

# Workers International News

6<sup>D</sup>



*Theoretical  
Organ of the  
Revolutionary  
Communist  
Party*

EDITORIAL NOTES  
TRANSPORT and COTTON  
CONSCRIPTION  
LABOUR M.P.s' "REVOLT"

· WORKERS' CONTROL and  
COLLABORATION with the U.S.S.R

By LEON TROTSKY

CONFLICT IN INDIA

By T. CLIFF

Some Diplomatic Horsedeals Exposed

By D. JAMES

January — February 1947

# WORKERS INTERNATIONAL NEWS

256 HARROW ROAD, LONDON, W.2.

Telephone : CUNningham 2526.

VOLUME 7.

JANUARY - FEBRUARY, 1947.

NUMBER 1.

## CONTENTS

	Page
EDITORIAL NOTES ... ..	2
SOME DIPLOMATIC HORSEDEALS EXPOSED ... .. D. James	7
WORKERS' CONTROL ... .. Leon Trotsky	14
TASKS IN GERMANY ... .. E. Grant	18
CONFLICT IN INDIA ... .. T. Cliff	27

## *Editorial Notes*

**TRANSPORT AND COTTON.** The nationalisation of Transport; Rail, Road and Inland Waterways and Port Facilities is to be carried out on the familiar pattern of state capitalism. Compensation is to be based on the average price of Railway securities on 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th of November 1946. Or the average from February to July 1945 if this is higher. The stock is to be freely negotiable. The cost will be £1,019.7 millions according to the "**Financial Times**." The nominal value is £1,142 millions. This is for railways alone.

When it is taken into consideration that the railway equipment is partly obsolete and enormous sums will be required to modernise it the magnitude of the burden which will be imposed upon the railway workers and the country as a whole can be seen.

Meanwhile, the industry is to be run as a business enterprise. There is not the remotest suggestion of the control or running of the industry by its employees. A Transport Commission is to be established with a chairman and four members, the Minister as usual, it can be predicted will appoint the usual "business executives", i.e. representatives of monopoly capital, probably from the Boards of Directors of the railway companies, with one or two trade union bureaucrats as adornments. There will also be appointed four transport executives: for Railways, Docks and Inland Waterways, Road Transport and London Passenger Transport. These will operate on the same lines as the overall Transport Commission itself.

The nationalisation of the railways is no new radical departure for capitalist countries. In South Africa, Germany, France and other capitalist countries the railways have been state owned for more than a generation. The capitalists opposed half-heartedly this measure only on the grounds that it would not achieve the desired results. The "**Economist**", for example, is not opposed to the nationalisation as such, but argues that bureaucratic control and the state bureaucracy will defeat its own ends and prevent the development of cheaper transport which is a basic necessity for British capitalism which is fighting for its way on the world market.

The compensation terms mean a burden of £25½ millions per annum—a crippling cost when the needs of the industry are considered and its cost of modernisation is added.

The Transport Commission, "independent" of the Government is to take into account the interests of the "consumer", i.e., of the large capitalist interests who use the railways for the transport of goods. The demand of the capitalists will be for rationalisation, speed up and economics in the running of the industry. Like the Post Office, it will be expected to provide cheap facilities for the ruling class. And, as in the case of the Post Office, the last consideration of the bureaucrats and capitalists at the top will be the interests of the workers in the industry. The Post Office workers are notoriously low paid so far as the lower ranks are concerned.

Nationalisation, by itself, is not the solution of the problems facing the working class. Particularly when it applies to only a few of the basic industries which have been ruined by British capitalism. These industries will serve as handmaidens to the rest of capitalist industry which will remain individually owned. These measures of nationalisation are intended to provide cheap fuel, lighting power and transport, thus to streamline the structure of British capitalism. Nationalisation is a step forward even in the manner it is carried out by the Labour Government. But this merely poses the problem of socialism. It does not solve it. Only control firmly in the hands of the working class can guarantee that the nationalised industries will be run for the benefit of the workers in these industries and in the interest of the working class as a whole.

The Railway workers must demand that committees elected by the railway men on the job shall carry out the running of the industry. They must demand the abolition of bureaucratic capitalist set-ups and that the planning and running of the railways, as of other industry, shall be in their hands with technicians acting in consultation with them in an advisory capacity.

The Labour leaders have attempted to reconcile the bourgeoisie to large scale measures of nationalisation by assuring them that these basic industries will act as handmaidens to private enterprise in the 80 per cent of industry which is to remain directly in the hands of the capitalist class. Nationalisation will not apply to those industries which do not require an enormous outlay of new capital, which is virtually prohibitive to profit, in the ailing British economy. It will apply consequently for this and other reasons, to the basic heavy industries which have remained with obsolete, backward and even antiquated equipment. In the secondary, and more modern industries Morrison has announced that the profit motive will be "socialised", and the now reformed capitalists will run industry for the benefit of the community. A sugary covering for the trustification and domination of industry by Big Business which the Labour Government is actually assisting.

This process is shown with crystal clarity in the case of the cotton industry. Here is an industry which like steel and coal has been ruined by generations of mismanagement by capitalists who until this century had no serious competitors on the world market. Ever since the end of World War I, it has been in a state of chronic crisis which it has been impossible for the industrialists of Lancashire to solve. The multiplicity of small firms each doing one part of the process of producing cloth such as spinning, weaving, carding etc., the number of middlemen, the outdated machinery which was being used, left British capitalists at a hopeless disadvantage in the race for markets which were not protected by the Empire preference or tariff agreements.

On the present basis the industry could not survive foreign competition. But instead of taking over the industry and overhauling it for the benefit of the workers, the Government is taking steps to compel amalgamation and trustification in the cotton industry which will make the Government a direct sponsor of the plans of Big Business in Cotton. There are to be lavish state subsidies for the introduction of modern machinery which, it is estimated, will amount to £25,000,000 (orders to be placed in two, and completed within five years) but only to the larger aggregations of capital. There is to be a 25 per cent grant for re-equipment but only to the cotton spinners or groups of mills representing "not less than, say 500,000 spindles". Of the 280 spinning firms in the industry less than 30 already represent almost half the 39.1 million spindles in the industry in 1940. 18.8 million spindles were owned by concerns with up to

200,000 spindles each. The spinning section of the cotton industry which is already under the domination of the big firms will thus be further placed in their control, laying the ground for a series of further amalgamations at a later stage. This will leave a handful of firms in control of spinning, and prepare the way for similar treatment for other sections of the cotton and textile industry.

The employers, the state and the union are to act as "partners" in the reorganization of the industry through the "Cotton Working Party". The two-shift working system must be introduced "as and when the mills were progressively modernised", and "both sides" of the industry must encourage and accept the "new methods of labour deployment and utilization". What this means is rationalization at the expense of the workers. A tremendous speed-up and intensification of labour, with the workers compelled to operate more spindles and thus bearing the brunt of the burden of modernization.

There is nothing of Socialism in such proposals. The language of "partnership" is the usual fraud of class collaboration. The contribution of the workers to the actual running of the industry, supervising the accounting, costing and organization will be nil. The control and . . . the profits will be in the hands of the capitalists. Such measures do not assist the workers but merely increase the power of the ruling class. The workers in the Labour and Trade Union Movement should reject these proposals completely. The Labour Government becomes the governess of Big Business to which the interests of the worker are inevitably subordinated. No subsidies to the Big employers! For nationalization without compensation and under workers' control!

**CONSCRIPTION.** The home and foreign policy of the Labour Government make a perfect pattern. Foreign policy is merely the continuation of policy at home. And in obedience to this law the Labour Government is throwing overboard all the past traditions of the Labour movement in introducing conscription. Having taken a stand in defence of the British Empire and in endeavouring to prop up British Imperialism's enfeebled position in Europe and the world, the Labour Government requires large armed forces—far bigger than ever in peace-time—to back up this policy. To defend themselves against any incursions into their sphere of influence by the Stalinist bureaucracy and, more remotely, by American imperialism. Also they need a huge armed force to impress the colonial peoples with the danger of "trouble" if they should strike a blow against the shackles of British Imperialist slavery.

This measure is one that would have caused uproar and disturbances if introduced by a Tory Government. It has aroused intense dislike and opposition among the workers despite all the attempts on the part of the Government to justify it. Over 50 Labour M.P.'s voted against the Bill introducing the measure in Parliament. They did this under the "Conscience clause" of the Labour Party rules permitting them to make this gesture. Most of those voting against however did so from pacifist motives.

The Stalinist M.P.'s voted for conscription and this betrayal was supported by the "Communist" Party. They faintly bleated for a change in foreign policy proclaiming that then conscription would be the "fairest" way of bearing the burden of defence of "our" commitments.

The Labour M.P.'s who voted against this measure while adopting a progressive attitude did not do so from the standpoint of the class struggle. Many asked for a "voluntary" system rather than one which compelled large sections of the population to serve in peace-time. In reality all that this means is that hunger forces large sections of the workers "voluntarily" to enlist in times of unemployment. Thus the pacifist Labourites support the conscription of those sections of the sons of the workers who are driven to enlist by hunger.

The Marxist attitude is a different one. The army is a reflection of society. The army under the Labour Government has not changed its basic structure or organization. It remains an instrument for the defence of the interests of the capitalists both at home and abroad. The officers and the general staff are selected representatives of the ruling class, imbued with capitalist ideology and trained to serve its interests. The State, in the last analysis, can be reduced

to armed bodies of men, with their appendages the courts and the prisons. Who controls these bodies is master of the state. Through the officer caste the ruling class retains firm control of the power in Britain. And the Labour leaders have retained the old ruling class machine intact. A few minor reforms have been made in the conditions of the men, in order to try and attract volunteers, but nothing of the sacred rights of blimpercy to control the armed forces has been touched.

The Revolutionary Communists are opposed to conscription because it is for the purpose of upholding the interests of British Imperialism. They are opposed to a volunteer army for the same reason. Our attitude is dictated by the class nature of the army! Such an army at a time of crisis will be used by the capitalists against a reformist or even Liberal Government as the lessons of history demonstrate in the case of Spain and other countries. It can never serve the needs of the working class. That is why we demand the dissolution of the standing army and its substitution by the armed people. The workers can place no trust in officers selected for their loyalty to the ruling class. We stand for the abolition of military law while the present army exists, for the election of officers by the soldiers and the clearing out from the army of the specially picked officer caste serving the ends of capitalism.

In order to have a force which will loyally fight for the interests of the workers, instead of the Sandhursts where the scions of the ruling class learn how to command the ranks and learn the arts of war the Labour Government should establish schools set up by the trade unions at the expense of the state for the training of workers, selected by the organizations of the working class, to become worker officers.

Such a policy and programme is entirely different from the conceptions of those Labour M.P.'s who voted against conscription because it involves a **clear class** approach to all the problems with which the workers are faced. Again as in the case of the foreign policy dissentients the "rebels" are not prepared to organise systematically an opposition within the Labour movement on this question.

However, this complete break of the Labour Party leadership with its past traditions on this question has left a deep impression on the worker elements particularly those who will be affected by it. It was noticeable that most of the women Labour M.P.'s voted against the Bill. This symbolised the opposition of working class women to having their sons torn away to serve the needs of capitalist militarism.

All these opposition currents within the working class will merge into one broad stream in the stormy days that lie ahead.

The conditions which produced the shortage of labour and its concomitant "full employment" were a consequence of the war and the shortages arising out of it. "Full employment" was not caused by a planned policy on the part of the Labour Government but by the economic laws operating when Labour came to power. Already, ominous warnings have been issued by the leaders of the Labour Government as to the parlous condition of Britain, her trade and industry, and the possible debacle that lies ahead.

Among many speeches on this question by the leading figures in the Government was that of Mr. Dalton, Chancellor of the Exchequer, who speaking appropriately enough at a dinner to the bankers and merchants of the City of London, on October 16th said: "A year or two hence the balance of our overseas trade, the strength of our reserves of foreign exchange, and the danger of a trade depression starting somewhere outside this island, might well pre-occupy us."

