is definitely not propitious to fascism, as the April 1961 failure of the colonialist and army plotters indicates. The successive shifts to the right in French politics can be reversed with stunning speed as the long chain of colonial revolts finally crosses the Mediterranean and fires the French workers. In Belgium the loss of the Congo at once sharpened class relations when the capitalists, in their customary way, attempted to maintain their assets column at the expense of the workers. The disintegration of the British empire, now proceeding at swift pace in Africa, will have similar ultimate consequences in Britain despite all the sagacity at the disposal of the world's most politically adroit ruling class.

As for the United States, Cuba is only the harbinger of what is in store as the peoples of Latin America, in defiance of Wall Street's "Monroe Doctrine," write their own doctrine of national sovereignty and economic emancipation. This revolutionary process in the vast area extending from Lower California to Patagonia will repeatedly shake the American workers if they have not already been aroused by other events from their lethargy.

The Soviet successes likewise penetrate into popular consciousness. At first it seemed utterly incomprehensible to Americans that the Soviet Union could, on its own, duplicate the feat of producing an atom bomb. It was widely accepted that the success must be due to "spies" who "stole the secret." This fatuous belief weakened when Soviet technology speedily developed the hydrogen bomb. It was knocked out completely when the Soviet Union put the first sputnik into orbit, then proceeded to hit the moon, take photographs of its far side, launch a space ship to the sun, then Venus, and finally put the first man into orbit around the earth. The Soviet Union is even beginning to challenge American imperialism in certain areas of the world market. The oil monopolists, for instance, complain about the capacity of the Soviet Union to undersell them in

many areas, including Western Europe. Such achievements help convince pragmatic Americans of the potentialities of planned economy. How else to explain how a country that did not topple feudalistic Czarism until 1917; that suffered the destruction of two world wars, a civil war and three catastrophic invasions; and was hampered by bureaucratic mismanagement and totalitarian practices, could nevertheless take a world lead on the frontiers of technology within four decades?

The impact upon the colonial peoples of comparable Soviet gains in the fields of mass education, public health and sports is a topic of continual concern in the capitalist press. More observant editors might feel still greater concern over the fact that the Soviet achievements have not gone unnoticed among the workers of Western Europe and even the United States. Planned economy is in the world to stay; its superiority over capitalism is sinking into the thinking of wide layers of workers in the imperialist sectors, whatever their reservations concerning the lack of democracy in the Soviet zone.

Finally, the threat of nuclear war permits no thinking person to rest. It is true that many, seeing no effective way to stop the drift in that direction, try to block from consciousness their fear of a contest in which each side demonstrates with what dispatch it can deliver its stockpile of hydrogen bombs to the other. But the fear is there nevertheless; and few days go by in which the media of mass communication fail to bring it to the surface by reports of one or another belligerent action. Figures of the stature of Einstein, Schweitzer, and Bertrand Russell, as well as leading nuclear physicists, insistently express their concern over the gravity of the danger.

This fear and uneasiness have led to increasingly bigger demonstrations against the danger. The demonstrations began under pacifist leadership which seeks to channel the protest into prayer and supplication to the powers that be to pay heed and reform themselves. The goal is utopian but the desire of the demonstrators for peace is not. Like other social protest movements that have begun in seemingly mild and innocuous ways, the demon-

strations against nuclear war can become radicalized and take militant class forms. A significant sign is the tens of thousands of mothers marching in the parades. The appearance of women in numbers in the field of political action is a classic sign of the rise of revolutionary temper among the masses. Another significant sign is the youthfulness of the majority of participants and their dedication to the cause of peace.

VI

Importance of the Youth

Revolutions are carried forward mainly on the shoulders of the youth. The generation of the postwar world appears destined to make the greatest revolutions in human history. Many got their baptism in great demonstrations like the one in Bogota in 1948 or those that swept Western Europe in 1945-47. Still younger contingents came into activity in Cuba in 1958 and 1959 or in the mass actions last year in Japan, South Korea and Turkey that gave a foretaste of what is to come. In the "sit-ins" today in the U.S., the new generation is reviving American radicalism.

