



INTERNATIONAL

WORKERS OF THE WORLD — UNITE!

NATALIA SEDOVA

Editorial: THE BRITISH LABOUR MOVEMENT AND THE COMMON MARKET

THE NEW PROGRAMME OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

by ERNEST GERMAIN

The Repercussions of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU

by THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT

The Decisive Hour of the Algerian Revolution

by MICHEL PABLO

The Prospects of the Revolutionary Struggle in South Africa

by RICHARD HUGHES

AN OPEN LETTER TO FIDEL CASTRO

by MICHEL PABLO

Materialism and the Indian Bourgeoisie

by C. G. SHAH

Trotsky's rehabilitation requested by 62 Ceylon M. P. s

WINTER 1961 - 1962

14

2 SHILLINGS
35 CENTS

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

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

Number 14

Winter 1961 - 1962

NATALIA SEDOVA

The technical preparation of this issue of the Fourth International was almost complete when we received the news of the death of Natalia Trotsky, which took place at Corbeil, near Paris on the 23rd January 1962.

Natalia was born at Romi, Poltava province in the Ukraine, in 1882 and from her early youth she had been active in the revolutionary movement. During her first stay in Paris in 1903 she met Leon Trotsky and became his companion. Alongside Trotsky she participated in the movement and activities which led up to the October revolution. She was arrested in 1905. Returning to Russia with her husband and two sons from the United States, she took part in the revolution and played a leading role in cultural organisations of the new state.

As the bureaucratic degeneration of the first workers' state developed Natalia supported wholeheartedly Trotsky's struggle against growing stalinism and together with Trotsky she was exiled to Alma Alta and then in 1928 expelled from the Soviet Union. Thus started the most tragic period of her life, during which she first lost both her sons and finally in 1940 she suffered the worst blow of all when Trotsky was assassinated in Mexico.

Remaining true to the memory of Trotsky and his ideas and fully confident of the final victory of revolutionary socialism, she devoted the rest of her life to defending the heritage of her companion against the slanders of stalinism and all other distortions.

In the last year of her life she expressed solidarity with the two leaders of the Fourth International, Raptis and Santen, who were on trial in Holland for their activities on behalf of the Algerian Revolution, by sending a letter to the chairman of the Amsterdam court.

After the 22nd Congress she demanded of the leadership of the CPSU that they revise the Moscow trials and authorise the publication of Trotsky's works in the land of the October Revolution.

The funeral of Natalia was held in Paris at the Père Lachaise cemetery on the morning of the 29th of January 1962. There was a large attendance of old revolutionary fighters, of members of the working class movement and of a new generation of proletarian militants and intellectuals. The chief mourner was Seva, the grandson of Trotsky, who came over from Mexico. Natalia's ashes will be flown to Mexico to rest alongside those of Trotsky.

The speakers, all of whom knew Natalia personally, were André Breton, French writer; Marguerite Bonnet, in the name of Alfred Rosmer who was unable to be present because his wife died three days before Natalia; Pierre Naville, French sociologist; Isaac Deutscher, Trotsky's biographer; Laurent Schwartz, professor of mathematics at La Sorbonne and chairman of Committee of Solidarity with Algerian victims of imperialist repression; Joseph Hansen, editor of the Militant of the United States; Pierre Frank, secretary of the French section of the Fourth International and Livio Maitian on behalf of the International Secretariat.

THE BRITISH LABOUR MOVEMENT AND THE COMMON MARKET

As the documents adopted by the VIth World Congress of the IVth International correctly predicted, the Tory government has been forced to open negotiations in view of Great Britain's entry into the Common Market. The laws of capitalist concentration operate in an implacable way; they don't even respect the venerable Commonwealth! Weakened by a rate of growth which is greatly inferior to that of its continental competitors; suffering from a more pronounced productivity gap compared with them, British imperialism, whose share of world exports has declined from 13% in 1913 and nearly 11% in 1928 to 10% in 1950 and 7.8% in 1960, has only the choice between entry in the Common Market or further decline which will reduce it to a fourth-rate power. It chooses necessarily the first solution.

If the economic integration between the Common Market and Great Britain becomes a fact, a new capitalist power of utmost magnitude will be coming into being. It will strengthen the military and political cohesion of capitalism in Western Europe — on the condition that economic integration resists the blows of successive recessions and intensified class struggles it will fan. It will above all represent a formidable weight on the world market of raw materials, buying alone more than 50% of the total world's imports of primary products. For that reason alone, the colonial and semi-colonial bourgeoisies of Latin America, Asia, Africa and Oceania fear this integration. They are afraid, not without reason, lest this all-powerful client accentuate even more the unequal character of exchange and trade between imperialist and colonial countries, lest it depress even more the terms of trade at the expense of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Once again experience confirms that in the framework of capitalism, any tendency to regional *economic* integration accentuates in fact the tendencies to economic disintegration and growing disequilibrium on a *world* scale, in the same way as the suppression of competition by monopolies leads to more destructive and wasteful competition between the monopolies themselves.

In the semi-colonial countries, revolutionary marxists must answer the commercial threat which represents to these countries Britain's entry into the Common Market by advancing transitional slogans like the establishment of a *pool of raw materials* and the *expansion of trade with the workers' states*. In Britain they have the special responsibility of uniting the whole working class movement, and above all the left wing of the Labour Party and the Trade-Unions around a correct answer to the problem of the Common Market, an answer which would make possible a larger, more united and more energetic anti-capitalist mobilisation of the British workers.

From this point of view, it would be a disastrous mistake to establish a "united front against entry into the Common Market" with reactionary capitalist tendencies as those of Lord Beaverbrook. It is true that Britain's entry into the Common Market will strengthen capitalism, and that the labour movement never could approve of such a

move. But it will strengthen capitalism exactly in the same way as capitalist concentration and the emergence of trusts reinforces capitalism, compared with the epoch of a free-for-all among small and medium-sized firms. In the same way as marxists never fight against trusts in the name of a return to capitalist free competition, they cannot fight Britain's entry into the Common Market in the name of "national sovereignty" or, even worse, the defence of "our Commonwealth".

This kind of a struggle against Britain's entry into the Common Market would not only be reactionary and utopian. It would also profoundly demobilize the working class movement. Some tendencies within the Labour Party left today state that entry into the Common Market would liquidate any possibility of overthrowing capitalism in Great-Britain. Now it is a fact that entry *will* take place. All propaganda which stresses the "tremendous obstacles" which such entry would immediately place on the road towards a socialist Britain will therefore only increase scepticism and pessimism among militant workers, and play right into the hands of the right wing which will state very firmly that within Common Market conditions a fight for a socialist Britain or even for extensive public ownership is "unrealistic".

Equally mistaken would be any passive acceptance or even approval of Britain's entry into the Common Market, in the name of an undigested brand of "internationalism". Revolutionary marxists are not in favour of regional international economic integration anywhere anytime. They certainly did not approve of the kind of "economic integration" which, after all, the Nazis also realized in some ways during the first stages of the Second World War in Central, Western and Eastern Europe. They cannot make abstraction of concrete conditions and class forces, which unfortunately means that, in Western Europe to-day, such an integration would strengthen the capitalist class much more than the working class. They cannot close their eyes to the political and military aspects of this integration, directed against the workers' states and the colonial revolution, in the same way as they cannot deny the facts of life, i.e. the fact that the European bourgeoisie has to-day achieved a degree of inter-penetration and unity of vision and action, while the working class movement has been deeply divided and partially demoralised by its treacherous traditional leaderships.

An adequate answer to Britain's entry into the Common Market can only be worked out by revolutionary marxists in taking the concrete economic and social situation of Great-Britain as a starting point. In fact, entry into the Common Market is part of a general plan of "rationalizing" British economy *at the expense of the working class*. This is a plan of strengthening the competitive power and the striking force of British capitalism, as well in relation with its foreign competitors as in relation with the British workers themselves.

This plan offers a "solution" — in the interests of Capital, and for a short period only — of the real ills

of British society and economy, on the condition that the workers are ready to accept it. M. Selwyn Lloyd's latest budget gives one a first taste of the nature of that plan. The lock-out at Rootes, the closing down of a Wales steel plant, are other indications of things to come. The first task of the British labour movement is therefore that of organising a common and united resistance against this "austerity" plan. This battle must be waged by the united forces of the trade-unions and the Labour Party. British revolutionary marxists must present a common defensive plan of action to the whole labour movement, against the wage freeze and against the attacks on the social services. They must condemn as capitulators all those among the trade union bosses and the Transport House pundits who, pretending that big industrial action would "harm" Labour's chances at the next general election, tend to put a brake, to divide or even to sabotage this common struggle of the workers in defence of their standard of living.

Even if this first defensive battle will be crowned by success — which isn't certain at all — the defence of the British workers' standard of living against the consequences of the Common Market will not be automatically be insured. Capitalist competition in the framework of the Common Market implies periodic attempts of each capitalist class to better its competitive positions by reducing its workers' wages relatively to those of the competitor countries, or even absolutely, and thereby reducing its costs of production. The workers of a country who have the highest wages within the Common Market are always the most likely to be hit by such an attack. After the French and the Belgian workers, it is now the British workers' turn, then the Western German workers will be hit in their turn.