While demanding greater and greater effort from the working class, anxiously the Labour leaders await the coming slump. They are preparing to abandon their empty boasts of establishing "full employment" under capitalism, the Keynesian theories are thrust aside in face of the "expert opinions" of the officials of the Board of Trade and other departments. Already they talk of establishing "a high and stable level of employment" instead of full employment as previously. The American loan is rapidly being used up. And American

imperialism bursting asunder all the bonds and regulations of prices, is galloping ahead in the mad rush for profits at the expense of the American masses. The hectic boom will be followed by a collapse of the sellers market in the next period, which in turn, will produce grave complications in British economy as well. Soberly assessing the situation Marquand, Secretary of the Department of Overseas Trade, informed parliament that his experts were expecting the end of the sellers' market in the foreseeable future, a depression on the lines of that of 1921, and as after then, a new economic rise to be followed by another 1929. On the basis of the laws of capitalism to which British economy is geared, this is an accurate estimate of coming events. Except that the new 1929 will be far more severe and convulsive, will provoke far greater misery and suffering among the masses throughout the world.

Thus the insane cycle of capitalism is to be repeated. War, slump, preparation for war, war, reconstruction, depression, slump . . . and war . . .

There is only one trifle that has been overlooked by the capitalists and their Labour lackeys. The coming of the economic crisis will further upset the precarious stability which capitalism has maintained economically and politically since the end of the war. The ruling class will seek to push aside their labour lieutenants and will look for salvation in neo-fascist bands. The working class will be revolutionised on a world scale. In Britain, the Labour movement will be shaken from top to bottom. The masses will demand planned economic activity on socialist lines to prevent the unemployment and misery caused by the chaos of capitalism. The last strongholds of reformist thought will be shaken to their foundations in the struggles that the slump will provide in the coming years.

**LABOUR "REVOLT"** It is on this background that the "revolt" of the Parliamentary Labour Party must be viewed. In itself, it had no great significance. But as a portent of the fissures which will rend the Labour Party, it is symptomatic. The "revolt" was a reflection of the discontent of the rank and file Labour workers with the Government's foreign policy.

The bourgeois newspapers, particularly the foreign press, gave the "revolt" a greater importance than it warranted. The Tory press tried to exaggerate the fissure within the Labour Party with the object of discrediting the Labour Government. At the same time, they used the opportunity, as did the Labour leaders themselves, of demonstrating that there was a unity of purpose between Government and opposition in defending the interests of British imperialism—apart from groups of "malcontents" and "extremists."

Premature hopes in this revolt were expressed by left wing tendencies in various parts of the world. But an analysis of the elements which composed this opposition would indicate the essentially temporary and platonic nature of their groupment on this occasion. They were united only in opposition to the Government's policy, but they were inspired by entirely differing and even contradictory motives and outlooks. There was the quasi-Stalinist and Stalinist fraction who sought agreement with Russia there were the Zionists and their sympathisers who demanded a Jewish state in Palestine; there were the anti-Zionists; a grouping who wanted a "middle way", and "independent" policy between American imperialism and the Stalinist bureaucracy; and there were the pacifists; there were those under the pressure of mass feeling who were opposed to the intervention in Greece and the continued relations with the Franco regime and there were a number of confused lefts seeking, in a muddled way, some basis for a "socialist foreign policy". All stood behind the futile and ineffectual policy of U.N.O. as a means of achieving peace and human progress. The whole grouping supported the home policy of the Labour Government in its main lines.

This in itself was a reflection of the immaturity of the opposition. Home policy cannot be separated from foreign policy. They are complementary.

The gesture had to end, as such an aimless expression of revolt must, as a purely platonic protest with no hardened tendency crystalising out of it. In view of the large number of rebels involved, the right wing Government sup-

porters could not take disciplinary action and the net outcome assisted, rather than undermined the Government, by dulling the discontent of the masses.

However, the "revolt" has not passed by without leaving traces in the consciousness of the working class. At the present stage there exists no organised left wing in the Labour Party. But the full debacle of Labour's policy at home has not yet been felt by the masses. When it is, the pressure will tend to crystallise the different wings within the Labour Party. The collapse of the Labour Government's programme will lead to the radicalisation of the working class on the one hand, and inevitable splits will take place in the Labour Party. The crisis within the country, and the crisis of the Labour Government itself, will pose the question of programme point blank. A centrist wing will begin to emerge, even within the ranks of the Parliamentary Labour Party. The present mood of watchful waiting will give way to stormy movements of revolutionary indignation. For the first time the ideas of Marx and Lenin will find a mass echo in Britain and pave the way for building the mass Revolutionary Communist Party.

## SOME DIPLOMATIC HORSEDEALS EXPOSED

By DAVID JAMES

**T**HE popular idea of democracy comprises more than freedom of speech, organisation and the Press, and the right of trial by jury. In its broadest conception it means that the State is controlled by the population, that the Executive is a subordinate agency of the elected popular assembly, or Parliament, and that the Government carries out the people's will as expressed through this body.

This, at any rate, is the "theoretical" conception of democracy; and the apologists of bourgeois democracy always claim that this is the norm to which their régimes approach, even though there may be imperfections in practice.

It is as well to bear this in mind, since the Second World War has recently concluded, and the victorious Governments have claimed and continue to claim that they intend to establish the democratic order throughout the world. We must judge their actions by the standard which they themselves set.

### DEMOCRACY IN PRACTICE

In practice, of course, things are rather different. The vulgar idea of democracy starts off from the assumption that every citizen is equal in relation to the State, and his share in

controlling it is represented by his single vote. But in a class society all citizens are not equal. There can never be equality between a ruling class and an exploited class.

For this reason Marxists have never accepted the fiction of an ideal democracy. Democracy, as Lenin pointed out, is a form of State. The State exists in order to uphold the system of property relations on which the given society is based, and the laws which are framed to protect and perpetuate these property relations. It therefore defends the position and privileges of the ruling class which bases itself on these property relations, and becomes in effect the organ of the ruling class.

A real democracy therefore can never approach the "ideal" democracy we have defined above. The deviations are necessary, not accidental. The only situation in which all people can be really equal, is in a classless society, in which no group bears a favoured relationship to the means of production and enjoys a favoured position in the distribution of goods. This would at the same time do away with the need for a State as a body apparently standing above society and regulating the relations between classes. The disappearance of the State would mean

the disappearance of democracy itself, as a form of State.

Under capitalism, the "theoretical" democracy beloved of the vulgar theoreticians is always and everywhere violated. This is so even in the freest capitalist democracy. Freedom of expression always means freedom for the Press lords and film magnates, and innumerable restrictions for the working class. But this is especially true when we consider imperialism. All big capitalist nations, and many small ones, oppress the peoples in their colonial possessions and spheres of interest; deny them many of the democratic rights enjoyed even by the workers at home! and, above all, deny them the elementary democratic right of national freedom and self-determination.

### IMPERIALISM AND SECRET DIPLOMACY

Every capitalist State, in its foreign relations, engages in secret diplomacy, makes pacts and alliances known only to the very restricted ruling circle. This is one of the most naked violations of democracy, for two reasons.

Firstly, the very idea of secret diplomacy contradicts one of the fundamental democratic principles. The Government concludes a treaty without telling even the Assembly to which it is responsible, far less the population which elected it. The idea that the people control the actions of the State is thereby completely violated. They may be drawn into any action, even a war, without even having been aware of the commitments made in their name.

The second reason is that such agreements are directly or indirectly concerned with the division of other people's territory, and are of a nature that would arouse the opposition of the mass of the people if they were aware of them. That is precisely why they are kept secret. In short, democracy is violated at home in order that it may be more effectively violated abroad. Imperialism and secret diplomacy are inextricably tied up.

### SECRET DIPLOMACY IN THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The secret diplomatic history of the first "War to Make the World Safe for Democracy" is a vast subject. There is no space for it here, since we are dealing with more recent examples. But it is worth noting, for instance, that Great Britain was directly in-

involved in the war by a secret agreement with France, which pledged her to protect the North Coast of France in case of war. This agreement was unknown to the House of Commons, and the Prime Minister, Sir Edward Grey, even had the audacity to say the following to the House on June 11th, 1914:

"If war arose between European Powers, there are no unpublished agreements which will restrict or hamper the freedom of the Government or of Parliament to decide whether or not Great Britain should participate in a war."

**The agreement was in force when he spoke, and whether Belgium had been invaded or not Britain would have been involved!**

Another example, famous because of subsequent events, was the secret agreements between France and Tsarist Russia, for the annexation of the Dardanelles, Armenia, Galicia, Alsace-Lorraine and the division of Persia, in the event of a victorious end to the war.

In characterizing World War I. as an imperialist war, Lenin and the Bolsheviks frequently referred to these secret treaties as one proof among many. The fact that the "democratic" Government of Kerensky did not publish these treaties, but wished to keep them in force, condemned it as an imperialist Government. The Bolsheviks opposed the Government and the war it was conducting, and drew the conclusion:

"As the capitalists dare not publish the treaties, we must overthrow the capitalists." (Lenin, "A Lecture on War", May 1917)

### THE LABOUR LEADERS AND SECRET DIPLOMACY

Attempts may be made to argue that what happened in World War I. is past and gone. In this war just concluded these horse-deals were excluded by virtue of the fact that the capitalist powers opposed to Hitler Germany were in alliance with the Government of the Soviet Union. We shall prove later how foul was the rôle played by the Stalinist rulers of Russia in their diplomacy before and during World War II. It may be contended that even that episode sinks into the oblivion of a dead past. Now we have a Labour Government in power.



To dispel any illusions which may exist about the integrity of the diplomacy of the Labour leaders, it is enough to take two recent examples of their solicitude for the maintenance of the existing order abroad. **Their desire to avoid a struggle for power on the part of the workers in two countries has driven them to support and prop up two of the most reactionary dictatorships: the Greek Monarchy and the dictatorship of Franco.**

#### THE INVASION OF GREECE

Ernest Bevin has recently brought Winston Churchill's work to a successful conclusion by installing the King of Greece on the throne. It is interesting to remember that the invasion of Greece, which at the time was represented as "helping the Greek people to clear the Germans out", in reality had very different aims, which were discussed concretely at the Quebec Conference in 1944, and plans were decided upon for action to prevent the Greek masses from overthrowing their ruling classes. Mr. Churchill let this out in the House of Commons on December 9th, 1944:

"I pointed out that if there was a long hiatus after the German authorities left the city (Athens—D.J.) before the organised Government could be set up it was very likely that E.A.M. and the Communist extremists would attempt to seize the city and crush all other forms of Greek expression except their own."

My honoured friend, the President (Roosevelt) was of opinion we should certainly have plans made, and accordingly at the Quebec Conference it was proposed by the Combined Chiefs of Staff that the British should prepare the forces to occupy the Athens area and so pave the way for the commencement of relief and for the establishment of law and order and for the instalment of the Greek Government which we and the great bulk of the United Nations had formally recognised."

To think that some naive and not-so-naive people made out that the secret talks were about how to fight the Nazis!

In connection with Greece, a further example of a secret agreement disposing of the political fate of peoples without consulting them in the least is provided by a report in the "New York Times", February 6th, 1946, from C. L. Sulzberger, one of its most

trusted foreign correspondents. He gave details of a secret Anglo-Russian agreement, made in the spring of 1944, dividing spheres of influence in the Balkans:

"Russia was given control in Rumania and Britain received control in Greece.

The British wanted a long-term limit attached, but the Russians refused. The first arrangements were made between Mr. Eden, then Foreign Secretary, and the Soviet Foreign Minister, M. Molotov. Agreement was concluded by an exchange of cabled messages between Mr. Churchill and Marshal Stalin.

Corollary agreements, of which less is known, gave the Soviet Union predominant influence in Yugoslavia.

The United States was in a sense a tacit partner in this agreement."

But not by any chance the peoples of Greece, Rumanian or Yugoslavia!

#### BRITISH LABOUR GOVERNMENT'S ATTITUDE TO FRANCO SPAIN

It is well known that the British Labour Government adopted an obstructive attitude at U.N.O. to proposals for action to bring down the régime of General Franco in Spain. The political reasons for this were exposed when Drew Pearson, the American journalist, obtained a copy of secret instructions sent from the Foreign Office to Sir Alexander Cadogan, and published them in the American Press. Naturally, the British Government denied it; but Drew Pearson has frequently obtained secret British documents, the latest being the Government's proposals on Palestine a few days before they were issued, and in every case the documents have been genuine.