Campuses the world around are alive with new currents. Here the intellectuals, sensitive barometers to the rise and fall of social pressures, meet students in search of the truth. Here, on the ideological front, the battles of the coming revolution are anticipated in argument and debate over issues that at times appear remote from the living class struggle. But the discussions over "humanism" and "alienation" lead directly into such problems as war and peace, the struggle for equality, the relation of democracy to socialism. Discussion leads naturally to action, a tendency reinforced by the rise in number of students from working-class families. Actions begun under student auspices can be taken up by far more powerful forces. It is noteworthy that both the Hungarian workers uprising and the Cuban Revolution began with ferment among the intellectuals and dissent on the campus.

Another symptom of greatest importance is the appearance of young socialist — and communist-minded radicals. The most politically alive sectors of the Zengakuren movement, for instance, are ardently studying Marxist ideology, including Trotsky-

ism. The development of the Zengakuren movement only bears witness in a spectacular way to what is occurring around the globe as the new generation grasps the import of the great issues of our time and turns in the direction of revolutionary-socialist politics.

It is true that dangerous counter-currents exist, especially in the United States where such reactionary and even fascist-minded organizations as Youth for Goldwater and the John Birch Society have made headway. These are symptoms of incipient class polarizations. In fighting reactionary tendencies, the youth wins its political training and prepares for the class battles to follow.

Still to be heard from is the decisive sector of the youth — the new generation of industrial workers. They will begin coming into action, as they have in the past, when the class struggle flares in picket lines and in demonstrations of the unemployed. Young workers, combining the energy of youth with the mature outlook of wage earners, and directly linked to the industrial process and the older generation of workers, are in strategic position to assume leadership as the revolution develops. Their role in sparking the Belgian general strike shows what bright promise exists among their ranks.

VII

The Search for Leadership

Any number of negative signs — such as the danger of nuclear war, unemployment in wealthy United States, racial discrimination, endemic hunger in Asia, Africa and Latin America — testify to the depth of the crisis of leadership that has faced humanity since the eclipse of revolutionary socialism in 1924. At the beginning of the end of this crisis, the phase we are living in right now, objects stand in a strange half light. Leaderships are thrust forward that in the logical sequence of history have been superseded; they are compelled to meet tasks that belong to a different class; but they handle these in a way that presents the world with all kinds of deformations, partial steps, and unexpected combinations. In 1938, for instance, the Mexican bourgeois government expropriated the oil industry and placed it under workers management. Peron in Ar-

gentina and Nehru in India both introduced Five Year Plans. Nasser took over the Suez Canal. The most spectacular case to date is the Cuban Revolution in which a petty-bourgeois leadership, beginning with a bourgeois-democratic program, followed the dialectical logic of the revolution instead of the formal logic of their own program, and ended up establishing the first workers state in the Western Hemisphere and proclaiming it an example for all of Latin America.

What is the meaning of all this for revolutionary socialism? Some have proclaimed that it signifies a Marxist leadership is not needed, or that at best a Leninist-type party can only accomplish the inevitable with greater quickness and efficiency. Even if this were true, it would not prove the lack of necessity for such a party. "Quickness" and "efficiency" may prove to be the essence of the matter in blocking the plunge into nuclear war. But the truth is that the facts speak with greatest eloquence of the necessity for an international party of the kind that Lenin and Trotsky set out to build in 1919, a party based upon national organizations rooted in the mass movements of their countries and determining their own leaderships and direction of development.

The masses, particularly in the colonial areas, feel the desperateness of their situation in the keenest way. They are completely unable to wait until a revolutionary-socialist party is constructed before they move into action. Since such parties do not exist, except as small nuclei, the masses, following a well-known law of politics, push into power whatever leadership of national scope happens to stand to the left of the ruling party. In default of socialist leadership — a default due to the decades of betrayal by the Social Democratic and Communist parties — nationalistic bourgeois and petty-bourgeois formations of all hues occupy left positions and are much stronger than they would be if they were flanked by revolutionary-minded proletarian parties. That a Mossadegh can be thrust into government power and nationalize British oil holdings thus in no way signifies that the Iranian masses can count on bypassing the task of

building a revolutionary-socialist party. On the contrary, it testifies to the ripeness of conditions for formation of such a party and the need for it to assure swift and sure success. Mossadegh's downfall and the return of Iran's oil industry to the British colonialists demonstrated how vulnerable the masses were without a combat party.