In the same way as the struggle against the Selwyn Lloyd wage freeze cannot succeed if each sector and each union defends itself separately, in the same way the struggle against the periodic pressure on the wages in the Common Market countries will not be successful if each working class defends itself separately from its fellow workers of the neighbouring countries. The working class answer to the capitalist Common Market must be first of all a defensive one; a European cartel of trade-union and workers parties, without exclusion of any important sector of the movement. Revolutionary marxists should campaign for the T.U.C. convening in London a General Congress of European Labour, into which should be invited not only the trade-unions affiliated to the ICFTU (German DGB, Belgian FGTB, Dutch NVV, French CGT-FO Italian CISL and UIL), but also the two big unions affiliated to the WFTU (French CGT and Italian CGIL) and the big Christian trade union confederations of France, Belgium and Holland. Goal of this Congress should be the elaboration of a common plan of defence of the standard of living and of full employment for all workers in the Common Market countries.

But in order to be successful, each defensive struggle to-day inevitably leads to an offensive struggle for trans-

itory demands. The Tory plan of entry into the Common Market and the anti-working class offensive is the capitalist answer to the crisis of obsolescence and decline of the British economy. To this capitalist answer, the British labour movement must counterpose its own socialist answer. In order to guarantee a revival and a rapid growth of their country, the British workers must fight for the Labour Party coming into power on a socialist program, and not on the recipe of a few rosy reforms prepared by Gaitskell. They must fight for the nationalisation of all key industries, banks, insurance companies, under workers control; for the elaboration and the application of a general plan of overall economic development, which will guarantee a high and regular rate of expansion of the decisive public sector of the economy; for a severe taxation of high incomes and fortunes, as well as of all luxury goods, which will enable a rapid expansion of outlays for public education, public health, public housing and scientific research; for a municipalisation of all rented houses and flats; for a break with NATO; for a fundamental reorientation of Britain's foreign and commercial policy towards the workers' states; for freedom to all colonies. In other words: to the capitalist plan of "rationalising" British economy by entry into the Common Market, the labour movement should counterpose a workers' plan of a socialist Great-Britain.

It is much easier to mobilise the British workers for these precise and positive goals, than to mobilise them *in action* against Britain's entry into the Common Market. Even if that mobilisation does not succeed to overthrow the Tory government, it will start such a broad wave of working class struggles that the conquest of power could be envisaged in a next stage. Britain's entry into the Common Market cannot and will not prevent such a mobilisation for a whole transitional period, provided the labour movement is not paralysed and demoralised by inadequate leadership and big defeats.

On the propaganda level the idea of the *Socialist United States of Europe*, including the countries of Western Europe as well as the Eastern European workers' states, should be counterposed from now to the capitalist Common Market. The more capitalist economic integration of Europe proceeds, the more this idea will have to be transferred from the field of propaganda to the field of action, prepared by a new series of transitional demands which will have to be formulated as well within the framework of the Common Market as in a way to break up that framework. But to-day, and during a whole transitional stage, this propaganda task should in no way distract revolutionary marxists from a program of action for the immediate future, which could lead to struggles of a tremendous scope and promise impressive victories: to transform the struggles in defence of the workers' standard of living into a general attack on the Tories and into an offensive fight for overthrowing the Tory government, for the coming into power of a Labour government on a program of the building of a planned economy and a socialist Britain.

THE NEW PROGRAMME OF THE CPSU

by ERNEST GERMAIN

Marxism endeavors to apprehend the laws which govern the evolution of human societies. It attempts above all to apprehend the logic and the dynamics of capitalist society, to provide the working class with a valuable instrument for the revolutionary transformation of society: it is impossible to change reality *consciously* unless it is understood adequately.

Thus the programme of an organization claiming to be Marxist must be examined above all according to its capacity to apprehend the social reality of the epoch in which it is drafted. It must then be examined to what extent its theoretical and practical insight enables the proletariat to fulfill its historic role.

But we would be pedestrian Marxists — “idealistic” Marxists so to speak — in the extreme if we remained at the level of these initial, obvious remarks. A programme is a theoretical work by a group of men who cannot escape the laws of historical materialism whatever the level of consciousness to which they aspire. Even if their vision pierces into the obscurities of the future they remain bound to their epoch by a thousand threads. The *Communist Manifesto* remains even today astonishing for the boldness of its young authors, but even they could not foresee the era of electrification or atomic energy or the concrete form in which the conquest of power by the proletariat would take place: the Republic of Soviets, that is to say democratically elected councils of workers and poor peasants. The Bolshevik Party was without doubt the most audacious party which history has known up to the present day. The programme which it adopted after its seizure of power at the Ninth Congress in 1919 reflects this audacity. Yet even this programme could not foresee the Fascist dictatorship, the temporary shift from the international Socialist revolution to the colonial revolution, nor even the new colossal upsurge of productive forces which capitalism in its death agony has witnessed for nearly half a century thanks to a new and powerful technological revolution.

When we pass from these major theoretical achievements to much more timid burblings, (often rooted in “bad faith” and corresponding not so much to objective reality but to the pressure of the social milieu on the ideologists) the difficulty of breaking free from the narrow limits of time and space becomes insurmountable. The Gotha programme of the German Social Democrats — the result of 15 years of experience and of sincere efforts by thousands of advanced workers — appeared completely outmoded by events

ten years after it had been published. The Erfurt programme from the same party knew hardly a better fate, although produced by the leaders of a Marxist Party which at the time was admired by Lenin himself. Must we also recall that the powerful Austrian socialist party at the beginning of the twenties drafted the Linz programme which on paper predicated the dictatorship of the proletariat and yet ten years later that same party showed itself incapable of elementary self defence before the onslaught of Fascism and this because it feared to “provoke” the enemy?

Every programme thus merits a double examination. It possesses an intrinsic value, whether positive or negative. At the same time it is the image of the men and of the epoch in which it is produced, often, rather in spite of its authors than because of them. The recent draft programme which Krushchev has prepared and which has been adopted at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU should be submitted to this double test, the one critical the other explanatory.

IS THIS A “PROGRAMME OF COMMUNISM”?

Does this outline programme provide us with a scientific analysis of the social reality in which we live? Does it offer the proletariat the necessary arms to fulfill their role in the capitalist world? Does it give the proletariat of the Soviet Union and of the other workers’ states, perspectives worthy of Communism? These are the questions concerning the intrinsic value of the programme which will let us know if we are in the presence of an authentic “programme of communism”, without necessarily approving all the analysis or all the conclusions which it offers.

Deficient analysis of contemporary capitalist reality.

Without doubt the most feeble and conservative aspect of the programme is that analysing the contemporary situation; it is also the most baffling for several reasons. It can be summarised under three headings.

1) Sections perfectly correct, but which are in this case only repetitions of ancient truths copied from the programme of 1919 or even that of 1903.

2) Sections plainly false, above all when the authors of the outline have tried — very timidly — to “innovate”, to analyse the new phenomenon of contemporary capitalism or to rationalise soviet reality if not to disguise it.

3) Sections where aspects of contemporary reality are passed over in silence, which are not mentioned, even by allusion and for which the strange Marxists who edited this programme have

no explanation whatsoever to offer. Of this more later. We can say at once that the outline programme makes no mention of Stalin and the cult of personality, the various revolutions begun and lost since 1918, the Peoples Communes in China, the Cuban revolution — the first revolution which has overthrown capitalism under the leadership of a party which is bound to Moscow neither in name or fact — nor of the tasks posed to the proletariat in the Imperialist countries and the workers' states by colonial wars (save for vague and insignificant terms such as "support").

The draft programme edited (in French) in Moscow by the Foreign Language Publications apparently only consists of 150 pages. In reality it should contain 250, but these 100 supplementary pages have evaporated. These are blank pages which the printers have "forgotten" to join to the work. Since the "intellectual workers" have forgotten Stalin, the "manual workers equal in law" can allow themselves this little oversight.

In those places where the analysis of Capitalism does not refer textually or by summary to the passages in the Communist Manifesto or in the Bolshevik programmes (1903 and 1919) the programme contents itself with commonplaces without interest which leave a hundred questions unanswered.

The text (p1) affirms that the XXth century is a "century of tremendous increase in productive forces and in the development of science", that the "putrefaction of capitalism is accentuated" (p23) that "this putrefaction does not mean a complete stagnation, sclerosis of the productive forces, and does not exclude expansion of the capitalist economy in certain periods, in certain countries" (p23). It adds that "as a whole capitalism paralyzes more and more the development of modern productive forces" (p24) and that the crisis of the world capitalist economy "deepens". (p25).

These formulas are the same as those, touched with revisionism, on "State Monopoly-Capitalism" which remains undefined. Is it the monopolies managing the state? Or the taking over of a part of the economy by the state for the profit of the monopolies? or the monopolies making use of the state to control the non-monopolised sectors of the economy? The "outline" uses this description to cover these three distinct phenomena besides a few others—they are in no way distinguished by a specific analysis. Is the "world crisis of the capitalist economy" the periodic crisis of overproduction or a structural crisis? Has it been accelerated since 1914, 1929 or since 1949? How is it that since the second world war in spite of this "accentuated crisis" (structural?), the periodic crises of overproduction not only follow a rather more rapid rhythm but *are much reduced*

in intensity and of shorter duration compared with the period 1913-1938? Is this phenomenon transitory? If so how is it to be explained and how will it come an end? If not, what conclusions can be drawn about the future evolution of capitalism?

How to explain the evident contradiction, unforeseen by Marxist-Leninist theory, that for twelve years the loss of colonial empires and the continual weakening of the Imperialists' position in the world has not been accompanied by an aggravation of the economic situation in the Imperialist countries, but on the contrary has been accompanied in all these countries, with the possible exception of the United States, by the most rapid development of their productive forces that they have known since the beginning of the twentieth century, if not since the beginning of Imperialism?