The document was reproduced in the "Daily Telegraph", 15.4.46. The curious language is explained as due to paraphrasing, in order that no-one could use it to break the British code. Here are extracts:

"The United States and the United Kingdom are against opening the Franco case for the moment. They believe that if diplomatic weight is continued to be put on gradually, Franco will effect a compromise acceptable to most factions, though not acceptable to the revengeful, professional, traditional Spanish clique.

This clique (Spanish Communists) would not accept the envisaged Republican set-up anyhow. Negrin sits

most uneasily among the Republicans. Del Vayo is trying to effect a compromise in the Republican party. Del Vayo is one of the few Negrin sponsors left.

"On the other hand, a large part of the Republicans are acceptable to the United Kingdom and the United States, inasmuch as they are against the Communists.

"France is on the spot due to the fact that she has been forced by the Communists to close her Spanish border.

"Left-wing French Socialists will go along with Poland, Mexico, Russia and most probably Australia. The French Catholic party and the Quai d'Orsay are almost all officially against an attack on Franco.

"Most officials of the Quai d'Orsay were the ones who functioned so well under Vichy. The Catholic Church is very active. They think that if action were taken in Spain a Catholic pogrom, something on the same scale as Hitler's Jewish pogrom, would be engineered by revengeful political Reds. The Pope believes that a compromise is absolutely possible in the next few weeks.

"The United States and the United Kingdom will try to hold or postpone or complicate by obscuring procedure (at the United Nations) until the compromise has been effected."

The hypocrisy of the Labour leaders in their pretensions that their diplomacy is open and above board, that it is designed only to serve the interests of the toiling masses of this and other lands, needs no clearer exposure than these examples.

So much for the Labour leaders from whom nothing more is to be expected. They are the servants of capital. They must defend the interests of capital . . . by capitalist methods. But what of the rulers of the Soviet Union? No greater exposure of the degeneration of Stalinism is possible than a comparison of the diplomacy of the USSR under the rule of the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin and Trotsky, and the diplomacy of Stalinist dominated Russia.

### **THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND THE SECRET TREATIES**

The capitalist Powers, Allied as well as German, in World War I, made a mockery of their claims to be fighting for democracy by maintaining the secret agreements previously referred

to. But in spite of them, and to their great embarrassment, the treaties were published nevertheless.

When the Bolsheviks came to power they opened the archives of the Russian Foreign Office, and immediately began to publish all the secret agreements they found. The reason for this was simple. The Soviet Government had not established an "ideal" democracy, any more than the capitalists before them. But for the first time the State represented the working class and poor peasantry organised as the ruling class, and on this basis could establish a far wider and more genuine democracy than any capitalist State. Because capitalism had been overthrown, imperialism which accompanies it could also be abolished. Instead of the enslavement of peoples, the workers' Government proclaimed the international solidarity of all workers and oppressed. Power-politics were replaced by revolutionary politics. Thus reads the Decree of Peace of the All-Russian Convention of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, November 8, 1917:

"The Government abolishes secret diplomacy and on its part expresses the firm intention to carry on all negotiations absolutely openly before all the people, and immediately begins to publish in full the secret treaties concluded or confirmed by the Government of landowners and capitalists from February up to November 7th, 1917 . . ."

The Soviet Government proposed an immediate peace with no annexations and no reparations, and appealed to the workers of the warring countries to take the action necessary to bring about such a peace. At the same time it appealed to the peoples of the East to come to its support, in the following stirring words:

"Mohammedans of the East! Persians, Turks, Arabs and Indians! All you whose bodies and property, freedom and native land have been for centuries exploited by the European beasts of prey! All you whose countries the plunderers who began the war now desire to share among themselves! We declare that the secret treaties of the deposed Tsar as to the annexation of Constantinople, confirmed by the late Kerensky Government—are now null and void. The Russian Republic, and its Government, the Council of People's

Commissars, are opposed to the annexation of foreign lands; Constantinople must remain in the hands of the Mohammedans.

We declare that the treaty for the division of Persia is null and void. Immediately after the cessation of military activities troops will be drawn from Persia and the Persians will be guaranteed the right of free self-determination.

We declare that the treaty for the division of Turkey and the subduction from it of Armenia, is null and void. Immediately after the cessation of military activities, the Armenians will be guaranteed the right of free self-determination of their political fate.

It is not from Russia and its revolutionary Government that you have to fear enslavement, but from the robbers of European imperialism, from those who have laid your native lands waste and converted them into their colonies.

Overthrow these robbers and enslavers of your lands! . . . ."

(December 7th, 1917)

Thus did the Russian Revolution open the lid of the sewer of secret diplomacy, bring the gangster horse-deals into the light of day, and call upon the masses to revolt against their capitalist rulers; to take power into their hands and abolish secret diplomacy for all time.

In this war, and prior to it, the usurpers in the Kremlin, clothing themselves with the tradition and the authority of the October Revolution, capitalising the trust inspired by the Revolution, conspired with the capitalist hangmen of the proletarian revolution—Fascist and "Democratic"—to keep the workers enslaved.

#### **THE SECRET PROTOCOLS TO THE RUSSO-GERMAN PACT**

At the Nuremberg trial, the existence of secret protocols to the Stalin-Hitler Pact was established. In spite of protests from the Russian Prosecutor, Gen. Rudenko, who objected that "the court was investigating the case of the major German war criminals and not the foreign policy of the Allies," Lord Justice Lawrence allowed them to be read to the Court, from photostatic copies.

For the following detailed material we are indebted to the Belgian journal "Europe-Amérique", 25.7.46, from which all the quotations in this section are taken.

The first document is dated Moscow, August 23rd, 1939, and is signed by Ribbentrop "for the German Government" and by Molotov "in the name of the Government of the U.S.S.R.":

"On the occasion of the signing of a treaty of non-aggression between the German Reich and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the undersigned, representing the two parties, discussed in the course of a highly confidential conversation the problem of demarcation of spheres of influence of each of the parties in Eastern Europe.

The conversation led to the following results:

1. In the case of politico-territorial changes (i.e. invasion by Russia and Germany—D.J.) in the territories belonging to the Baltic States—Finland, Latvia, Esthonia and Lithuania—the Northern frontier of Lithuania will form the line of demarcation of the spheres of interest between Germany and the U.S.S.R. The two parties recognise the interest of Lithuania over the territory of Wilno.

2. In the case of politico-territorial changes in the territories belonging to the Polish State, the spheres of interest between Germany and the U.S.S.R., will be approximately divided by a line following the rivers Narow, Vistula and San. The question of deciding whether the interests of the two parties will render desirable the maintenance of an independent Polish State, and of deciding how the frontiers of the said State shall be fixed, can only be determined definitely in the course of future political developments. In any case, the two Governments will resolve this question by means of a friendly agreement.

3. As far as South-Eastern Europe is concerned, the U.S.S.R. underlines its interests in Bessarabia. Germany affirms that she is totally disinterested in this zone from a political point of view.

4. The two parties agree to maintain this protocol strictly secret." The second agreement, equally secret, is dated from Moscow, September 28th, 1939; it carries the same signatures:

"The undersigned plenipotentiaries declare that the following agreement has been concluded between the Governments of the German Reich and the U.S.S.R.:

Paragraph No. 1 of the secret pro-

to col of August 23rd, 1939, is modified as follows: The territory of the Lithuanian State will fall in the Soviet sphere of influence, while on the other hand the district of Lublin and parts of the district of Warsaw will fall in the sphere of influence of Germany. While the Government of the U.S.S.R. will take special measures in Lithuanian territory in order to protect its interests, the present German-Lithuanian frontier will be rectified in order to constitute a simple frontier, of such a nature that Lithuanian territory south-west of the line marked on the attached map will belong to Germany."

Further, the U.S.S.R. agrees that the measures mentioned above will in no way affect the economic agreements at present in force between Germany and Lithuania."

**To set against these secret agreements, we have the following public declarations of the Stalinists and the Soviet Government:**

On August 28th, 1939, "La Voix du Peuple" (Belgian Stalinist paper) emphasised certain statements of Voroshilov:

"The declarations of comrade Voroshilov (Peoples' Commissar for War) are sufficiently clear on this subject; 'The Pact is in no way directed against Poland,' and the slanderous fantasies of imaginative falsifiers about a 'partition of Poland', and of Rumania as well, are entirely worthy of the columns of the 'Peuple' (Belgian Socialist paper)."

The Soviet-Esthonian Pact of October 3rd, 1939, stipulated:

"... The Soviet Government guarantees the independence of Esthonia and its existence as an independent State, against the aggression of the great imperialist Powers."

The Soviet-Latvian Pact of October 5th.:

"... The U.S.S.R. will respect the economic, social and administrative structure of Latvia."

The Soviet-Lithuanian Pact of October 11th.:

"The Soviet Government guarantees the defence of the independence, inviolability and security of the sovereign State of Lithuania."

Comment on Stalinist cynicism is surely unnecessary!

Having been forced by the Nazi attack to transfer their alliance with

capitalism from its fascist to its "democratic" variety, the Stalinist leadership still pursued the same course of treacherous, backstage diplomatic deals directed against the proletarian revolution. The agreements negotiated with Roosevelt and Stalin add up to no less than gigantic conspiracies against the world working class. In every case agreements were made to divide the territories conquered without any consideration for, or reference to, the peoples living in the lands to be treated as booty, as spoils of war.

### **RUSSIA'S DECLARATION OF WAR ON JAPAN.**

At the Crimea Conference, on February 11th, 1945, an agreement was signed which provided for dividing up the loot arising from Japan's defeat. It represents the conditions which Stalin imposed for entering the war. It is a remarkable document, since the territory concerned was stolen by Japan from China. Having agreed on dismembering the body of their gallant ally China, they then agreed that Roosevelt (the Great White Democrat of Hallowed Memory) should have the job of bullying China into acceptance.

"Livadia, 11th February, 1945.

"The leaders of the three Great Powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America and Great Britain—have agreed that in two or three months after Germany has surrendered and the war in Europe has terminated the Soviet Union shall enter into the war against Japan on the side of the Allies on condition that:

1. The status quo in Outer Mongolia (The Mongolian Peoples' Republic) shall be preserved;
2. The former rights of Russia violated by the treacherous attack of Japan in 1904 shall be restored, viz.
  - (a) The southern part of Sakhalin as well as all the islands adjacent to it shall be returned to the Soviet Union;
  - (b) The commercial port of Dairen shall be internationalised, the pre-eminent interests of the Soviet Union in this port being safeguarded and the lease of Port Arthur as a naval base of the U.S.S.R. restored;
  - (c) The Chinese-Eastern Railroad and the South-Manchurian Railroad, which provides an outlet to Dairen, shall be jointly operated by the establishment of a

joint Soviet-Chinese company, it being understood that the pre-eminent interests of the Soviet Union shall be safeguarded and that China shall retain full sovereignty in Manchuria.

3. The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer-Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshall Stalin.

The Heads of the three Great Powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated.

For its part the Soviet Union expresses its readiness to conclude with the National Government of China a pact of friendship and alliance between the U.S.S.R. and China in order to render assistance to China with its armed forces for the purpose of liberating China from the Japanese yoke.

J. V. Stalin.  
Franklin D. Roosevelt.  
Winston S. Churchill."

This agreement was kept secret until February, 1946, when it was published by the Stationery Office.

For comparison, here is an extract from the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of May, 1924:

"The Governments of the contracting parties declare that in the future neither of them will conclude any treaties or agreements whatsoever, capable of causing detriment to the sovereign rights or interests of the other. . . .

The Government of the U.S.S.R. agrees to renounce the special rights and privileges with regard to all concessions in any part of China whatsoever, acquired by the Tsarist Government under various conventions, treaties, agreements etc."

#### AND NOW?

Today the price is being paid by the masses for the actions of their rulers during World War II. The capitalist bandits of Wall Street, with the "Socialist" servitors of British finance cap-

ital in the heels of the hunt, are engaged in a diplomatic struggle with the Kremlin oligarchy for the plunder of the whole world.