Not even the Cuban experience nullifies this conclusion. In fact it powerfully reinforces it. The Cuban leaders were compelled by life itself to recognize that their revolution is no historical exception and that Marxism applies in the Caribbean, too. With what forcefulness experience has spoken in the Cuban revolution!

In contrast to the defeat in Iran, which dampened party-building prospects for the time being, the victory in Cuba immediately brightened prospects. Cuba, which took the lead in opening the socialist revolution in Latin America, may well open a new phase soon in party building. The very necessities of the Cuban revolution point in this direction. Cuba has demonstrated what a fatal error it would be to cross off in advance a revolutionary-minded petty-bourgeois formation simply because it begins with a petty-bourgeois outlook. It is clear that such formations, in some of the colonial countries at least, constitute a source of recruitment for the international revolutionary-socialist movement.

Bourgeois nationalism, such as that represented by Nehru, Quadros and Cardenas, offers no new problems despite its current strength. The main line of approach, worked out by Lenin, is to recognize it as an allied force in the struggle against imperialism but one in which the proletariat places no political confidence because of its unreliable and wavering character. Correctly appraised, the growth of bourgeois nationalism in the world today — along with its radicalism in some areas — is an important sign of the decay of imperialism and of the immense opportunities opening up for revolutionary socialism in the colonial areas.

If the strength of radical nationalist leaderships in the colonial areas is due largely to the default of both the Social-Democratic and the Com-

munist parties, the continued existence and even revival of the Social Democracy is due to the default of Communism that occurred in the years of Stalin's dictatorial rule. From the historical point of view, the Social Democracy was finished when it betrayed the proletariat in World War I. It gained a new semblance of life only because militant workers turned in revulsion from Stalinism. But nowhere has it opened up any new perspective. It continues to do what it did in World War I — tie its followers hand and foot to bourgeois democracy, no matter how decayed. In Germany this has become so crass that the party has officially given up any pretense to Marxism.

Due to a big base of socialist-minded workers in some countries, however, the Social Democracy displays contradictory tendencies. Against the rightist pole represented by Germany, Holland and Scandinavia stand center and left formations which are quite strong in Britain and Belgium. These sectors of the Social Democracy are in ferment today. The ranks, who stand in the militant vanguard of the working class, are moving toward the left. Their leaders, tied to the right wing to one degree or another, feel pulled and torn. The division reflects a sharpening of class relations that portends a new wave of struggles. The most dynamic sections of the left-wing Social-Democratic workers will find their present inclination to move in the direction of revolutionary socialism strongly reinforced by coming events.

In the United States, the Social Democracy is so reduced in size, influence and energy that it has been forced to retire from electoral activity. The completely ossified right wing runs things with an iron hand; however, differences over the Cuban Revolution and its defense have cropped up, primarily among the youth.

What happens to the movement in and around the Communist parties is incomparably more important in world politics than the final fate of the Social Democracy, despite the latter's weight in countries like Great Britain. The Social Democracy, linked to the conservative trade-union bureaucracies of the Western powers, shares their basic outlook and deep-

seated disinclination toward an independent course in opposition to capitalist rule. The Communist parties are linked to the conservative bureaucratic caste of the Soviet countries, which, in turn is bound to the planned economies. The difference, which at first sight appears minor, has proved to be a crucial one.