The outline gives in passing a sideblow at the absurd theory of the "absolute impoverishment of the proletariat" when it speaks of "the relative, sometimes even absolute impoverishment of the workers' conditions". This formula is correct; we have held it in the past against the theories in vogue in the CPs, particularly in the F.C.P. and the CPSU (1). However in the same document formulations can be found in flagrant opposition to this correct definition. Thus on page 2 it is stated that "the economic laws of its development (that of capitalism) lead *inevitably* to the formation of an *immense* reserve army". Now if this army is really inevitable and immense then absolute impoverishment is also inevitable and advanced. Only when it is understood that at certain periods the reserve army has a tendency to diminish or at least not to increase, can it be appreciated that there is no "law" or "inevitability" about "absolute impoverishment". Finally, this viewpoint is resumed in a particularly equivocal and contradictory passage which we reproduce *in extenso*:

"The fear of revolution, the successes achieved by the Socialist countries, the pressure exercised by the workers' movement force the bourgeoisie to make partial concessions on wages, conditions of work, social insurance. *But* the perpetual increases in the cost of living and inflation reduce frequently (not always then?) these concessions to nothing. Wages lag behind the material and cultural needs of the worker and his family which increase with the development of society. *Even the relatively high standard of living of the few advanced capitalist countries is based on the misery of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, on unequal trade, discrimination against female labour, the cruel oppression of the black races and foreign workers as well as the intensi-*

1) See "Quatrième Internationale" June-July No, 1957: Is there a Marxist theory on the "impoverishment of the proletariat"?

fied exploitation of these same countries. The bourgeois myth of "full employment" is only a sinister farce because the working class suffers from the uncertainty of tomorrow. Despite certain successes obtained by the working class in the economic struggle, its general situation *deteriorates* in the capitalist world".

There is only one correct phrase in this paragraph, that concerning the world conditions which limit the significance of the trends in wages in the advanced capitalist countries; even that is incomplete. But all the rest is contradictory nonsense. If the "bourgeoisie" is forced to make "certain concessions" on wages, how can it be argued that the situations of the workers is deteriorating? Or perhaps "the capitalist world bloc" includes both the workers of the colonial nations and those of the Imperialist countries? If so, then it is an "average" without any real significance, since one of the contradictions of social reality is precisely the contrast between the decline or stagnation of the standard of life of the colonial or semi-colonial peoples, and the undeniable raising of the standard of living in the Imperialist countries over the past 15 years (20 years in the USA, Canada, Australia and in those countries spared by the second world war).

The "bourgeois myth" of full employment is doubtless a farse in a long term historical perspective, but it has certainly not been myth over the past 15 years in a series of Imperialist countries. "The constant increase in the cost of living" could only render the "concessions of the bourgeoisie" nugatory if finally there was no rise in real wages. Now this increase is uncontestable in most of the Imperialist countries over the last twelve years. To believe that capitalism is somehow "embellished" if the true facts are stated, is to have an erroneous conception of Marxism which above all is a rigorously scientific method of analysis. It is this clinging to confused formulas such as those in the "draft" which gives ammunition to the revisionists and the social democrats, by creating the impression that a deliberate attempt is being made to deceive the soviet workers on the real situation in the Imperialist countries. The task of a Marxist Party is to explain the causes of these real phenomena, the increase in the standard of living of the workers of the Imperialist countries, to indicate their limits and to assess at what point this increase will or will not limit the struggle of the proletarian class in the Imperialist countries.

It is easy to raise criticism someone will say. But our movement must be severe in relation to the pseudo-theoreticians whether they be in the Stalinist camp or among the social democrats. It has not contented itself with posing questions; it has attempted to elaborate answers. If one studies the "Godesberg Programme" of the German SPD

or the recent "Statement of Aims" of the British Labour Party; if one reads the "Draft Programme" of the CPSU and compares these inept texts with the documents adopted on the same subjects by the Fifth and Sixth World Congress of the Fourth International and by the IEC of our movement convened between these two Congresses (2) it can be said: if the Fourth International is still weak from the organisational standpoint, no one can deny that it constitutes today the only serious Marxist current in the international workers' movement, the only current which endeavors to follow closely the evolution of world reality and tries to give a Marxist explanation of the situation, particularly to the new economic phenomena which have appeared.

Equally inadequate analysis of the workers' states and of "underdeveloped nations".

The analysis of the objective situation of the colonial and semi-colonial countries is even weaker and more deficient than that of the objective situation in the Imperialist countries. The "Draft" juggles with some general notions ("reactionary pro-Imperialist regimes"; "based on feudalism"; "national bourgeoisie") without attempting the least analysis of the economic and social content of these ideas. What is the national bourgeoisie? Is it the Industrial bourgeoisie? Does it include the class which in turn becomes "monopolist"? If so where lies the line of demarcation? Are Tata and Birla in India the representative of the "national bourgeoisie"? What are the specific political movements inspired by these different strata and classes? Whoever desires a Marxist answer to these questions — and we are only enumerating the most elementary ones — need not bother with the "Draft". It will be of no use to him.

As for the analysis of the situation of the workers' states, of the USSR in particular, it includes some ancient truths but it is guilty of silence and of the grossest revision of certain fundamental notions of Marxist-Leninism.

Mention has already been made that Stalin is not even referred to — and more serious — that the whole phenomenon of bureaucratisation is passed over in silence. From this point of view this programme is a step backwards by comparison with the programme of 1919 which, without previous experience, was sufficiently conscious to emphasise the dangers of a bureaucratic deforming of the workers' state. The enormous — and terrible — experience suffered by the USSR and by the "people's democracies" in the course of the last thirty years is simply passed over in silence

2) Theses on "The perspectives of the workers' movement in Europe and our tasks" January 1960 "Quatrième Internationale".

without any conclusion, however general, being drawn.

The idea put forward by Marx in his writings on the Paris Commune, then by Lenin in "State and Revolution" and in his writings of the years 1918-1921, that differences in wages between officials and workers, and the high salaries given to specialists could be a source of demoralization for the workers and a source of bureaucratic deformation for the state, is replaced by the absurd formula of remuneration "according to the quantity and quality of work" (pp. 10, 93) in which the quality of work of an admiral, a prima donna or a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee is considered ten or twenty times superior to the "quality" of the highly skilled metallurgist or the acetylene welder. What are the objective criteria? According to what "inexorable law", to use the language of the authors of the draft? Mystery...

"The former opposition between town and country... has been overcome" affirms the draft (p10). Indeed. Forced collectivisation (there is no mention of this in the draft, not even a condemnation) was not precisely the expression of perfect harmony. Neither did the reaction of the peasants to this forced collectivisation express a tender love for the town. Their behaviour since the world war indicates the same attitude. If all opposition between town and country had really been overcome, how is it possible to explain the 25 years of stagnation in the production of cereals, recognized by Krushchev himself in 1955? How to explain the fact that the deliveries of grain from the Kolkhozes to the state (and thence to the town) have not ceased to decline in the greater part of the USSR, as Krushchev himself recognized in the Plenum of the CC in January 1961?

And what can one say of the following passage, particularly revolting when it is compared with the reality it purports to describe?

"The whole life of Socialist society is based on a full democracy. Through the medium of the Soviets, the trade unions and other social organizations of the masses the workers participate actively in the direction of public affairs, in the solution of the problems which are posed in the building of the economy and in culture. Socialist democracy means political freedoms: freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly and association, freedom to elect and be elected, as social rights: the right to work, to leisure, to education, the right to be provided for in old age and in case of illness or being disabled for work; equality between citizens of all races and nationalities; equality of rights between men and women in all spheres of public life economic and cultural. As opposed to bourgeois democracy, socialist democracy does not rest with proclaiming the rights

of the people, but guarantees the real possibility for the exercise of these rights" (p. 10-11).

The cynicism is devastating. Perhaps the authors of the "Draft" are thinking of the Soviet Constitution of 1936 edited by the unfortunate Bukharin, because these are certainly "proclamations on paper"? But no, these are "real possibilities". If we understand it correctly then all soviet workers have the right to organize a demonstration to protest against the bad organization of the food supply (freedom of assembly). They all have the right to organize public meetings to alter the law which restricts in practice access to the university of young workers (freedom of association). They have the right to organize any political group so long as it respects the Soviet constitution. Does this happen every day in Moscow and Leningrad? Has it happened only once during 30 years? Then do these liberties exist "only on paper" and not in practice! (3).

Speaking at the VIIIth Congress of the CPSU, precisely on the revision of the party programme, Lenin affirmed:

"Whereas a demand such as the guarantee of the right of association was formerly particularly important, our opinion on this subject is that no one can prevent associations today and that the power of the Soviets has only to assure the provision of assembly halls". (Works, vol. 27, p. 134, new series 1961).

The whole workers tradition is in agreement with this. Who would dare affirm that this is so today in the USSR? Is there freedom of the press when writers and students are denied the right to publish at their own expense non-political writings, for the simple reason that they do not have the approval of some official censor, although the power of the Soviets should put the printing presses at the disposal of all the workers, all citizens except counter-revolutionaries?