From the capitalist ruling cliques nothing more was to be expected. The masses in Britain showed they understood that when they so decisively pushed the Labour leaders into power. But from these same Labour leaders has come only a continuity of imperialist plundering and maintenance of the yoke of capitalist exploitation on the necks of the toilers in the metropolis and in the colonial countries. Britain, despite all the idealistic fulminations of Bevin and Attlee, has retreated from her domination of Egypt and India only to the extent that she has been compelled to do so from weakness. The withdrawal from Indonesia has come only when they are satisfied that the best possible bargain has been struck for Dutch imperialism. British arms and conscript soldiers are the real support of the bloodstained Monarchist scum who terrorise the Greek masses.

So far as the Stalinist rulers of the USSR are concerned, they have abandoned all pretensions of extending the Russian Revolution on the basis of the independent actions of the masses, fostered by the Communist Parties, inspired and aided by the Revolution in Russia and by the Red Army where needs be.

From the Moscow of Stalin comes no renunciation of the secret treaties, for the rulers of the USSR are involved in them. From the Government of Stalin comes no renunciation of treaties or agreements "capable of causing detriment to the sovereign rights or interests" of the peoples. And it cannot be otherwise. For reaction has a logic of its own. Having abandoned the road of Lenin, the reliance on the independent strength and capacities of the workers of the world, Stalinism is forced to employ the same horse-deals and secret diplomatic manoeuvres as the capitalist rulers.

The Stalinist bureaucracy, no less than the world capitalists lives in fear of independent revolutionary struggles on the part of the workers, for any real and successful mass struggle to bring about the social revolution would involve also the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy and the reinstatement of Soviet democracy in Russia. That is the explanation of the shameful secret diplomacy of the Kremlin clique.

# WORKERS' CONTROL AND COLLABORATION WITH THE U.S.S.R.

By LEON TROTSKY

The following is taken from the book "Germany What Next" published in 1932. The material contained in this chapter is invaluable in assisting in the understanding of the development of present-day events, and particularly essential for an understanding of the Trotskyist conception of the meaning of "workers' control"—a term much bandied about in Left-wing circles these days. And this deals also with the question of workers' management, particularly in nationalized industries. —Ed.)

**WHENEVER** we speak of the slogans of the revolutionary period, the latter should not be construed in too narrow a sense. The Soviets should be created only in a revolutionary period. But when does that begin? One cannot consult the calendar and thus learn. One can only feel one's way through action. The Soviets **must** be created at the time when they **can** be created.

The slogan of workers control over production relates, particularly and in general, to the same period as the creation of Soviets. But neither should this be construed mechanically. Special conditions may draw the masses toward control over production considerably prior to the time when they will evince themselves ready to create Soviets.

Brandler and his left shadow—Urbahns—have used the slogan of control over production, independently of the political background. This has served no purpose other than to discredit the slogan. But it would be incorrect to reject the slogan now, under the conditions of the looming political crisis, only because on the face of it the mass offensive doesn't exist as yet. For the offensive itself, slogans are necessary which would define the perspectives of the movement. The period of propaganda must inevitably precede the penetration of the slogan into the masses.

The campaign for workers' control can develop, depending upon the circumstances, not from the angle of production but from that of consumption. The promise of the Brüning Government to lower the price of commodities simultaneously with the decrease in wages has not materialised. This question cannot but absorb the most backward strata of the proletariat, who are today very far from the thought of seizing power. Workers' control over the outlays of industry and the profits of trade is the only real form of the struggle for lower prices. Under the conditions of general dissatisfaction, workers' commissions, with the participation of worker housewives, for the purpose of checking up on the increased cost of margarine can become very palpable beginnings of workers' control over industry. It is self-evident that this is only one of the possible manners of approach and it was given only as an example. Here the matter will not as yet concern the management of industry; the working women will not go so far at once, such a thought is far removed from her mind. But it is easier for her to pass from the consumer control to the productive control and from the latter to the direct management, depending upon the general development of the revolution.

In contemporary Germany, under the conditions of the present crisis, control over industry signifies control not only over the operating but also over the partly operating and shut down industries. This presupposes the gaining over for control of those workers who worked in those industries prior to their dismissal. The task thereby must consist of setting the dead industries into motion, under the leadership of Factory Committees on the basis of an economic plan. This leads squarely to the question of the governmental administration of industry, i.e., to the expropriation of the capitalists by the workers' government. Workers' control, in this wise, is not a prolonged

“normal” condition, like wage scale agreements or social insurance. The control is a transitional measure, under the conditions of the highest tension of the class war, and conceivable only as a bridge to the revolutionary nationalization of industry.

The Brandlerites accuse the Left Opposition (the Trotskyists.—Ed.) of having snatched from them the slogan of control over production after having jeered at this slogan for a number of years. The accusation has quite an unexpected tone! The slogan of control over industry was first issued, on a wide scale, by the Bolshevik party in 1917. In Petrograd, the charge over the entire campaign in this sphere, as well as in others, was placed in the hand of the Soviet. As an individual, who watched this work and participated in it, I bear witness that we were never obliged to turn to Thalheimer-Brandler for initiative, or to make use of their theoretical information. The accusation of “plagiarism” is formulated with considerable carelessness.

But that is not the chief trouble. The matters are much worse with the second part of the accusation—until now the “Trotskyists” have argued against a campaign under the slogan of control over production, but right now they come out for this slogan. The Brandlerites see herein our inconsistency! As a matter of fact they only reveal a complete ignorance of revolutionary dialectic, which is packed into the slogan of workers’ control by reducing it to a technical prescription for “mobilising the masses”. They condemn themselves when they cite the fact that they have been repeating for a number of years the slogan which is suitable only for a revolutionary period. The woodpecker who has drilled away at the bark of an oak tree, year in and year out, in all probability at the bottom of his heart, also holds to the conviction that the woodman, who had chopped down the tree with the blows of his axe, has criminally plagiarized from him, the woodpecker.

For us therefore the slogan of control is tied up with the period of dual-power in industry, which corresponds to the transition from the bourgeois regime to the proletarian. Not at all, contradicts us Thalheimer, dual-power must signify “equality (!) with the proprietors”; but the workers are fighting for their complete leadership of industries. They, the Brandlerites,

will not allow the revolutionary slogan to be “castrated” (that is the way they put it!). To them, “control over production signifies the management of the industries by the workers.” (January 17, 1932.) But why then call management as **control**? In the language of all mankind under control is understood the surveillance and checking of one institution over the work of another. Control may be active, dominant, and all-embracing. But it remains control. The very idea of this slogan was the outgrowth of the transitional regime in industry when the capitalist and his administrators could no longer take a step without the consent of the workers; but on the other hand, when the workers had not as yet provided the political prerequisites for nationalization, not yet seized the technical management, nor yet created the organs essential for this. Let us not forget that what is broached here concerns not only the taking charge of corporations, but also the sale of products, and the supplying of factories with raw materials, and new equipment, as well as credit operations, etc.

The correlation of forces in the factory is determined by the force of the general onset of the proletariat upon the bourgeois society. Generally speaking, control is thinkable only during the indubitable preponderance of the political forces of the proletariat over the forces of capitalism. But it is wrong to think that in a revolution all questions must needs be and are solved by force: the factories may be gained with the aid of the Red Guard; their management requires new legal and administrative prerequisites; and over and above that, knowledge, routine, and organs. A certain period of apprenticeship is required. The proletariat is interested in leaving the management during that period in the hands of an experienced administration, but compelling it to keep all the books open and establishing a wide awake supervision over all its affiliations and actions.

The workers’ control begins with the individual workshop. The organ of control is the factory committee. The factory organs of control join together with each other, according to the economic ties between the industries themselves. On this stage, there is no general economic plan as yet. The practice of workers’ control only prepares the elements of this plan.

On the contrary, the workers' management of industry, to a much greater degree, even in its initial steps, proceeds from above, for it is inseparable from state-power and the general economic plan. The organs of management are not factory committees but centralised Soviets. The role of the factory committees remains important, of course. But in the sphere of management of industry it has no longer a leading but an auxiliary role.

In Russia, where following the bourgeoisie, the technical intelligentsia was convinced that the Bolshevik experiment would endure only a few weeks, and therefore had steered its course towards all sorts of sabotage and had refused to enter into any agreements, the stage of the workers' control did not develop. Moreover, the war was destroying the economic structure by changing the workers into soldiers. Therefore there is comparatively little in the Russian experience to be found in relation to workers' control, as a special regime in industry. But this experience is all the more valuable for the opposite reason: it demonstrates that even in a backward country under the general sabotage of not only the proprietors but also of the administrative-technical personnel, the young and inexperienced proletariat, surrounded by a ring of enemies, was able nevertheless to assemble the management of industry. What wouldn't then the German working class be able to accomplish!

The proletariat, as has been said above, is interested in seeing to it that the transition from the private capitalist to the state capitalist and then to the socialist method of production be accomplished with the least economic convulsions and the least drain upon the national wealth. That is why, while nearing power and even after seizing power, by way of the boldest and most decisive struggle, the proletariat will evince a complete readiness to establish a transitional regime in the factories, plants and banks.

Will the relations in industry in Germany during the period of revolution be composed differently from those in Russia? It is not easy to answer this question, particularly from the side lines. The actual course of the class struggle may not leave place for workers' control, as a special stage. Under the extreme tension of the developing struggle, under the increased

pressure of the workers on the one side and the sabotage on the part of the proprietors and administrators, on the other, there may be no room left for agreements, even though temporary. In such a case, the proletariat will have to assume together with the power, the full management of industry. The present semi-paralyzed state of industry and the presence of a great army of unemployed make quite possible such a "condensed" way.

But, on the other hand, the presence of mighty organizations within the working class, the bringing up of the German workers in the spirit of systematic activities, and not of improvisations, and the tardiness of the masses in swinging towards revolution which can tip the scale in favour of the first way. Therefore it would be inexcusable to reject beforehand the slogan of control over production.

In any event, it is obvious that in Germany, even more than in Russia, the slogan of workers' control has a purport apart from that of workers' management. Like many other transitional slogans, it retains an enormous significance independent of the degree to which it will be realised in reality, if realised at all.

But its readiness to establish transitional forms of workers' control, the proletariat vanguard wins over to its side the more conservative strata of the proletariat, and neutralises certain groups of the petty bourgeoisie, especially the technical, administrative, and banking staffs. Should the capitalists and the entire upper layer of the administration evince an utter irreconcilability by resorting to methods of economic sabotage, the responsibility for the severe measures that spring therefrom will fall in the eyes of the nation not upon the workers but upon the hostile classes. Such is the supplementary political purport of the slogan of workers' control along with the above mentioned economic and administrative purport.

In any case, the extremes of political cynicism are attested by the fact that those people who have issued the slogan of control in a non-revolutionary environment, and thereby given it a purely reformist character, accuse us of centrist duality, because of our refusal to identify control with management.

The workers who will reach the questions of the management of industry



will not wish nor will they be able to become drunk with words. They have become used in factories to dealing with materials, less flexible than phrases, and they will comprehend our thoughts better than bureaucrats; genuine revolutionary thinking does not consist in applying force everywhere and at all times, and far less in choking with verbal enthusiasm over force. Where force is necessary, there it must be applied boldly, decisively and completely. But one must know the limitations of force, one must know when to blend force with a manoeuvre; the blow with an agreement. On anniversaries of Lenin's death the Stalinist bureaucracy repeats coined phrases about "revolutionary realism" in order the more freely to jeer at it during the remaining 364 days.

The prostituted theoreticians of reformism attempt to discover the dawn of socialism in the emergency decrees against the workers. From the "military socialism" of Hohenzollerns to the police socialism of Bruning!

Left bourgeois ideologists dream of a planned capitalist economy. But capitalism has had time to demonstrate that in the line of plans it is capable only of draining the productive forces for the sake of war. Disregarding everything else, in what manner can the dependence of Germany—with its enormous figures of import and export—upon the world market be regulated?