Despite the decades of efforts under Stalin and his heirs to reach an accommodation with the capitalist rulers comparable to that of the trade-union bureaucracy, "peaceful coexistence" has proved to be utopian. One reason for this is that while the capitalists have found the labor lieutenants indispensable to their rule, they cannot accept the Soviet bureaucracy on the same basis. The Soviet bureaucracy is linked to a different social system which offers a permanent challenge to capitalism. So long as the Soviet Union was isolated, Roosevelt was, for example, able to coexist profitably with Stalinism. But they cannot endure an expanding Soviet economic system. The capitalist class as a whole, especially its leading American sector, views planned economy, especially its strengthening and extension, as a mortal peril. The capitalists make little distinction between planned economy and those in charge of it, whether they live off it in a parasitic way or defend it by revolutionary-socialist means. American imperialism is committed to destroying the Soviet system as a whole, including the bureaucracy, and opening up these fields to capitalist investment and exploitation. Historic experience has revealed that the Soviet bureaucratic caste tends to act differently from the trade-union bureaucracy of the West when the chips are down. The German trade-union bureaucracy, for instance, sank before the assault of fascism with scarcely a murmur. The Stalinist bureaucrats sacrificed their German representatives in similar style but when the Nazi invasion occurred and their own heads were on the block, they recovered from their shock and fought back with desperation. The consequences were immense as the world is now well aware.

But the development of the planned economy is also decisive for the fate of the caste in a different way. The

successes, which tend to first strengthen, ultimately undermine the bureaucracy. As in other fields, the increased health of the host is no favorable augury for the parasite. To understand the "new reality"; that is, the difference between now and Stalin's time, it is essential to bear this in mind.

In four areas relations are now much more complex and difficult for the bureaucracy. First, the working class at home is far stronger numerically and culturally. Its self-confidence is higher as are its expectations and its impatience. With Stalin's death, it looked for big concessions and has gained a considerable number. The same general strengthening of the working class is to be found throughout Eastern Europe as the uprisings in East Germany, Poland and Hungary testify. Secondly, the Soviet Union is no longer isolated internationally. The victory over German imperialism, the sweep into Eastern Europe, the victory of the Chinese Revolution, broke the capitalist ring of containment established in the early twenties — one of the main conditions for the growth and the power of the bureaucracy. The rapid recovery from the destruction of the war and the great gains which have made the Soviet Union second only to the United States in world power have placed completely new diplomatic weapons at its disposal. This has broken down another condition for bureaucratism — the international weakness of the Soviet Union. Thirdly, the extension of planned economy to other countries brought into being rival tendencies within the bureaucratic structure itself. Moscow can no longer simply lay down the law without thought of contradiction; it must consider the interests and the opinions of Peking, Belgrade, Warsaw, etc. Fourthly, the rise of the colonial revolution has brought a host of problems ranging from the opportunity of fostering "neutralism" to the difficulty of exorcising the specter of a socialist revolution which might touch off a great movement in the Soviet Union for a return to the proletarian democracy of Lenin and Trotsky.

Just as the Soviet bureaucracy, in yielding concessions at home, never loses sight of the essence of the mat-

ter — its own power and privileges; so abroad it retains its policy and objective of a deal with the imperialists through "peaceful coexistence" at the expense of revolutionary struggles. But in this "new reality" of enormous pressures, inviting openings and deadly dangers, the Soviet bureaucracy has had to revise and adapt and shift its line. Many parallels can, of course, be found in Stalin's shifts and adaptations, but the differences are exceedingly important. The left turn in 1929, for instance, was forced by the crisis of the regime, brought on by kulak pressure, and was calculated primarily as a blow at the Trotskyist Left Opposition which had warned of the kulak danger. The left turn which Khrushchev began initiating in 1958, even as he stepped up his summitry blandishments, is calculated to avoid being outflanked from the left; but it is forced by pressures from Peking and by revolutionary pressures of the national independence struggles in Algeria, Africa and Latin America. The consequences of a left turn in these circumstances can have completely opposite consequences from those calculated by Stalin.

Even Moscow's repeated efforts to straddle an issue like the Algerian conflict ran into resistance Stalin never experienced in the latter years of his rule. The Chinese Communist party, holding state power, objected and its objection carried sufficient weight to finally wring a concession in the substantial form of moral and material aid to the Algerians.

Likewise in wheeling and dealing with "summitry," Moscow has lacked the free hand Stalin enjoyed. Peking has justifiably been reluctant to approve a summit conference from which its representatives are excluded, and it has vetoed at least one projected conference.

On questions of war and peace, the nature of imperialism and the role of the colonial bourgeoisie, the criticisms of the Chinese, regardless of their real motivation, have resounded throughout the ranks of the Communist parties and beyond, and have intensified the differences at work within the Kremlin's orbit.