There are similar remarks on the subject from that part of the "draft" which concerns relations between the workers' states... "the formation and development of the world socialist system is founded on the basis of the sovereignty and free consent in accordance with the vital interests of the workers in all the states of this system" (pp. 17-18) affirm the authors of the "draft". The Soviet intervention in Hungary, did that take place on

3) This was written before the "peace marchers" had reached Moscow. Certainly, we are not pacifists; we affirm the right of the workers' states-even degenerated- to defend themselves against the Imperialist menace. But in the USSR, the law forbids only counter-revolutionary propaganda or propaganda for war. That of the "peace marchers" is not counter revolutionary and it needs real dishonesty to call it war propaganda. Nevertheless some of their pamphlets were seized and they were forbidden to demonstrate before the ministry of defence. What then of "freedom of assembly"?

the basis of the free consent of the Hungarian workers? Did not these workers conduct a general strike lasting three weeks, the longest in the world history of workers' struggles, against this intervention, under the leadership of workers' councils whose representative character was recognized by the Soviet army since they proceeded to negotiate with them? Was not this intervention aimed at the legal and sovereign workers' government led by Imre Nagy? Do the authors of the "draft" have the effrontery to claim that the division of Germany was realised with the "free consent" of its people? Without doubt it has proved necessary to construct a wall along the line of demarcation between East and West Berlin, to allow the inhabitants of East Berlin a chance to express their "free consent" to the regime installed in their city....

As a consequence of accumulating commonplaces, eulogistic clichés and dithyrambic adjectives on the subject of the "world socialist system", the authors of the "Draft Programme" seem blissfully unaware that they are involved in flagrant contradictions. On page 14 the draft proclaims that:

« the socialist regime creates conditions to overcome the disequilibrium both economic and cultural between countries, the heritage of capitalism... all that is guaranteed by the advantages of the economic system of socialism by equality in economic relations ».

On page 16-17, they affirm that « in the socialist camp... no one has nor can have rights or particular privileges ».

The authors seem to forget that an official declaration of the Soviet government — the famous declaration of 23 October 1956 — recognized that this principle had been violated for a long period. Above all they disregard the contradictory character of this principle: *As long as exchange value exists, exchange on the basis of equality between nations of unequal economic development creates precisely privileges for the more advanced countries.* All exchange on the basis of equality "according to the prices on the world market" deprives less developed countries of a part of their wealth to the gain of the most developed countries. In practice moreover the soviet leaders have tacitly recognized this fact for since 1956-7 they have tried to compensate for this actual inequality by *unilateral aid* (and not assistance on the basis of equality), by cheap credits. But for easily comprehensible reasons of which more later, the « draft programme » makes no mention even of the *duty* of more advanced states *to sacrifice unilaterally* and without demanding a political equivalent, a part of their resources, to accelerate the economic growth of less advanced workers' states.

As for the following passage: « the tendency to wish to construct socialism in isolation, at the mar-

gin of the world community of the socialist countries... is harmful from the economic point of view, because it ends in waste of social labour, the slowing down of the rate of growth of production.. » (p. 17) this is perfectly correct from the general and abstract point of view, but it appears strange when related to the actual situation, that is to say the deformation or even the bureaucratic degeneration of the leaders of this « world community » who *deliberately drove* out socialist Yugoslavia in 1948; who tried to strangle it by a monstrous blockade; who afterwards sought to drive it into the arms of capitalism and who at the beginning of 1957 had again in part disorganised its planning by refusing to fulfill *contracts and orders*. In spite of this the « rate of growth of production » is greatly superior in Yugoslavia compared with that in the other workers' states, which demonstrates not the virtues of isolation but the disadvantages of bureaucratic control and the advantages of control by workers' councils...

Total absence of a programme for revolutionary action by the workers of the Imperialist countries.

The part in the « Draft Programme » devoted to the tasks of the international communist movement begins with a flagrant untruth:

« By the value of its example victorious socialism exerts a revolutionary influence on the spirit of the workers of the capitalist world, incites them further in the struggle against Imperialism and eases in great measure the conditions of this fight » (p. 32).

Since the whole of this passage does not apply to the colonial revolution which is treated separately, it is typical of the pious avowals and even more pious lies with which this « draft » overflows and which Maurice Thorez calls rather imprudently a « Monument of Marxist Thought ». It is true of course that the same Thorez had even more dithyrambic formulas for a certain « Short History of the CPSU », today consigned to the rubbish bin. It is indeed a « monument » which can affirm — without qualifying clause or any reservation — that « victorious socialism » has exercised a « revolutionary influence » let us say on the workers of the United States, of Canada, of Great Britain and of West Germany (300 million citizens in the capitalist world) since 1945...

In fact all the communist leaders know from their own experience (the leader of the Norwegian CP recently admitted this publicly on the morrow of the legislative elections) that if the *existence* of the USSR indubitably weakens international capitalism and thus contributes *objectively* to the international class war, the policy followed by the Soviet leaders and the catastrophic error in *bestowing the label* « socialist » on conditions of existence inferior to those of the most advanced capitalist

nations have *subjectively* seriously impeded the struggle for socialism in the Imperialist countries. The considerable *weakening* of the communist parties in most of the Imperialist countries since twelve years is in part due to this factor. For the rest it is due to the very grave opportunist errors committed in these countries during the revolutionary crisis at the end of the second world. But the « draft » makes no mention of this decline nor of its causes.

Magic formulas such as « the capitalist nations are permanently shaken by class war » (p. 33), « the reactionary forces of the different capitalist nations are in no condition to meet the growing forces of democracy and socialism » (same page), « even in countries where the positions of the reformists are still powerful, substantial changes (sic) are working towards the left in the heart of the workers' movement » (p. 34), by their non dialectic, dogmatic and sterile character contribute nothing to a clarification of the serious questions placed before the western communist parties. Communists struggling in the imperialist countries know very well that the United States is a unfortunately not « shaken permanently » by the class struggle; that the « reactionary forces in France have unfortunately been very capable of « opposing » the « forces of socialism » which in place of growing have been sensibly weakened; that in West Germany « substantial changes » have worked not in the direction of the left but towards the right in the heart of the workers' movement.

In toto the « draft programme » remains loyal to the neo-reformist theses of the XXth and the XXIst Congress of the CPSU and in this sense constitutes a retreat on the « Declaration of the 81 ». It affirms without any proof that « even before the defeat of capitalism » the working classe « can force the ruling circles (?) to stop preparations for a new world war... to put the economy at the service of peaceful industry » (p. 34). This is the most reactionary aspect of the theory of peaceful co-existence which appears here and which tends to *substitute for the battle to overthrow capitalism a battle to « compel » the imperialist bourgeoisie to become « peaceful »*. This is a reactionary utopia, an utopia because it has no chance of being achieved, reactionary because in consequence of this conception the communist parties tend to restrain the struggles of the masses which periodically go beyond the framework of capitalism, to moderate the objectives of these struggles and refuse to give them anti-capitalist perspectives.

Neo-reformism can be seen even more plainly in the following passage:

« Resting on the support of the majority of the people and resolutely opposing opportunist elements, incapable of renouncing the policy of conciliation with the capitalists and the peasants, the

working class can inflict a defeat on the anti-popular and reactionary forces (?), conquer a solid majority in parliament, transform it from being an instrument of the bourgeoisie into an instrument at the service of the working people, boldly deploying the extra parliamentary action of the masses, break the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for the peaceful accomplishment of the socialist revolution ».

Naturally, revolutionary marxists have never defended the thesis by which socialist revolution must necessarily be accompanied by a *violent* revolution, civil war, etc. The degree of violence which it involves depends exclusively on the balance of forces and the ability of the class enemy to resist. The « draft programme » is right when it recalls somewhat clumsily well known truths on this matter. But for them, as for Lenin, the *content* of revolution is the expropriation of the capitalists and the construction of a new state apparatus based on democratically elected councils of workers and poor peasants, thus accomplishing in reality the transformation of the working class into the ruling class which takes over the management of the economy and the state. A "parliamentary road to socialism" which neither mentions the expropriation of capital nor workers' councils, obviously constitutes a revisionist conception of the "socialist revolution". The authors speak a great deal of the "principal ideological danger" which is that of revisionism (pp. 38-39); they do not seem to be aware that they have also jumped with both feet into the revisionist swamp.

In reality, these neo-reformist passages — interspersed in an eclectic manner with other "orthodox" references which insist on the *necessity* of "revolution" and "the dictatorship of the proletariat" under the "most varied forms" — only constitute a rationalisation, a theoretical equivalent for what took place in the "people's democracies". In fact it was only due to foreign intervention, thanks to the military bureaucratic pressure of the leaders of the USSR, that the communist parties of these "people's democracies" have been able "to transform parliaments from instruments of the bourgeoisie into instruments of the working people", not without also transforming into a farce the very notions of "parliament", "elections" and "parties". Of course the "draft programme" strongly insists that the CPs do not desire to conquer power "as the result of a war" or "with foreign aid". But history has not yet given us an example of a independant communist party achieving power by the parliamentary road without a foreign occupation. Formerly this was the principal argument of communist propaganda against the reformist social democracy. It is becoming a key argument of marxist revolutionaries against the neo-reformism of Krushchev.

The whole chapter on the tasks of the workers' movement in the imperialist countries suffers from two fundamental weaknesses. It gives no scientific, realistic perspective of the class struggle in these countries; it in no way answers the key problem posed by the class war, that is the *problem of transitional demands* and *transitional forms of organization* to bring over the great majority of workers with a predominantly reformist outlook to conduct in practice struggles which open the way to socialism.