We, on our side, propose to begin with the sector of the German-Soviet relations, i.e., the working out of a wide plan of collaboration between the Soviet and German economy in connection with and supplementary to the second five year plan. Tens and hundreds of the largest factories could go ahead at full steam. The unemployment in Germany could be entirely liquidated—it would hardly take more than two or three years—on the basis of an economic plan, which would embrace from all sides only these two countries.

The leaders of capitalist industry in Germany, obviously, cannot make such a plan, because it means their social self-elimination. But the Soviet Government, with the aid of the German workers' organizations, first of all, the trade unions and progressive representative of German technology, can and must work out an entirely practical plan, capable of opening truly

grandiose perspectives. How petty will appear all these "problems" of reparations and supplementary toll pennings in comparison to those possibilities which will be opened by coupling the natural, technical and organizational resources of the Soviet and German national economies.

The German Communists are spreading wide-scale propaganda concerning the successes of Soviet upbuilding. This work is necessary. They fly into sugared embellishments. That is entirely superfluous. But worse yet, they have been unable to link together both the successes and the difficulties of the Soviet economy with the immediate interests of the German proletariat; with unemployment, with the lowering of wages, and with the general economic impasse of Germany. They have been unable and unwilling to pose the question of Soviet-German collaboration on a strictly practical as well as deeply revolutionary basis.

During the first stage of the crisis—more than two years ago—we posed this question in print. And the Stalinists immediately set up a hue and cry that we believe in the peaceful co-existence of socialism and capitalism, that we want to save capitalism, etc. They failed to foresee and understand just one thing, to wit, what a potent factor in the socialist revolution a concrete economic plan of collaboration could become, if it be made the subject of discussion in trade unions, and at factory meetings, among workers of operating as well as of shut down industries; and if it be linked with the slogan of workers' control over production, and subsequently with the slogan of seizing power. For international planned collaboration can be realised only under government monopoly of foreign trade in Germany, and the nationalisation of the means of production, in other words, under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Along this road, one could pull new millions of workers, non-party, social-democrat, and Catholic into the struggle for power.

The Tarnows are scaring the German workers with the prospect that the industrial breakdown as a consequence of the revolution would result in frightful chaos, famine, etc. Let it be kept in mind that these same people supported the imperialist war which could bring to the proletariat in its train nothing save tortures, hardships

and degradation. To burden the proletariat with the agonies of war under the banner of the Hohenzollerns—yes! Revolutionary sacrifices under the banner of socialism?—No, never!

Discussions concerning the topic that “our German workers” would never agree to suffer “such sacrifices” con-

sist in simultaneously flattering the German workers and vilifying them. Unfortunately, the German workers are too patient. The Socialist Revolution will not exact from the German proletariat one hundredth of the sacrifices that were swallowed up in the war of the Hohenzollern?Leipart-Wels.

# NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION OR PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION: THE TASKS IN GERMANY

(Discussion Article)

By E. GRANT

**T**HE comrades of the I.K.D. (a section of the German Emigré Trotskyists) have replied to our criticism of their **Three Theses** in an article entitled “Two Balance Sheets” published in October 1946 “Workers’ International News.”

While ostensibly correcting certain errors, viz., their claim that “the national oppression has remained, only the uniforms of the oppressors have changed”, they reinforce their fundamental revision which is contained in the assertion that what we are faced with in Europe was not, and apparently is not, the proletarian revolution, but wars of national liberation and a revolution “**basically equivalent to a democratic revolution.**”

Ignoring the fundamental issue, the class character of the revolution, they jeeringly reiterate that the proletarian revolution which had been confidently anticipated by the Fourth International, has not materialised.

True, it has not materialised. And an instructive discussion can and must be conducted as to the reasons for the failure of the proletariat to take power in the first revolutionary wave following World War II. But this does not invalidate the orthodox Marxist attitude towards the class struggle in Europe today any less than did the similar failure of the proletariat to conquer power anywhere in the world apart from Russia after World War I.

Lenin and Trotsky explained this failure by the treachery of the Second International, of Social Democracy. Today the masses are deceived by two traitor “internationals”, the reformist and the Stalinist. The latter being far

more formidable owing to the authority usurped from the October revolution, having a base far stronger than that ever possessed by Social Democracy. This factor places exceptional difficulties in the path of the proletariat. The Stalinists have for the moment, successfully switched the movement of the masses away from the proletarian revolution into the channels of the “peoples revolution”, i.e. into the channels of bourgeois democracy, as did the Social Democrats after the last war.

Our German comrades of the I.K.D. should remember the experience of Weimar. Had any sneering petit-bourgeois sceptic reproached Lenin and Trotsky, say in 1920, asking where was the promised revolution in Europe, they would have received a fitting but hardly polite reply. Our answer cannot be any different.

The basic thesis of the I.K.D., which our comrades maintain without any real attempt at defence against criticism, is that capitalist “retrogression” makes necessary in Europe a detour through what they define as “**basically equivalent to a democratic revolution.**” For the basis of this, let us quote again the original “Three Theses”:

“The prisons, the new ghettos, the forced labour, the concentration and even war prisoners camps are not only transitional political-military establishments, they are just as much forms of new economic exploitation which accompanies the development toward a modern slave state and is intended as the permanent fate of a considerable percentage of modern mankind.”

This impressionistic evaluation, written at the height of the war, is being refuted by events. This capitalist "retrogression" theory is further developed, on the basis of the temporary springing up of small factories during the war, as evidence of a return to the "slave state", the middle ages, and the dawn of capitalism. Temporary features caused by the needs of the war, are transformed into permanent features of the present epoch. Thrown overboard is the Marxist theory of the concentration of big industry at the expense of small, of the replacement of handiwork by machinery, the development of the "free" labourer as against the serf and slave labourer of the past. The political wisdom of the comrades of the I.K.D. is summed up thus:

"In contrast to the use of complicated machinery, and in contrast to the concentration and over-development of an industry fit only for war purposes, there is compulsory labour, that is, the mass use of manual labour which is cheaper than machine labour, the founding and extension of small and middle-sized forms because of the shortage of consumer goods, the restoration of handwork, the dissipation and ruin of the monetary system . . ."

" . . . The political situation in these systematically exploited countries (under Nazi domination) is characterised above all by the destruction of workers and non-fascist bourgeois parties. Step by step unions, political and cultural societies of all kinds, religious organisations, etc., are wiped out according to the German pattern, changed or in some way put under direct fascist control. With certain exceptions, where this process has not yet been fully completed, there is no longer an independent traditional bourgeois or proletarian political or workers' movement, and in these countries (especially in Poland and Czechoslovakia) even the 'national' bourgeois is being more and more crushed by such means as 'aryanisation', compulsory sales and direct expulsion. All that is left of the old organised 'movements' are today nothing but illegal circles, which have little connection with each other and can in no way act as an entity . . ."

" . . . As it is pushed to that limit which is daily drawn closer by this enemy, it levels all and every-

thing and takes a direction which can be described as nothing but a 'drive for national freedom.' In a few countries (Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, in part Poland, etc.) this drive has crossed the limit and has turned into a real peoples' movement. In it participate all classes and strata, from workers, farm labourers, farmers, urban petit bourgeoisie (tradesmen and artisans, that is, together with the farmers, those classes, which in spite of their large numbers are remnants of pre-capitalistic modes of production) to officials, priests, intellectuals and generals. "

"If in the Europe dominated by Germany there is no longer an organised and active workers' movement and even the bourgeois organisations are out of the picture, there can also be no talk of the existence of real revolutionary organisations, insofar as they are understood, as united structures, which, even if illegal, would be willing and capable of influencing the development by means at least of correct agitation and propaganda . . ."

"However one views it, the transition from fascism to socialism remains a utopia without an intermediate stage, which is **basically** equivalent to a democratic revolution."

With small changes, Dimitrov and Stalin could have subscribed to such an analysis.

So the workers' movement is still non-existent! On the contrary, the Labour movement in Western Europe, far from having been destroyed, has come out of the war stronger than it entered it. True, the supporters of the Three Theses have tried to get round this little difficulty by decreeing that since the workers' movement is not led by Marxists, it is no workers' movement.

"Now that the war is over," they write, "there is no working class movement (in the sense of a political movement independent of the bourgeoisie, not counting the Social Democrats and Stalinists who work for and on behalf of the bourgeoisie), there is no revolution, and there is no leadership of the Fourth International."

("Two Balance Sheets")

But in that case there has not been a Labour movement in Europe since 1923. To tell the workers of France that their Trade Unions and political

parties do not constitute a workers' movement would produce the deserved reply! Of course, the I.K.D. have only discovered this formulation recently. Before the re-emergence of the Labour movement in Western Europe, they described the British Labour Party and Trade Union movement as the only workers' movement left in Europe. The British Labour Party can hardly be described as "Marxist" or conscious of the historic mission of the proletariat.

From the foregoing, it can be clearly seen that this new argument is advanced to conceal the complete refutation of the original conceptions of the **Three Theses** in the real world of brutal facts.

The re-emergence of the Labour movement in all the countries of Europe reveals that the whole "retrogression" theory of the Three Theses was fundamentally false. Under the totalitarian lid of Fascism, the class struggle continued to boil. If the socialist revolution was to be achieved it could only have been led by the working class as a class, at the head of the mass of the people fighting against foreign oppression and its national agencies at home, i.e., the national bourgeoisie and its appendages. The proletariat could drag at the tail of the bourgeoisie through the "all peoples' movement" (as was consistently carried through by Stalinism in Western Europe), or the mass of the petit bourgeoisie would be won to the programme of the proletarian revolution on the basis of a revolutionary proletarian policy. There was no middle way. Either with the bourgeoisie or with the proletariat. That is the sole alternative in the present epoch.

To refresh the memory of those who have followed this discussion, or for the benefit of those who have not read our previous article, we reiterate:

"They (the I.K.D.) draw the conclusion that the bourgeoisie through a 'democratic' revolution, can still play a progressive role! It is true that they put this forward under the guise of a 'peoples' movement, the class character of which they do not define. But never in modern times has the 'people' or the 'nation' as such played an independent role. The petit bourgeois masses in all their layers, can support either the proletariat or the bourgeoisie. There cannot be in modern society, any

other state but that of the proletariat or the bourgeoisie. Lenin clearly developed this idea when he wrote:

'all political economy—if one has learned anything from it—the whole history of the revolution, the whole history of political development during the nineteenth century, teaches us that the peasant goes either with the workers or with the bourgeois. If you do not know this, I should like to say to such citizens, just reflect upon the development of any one of the great revolutions of the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries, upon the political history of any country in the nineteenth century. It will tell you why. The economy of capitalist society is such that the ruling power can only be either capital or the proletariat which overthrows it. Other forces there are none in the economics of society.'

We ask the I.K.D. comrades: Just reflect upon the development of Europe since the fall of the Nazis! What has emerged? Not an all class peoples' movement, but a division of political alignments in accordance with the basic class divisions in society; a polarisation with the working class parties on the one side and the reaction on the other, with the petit bourgeoisie uneasily balancing in the "centre" Christian Democratic parties, a position which they cannot maintain indefinitely. Either they will go to the right in a neo-fascist reaction, or will be won to the proletarian revolution under the leadership of the proletariat.

#### THE ROLE OF EAM IN GREECE

The comrades of the I.K.D. in their "Two Balance Sheets" say:

"Mistakes, if they are not investigated openly and corrected, must of necessity be repeated and become graver with repetition. Witness the British Section and the fighting in Greece. This broke out just after the R.C.P. had drawn up a resolution on the National Question, point 5 of which declares all national resistance movements to be 'agencies of one or the other group of imperialist powers.' This goes for E.A.M. as well, therefore the R.C.P. would have had to make its stand against E.A.M. with Churchill, if he was so blind as not to know his own agency. This was not done; the 'Socialist Appeal' came out in full support for E.A.M. and could hardly have done otherwise. But what about the re-

solution which had proved to clash with reality was it revised? No; it was reality that had to undergo revision. The revolt in Greece was promoted to the rank of the proletarian revolution. This valuable support, unfortunately, could not prevent the defeat of the revolt; upon which—again without any investigation—it was discovered that E.A.M. after all, was only a resistance movement, and Greece is paraded as an example what devastating results followed from supporting a national movement. If it is 'supported' as here, by ignoring it until the point of uprising is reached and then hailing it as the proletarian revolution, this is certainly correct."