Thus what we have been witnessing in the past fifteen years is the expansion of planned economy, the

temporary strengthening and then break-up of Stalinist monolithism. This took spectacular shape in 1956 at the Twentieth Congress with Khrushchev's repudiation of the Stalin cult and his confirmation of many of the crimes of the tyrant.

The hypnotic trance that served for ideological cement was broken. The American Communist party, for instance, which had banned factions for so many years, became riddled with groupings. They proved incapable of effectively challenging the old leadership and went in various directions, some to the Socialist Workers party, the bulk into political passivity or, still worse, into the Democratic party where they had already been working for years in behalf of alleged antimonopoly candidates. A similar process occurred in Britain, with larger numbers finding their way to the Trotskyist movement. The Canadian Communist party suffered great reduction in size. In Hungary the downfall of the Stalin cult was a key factor in touching off the workers uprising in 1956. Significantly, a big section of the Hungarian Communist party swung to the side of the proletarian rebels and was prominent in the workers councils that were formed.

In countries where the Communist parties managed better to hold together, the shock nevertheless opened the minds of the rank and file to critical thought. They are now much more prepared to attempt to estimate situations and issues for themselves and to weigh the positions of other radical tendencies on their merits instead of simply brushing them off without a hearing. Many of them have become aware of great gaps in their knowledge and, in trying to make these up, are even doing a little bootleg reading in Trotskyist writings. The fact that Peking, Moscow and Belgrade feel forced in their ideological disputes to refer to "Trotskyism," even if sometimes only by innuendo and most often by misrepresenting the real Trotskyist positions, helps the process along. The ranks of the Communist parties, as Trotsky long ago forecast, will provide some of the most important forces in the world-wide reconstruction of the revolutionary-socialist movement.

VIII

The Fourth International

A completely new force must now be taken into account — the Cuban revolution and its leadership. Havana wields immense independent influence throughout Latin America. With the defeat of the invasion sponsored by the White House in April, the prestige of the Cubans rose high on the world scale.

Not least of the areas in which this holds true is the Soviet zone where the Cuban Revolution has appeared as a bright light in the nightmarish darkness of Western Hemisphere politics. With what gratitude the Soviet and Chinese and East European workers look to the valiant Cubans who began the socialist revolution in Latin America under the very nose of the imperialists who have been brandishing the atomic bomb since 1945!

The Cuban Revolution gave every Communist party in the world, and above all the Cuban Communist party, something to ponder. A handful of determined revolutionaries demonstrate that the masses can be mobilized and power won without Moscow's approval. They demonstrated it without the help and even against the opposition of a strong Communist party. The bypassing of the Communist party opened up a new vista throughout the world on the possibilities of overcoming the obstacle of Stalinism in constructing revolutionary parties.

It showed other things, too. Among these was the swiftness with which revolutions in colonial countries can pass from the bourgeois-democratic to the proletarian stage under a leadership that is not hampered by Stalinism. Another was the demonstration that the appearance of this new leadership did not at all weaken the Soviet Union. Instead, it strengthened the defenses of planned economy. It was fresh and dramatic confirmation of the Trotskyist position that the best defense of the Soviet Union lies in extending the revolution and spreading planned economy into new areas. The aid granted by Khrushchev to the Cuban Revolution did more to strengthen the Soviet Union and the cause of world peace than all the years of angling for a live-and-let-live understanding with the "summits" of imperialism.

The imperative necessity for building a proletarian combat party, discerned and put into practice by Lenin, has not lost any of its urgency since the founding of the Third International. All the great events since have served only to reinforce the correctness of Lenin's views. Now mighty forces, gathering on a world scale, project creation of such parties in the very process of revolution.

All the elements are at hand — the basic program developed by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, the example of successful revolutions as well as the lessons of catastrophic defeats, the existence of powerful workers states, the swiftening tempo of events, the radicalization of great masses, the upsurge of class struggles, the flaring of revolutionary contests throughout the world, major crises in the imperialist sector, the disintegration of Stalinism, the sharp dissatisfaction and the striving towards decisive changes in the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie in many countries, the appearance of revolutionary currents that turn inevitably toward Marxism.