The only "perspective" which this chapter puts forward is the thesis, completely contradicted by the experience of the ten last years, that the stronger grow the USSR and the countries of the "socialist camp", the more bitter becomes the class struggle in the imperialist countries and the stronger the communist movement. Subsidiary to this thesis is the illusion, which is widespread today in the leaderships of the CPs in the Imperialist countries, that this will be verified the moment that the standard of living of the soviet workers surpasses that of the most advanced capitalist countries.

This thesis is moreover explicitly contained in the "Draft programme" (p. 49). It is nowhere proved; does not the *absolute* standard of living influence the consciousness much more directly than a relative comparison with conditions elsewhere, above all when this standard of living is already high? It would then be necessary to demonstrate by what economic mechanism a lowering in the standard of living is probable — or inevitable — in the twenty years to come. Besides, this thesis is profoundly demoralising, for it tends to postpone the struggles for the victory of socialism in the West to a hypothetical point in the future, which can be 15, 20, or 25 years away or even more.

A strategy in the colonial revolution which paralyzes the communist movement.

The very title of the chapter which deals with the tasks of the communists in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is significant: "The movement of national liberation". Thus the soviet bureaucracy continues to put forward its menshevik conception of two stages mechanically separated from one another, that of "national liberation" followed by that of the "socialist revolution". This conception has paralysed the communist parties of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, has prevented them from playing the role of the leadership or even of vanguard in many revolutions over the past ten years, and has resulted in severe defeats after shameful capitulations in countries such as Egypt and Iraq.

"Only a communist party which puts forward a class policy, a proletarian policy, a party armed

with revolutionary vanguard theory, forming a single bloc, closely bound to the masses is capable of organising and leading the people to the victory of socialism" (pp. 13-14) affirms the "draft programme".

How beautiful and easy... on paper. However an embarrassing fact exists for the authors of this "draft". It is called Cuba. There a powerful communist party largely in control of the trade unions, possessed many cadres a well established tradition. There has been a major revolution in Cuba. Unfortunately for those who love dogmas and ready made schemes, it was not the communist party which unleashed this revolution; on the contrary it was restraining and sabotaging it until the very last moment. The heroic forces of the "July 26th" movement led by Fidel Castro were responsible for launching the insurrection, mobilising the people for armed combat against dictatorship of Batista, overthrowing this dictatorship, realising agrarian reform, breaking with the native bourgeoisie and — in spite of the hostility and lack of comprehension of the CP — going forward to the nationalization of all capitalist property and to the construction of socialism. This decisive historical experience finds no place in the dogmas of the authors of the "draft", or in the dogma that the communist party alone is capable of overthrowing capitalism or that which claims "national liberations" is separated by a whole stage from the "socialist revolution".

The "draft programme" continues to uphold a "broad democratic movement" which must include the "national bourgeoisie". Only the "reactionary sections of the local exploiting classes" — who are the non-reactionary sections? — are excluded from this (p. 44). The authors of the draft continue thus:

"The national bourgeoisie has by its nature a double character. In present conditions, the national bourgeoisie of the colonial, ex-colonial and dependant countries who are not bound to the imperialist milieux, is objectively interested in the accomplishment of the essential tasks of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. It follows that its progressive role, its capacity to participate in the solution of the pressing problems of national interest, has not been exhausted.

However the more contradictions develop between the workers and the exploiting classes and the class struggle sharpens internally, the more the national bourgeoisie tends to ally itself with the imperialists and internal reaction. The process of development of the liberated countries is very complicated and involves several stages. Taking into account the different historical, social, and economic conditions of the liberated countries (?), the creative initiative of the masses will lead to numerous unique features in the forms and rhythms

of their development on the path of social progress" (pp. 45-46).

Up to the present however it has hardly been the "creative initiative of the masses" which has really innovated "on the path of social progress" (old reformist formula, be it noted). Rather it is the fertile imagination of the bureaucrats who, since the conference of the 81, have brought to light a creature formerly unknown, neither fish nor fowl, called "the State of the national democracy".

According to the Marxist Leninist theory of the state, the state is a weapon of coercion of one class against another... "The state of the national democracy", it would seem, is not the instrument of any class in particular, but the expression of a "bloc of all the progressive and patriotic forces in combat for complete national independence, for a powerful democracy, for the final accomplishment of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal democratic revolution" (p. 47).

The authors of the "draft programme" succeed here in contradicting themselves on every page. On the preceding page, it was a question of the disadvantages of a capitalist economy for colonial peoples on the path to liberation. One might conclude then that to accomplish the "final" national liberation means to overthrow the system of capitalist exploitation. In these conditions, the economy emerging from the outcome of this revolution would be an economy with a socialist base (as in Cuba), and we would then see a socialist revolution, not simply a national one, a workers' state and not a "national democracy".

Let us now examine the reverse hypothesis. Let us admit that "to lead the revolution to its final conclusion" means, in the context of the colonial countries, to leave intact "indigenous" capitalist property. In this case the bourgeoisie remains the exploiting class. Now the marxist theory of the state tells us that the state is the coercive instrument of the dominant class. Then in this case the state would not be a "national democratic state", but a bourgeois state, however extremely democratic. Lenin also has taught us that the most democratic bourgeois republic is only a veiled form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Would not this apply even more to the colonial countries?

The authors of the "Draft programme" give us then the choice between two revisionisms: that it is possible to eliminate the capitalist economy without creating a workers' state: that it is possible to wage the struggle for the liberation of the colonial peoples to a final conclusion without eliminating the capitalist economy. Between these two revisions, each to his choice. But even after this mournful choice, no trace can be found of the "state of national democracy".

When the defenders of this revisionist in-

novation are pressed to their last defences and the question is posed to them: "Give us then examples of states of national democracy", they quote neither Iraq, nor Ghana, whose bourgeois status cannot be doubted, nor even Guinea. They quote... Cuba, that is to say a country where the foreign and native bourgeoisie has been completely expropriated and has disappeared as the possessing class; where not only the means of production have been nationalized but the working people are armed. If the point is argued further and the question asked: "What then is the difference between the Cuban state and the countries of the "people's democracy" a few years ago? The only serious answer given (except by the Cuban CP which is beginning to admit that the workers' state is an actuality) is that... there is no communist party in power. How strange these marxists are who use purely subjective criteria to define the nature of the state and finally conclude that the bourgeoisie of a country can be expropriated and a new social structure erected based on the nationalization of the means of production.. without it being a workers state.

When the "draft programme" states, as on p. 48, that "national states" appear more and more as an independent force in the world arena", confusion is at a premium. Here we have national states (always without a class character), which seem wifferent from "states on national democracy" but which have the advantage on this mysterious animal by the signal distinction of existing. Without doubt this means the states of India, Egypt, Iraq, Ghana, perhaps even Morocco, Tunisia? We can quite understand that the authors have had some scruples about characterising these states as "democratic", since one of their principal activities consists in imprisoning communists, and other militant workers and poor peasants. But these states — which exist — are they not *bourgeois* states? is this not to grossly deceive the peoples of these states and the soviet peoples to affirm so irresponsibly that the governments of these states constitute "in the main a progressive, revolutionary and anti-imperialist force"? Can one convince the Chinese people that the Nehru government plays such a role? Or the Algerian masses that Bourguiba or King Hassan II play a revolutionary role? Or the Egyptian and Iraqi *fellah*-crushed by an agrarian reform "from above" — that Nasser and Kassem perform a "revolutionary role"? Or the workers of Ghana who have just protested by a general strike against the worsening of their standard of living that Nkrumah plays a "progressive" role?

All these contortions, all this confusion, all this mixture of half truths and three quarter lies are resorted to by the authors of the "draft programme" because they refuse to apply the el-

ementary marxist principles which experience has confirmed. In colonial and semi-colonial countries, the proletariat and poor peasants, organised in popular or proletarian formations separate from the bourgeois parties — and as soon as possible in revolutionary marxist parties or tendencies — can give critical support to any concrete, anti-imperialist action undertaken by the national bourgeoisie. But at the same time the masses should be educated in a spirit of distrust in relation to this bourgeoisie, so that they learn that by its nature this bourgeoisie is incapable of leading the revolution to its final conclusion, that it will pass inevitably into the counter-revolutionary camp, above all at the moment where a radical agrarian reform threatens the edifice of private property, that they should then be led to push through the revolution without halting at any stage, to pursue the revolution "in permanence", until social and economic liberation completes national liberation, that the construction of a socialist economy and society can develop after the destruction of the bourgeois state and the construction of a state of a new type, the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the poor peasants, based on the democratic committees elected by the working people.

AN ANAEMIC CONCEPTION OF COMMUNISM.

But if the "draft programme" is modest and misguiding for the masses of the imperialist countries, of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, it is on the contrary full of magnificent promises in relation to the masses of the workers' states and above all in relation to the masses of the USSR. The "draft programme" finishes with a triumphant call: "The party solemnly proclaims: the present generation of soviet citizens will live under communism" (p. 150). It proceeds to define the content of this "communism" both on the socio-economic and the political planes.

On the socio-economic plane we find the following definitions: "In the course of the next decade, the Soviet Union which will create the material and technical basis for communism will overtake in production per capita the most advanced and the wealthiest capitalist nation: the USA; the material well-being and the cultural and technical level of the workers will be increased considerably; comfort will be assured for all; the kolkhoz and sovkhoz will be transformed into highly productive cultivation; the needs of soviet citizens for comfortable dwellings will be satisfied in the main; painful manual work will disappear; the USSR will become the country with the shortest working day.