Even if this false explanation of the position of the R.C.P., as given by these comrades, were correct, the conclusion that they draw on the basis of their analysis, that the R.C.P. should have taken its stand against E.A.M. with Churchill does not follow at all. Attlee and Bevin are the agents of the British ruling class and we expose them as such. But let Churchill and Eden launch an attack against the Labour movement led by Attlee and Bevin tomorrow, and we will find ourselves side by side with Attlee and Bevin against Churchill and his class. Surely this is elementary.

However, the position of the R.C.P. is somewhat distorted by the I.K.D. comrades in the above quotation. To get a clear picture of the R.C.P.'s attitude towards the Resistance Movements, permit us to quote the relevant sections of the resolution on the National Question in Europe:

"The Revolutionary Communist Party condemns and fights against the national oppression of one nation by another; it supports the right of complete self-determination and political secession of every nationally oppressed people.

2. In spite of imperialism and its present phase of imperialist war, all the objective conditions demand that a genuine struggle for national freedom must be linked to the programme of the socialist revolution and the struggle for the United Socialist States of Europe.

While condemning the Nazi oppression, the resolution condemns equally the national oppression which is carried on by the Allies, and defines the attitude of the revolutionaries to the

resistance movements, as follows:

"4. The role of the European ruling classes is clear to see. They collaborated as a class with the foreign Nazi oppressor and now seek to play the same role as agents of the military victors—Anglo-American imperialism and the Kremlin. Without the active support of Stalinism and Social Democracy the capitalists would long have lost all semblance of support among the workers and peasants. By subordinating the working class and its organisations to the leadership of the bourgeoisie and to the programme of Anglo-American imperialism and Stalinism, the Social Democrat and Stalinist parties play a counter-revolutionary role. It is the duty of revolutionaries, while striving at all stages of the struggle to win the rank and file to the banner of Trotskyism, to oppose and expose the role of these parties and their auxiliary organisations.

5. Despite their undoubted support from many thousands of the best proletarian fighters, who see in the Resistance Movements not an instrument for the replacement of one master by another, but rather the instrument for the overthrow of capitalism and the emancipation of the working class, these National Resistance movements in Europe today are agencies of one or other group of imperialist powers. As movements they are incapable of genuinely struggling for national freedom."

That places in correct perspective the attitude of the R.C.P. towards the resistance movements. That characterisation stands the test of events and requires no correction. It is clearly applicable to E.A.M. as well. During the imperialist war E.A.M. was on the side of Anglo-U.S. imperialism against German imperialism. The R.C.P. did not take an ultra-left position on the question of national liberation. It stood four-square for national liberation of the peoples of Europe from the shackles of German imperialism. But we never failed to warn that the leadership of E.A.M. and other resistance movements were agents of imperialism. Our warnings were confirmed by events. E.A.M. did its best to come to a compromise with imperialism and tried to disarm the working class in the face of the Royalist-fascist reaction

and their imperialist backers.

The fact that E.A.M. came into collision with Churchill and the imperialists was due to the fear of the latter that E.A.M. would not prove a reliable instrument in preventing the socialist revolution, and that through E.A.M., Greece might come under the domination of Stalin, thus rounding off his hold on the Balkan peninsula.

The jibe about Churchill being "so blind as not to know his own agency" befits the level of the rest of the arguments. They might as well have asked: Why did the Trotskyists support the Spanish Republic against Franco, a Republic which they designated as an agency of Anglo-French imperialism and Stalinism? Or do perchance the comrades now deny this and in retrospect discover that we had a "peoples' movement" in Spain as well? This characterisation did not prevent the Trotskyists from describing the Spanish events as an attempt at the proletarian revolution on the part of the masses, in spite of the content given it by the bourgeoisie and Stalinists. The movement in Spain was a proletarian revolution, which was diverted into a "peoples' bourgeois democratic movement against fascism, in alliance with the "shadow of the bourgeoisie", while the bourgeoisie itself was on the side of Franco.

So it was with E.A.M. in Greece. The masses supported E.A.M. The bourgeoisie was with Churchill, while the "shadow of the bourgeoisie" united with the Stalinist leadership, and thus distorted the mass movement in a bourgeois direction.

Despite the Stalinist attempt at "national unity", the class struggle broke through the "national peoples movement". This resulted in civil war between the proletarian-poor-peasant wing and the bourgeois wing within the Resistance Movement, even while Greece was under the domination of the Nazis. After the so-called "liberation", de facto power was in the hands of the working class, just as in Spain after the insurrection of the workers in Barcelona, Valencia and Madrid in the first days of the revolt. The E.A.M. leadership frustrated the movement of the masses, gave up their arms and tried to arrive at an agreement with the imperialists. Despite their attempts at capitulation to the imperialists, civil war broke out because of the movement of the masses.

If the I.K.D. members deny that the revolt in Greece was an attempt at the seizure of power on the part of the proletariat, how do they characterise this movement. A "peoples' movement"? The revolt began as a spontaneous movement on the part of the masses, despite all attempts of E.A.M. to prevent its breaking out. The incident which set the spark off was a classic one in the highly charged atmosphere to provoke a revolution. The firing on an unarmed demonstration on the part of the Royalist-fascist Security Battalions was similar to the firing of the Czars troops on the demonstration led by Father Gapon at the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg in 1905. Should Lenin, instead of demanding the independence of the proletariat, have advocated the merging of the Labour movement in the all-class peoples' movement? To pose the question, is to answer it. The firing in Constitution Square, Athens, as even the bourgeois "Times" understood, sowed the seeds of civil war. Civil war between which classes, and for what aims? For the "peoples' revolution" or for the conquest of power by the proletariat? E.A.M. was a classic example of a Popular Front betrayal of the proletarian revolution. Had E.A.M. been successful, the regime that would have issued from the struggle could only have been a bourgeois regime.

All talk of "democratic revolution", "national revolution", "all class peoples' movement", etc., in the final analysis cannot but be a refurbished version of Popular Frontism. There cannot be a "democratic revolution" suspended in mid-air. The "peoples' revolution must have a class basis. And so we arrive back where we started. Define the class content of your revolution, and then we will know where you stand!

If the I.K.D. argues that the revolt was not a proletarian revolution, but an all-class national democratic revolution, then they have no grounds for criticising E.A.M. It follows that the tactics of the Stalinists in Greece were correct. It follows too, that the I.K.D. was correct that there was no proletarian movement in Europe under the Nazis, and that what we had was a national peoples' movement, which could not be defined as having come under the leadership of agents of imperialism.

From all this, it follows that the Stalinists have served the cause of socialism in establishing their "Peoples' Front movements in Spain, France, Greece. Why then the need for the Fourth International? This is the inevitable conclusion they must arrive at.

#### WHAT IS THE AIM OF THE "DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION"?

In dealing with the elusive "democratic revolution" which is neither proletarian nor bourgeois, the I.K.D. attempts to get out of the inextricable confusion by defining the content as follows:

(Grant is) "fighting windmills. (For instance the democratic revolution which we (I.K.D.) are alleged to substitute for the proletarian revolution whereas, in reality, we said that the democratic revolution in our epoch, 'can be realised only by the smashing of the framework of capitalism'.")

Confusion thrice confounded! We are gratified to learn from these comrades that the "democratic peoples' revolution" which they state is necessary in our epoch cannot be accomplished by bourgeois democracy. They claim they are now "alleged" to substitute something for the proletarian revolution. What then are they substituting for the proletarian revolution? Do they seriously argue that all classes, including the oppressed bourgeoisie in the peoples' movement are going to "smash the framework of capitalism"? Is there any other revolution, apart from the proletarian revolution, that can smash the framework of capitalism. When these comrades are pinned down to Marxian definitions, one can see how they slide back and forth, and their Theses become nothing short of nonsense.

On the road to the proletarian revolution, a variety of democratic demands are necessary. But we work not for a "democratic revolution"; our aim is the conquest of power by the proletariat. To fool around with terminology in the way our comrades do, is impermissible for Marxists. We tell the petit bourgeois masses that their problems can only be solved through the proletarian revolution; to pose the problem in any other form is to deceive them and to create a "democratic noose" for the proletariat. The bitter experience of Stalinism confirms this. But perhaps to call it the proletarian

revolution is too harsh and may drive away the petit bourgeoisie? Why not call it the "peoples' revolution"? In some passages the arguments of the I.K.D. could only be construed as such; while in others it is refuted. In Greece, they accusingly say to the R.C.P.: You promoted the revolt in Greece to the rank of proletarian revolution. So apparently the "peoples' revolution" is different from the proletarian revolution, and yet at the same time it can be realised only by "smashing the framework of capitalism"! These comrades have the temerity to say that we are tilting at windmills, in other words, inventing straw men!

What then are the differences between the democratic revolution and the proletarian revolution? The real answer is that the comrades make it mean different things at different times, sometimes identifying it with proletarian revolution, sometimes a new stage, and sometimes one knows not what!

#### THE TASKS IN GERMANY.

Just as they lumped the different classes in Europe under the rule of the Nazis indiscriminately together, so now in relation to Germany, they lump together all classes oppressed by the Allies, to be united in an "all-embracing national democratic revolution."

Germany, of course, has to wage a struggle for national freedom against her oppressors, just as the countries oppressed by Germany faced the same problem. But the whole crux of the problem lies in HOW the struggle for national liberation is to be waged.

The answer of the Fourth International is that national liberation can be accomplished only by the proletariat at the head of the movement. That will be the central idea put forward by German Marxists. Far from blurring over the class lines, these will be emphasised. Only a clear fighting class policy will win the petit bourgeoisie over to the programme of the socialist revolution, which is indissolubly bound up with the struggle against the Allied oppressors. Such a struggle can only be waged as a class struggle. Yet the I.K.D. comrades, again using intentionally vague formulations, leave the door wide open to the most shameless opportunism, and even capitulation to reaction. They say:

"Unless the Fourth International makes the support of all movements

for national liberation according to the 'Three Theses' the main point in its programme for Germany, it will not be able to offer the masses anything beyond the programme of the reformists—nor even beyond the performance of the occupation authorities; for these have expropriated German capitalists (without compensation!) and clapped them into jail into the bargain—witness the action of British Military Government against the coal owners of the Ruhr."

The German workers, we can be sure, will weep no tears over the fate of the coal barons in the Ruhr, nor of the bourgeoisie as a whole in the territory occupied by the Russians. But the demand of the German Trotskyists in both sections of Germany will be **for the withdrawal of the occupation troops, and for the running and controlling of German industry by the working class.** To imagine that the problem of German economy can be separated from the question: **which class will control, is to turn one's back on Marxism.**

We can only penetrate the ranks of the Social Democrats and Stalinists by giving them a **class** alternative to the capitulation of their leaders to the Allies. The struggle for freedom from national oppression in Germany can be waged on the lines of Schlageter, the reactionary forerunner of the Nazis, or it can be waged by the method of Lenin and Trotsky, on class lines. The petit bourgeoisie goes either with the bourgeois reaction or with the proletariat.

In Russia, the Bolsheviks waged a ruthless struggle against those who sought to surrender the class independence of the proletariat in the "peoples movement" against Czarism. In the East, they denounced as the grossest treachery, the subordination of the communist movement to the bourgeois "peoples movement" for national liberation. Only the proletariat, fighting on an independent class programme, could win the petit bourgeois masses to the struggle for national liberation, which could only be a struggle for power, i.e. dictatorship of the proletariat. Transitional demands would be advanced—Constituent Assembly, expulsion of the occupation troops, but these would not be separated from the struggle for power.

Events one after another, are reveal-

ing the petit bourgeois mode of thought, even the reactionary content of the ideas of the I.K.D. comrades. The day before yesterday, as impressionists, they were driven off the class compass by the spectacle of the national oppression of Europe by the Nazis. Then they floundered on the Allied conquest of Europe. Today, they have attempted to find their last hideout in Germany. But Germany again, reveals pitilessly that the class structure of society results in a **political** division between the classes, and not at all their unification, even under the heel of a foreign conqueror, and even in a highly industrialised country like Germany whose industry has been partially destroyed.