The cadres centered around the Fourth International are witnessing the verification of the program and prognoses which they have so stubbornly defended during these difficult decades. They have every reason for the greatest optimism over the perspectives now opening up.

The Fourth International, "the world party of socialist revolution," was founded in 1938 under the guidance of Leon Trotsky two years before he was assassinated by an agent of Stalin's secret police. Trotsky had concluded that the Third International demonstrated in 1933 that it had died as a revolutionary organization when it joined with the Social Democracy in Germany in permitting Hitler to come to power without a struggle. The Socialist Workers party, which played a key role in founding the Fourth International, remained a member until the passage of reactionary legislation in the United States forced it to withdraw. However, the Socialist Workers party remains completely sympathetic with the emancipating socialist aims of the Fourth International and has re-

mained keenly concerned in a fraternal way over its welfare.

The Fourth International seeks to provide the international working class with the fullest possible understanding of the great issues of our time and its own historic destiny in settling them. To this end the Fourth International puts the truth first, no matter how bitter or dark. From the day it was founded, it has done its utmost to see clearly and to speak honestly. It has done this at great cost in martyrs and in persecution from all sides. To be a consistent representative of the truth in our times is not easy.

The Fourth International has played an indispensable role in preserving vital Marxist teachings and in applying them to the reality of our times. It does not view these teachings as sacred texts but primarily as a living self-critical method that keeps an open mind to new facts that call for new appreciation of long-ago discovered laws of the class struggle.

The world Trotskyist movement does not consider itself a sect or faction with interests separate and apart from those of the working class as a whole. Its interest is in articulating the long-range experience and historic aims of the proletariat and in doing as much as lies within its power to provide revolutionary-socialist leadership in immediate struggles. It makes no pretense at holding a patent on Marxist thought. Its contributions are offered freely in the best spirit of international science and it approaches the contributions of others in the same way.

From its inception, the Fourth International has faced great difficulties. As Trotsky noted at the outbreak of World War II, "In the conditions of triumphant reaction, mass disillusionment and mass fatigue, in a political atmosphere poisoned by the malignant decomposition of the traditional organizations of the working class, in the midst of heaped-up difficulties and obstacles, the development of the Fourth International of necessity proceeded slowly. Isolated and at first sight much broader and more promising attempts at unifying the left wing have been undertaken more than once by centrists who disdained our efforts. All these

pretentious attempts, however, crumbled to dust even before the masses had a chance to memorize their names. Only the Fourth International, with stubbornness, persistence, and increasing success keeps on swimming against the stream."

In addition to these difficulties, the Fourth International suffered the terrible blow of Stalin's murder of Trotsky. Then came years of fearful persecution in which outstanding cadres were lost in the gas chambers and concentration camps of fascism. In the United States, the boasted champion of the "free" world, the Trotskyist leaders were the first victims of the Smith Act.

Despite all this, Trotskyism survived and won new footholds on all continents. The imperishable character of its ideas is illustrated by the fact that to the imperialist rulers Trotskyism, with its consistent program of revolution, represents the ultimate threat to their system; while Moscow, Peking and Belgrade find the subject of Trotskyism cropping up despite themselves under the impact of the great key issues of our time. Even more impressive is the fact that the Chinese and Cuban revolutions in their main course followed objective laws long ago worked out by Trotsky.

A fresh interest in Trotsky, in his views and contributions, is apparent in many countries today. New editions of some of his books have appeared in increasing numbers. The most advanced intellectuals recognize increasingly that it is impossible, whatever one's attitude may be, to fully understand the reality of today without knowing the central tenets of Trotskyism.

It is obvious that conditions are maturing for the resurgence of revolutionary-socialist ideas and the popularization of Trotskyist principles on a wide scale. However, it must be frankly admitted that the Fourth International faces a serious internal crisis which has endured some years and which offers no easy or immediate solution. One of the key issues at the heart of the crisis is the relation in the International between centralism and democracy. In response to a question in 1937, Trotsky stated the problem that has come to trouble the Fourth Interna-

tional today as follows: "If every section lives its own life, without consulting the others, without submitting to democratically established decisions, it is not necessary to create an international. On the other side, if the international creates a central body which commands the national sections, it is not necessary to have intelligent people. It is sufficient to have robots in the national sections. Between these two extremes is the real policy, between the two extremes."