In the course of the second decade (1971-1980) the material and technical basis of communism will be created, an abundance of material and

cultural services will be assured to the whole population; soviet society will come close to the application of the principle of each according to his needs; the transition will be made to the collective property of the whole people. Thus communist society in the USSR will have been boldly outlined. The construction of communist society will be constructed completely in the following period" (pp. 65-66).

These are indeed dazzling perspectives-if the facts correspond to the definitions. We will look at them a little more closely.

In the course of the next decade the USSR will overtake the production per capita of the USA. Can this promise be fulfilled? It is most unlikely. It seems even more improbable when further on (pp. 68-9) it is stated that to do this it would be necessary to surpass two and a half times the present level of industrial production of the USA. Now the present indices of the level of production of the USA is superior by at least 35% (some would argue from 40-50%) to soviet production. The latter must then pass from an index 65 to 200 or 250, that is to say *it must triple or quadruple* production in the space of ten years. The present rate or growth of soviet industry is in the order of 8-10% per annum. With this in mind it is clear that at this rate the indices in ten years time would stand not at 200-250 but at 130-165 after ten years. Now the Soviet population surpasses by nearly 50 million the population of the USA; American production then has only to reach the indices 135-150 in ten years, and its per capita output would still remain 25-35% above that of the USSR. A rate of growth of 2½-4% would suffice, which is not impossible.

Furthermore *industrial production per capita* does not mean *standard of living per capita*. To arrive at this, account must be taken of agriculture, where American advance in the field of productivity remains enormous, and consumer durable goods accumulated from the past, where the American advance is equally enormous. Briefly, on Krushchev's definition a communist country is one whose standard of living remains inferior to that of a capitalist country. Pointless to insist on the curious character of such a definition.

A statistical example will confirm our scepticism. For 1970, the "draft programme" foresees a production of electricity of 900-1000 milliards kilowatts. Now the present output of electricity in the USA is 850 milliard kilowatts: in 1950 it was 620 i.e. an annual rate of growth of 6% per annum. With such a rate of growth, American production of electric energy will still surpass that of the USSR by nearly 50% in 1970, without speaking of per capita production.

The rash predictions of Krushchev in relation

to agriculture have already shown themselves. The same applies to his prediction at the 21st Congress that from 1965 the production of the workers' states would be over half that of world industrial production. Yet we are at the end of 1961 and the output of the workers' states has only reached 35% of world industrial output. Manifestly, Khrushchev has seriously underestimated the present increase of the Imperialist countries in Europe and Japan and also of certain capitalist semicolonial countries. To make such irresponsible promises (we denounced them at the time (4), adds nothing to the success and impressive dynamic of the soviet economy. This only expresses the boasting of the bureaucracy, a normal complement of its timid moderation before the mounting revolutionary forces in the world.

From the second decade an "abundance of material and cultural services" will be produced in the USSR. It will then be possible to proceed to distribution according to need. Now the "draft programme" makes a cruel deception on this point. It is true that it promises — in the course of the next 20 years — that "the social funds of consumption will be nearly equal to half of real income of the population" (p. 101). But it only arrives at this conclusion by including within it free education, social insurance, free medical service and other forms of indirect benefits which exist equally in the most advanced capitalist countries and which are currently valued at about 35-40% of the income at the disposal of the workers.

In fact genuine progress in relation to the most advanced capitalist countries are only promised in three sectors: free housing (an enormous step, but all depends naturally on the quality of the housing); free public services (including public transport); and free meals in factories and schools (that is to say a free meal once a day in the canteen). By serious marxist definition, this would be at the most the dawning of a socialist society, the dawning of the *first stage* of socialism which begins to point to the horizon beyond. But to call this a communist society "built in its outlines" is to debase communism, to reduce it to an impoverished definition.

This strange "communism" will retain commodities, money, market economy. It will retain wages and even "remuneration according to work" (p. 94). Worse still, under this "communist society", it will be necessary always "to stimulate materially" the process of production (p. 75), it will be necessary to fix "purchase prices" (sic) which will stimulate the kolkhoz to increase the productivity of work" (p. 84) as in a vulgar

market economy where production is geared to its "profitability"; it will even be necessary to maintain *inequality of remuneration* according to quantity and quality of work (p. 92) which remains well on this side of the definition given by Marx in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, that is, remuneration strictly egalitarian according to quantity of work alone. This is then a communism in which even bread is not free, in which real equality is still promised for... the day after to-morrow.

A few examples will allow us to illuminate the miserably truncated character of this "communism".

In May 1917 (44 years ago when there was neither automation nor nuclear energy) Lenin edited some notes for the revision of the Party programme. He looked forward particularly to the forbidding of industrial work of children under 16. The present draft programme looks forward to a category of young workers with less than 11 years of education, working effectively from 16, 15 or even 14 years of age (p. 128). Lenin foresaw the immediate reduction of the working day from six to four hours in unhealthy industries; the "draft programme" foresees a working day of 5-6 hours in these same industries (p. 97). In 1918, dealing with the draft of this same new programme, Lenin speaks of *the period of transition to socialism* thus: "to reduce progressively the working day to 6 hours; to gradually equalise *all* salaries and wages in *all* professions and categories" (Lenin's underlining - Vol. 27 Works - p. 158) but the authors of the draft programme have the effrontery to speak of "remuneration according to the quantity and the quality of work produced", not for the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, but for its second completed phase, the phase of communism.

These formulations do not permit misuse as mere labels. Do they not clearly indicate also that once more soviet society has not yet finished the construction of the first phase of socialism, not to speak of its second phase?

THE STATE WITHERS AWAY BUT IS STRENGTHENED AT THE SAME TIME.

These contradictions reach their climax when the authors of the draft programme consider the problem of political organisation in communist society.

First definition and first error:

"A process of transforming the state into a universal organisation of all the workers of socialist society has begun. Proletarian democracy is being more and more transformed into the socialist democracy of the people (p. 103).

The first part of this passage begins with "a

4) See "Quatrième Internationale" No. on the VI world congress, theses on the "Tendencies and Perspectives of the World Economy".

process of transforming the state into a universal organisation of all the workers" (in a free association of communes of producers and consumers as Engels stated and Lenin upheld. But the "draft programme" rejects these "anarchist" conceptions). This is none other than the withering away of the state. Our bold authors however have forgotten their ABC because suddenly they affirm that the withering away of the state is the transformation of "proletarian democracy into the socialist democracy of the people". They cannot recall that Lenin taught that "the withering away of the state is the withering away of democracy... Democracy is the state recognizing the submission of the minority to the majority, that is to say the organisation of violence systematically exercised by one class upon another, by one part of the population against the other" (State and Revolution Selected Works II pp. 227-228) To say that the state withers away but democracy exists, is to say that the state withers away and exists at the same time. To say that proletarian democracy is transforming itself into the democracy of the whole people, is to say that the systematic organisation of violence by the majority against the minority (dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarian democracy) is transforming itself into the systematic organisation of violence by the whole people.. against itself.

Second definition and second error.

"The state which has emerged as the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is being transformed into the state of the whole people, into the organ which translates the interests and the will of the whole people... The party starts from the standpoint that the dictatorship of the proletariat abandons its function before the withering away of the state. The state, in as much as it is the organisation of the whole people, will remain until the complete victory of communism. Expressing the will of the people it is called upon... to govern the degree of work and consumption, to assure... the legal socialist order and socialist property..." (pp. 103-104).

We have deliberately overlooked the passage concerning the role of the state in "national defence" during the existence of capitalist encirclement. This is an ancient quarrel of definition and an ancient confusion. But here we content ourselves with this glaring confession, it is quite sufficient. Thus, in this society at the threshold of communism, having completed even "in its main outlines" the construction of communist society, it is then still necessary to have a state *which imposes by violence*, discipline, legality, control of consumption and the level of work. Is this communism? Is it even socialism?

We use the phrase "by violence" designedly.

Lenin returned to the point many times: the State is not the simple submission of minorities to majorities, the simple observation of elementary rules of morality and discipline. The state is a *special machine*, a particular arm of coercion and violence, which *imposes* submission and this submission is that of one class of society in the name of another. "Democracy" said Lenin "is a form of state, one of its varieties. It is then, like every state, the organized, systematic application of coercion to men". As long as economic and social conditions do not permit the disappearance of classes, of exchange economy, and the desire for private gain, — as long it is in fact necessary to have an organised punitive body restraining citizens so that they do not steal collective property, do not appropriate an exorbitant amount from the supply of articles of consumption, do not molest women in the streets and do not organize crime. But the survival of this constraint demonstrates precisely that classes remain, that we are not yet in a socialist society, without speaking of communist society.

But perhaps this is simply an error of definition? The reality cannot be so explained. The soviet government has been obliged to reintroduce *the death penalty for economic offences* and it applies it to the little fish rather than the big ones — who however set the example. Do we need any further proof that the state remains and is not withering, that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" remains under the guise of a bureaucratic degeneration, and that the rest is simply nonsense, dust in the eyes of the workers, sheer deception?

Third definition and third error.

"The Party regards it as important to develop even further democratic principles in the administration. The principle of election and of accountability before representative organism and electors must be gradually extended to all the leading workers of state bodies. It is essential to reduce the personal appointed by the state apparatus, to initiate more and more people into public administration so that in the future state work in this apparatus ceases to be a profession" (p. 108).