In their practical activity in Germany, the protagonists of the I.K.D. position looked towards university students and various strata of "nationalist youth", without reference to class, to lead the "national revolution" which supposedly united all classes in Germany! Naturally, with their conceptions of a destroyed working class and the incapacity of the proletariat because of this, to give leadership to the nation, they turn their backs on the genuine forces of German national renaissance. They rejected the idea of the Fourth International concentrating on the working class organised anew under the banner of Social Democracy and Stalinism. These, according to these sceptics, represented only the "old" people, with memories in the past. The "nationalist youth" were the forces which would lead the struggle for the "all embracing national-democratic revolution".

Now that the elections have been held in Germany, what has been revealed anew? The stubborn division of Germany **on class lines.** The middle class, as in the countries of Western Europe, have grouped round the reactionary banner of Christian Democracy, and thus become a counterweight of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. But the workers, despite all, despite the pessimists of the I.K.D., have clung tenaciously to their class traditions and voted for the workers' parties. The wonderful powers of recuperation of the working class, their aspirations to achieve the socialist revolution, their class instinct, is shown by the fact that despite the terrible betrayals, the workers organisations received a greater percentage



of the votes than before the coming to power of the Nazis. There was no alternative revolutionary Marxist Party, but the elections prove precisely the possibilities for a genuine Marxist current based on the class internationalist programme.

Oh, ye of little faith! Instead of looking towards the drawing rooms and universities, look to the proletariat as the destined leader of the masses.

The struggle for national liberation does not and cannot prevent the inevitable differentiation of the population on class lines. And it could not be otherwise. National oppression does not abolish class exploitation, but merely aggravates it.

A revolutionary criticism of the policy of Stalinism and Social Democracy, a class struggle waged on the traditional lines of Marxism-Leninism, offers the greatest possibilities for the Fourth International in Germany today. Even the Social Democrats go farther than the I.K.D. Schumacher states that there is no solution for Germany other than a socialist solution. In order to gain the support of the German proletariat, the Social Democratic leaders are making centrist pseudo-left speeches. They have as a consequence, the support of the bulk of the youth, more particularly the working class youth which is instinctively groping towards the socialist revolution as the only way out. The task of the German Trotskyists will be to demand that the Social Democratic leaders match their words with deeds.

There are, of course, parties to the right of the Christian Democrats, playing with the ideology of nationalism. In every case they are either neo-fascist or represent some variety of extreme reaction. It was not for nothing that Trotsky castigated the Stalinists for their flirtation with nationalist demagogy and slogans in competition with the demagogic denunciation by the Nazis of the Versailles Treaty. Such a method cannot advance the struggle one single inch forward. It can only play into the hands of reaction. The struggle for national liberation must have a class axis, and cannot be separated from the socialist revolution. The petit bourgeoisie cannot be won to the socialist revolution by the adoption of a petit bourgeois "national democratic" programme on the part of the proletariat. That would merely mean that the proletariat

would drag at the tail of the petit bourgeoisie, and thus of the big bourgeoisie. The petit bourgeoisie can only be won to the struggle against national oppression under the banner of the struggle against capitalism. Otherwise, they will once again become a tool of reaction, in a more frightful form.

Germany will not go through the so-called "necessary detour" of the national democratic revolution in any shape or form. We can do no better than repeat what we said in our last article, and what was so studiously ignored by the comrades of the I.K.D.:

"In appealing to the moth-eaten and now reactionary tradition of 1813, etc., the I.K.D. are playing the traditional role of the German petit bourgeois intellectuals, whom Marx so scathingly castigated. If these ideas played any role at all, they could only be the basis for the new petit bourgeois reaction. Having been utterly discredited in its Nazi guise, the nationalist reaction is quite likely to hark back to these old traditions. The Stalino-Social Democracy, acting as agents of the conquerors, will discredit themselves in the eyes of the masses. If the Trotskyists do not put forward a clear internationalist revolutionary alternative, the way will be cleared for the petit bourgeois to rally round such a platform and become a helpless tool once again in the hands of the bourgeoisie. How 'imminent' or not the proletarian revolution in Germany may be, it is the goal to which all 'democratic' and economic demands form the transitional bridge and not the bridge to the 'democratic revolution.' In Germany, as in Eastern Europe there can be no 'democratic' revolution separate and apart from the proletarian revolution."

In Europe today, we stand, not on the threshold of the struggle for 'democracy' and 'great national wars of liberation' but on the struggle for the proletarian revolution and revolutionary wars against all attempts at capitalist intervention."

We base ourselves on the traditions of 1918, not on the traditions of 1813. There can be no democratic revolution in Germany other than that achieved by the Allies! In fact, the restoration of industry in Germany, even partially, which the allies have been compelled

to undertake, will restore also the self confidence of the German proletariat, whose temper has already been shown by the series of marvellous protest strikes directed against the "nationalists" (who have thrown bombs against the American military government) and the protest strikes against the release of Papen, Schacht and other Nazis.

The demonstrations were undertaken to show that never again will the German proletariat allow German reaction to take power without a fierce struggle.

Whether speedy or protracted; whether conducted for economic and democratic transitional demands, for a united Germany and for a Constituent Assembly embracing all Germany free

of Allied occupation, whatever demands will be put forward these can only be part of the struggle for the proletarian revolution during which Soviets and Workers' Committees can be set up. Other than this, there can only be the bourgeois counter-revolution in a democratic or fascist form, democratic counter-revolution, which will be supported by the Stalinists and Social Democrats under conditions of mass upsurge, just as the Social Democrats supported it in 1918.

If the position of the I.K.D. were to be accepted by the German proletarian vanguard, it would result in a frightful trap for the German proletariat and new misfortunes and defeats of the working class.

We are starting off the New Year with a drive for subscribers to our magazine. The main weight of the campaign will be taken by the R.C.P. members. But our target will not be achieved without the help of the readers who are not members of the Party but who, nevertheless, sympathise with our aims and objects or are at least desirous of seeing our ideas circulate among the widest possible strata of the labour movement.

Due mainly to printing difficulties, W.I.N. is not able to appear every month, but we ask you not to let this deter you from gaining subscribers. The subscription is not for 6 months or a year. It is for 6 or 12 issues as the case may be. So even if we are not able to produce a separate issue for each month, the subscriber will still get his (or her) money's worth.

## For Yourself and a Friend Take Out a Subscription

### FILL IN AND POST THIS FORM NOW!

To THE BUSINESS MANAGER :

R.C.P. PUBLICATIONS, 256, HARROW ROAD, LONDON, W.2.

I ENCLOSE \* 3/6 For 6 months Postal Subscription.

\* 7/6 " 12 " " " "

To Workers' International News.

Name .....

(BLOCK CAPITALS)

Address .....

Date ..... First issue required.....

\*Delete words which do not apply.

# CONFLICT IN INDIA

By T. CLIFF

**T**HE Labour Government leaders make out that the Cabinet mission to India proved their will to give freedom to that country. This is not the case. The Cripps mission in 1942 was not an indication that Churchill's government was in favour of the liquidation of the Empire. Quite the contrary: at that time the Japanese danger forced the British government to attempt a new means of strengthening the Empire through an alliance with the Indian Congress, the representative of the Indian bourgeoisie. The failure of Cripps's mission was to a large extent a result of the fact that the Indian bourgeoisie was not convinced that Britain would win the war and was ready if needs be to become the junior partner of Japanese imperialism instead of British.

The British Government is today compelled once again to try and build a strong alliance with the Indian bourgeoisie, as, on the one hand, Britain came out of the war much weaker than the USA which threatens to capture the markets of the British Empire, and, on the other hand, the Indian bourgeoisie is relatively much stronger than before. So that in an alliance of British with Indian capitalism, the relative weight of the Indian partners must necessarily be greater than it was heretofore. This makes the Indian bourgeoisie capable of striking a much harder bargain.

The end of the war bore witness to tremendous mass strikes in India. For the first time in the history of India the working class showed itself to be to a large extent politically independent of the Congress. While in 1942 the workers carried out a political strike in answer to the call of the Congress leaders to struggle (a strike the leaders themselves later betrayed), today the Indian workers carry out political strikes on their own account.

The Indian National Army trials, the Netaji birthday demonstrations, and, more important than all, the solidarity strike of the workers with the naval ratings, all showed clearly to the Congress leaders that they must hurry to find support in imperialism against the masses. The same mass movements also drives imperialism to come to terms with the Indian National Congress in order to find a more popular support for its regime.

## IMPERIALISM DOES NOT INTEND TO RELY ON THE INDIAN BOURGEOISIE ALONE

British imperialism does not intend to do away with those powers on which it has until now supported itself. The occupation army will continue to encamp on Indian soil; nor will imperialism give up its key positions in the police and secret service.

Furthermore imperialism has so formulated the long term plans and bound them up with so many reservations that the Interim Government has turned out to be nothing more than a Viceroy's Executive Council with a changed membership. Lord Addison, Dominion Secretary, could justifiably say: "The powers and duties of the Viceroy will remain as before."

Another guarantee of British rule is given by the Princes' States. According to the plan of the Cabinet Mission, these Princes are to have 93 representatives in the Constituent Assembly, i.e. about 25 per cent of all the delegates. They will not be elected by the 100 million inhabitants of these States, but will be appointed by their autocratic rulers.

Further testimony to the reactionary character of the Constituent Assembly—which is British imperialism's safeguard—is given by the fact that it is not directly nor universally elected. It is elected by the Provincial

Legislatures which, on their part, were elected by only that 11 per cent of the population which pays a certain minimum of taxes.

The Cabinet Mission added a further powerful factor to prop up British rule, in the communal electorate. Till now, separate communal electorates have existed for territorial representation in the first ballot, but once representatives were elected, they functioned jointly. Moreover, in the second ballot to the Provincial Legislative Councils, Hindus could till now vote for Moslems, and Moslems for Hindus. This principle was upheld by the Cripps mission. The present Cabinet Mission plan, however, divides each legislature into two absolutely separate groups in both ballots, so that, while formerly there were possibilities of unity between Moslems and Hindus in the second ballot, and there were common electorates even in the first ballot in some cases (the labour seats, Chambers of Commerce, Universities, etc.) now communalism rules supreme.

British imperialism guarantees its rule in yet another way: by the stipulation that the Provinces of India are to be divided into three big groups on communal lines. The 'A' group will be a Sub-Federation of all the provinces which contain mainly Hindus. The 'B' group will contain Hindus and Sikhs but the Moslems will have a slight majority (19 out of 36 members). The 'C' group will be similar in its composition to B group, with a small Moslem majority (15 out of 30 members). Now, according to the British Mission plan, any regulation or law of major communal importance will have to have the agreement of all three groups, as well as a majority vote in each of the two main religious communities. Such a scheme obviously provides the best basis, not for communal peace, but for the deepest disagreement and communal strife.

Above all these restrictive regulations is the stipulation that no decision of the Constituent Assembly will be valid until there is a treaty between the Constituent Assembly and the British Government. This shows quite clearly what sort of independence the British Government is ready to give to India.

One thing in the relation of British imperialism with India becomes increasingly clear—that today, with the rising class struggle of the workers

and peasants in India, the main weapon of imperialist rule cannot be the occupation army or even the Princes, but must be to keep India divided and engaged in communal conflicts. Let us examine this question.

### THE CHARACTER OF THE COMMUNAL CLASHES.

Despite Jinnah's declarations that the Moslems are a nation, and despite the Stalinist position of a few years ago to the same effect, all facts go to prove that the Moslems are not a nation. There is no special Moslem economic body different in character to that of the Hindus; nor have the Moslems a common language different from that of their Hindu neighbours: insofar as their culture varies from that of the Hindus, it is only the result of its backwardness, of its highly religious content.

If so, how is it that today, in the twentieth century, when the death knell of Indian feudalism is sounding, clashes between two religious communities assume such proportions?