However adversely the internal organizational and political differences have affected the functioning of the Fourth International, it is nevertheless true that a substantial body of cadres has been assembled on all continents. In some areas they are few and isolated. In others they have strong roots in the class struggle, enjoy great respect in the radical and labor movements and have established party bases that can expand rapidly under favorable conditions.

As indicated above, the key problem for the socialist revolution as a whole is to unite the anticapitalist, anti-imperialist and antibureaucratic struggles into one great emancipating movement. The Trotskyist forces, besides participating directly in each of these struggles, play an indispensable role in drawing them together on the ideological plane. The main historic contribution of the Fourth International to date has been a program that consciously expresses and unites the long-range interests of the working people in all three sectors of the world.

The process of fusing the struggles in the three sectors will undoubtedly prove relatively protracted although great successes in one sphere can speed up action in the others, thereby drawing them closer together at a more rapid pace.

In the Soviet zone the high rate of growth of the productive forces, increasing the relative abundance at the disposal of society, will stiffen the demands of the workers. The perspective is a more or less steady maturing of the conditions that will finally make possible the displacement of bureaucratic rule and the restoration of proletarian democracy. The bureaucracy will not undergo self-liquidation; but on the other

hand no quick or early explosions are likely to occur.

In the colonial world, events are proceeding at a much swifter pace as the revolutionary wave widens and deepens. Here a new set of difficulties comes to the fore among nations like India, Indonesia, Egypt and Ghana which have not progressed beyond the bourgeois-democratic stage. The task is to break through these limitations and take the path blazed by the Russian workers and peasants in 1917 and the Chinese and Cuban workers and peasants today. As the most dynamic sector at present, the greatest immediate revolutionary opportunities lie in the colonial area today.

In the industrially advanced sphere, deepening economic and political crises are jolting the working class out of its apathy and immobility. When radicalization will occur cannot be forecast with certainty. It is clear only that the ultimate effect of the long delay will be to give the struggles when they do break enormous depth, speed and decisiveness in altering the balance of world forces. Every foothold gained by the revolutionary-socialist movement now in the United States, in Canada, in Great Britain, in Japan, Western Germany, France, Italy, Belgium and Holland will receive tremendous amplification in the days to come. In this sector the main tactic to be recommended to revolutionary socialists is continued dogged perseverance in defending and teaching the program of Trotskyism and building Leninist-type combat parties.

As Trotsky declared in 1940: "The capitalist world has no way out, unless a prolonged death agony is so considered. It is necessary to prepare for long years, if not decades, of war, uprisings, brief interludes of truce, new wars and new uprisings. A young revolutionary party must base itself on this perspective. History will provide it with enough opportunities and possibilities to test itself, to accumulate experience and to mature. The swifter the ranks of the vanguard are fused the more the epoch of bloody convulsions will be shortened, the less destruction will our planet suffer. But the great historical problem will not be solved in any case until a revolutionary party

stands at the head of the proletariat. The question of tempos and time intervals is of enormous importance; but it alters neither the general historical perspective nor the direction of our policy. The conclusion is a simple one: it is necessary to carry on the work of educating and organizing the proletarian vanguard with tenfold energy. Precisely in this lies the task of the Fourth International."

This prognosis has been confirmed

"SECRET" LETTER...

(Continued from page 84)

ers of the Albanian Communist party — who unite with the Chinese leaders because of their common hostility to the Yugoslavs — and thus seek to support anyone willing to combat the spirit of the Twentieth Congress and the new leadership of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, they are making an awfully bad error of judgment. They would be very wrong not to reflect on the disastrous consequences that might follow from their colusive neutrality toward the actions of the disruptionists of the "Chinese faction" in the French Communist party.

It is up to the French communists to see the danger to their own party — the most consistent party of Western Europe — and to the world Communist movement posed by the disruptionist maneuvers and the undermining activities of a faction opposed to the principles defined in common and adopted

in the most powerful way. It has become a life-and-death question for the proletariat to construct its revolutionary party. At the same time the objective conditions for its appearance are much more auspicious than in 1940. From all indications, a great new period of revolutionary advances is opening. To the generation now entering the political arena has fallen the historic destiny of winning the final victory of socialism over capitalism.

according to the Leninist rules of communist democracy.