Now Lenin defined the dictatorship of the proletariat as a regime in which 1) the army of functionaries begins to be replaced by workers fulfilling these functions in rotation; 2) a state in which those functionaries who remain are paid the average wage of the worker. But the authors of the "draft programme" have assured us that we have in the USSR a society in which the construction of socialism is already completed; in which the construction of communism is being gaily embarked upon; in which this construction

will be in its turn completed "in its main outlines" twenty years from now-but in which there continues to exist an army of functionaries so numerous and so powerful (official soviet statistics count them in millions) that their abuses exasperate the people, that it is necessary to reduce their number (slogan thrown to and fro for more than 25 years) and that it is necessary "gradually" to elect them rather than to appoint them. The very task which Lenin stressed as an essential for the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, the authors of the programme promise to realise "gradually"... after the construction of communist society. They recognise in passing that here "administration" has not been characterised by the application of "democratic principles" (the formula: "even further" is simply a figure of speech) since there has been no election of functionaries. And they recognize in passing precisely this bureaucratic degeneration of the State which is characterised by the usurpation of a bureaucracy in the very sphere which according to Lenin lay the mission of the masses in the dictatorship of the proletariat: the management of the economy and the state.

HOW TO EXPLAIN THE PROGRAMME?

This has been a severe criticism of the theoretical weaknesses of the programme. It is not however without merits, at least objectively. Above all it is a powerful demonstration of the tensions which exist at the present within the soviet bureaucracy, within soviet society, and the whole "socialist world". What does the "draft programme" reveal in this connection? What conclusions can be drawn from it in relation to the future of the URSS and the "socialist world"?

Much more significant than a product of a "logic" or of an "ideology" appropriate to the bureaucracy (6) this programme is the product of the world and the soviet reality of today, of a reality seen through distorting mirrors no doubt, but which none the less forces the privileged stratum in power in the USSR to manoeuvre to yield, to fall back on its last defences in order to defend itself against the revolutionary forces which threaten its positions.

We can find the signs of four definite pres-

6) This is not to say that this "logic" or this "ideology" is absent. One of its significant features is a rigid positivism, with places "communist man" in the midst of implacable "laws" and impels him constantly to "discover new laws". This positivism, which has nothing to do with dialectical materialism, sometimes takes grotesque forms: "The law (sic) which rules the existence of the party is the rigorous respect of Leninist norms in the life of the party and the principle of collective leadership" (p. 144). It is a "law" which has been in abeyance for 25 years as was demonstrated at the XX Congress of the CPSU.

ures which are making themselves felt on the soviet bureaucracy, to which they must make concessions but which threaten constantly to overthrow it.

The bureaucracy and the pressure of the colonial revolution.

The first pressure is that of the colonial revolution in full spate. If the formulations of the "draft programme" are compared with those of the XXth Congress and even with those of the "Declaration of the 81 CPs" the traces of this pressure can be seen clearly. The victory of the Cuban revolution; the radicalization of the Algerian revolution; the near paralysis of the numerous communist parties in countries experiencing nevertheless an impetuous revolutionary advance—these are facts which have extracted from the Kremlin leaders.. some phrases. The importance of these phrases is of course not to be found in the intention of its authors. Its importance lies in the alibi it offers to the leaders of certain communist or para-communist parties to excuse the opportunist line of Moscow in relation to the colonial revolution.

The fundamental policy of the "draft programme" is the alliance with the national bourgeoisie of the colonial and semi-colonial countries — with the famous "national states" — with the object of forcing imperialism ("placed in the minority at UNO") to accept "peaceful coexistence". This policy is fundamentally opportunist because it eliminates the perspective of proletarian revolution in the rest of the world not only in the short run but in the long term also. Even when this opportunism takes a sharply adventurist form — the resumption of nuclear tests — the strategy remains the same: to exercise pressure on Imperialism, to rely on its conversion rather than its overthrow by the proletariat.

But within the framework of this opportunist policy the possibility is admitted the "countries liberated from the colonialist yoke" to choose "the non-capitalist path of development" (p. 46). This is only said in passing, it is so mixed up with restrictive clauses and reservations that it is quite obviously a purely verbal concession to the multiple forces which everywhere in the world more and more bitterly attack the Kremlin and the CPs for their passivity, their lack of audacity and their lack of initiative in face of the mounting energy of the colonial revolution. But revolutionary marxists will seize upon this phrase and turn it into a club to hammer the stalinist leaders who even in countries where the number of proletarians can already be counted in millions, obstruct in practice "the non-capitalist" development of their people.

The bureaucracy in face of the pressure of the Chinese revolution.

The second pressure is that of the Peoples Republic of China, great and indispensable ally of the Soviet Union, whose alliance is more valuable than all the nuclear weapons invented or inventable.

It reflects in part the most general pressure of the colonial revolution — and in this measure the criticisms to which the soviet leaders are forced to reply conform to those we have just formulated.

But it also reflects something else. The People's Republic of China has become the spokesman of the working masses of all the workers' states less developed than the USSR or more exactly, of all the peoples of the economically underdeveloped nations, including their reigning bureaucracy who criticise the leaders of the soviet bureaucracy of a *national egotism*, a flagrant lack of proletarian internationalism, when Krushchev promises a modern flat to each soviet family, even a car to each citizen of his country, while tens of millions of Chinese, of Vietnamese, of Koreans and even of Albanians, Roumanians, Bulgarians who are not certain of enough food or clothing in the course of the coming decade.

This criticism becomes particularly acute in a world made very conscious of the problem of aid to the "under-developed" nations. It so impresses the authors of the "draft programme" that they are led to introduce the following hardly credible formulation into it: "The fact that the socialist states progress within the framework of a single world system, while using the laws and the advantage of this system, allows them to reduce delays in the building of socialism and to pass to communism more or less simultaneously within the limits of a single and the same historical epoch" (p. 139).

Unless the term "historical epoch" is given a meaning so wide as to be meaningless (for example "epoch century"), this would seem to mean that the whole "socialist bloc", with China especially prominent would be able to construct communism in the space of a few decades, that is to say to utilise the criterion which Krushchev has generally employed, would be able to overtake in 30-40 years the per capita output of the USA.

The figures have only to be consulted to make clear what that would mean. And then the economists, the conscious communists of the PR of China could reply to the leaders of the soviet bureaucracy: either you are trying to say that within the existing framework of "mutual aid", such a "leap forward" is possible, in which case you are lying completely and mocking the heroic sacrifices and sufferings of the great Chinese people; or you are trying to say that the USSR is

ready to make all the necessary efforts in this direction — efforts which necessitate ten times, twenty times more material aid than that which is given at present — in which case this is a promise to which henceforth you are bound before the workers of the entire world".

It is not a question only of the conservatism, of the narrow national egotism of the soviet bureaucracy which are incontestable facts. *This is a major objective difficulty.* The soviet proletariat has made for more than half a century enormous sacrifices for the sake of communism. The bureaucratic degeneration of the soviet state has quadrupled and quintupled the sacrifices which have met the industrialisation and the military defence of the country; but these sacrifices would have been enormous even without stalinist leadership. At the very moment when for the first time in many years, the standard of living is increasing rapidly and regularly, no leadership of the soviet CP can demand new and major sacrifices to accelerate the industrialisation of the PR of China although here also it would be possible to give much more and much better, without touching the rise in the standard of living of the soviet masses, if the leadership of the state and of the economy were inspired by Leninist principles. But the objective difficulty remains.

This means that by a strange detour of history, the theory of socialism in a single country is yet again shown to be absurd, but in a domain where nobody have supposed it formerly. To affirm that the construction of socialism has been achieved in a single country; to affirm that it is possible in a single country to achieve "in its mains outlines" the construction of communism; to create the illusion that the rule "from each according to his capacities, to each according to his needs" can be applied "at first" in a single country — is to arrive at the absurd conclusion that food can be free in Vladivostock whereas in Manchuria men go hungry; that it will be enough to go from Erzerum to Batum to be clothed free of charge; that the soviet people must then establish a permanent barrier on its frontiers to press back the millions who would want to cross from the hell of their daily life to this paradise at the wave of a hand, so preventing the greatest human migration of modern times. The hypothesis is of course absurd. But what better to underline the viewpoint of the young Marx who affirmed that communism could only triumph universally, that communist society could only be a world society or at least one which included the major part of the globes population?

Let us add that the "Draft programme" contains a revealing phrase on the necessity to "perfect ceaselessly" the international division of labour" (p 141) which seems to reply in part to

the criticisms which certain CPs in power, notably that of Poland have addressed to the Kremlin.

The bureaucracy and the pressure of the soviet consumers.

The pressure which is most clearly defined in the "Draft programme" — in certain parts even on every page — is that of the soviet consumers.

When the "Draft" proclaims that "the difference between the high and relatively less high incomes must be gradually diminished" this reflects that the mass of the consumers is aware of this difference and is protesting noisily at the situation. When on the following page, the "Draft" affirms that:

"Already in the course of the coming ten years the real wages of the workers and of the employees who are receiving relatively low salaries will be increased in such a way that there will no longer remain in the country categories of workers and employees who are inadequately paid" (p. 95) that is to say then that whole "categories" — millions of men and women — consider themselves today inadequately paid. When the draft proclaims that the "CPSU emphasises the task of resolving the most acute problem for the rise in the standard of living of the soviet people: that of housing" (p. 96), it reveals that discontent with the scandalous housing conditions of most of the soviet population is growing ceaselessly. When the draft declares that:

"Women must be employed on relatively lighter but sufficiently paid work" (p. 96) a break is made with the stalinist thesis which symbolised equality between male and female by the fact that heavy and unhealthy labour was performed by women as well as men a state of affairs which does not fail to provoke latent discontent among the soviet women workers. When the "Draft" indicates that the "manufacture of automobiles for the population will be considerably increased" (p. 96), despite the fact that it declares previously: "The automobile park of the country will be increased so as to satisfy all the needs of business and passenger traffic. The location centres of automobiles will be multiplied" (p. 73), it is clear then that millions of soviet citizens do not accept the Krushchevian thesis according to which taxis can satisfy all the needs of the soviet people in cars, and that they certainly desire to acquire a vehicle as private property or permanent use. And so forth.