The Moslem League has gained a following only during the last decade. Before the world crisis, which affected India severely, the Moslem League was a negligible factor. Even Jinnah was at that time a member of the Congress, and found it necessary to declare in the Legislative Assembly: "I am a nationalist first, a nationalist second, and a nationalist last. I once more appeal to this House, whether you are a Moslem or a Hindu, for God's sake do not import the discussion of communal matters into this House, and degrade this Assembly which we desire should become a real National Parliament." At that time communal clashes were very limited and only a few goondahs (mercenary assassins) participated in them, the mass of the people being indifferent to the religious conflicts.

The great world crisis brought with it a change. It drove millions of workers, peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie into activity, and, a revolutionary party not existing, and the rotten policy of the Stalinist party turning them away, into the arms of Congress. Peasant leagues were constituted and sought support from Congress in a struggle against the big landowners. But that Congress will not lead any real struggle against the large landowners is evident from the

capitalist social character of its leadership. Many economic ties connect the Indian capitalists with the landowners, and the fear of any deep social change makes them hostile to an anti-feudal revolution. Ghandi therefore, in no uncertain terms spoke against expropriation of the landowners without compensation. The Moslem League took advantage of Congress antipathy to agrarian reform to incite the Moslems against the Hindus in the two Provinces where the majority of Moslems are concentrated, Bengal and Punjab.

Let us take some examples of this. In 1937, the peasant party of Bengal, the Krishak Proja Samity, approached the Indian Congress with a proposal to build a coalition government in Bengal. The condition for this was that the Congress agree to carry out certain agrarian reforms. Congress disagreed. The peasants in Bengal are in the main Moslems, while the landowners are in the main Hindus. And so the Moslem League took this opportunity of giving demagogical promises of agrarian reforms, thus succeeding in drawing the Krishak Proja Samity into a coalition with it. Needless to say, the reforms were not carried out, as the Moslem League leaders, in the main feudal lords, knew very well that this reform would affect not only the Hindu landowners, but also the Moslem. A similar process took place in Punjab, where the usurers are mainly Hindus, while the majority of the poor peasants are Moslems. Although there are also millions of Hindu peasant in Punjab (as well as in Bengal) the discussion about decreasing the interest on the agricultural debts received a communal coloration. In Bengal Congress opposes agrarian reform as an opposition party, and they follow the same policy in Punjab, taking even more open responsibility for it, as they are here part of the coalition government. The only place where the Indian Congress declares itself in favour of agrarian reforms, is in the United Provinces, Bihar and Madras, where the landowners are to a large extent Moslem, while the peasants are Hindu. Nothing, however, is done to implement the declarations. One Congress premier, for instance, declared that he would wipe out the zamindars within five days of taking office. Five months have passed, and not a thing has been done in this direction. The

Bombay government also pledged itself to abolish the zamindar system, but all its activities in this direction have boiled down to the abolition of grazing fees, the construction of a few roads to the villages, the drilling of some wells, and a few other minor reforms.

The fact that, while the working class has not yet become an important independent power, the Indian Congress is against any real agrarian reforms, driving the rising peasantry of Bengal and Punjab into their arms, plays right into the hands of the Moslem League demagogues. It may be said that the turning point in the development of the Moslem League, when it began to gain mass support, came with the establishment of Provincial Ministries in 1937, which compelled Congress to show its real face as regards the interests of the peasants. In 1937, before the Congress Provincial ministries were in power, the Moslem League only secured 4.6 of the total Moslem vote in the elections—321,772 out of the total of 7,319,445. And although it was only in 1936 that Jinnah came back to India, and began his active participation in the Moslem League leadership, because of the awakening of the peasantry and the lack of a revolutionary leadership, he succeeded in a short time in finding a numerous following.

The world crisis also drove millions of urban petty bourgeoisie to despair. Imperialist rule very much limited the possibilities of the new intelligentsia's finding work. The result was unemployment among the intelligentsia and very low salaries. A clerk did not receive more than £3 a month. The competition among clerks and among members of the free professions received a communal colouring owing to the fact that those who formerly filled these positions were mainly Hindus, while the newcomers were mainly Moslems. This was a result of the policy of imperialism which prevented the Moslems from receiving an education for a long time, and limited the opportunities for work by restricting the economic development of the country.

#### **WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COMMUNAL CLASHES?**

The power mainly responsible for communal clashes is British imperialism. It is she who is responsible for the preservation of feudalism, which is the social background for the influence

of religion on the masses. It is she who is responsible for the introduction about a century ago, and preservation of the zamindar system, whereby permanent large landowners were put to lord over big estates in place of the former system of tax farmers. The British rulers put Hindus to rule over Moslem peasants and vice versa, thus sowing the seeds of communal discord. It is British imperialism which is responsible for the competition of the clerks and members of the free professions, which receives a communal colouring. And it is she who is responsible for the communal electoral system, for the sub-Federation organisation, etc.

And so, to the platitude of the Labour Government that they want to give independence, but the Indians are not capable of ruling themselves, and will cut one another's throats in communal clashes, we must answer that the occupation army has not yet left India, that the pillars of imperialist rule—the Princes, zamindars etc.—are still in the saddle, and without their eradication the independence of India can only be a fiction.

The task of leading India's independence of course cannot be carried out by the feudalist Moslem League or by the capitalist Indian Congress.

### **CONGRESS PLAYS IN THE HANDS OF THE MOSLEM LEAGUE.**

We have already shown how the attitude of Congress towards agrarian reforms in Bengal and Punjab helped the Moslem League to gain mass influence. The 1943 famine in which three million Bengalese died of starvation, and for which the Moslem League was directly responsible as they constituted the Bengalese Ministry, would have put an end to this influence, had not the Hindu landowners of Bengal who were also criminally responsible for the famine, received the protection of Congress.

Congress had another excellent opportunity of undermining the influence of the Moslem League in the struggle of the masses in the States against their Princes. Kashmir has recently come to the forefront in this struggle. There the Moslems constitute over three-quarters of the population. The Maharajah is a Hindu who receives open support from the Moslem League leader, Jinnah. The leader of the Kashmir mass movement appealed to

Congress to intervene on their behalf. It was an excellent opportunity to prove to the Moslem masses the reactionary, anti-popular character of Jinnah and his clique. But the Congress is afraid of mass struggle. Sardar Patel, one of the most important Congress leaders, stated at the General Council of the All-India States' People's Conference in Delhi in June, 1946: "We do not want to start any movement in the States"; and the Madras Congress government did not stop at words, but arrested many who demonstrated in support of the Kashmir people.

The Moslem League is a feudal agent of British imperialism. Congress, in partnership with British imperialism, wrestles for better conditions for Indian capitalism. It may be envious of the influence of the Moslem League, but it cannot undermine it. While the mass workers' strike at the end of last year and beginning of this, together with the relative strengthening of Indian capitalism during the war as against British, increased the weight of Congress relatively to the Moslem League and British imperialism, the communal clashes, by strengthening the position of the feudal Moslem leadership, can bring a little shift in the triangle of powers—imperialism, the Indian bourgeoisie and feudalism.

If the British Cabinet Mission of six months ago was more condescending towards Congress than the Moslem League, the relation of the British Government to Nehru and Jinnah when they came to London, reflected the relative strengthening of the Moslem League through the communal riots. But British imperialism must be very careful not to press Congress too hard, as it can go over to direct action against imperialism, which, however inconsistently the Indian bourgeoisie behave in such action, can open the door to the intervention of the workers and peasants. The threat of mass action is Congress's strongest and weakest card in its wrestling for concessions from British imperialism.

### **THE INDIAN STALINISTS**

During the Stalin-Churchill honeymoon that lasted throughout the war, the Indian Stalinists were openly against the struggle for the independence of India, and they flirted with the Moslem League leadership. Their leaders discovered that there is a Mos-

lem nation and that the Moslem League represented its struggle for liberation. They nursed the programme of Pakistan while declaring that the mass strikes of the workers and general upheaval of August 1942 was a fifth column machination of the Japanese. With the deterioration of the relations between the Stalinist bureaucracy and British imperialism, the Indian Stalinists began to chant a new song. Incapable of leading an independent class struggle, they shifted their loyalty from the Moslem League leadership to the Indian Congress. At the beginning they were afraid to make this shift direct, particularly as their members had been expelled from Congress, because of their betrayal of the August 1942 anti-imperialist struggle. They therefore began to speak of the necessity for "Congress-League Unity". (As if the unity of reactionary feudalists and reactionary capitalists can benefit the masses in any way.) But this was only a stage in the complete swing over from the Moslem League to Congress. On 7th July, the Indian Stalinist leader, P. C. Joshi, wrote that it is "Only when the Congress puts its case on an entirely just basis that the Muslim masses will see through the tactics of their own reactionary leadership in relying upon the British, and the Congress will be able to get their support over the heads of their own leaders, if they resist". Pakistan was forgotten; Congress-Moslem League unity was forgotten. What remained was hope in the Congress leadership. When the Congress leaders showed clearly that their face was not towards struggle against imperialism but towards alliance with it, the Indian Stalinists began to fawn upon the "left" wing of Congress, the Congress Socialist Party.

### THE IMMEDIATE REACTION TO THE COMMUNAL MASSACRE.

What was the reaction of the different parties in India to the communal riots in Calcutta?

The Moslem League called for Pakistan and meanwhile sat with folded arms while the slaughter continued. Three days of bloodshed passed before the Government of Bengal, composed of members of the Moslem League took steps to bring about order. One would have thought no police force existed.

Congress demanded the intervention of the British army and the use of force, despite the fact that this would strengthen imperialism's hold over the country, and would serve as a big propaganda card in the hands of the 'freedom-loving' Jinnah. The British army came, not in answer to Congress's call, but when it suited it to come—after three days of slaughter and the death of thousands. It is also significant that the British Governor of Bengal, who understood, as did everyone else, the great possibility of the outbreak of communal riots on the Moslem League's Direct Action Day on 16th August, chose just this time to be away on leave.

Neither the Moslem League, nor the Stalinists put forward the one and only means of smashing goondahism: the establishment of a workers' and peasants' militia.

### THE WAY OUT.

The recent communal clashes in Bengal, which had repercussions elsewhere (especially in neighbouring Bihar), testify first and foremost to the shakiness of the positions of the feudalists, which drives them to employ the most extreme means of preserving themselves. The communal clashes thus serve not as a sign of the vitality of the old class regime, but of its senility. At the same time the wide support for the Moslem League demonstrates the awakening of the masses of peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie to the class struggle, at a time when the only possible revolutionary leader of this struggle lacks maturity.

The logic of the objective conditions points in an indubitable way to the only means of eliminating the roots of communal conflicts—the revolutionary class struggle, the conscious organisation and direction of the urban and rural masses.

Only the class struggle of the workers, Hindu and Moslem alike, can build real unity and overcome all communal differences. The agrarian revolution will unite all the poor peasants against all the landowners. In the tremendous territory of India, with its variegated population, the building of unity must be based on the broadest local activity. The only form of organisation which unites a high degree of

centralisation with active, broad de-centralisation, is the Soviet, which alone can deal a death blow to separatist movements. The organisation of the masses in Soviets is a precondition for the victory of the agrarian revolution, for the victory over foreign and local capitalism. The struggle against British imperialism and its agents (the Princes, feudalists and capitalists) must be concentrated around the slogan of a **real** Constituent Assembly elected by the whole people directly, and based on the masses organised in Soviets and armed in their militia.

The British workers must understand that Attlee's freedom for India is only a faked freedom. They must struggle for the evacuation of the British army from India; for an end to the economic control of British imperialism over the key industries of the country;

for the liquidation of the British Civil Service; for an end to British Government support for the Princes and feudal leaders, and its opposition to universal franchise.

In India the struggle to maintain the unity of the country and to destroy the tendencies of communal disruption falls on the shoulders of the Bolshevik-Leninist Party which is struggling to unite the broadest section of the toiling masses for complete independence from imperialism and for a new social order which holds no place for the capitalists and landowners.

Our comrades have proved capable of building the nucleus of the Revolutionary Party under the terrible conditions of imperialist oppression and war. They will be capable of the further tasks which history has thrust upon them.

*Every Worker MUST Read*

## MIDDLE EAST AT THE CROSSROADS

24 pages

By T. CLIFF

Price 6d.

## THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

16 pages

By LEON TROTSKY

Price 4d.

2 Workers' International News Pamphlets — **ORDER NOW!**