The responsibility of the leaders is shared by those militants who hold positions in certain international organizations, such as the Peace Movement, the World Federation of Trade Union, the "Franco-Chinese Friendship Society," the "Franco-Albanian" society, etc. This was seen at the time of the International Conference of Jurists in Sofia when, on the pretext of the necessity to reinforce the aid given to the Algerian National Liberation Front, we saw the delegates of People's China proselytizing directly in favor of their minority theses.

A communist contacted by a representative of a brother Communist party has the duty to send him back to his leaders by recalling to him the process of exchanges set forth by the Declaration of the eighty-one parties.

The duty of a French communist is to oppose anything that might constitute

meddling of another party into the internal affairs of his own.

On this point the Declaration of the Eighty-one Communist parties was absolutely unanimous and categorical:

"The Marxist-Leninist parties are all equal and have equal rights; they elaborate their policy on the basis of the concrete conditions of their own country, inspired by the principles of Marxism-Leninism."

It no less categorically condemned certain attempts of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia to win support for its theses by disseminating them within the ranks of other Communist and Workers parties: "The Yugoslav revisionists are indulging in subversive actions against the socialist camp and the world communist movement."

What is valid for the Yugoslavs is valid also for the others, from the moment when they start to indulge in the condemned practices.

"The interests of the communist movement demand the solidarity of each and every Communist party in observance of the analyses and conclusions in regard to the general tasks of the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism, worked out in common by the brother parties in their conferences," stated the Declaration.

The communists of France, simple militants, officials at various levels, or publicists, will understand the importance of the facts to which this document has now drawn their attention.

Attentively re-reading the "Declaration of the Workers and Communist parties" which was proclaimed as the current program of the world communist movement, they will be on watch to defend and strengthen, as the apple of their eyes, the indispensable ideological unity of the world communist movement.

When Socialism Caught America's Imagination

In 1912 the "Debs for President" campaign caught the imagination of the American labor movement; and the vote for socialism reached its high peak. What was the secret of Debs' success? Can militant trade-unionists of today learn something from this great American socialist leader?

Read the balanced political appraisal by James P. Cannon in **Eugene V. Debs — the Socialist Movement of His Time — Its Meaning for Today**. 40 pp. 25 cents.

Do you know what's being done today in the tradition of Debs? Here's a sampling from the writings of James P. Cannon that will help bring you up to date:

The History of American Trotskyism. The story of the difficult struggle to build a revolutionary socialist party in the heartland of world capitalism. 268 pp. Cloth \$2.75; paper \$2.

The Struggle for a Proletarian Party. A companion book to the History of American Trotskyism. Cloth \$2.75; paper \$2.

America's Road to Socialism. A lucid presentation of the prospects for socialism and a stirring forecast of what socialist America will look like. 78 pp. 35 cents.

Socialism and Democracy. The Marxist view on a topic that is under vigorous debate today. 21 pp. 15 cents.

Pioneer Publishers

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.

Two Pamphlets

Castro Speaks on Unemployment



“Does Mr. Kennedy want to end unemployment in the United States? Why, then let him nationalize the big monopolies; let him nationalize the banks, so that the banks can stop being private companies serving a few millionaires; let him put an end to military bases abroad; let him stop the armaments race, stop making rockets and battleships, pursue a policy of peace, and you will see how the problems and the crisis in the United States will be over. Instead of following our example, while the water reaches up to their neck, they try to make us disappear from the surface of the earth. And that is the irrationality of imperialism, prisoner on their own spiderweb. Simply because that system is a system operating for the benefit of an absolutely parasitic class.”

— Fidel Castro, February, 1961, Havana

24 pages 25¢

Published by Young Socialist Forum
Box 471, Cooper Station
New York 3, N.Y.

How Cuba Uprooted Race Discrimination

By Harry Ring

Introduction by
Richard Gibson

16 pages 15 cents

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place
New York 3, N.Y.