The global balance of these promises is without doubt impressive. This is particularly so when compared not only with 1917 or 1927, but even with 1945 or 1952. It is beyond doubt that in the course of the last ten years the standard of living of the soviet people has increased more than during the whole period 1917-1952, or the whole

first half of the XXth century. In particular spheres the promises will not perhaps be fulfilled. As regards agriculture especially, Krushchev continues to make rash promises, in spite of the experiences of recent years which should have taught him prudence. Nonetheless the idea can be accepted that these promises will broadly be fulfilled which means that in ten years time the standard of living of the soviet people will have reached or overtaken that of most of the countries of western Europe and will be amongst the highest in the world.

"Krushchevian reformism" is based essentially on the theorem that in satisfying the stomach, it will calm the heart and slow down the brain, at least on the path of criticising the bureaucratic deformations of the system. But this theorem is false. If the amelioration of the standard of living avoids indeed the explosions of hunger and anger such as those of 16-17 June 1953 in East Germany or that of the 23 October 1956 in Hungary, it will finish by stimulating and not restraining the critical anti-bureaucratic spirit above all in a country where access to "State and Revolution" is not only free but still (moderately) encouraged by the government. And the draft programme demonstrates incontestably that the bureaucracy is beginning to be subjected equally to a pressure on the part of soviet citizens who know that they are not only machines to consume more meat and milk than citizens in the United States, but that they are still *citizens* and *producers* who as such desire in short to exercise the rights which the soviet Constitution and the old party programme granted them—at least on paper.

The bureaucracy and the pressure of soviet citizens.

For the first time since the arrival in power of Krushchev the "draft programme" contains in fact precise promises not only on matters concerning the standard of living of the masses but on questions concerning their democratic rights. Until now the new stratum of leaders who have succeeded Stalin have been content to abolish the most barbarous abuses of the stalinist era (all-powerful secret police; absence of a minimum of judicial guarantees for the defence: dissolution of concentration camps, etc.). Now, it is *obliged* to put forward reforms equally in the political domain.

The most essential of these reforms occurs in the following propositions:

1) "It is opportune to renew at each election at least a third of the deputies to the soviets" (p. 105).

2) "The principle must be established by which the leaders of the institutions of the Union of the republics and of the regions cannot be

elected to their post, as a general rule more than three consecutive times" (p. 105).

3) "There must be put in to practice in full measure... free, detailed and public discussion in the sessions of the Soviets of all the important questions of state administrations, of economic and cultural programmes; ...the systematic discussion by the soviets of contributions from the deputies... (pp. 105-106).

4) "Legislative initiative, that is to say the right to submit statutory proposals must be allowed to the trade unions, to the Komsomol and to the other mass social organisations, represented by their central organs and organs of the Republics" (p. 107).

5) "It is right that the most important statutory proposals be submitted to popular approbation (referendum)". (p. 107).

6) "The party believes it necessary to reduce the number of personnel appointed from above, to renew at each ordinary election about half the members of every social organism. The party judges it appropriate that the leaders of the social institutions are not elected as a general rule more than two consecutive times" (p. 112).

7) "The development of democracy in the party..." (p. 147). - "To practice the systematic renewal, in proportions determined by the elected members of all the organisations from those of the base to the central committee, taking into account the continuity of the leadership. In all the ordinary elections, a quarter at least of the members of the CC of the CPSU and of its presidium will be renewed. As a general rule, the members of the Presidium will not be elected more than three consecutive times.. The members of the CCs of the CPs of the federal republics, Party committees of the territory, of the region, will be renewed by a third at least, at each ordinary election... The secretaries of the organisations of the base of the party cannot be elected more than two consecutive times" (pp. 145-6).

It is necessary to add an eighth point which we mentioned above, concerning the progressive election of functionaries.

How do we estimate this list of political reforms, at first so impressive? Two preliminary remarks suggest themselves. Firstly the series of measures proposed today as sensational innovations are already contained in the soviet constitution. It is admitted then (tacitly-which is not a good example of that ardently praised virtue called self-criticism) that these measures have hardly been applied in practice.

In addition other measures are very greatly circumscribed in their democratic quality by the fact of restrictive clauses. "As a general rule",

the members of the Presidium will not be elected more than three consecutive times. But "certain responsible figures of the party, of recognized authority and outstanding political and organisational qualities can be re-elected to the leading bodies several consecutive times for longer periods" (p. 145). The "condition" of being elected with a majority of three quarters is rather platonic when one realises that at congresses the members of the Presidium are elected unanimously. Similarly a leader of the soviet bodies who "in the case where personal gifts in the general opinion make useful and necessary his further activity within the leading organisation" can be reelected more than three consecutive times with the three quarter majority (p. 105).

This said, a safety valve has nevertheless been opened which demonstrates that political pressure has taken important forms. Certain of the introduced reforms will remain doubtless a dead letter. Others will be largely put into practice (notably the referendum, the right of initiative from trade unions and other social organisations, the discussion of interpellations from deputies), but for questions of a secondary order and mainly local or regional interest.

The essence of these measures lies however in the fact that *the police dictatorship of Stalin has been succeeded by a political dictatorship, plebiscitary in form, in which the atomised mass of individuals enjoys in reality increased rights, except that of organising themselves*, and is able to check if only on secondary questions, the policy defined by the leading group of the bureaucracy.

Yet in comparison with the period which preceded from the death of Stalin to the elimination of "the anti-party group", freedom of discussion within the leading organisations of the party risks being *limited* and not increased by the reforms of the "draft programme".

During this whole period, in order to crystallise his power and avoid the excessive pressure of the army, Krushchev and his friends have been obliged to enlarge the circle who participate in real discussions where questions of political orientation have been determined. He had at the same time to appeal to the mass of the members of the CC against the members of the Presidium, at the time of the decisive struggle against Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovitch and their friends. Such an evolution favoured the formation of groups and tendencies within the Central Committee, indeed rendered their reappearance inevitable. With the new method, where at each congress one third of the membership is renewed, except for a small group of "indispensables" around Krushchev — who have appointed themselves to this category — each member of the central committee who desires to defend views different from those of

the first secretary sees himself threatened automatically not with expulsion" (a measure against which remedy may be had and which involves a precise procedure) but with "non-re-election" at the next Congress. As it is the retiring leadership which proposes to congress the list of members for re-election, the members not to elect and the new candidates, this elimination by the narrow and "democratic" path can only be contradicted by an appeal to the members over the head of the Central Committee, an appeal explicitly forbidden as a "manifestation of factionalism and cliquism, incompatible with the spirit of a Marxist-Leninist party".

The same criticism applies to the apparently more democratic character of soviet elections. The Central Committee controls the Party, and through the latter, the trade unions, the Komsomols and all the organisations referred to as "social". The fact that the members of the soviets are regularly renewed in no way reduces the extremely bureaucratic and autocratic character of the system, so long as the leading fraction of the party retains an absolute monopoly on the presentation of candidates, whether directly or by the intermediary of the "social organisations" which it controls.

This is the weak point in the whole edifice, a weak point which looks a ridiculous weakness in the conditions where "communism" will be constructed "in its main outlines". The forbidding of fractions (not "groups" or "tendencies") was justified by Lenin in 1921 by the extreme danger that the dictatorship of the proletariat was undergoing from the pressure of the peasant petit bourgeois milieu in Russia. He explained that in these conditions, every fractional conflict in the party could become the indirect (and unconscious) vehicle of the class conflict in the country.

But now we are told that the antagonisms of class have disappeared; that classes themselves have disappeared "in their main forms"; that there are no longer possible divergences "in depth" since these divergences only reflect in the last analysis antagonistic class interests. But at the same time "factionalism and group spirit" continue to be forbidden. Better still, the programme of 1919 is altered, since it contained no reference to this "Leninist rule" of which apparently Lenin himself had no knowledge... (7).

7) Example (among many others): in the notes of Vol 26 of Lenin's works which have just appeared it is mentioned that Bukharin had formed in 1916 an "anti-party group" to oppose the "line of the party" on national policy. Lenin did not seem to share this judgement since he proposed and obtained the admission of the same Bukharin in 1919 to the Political Bureau and he sent him in 1920 to the IX Congress as a special representative of the CC for the trade Unions, saying to comrades who criticised this appointment "do you know a better theoretician than Bukharin?" In the spirit of the present "draft" Lenin would have had to exclude him from the party. It is also true that by this same spirit, Lenin was hardly... "leninist."

All this adds up to the ridiculous conclusion: when the Bolshevik party was weak, surrounded with powerful enemies, it was able to afford the luxury of freedom for tendencies and whole groups; when it was leading the soviet state in the middle of the civil war and of foreign intervention, at a time when the survival of the soviet state hung by a thread, when the latter was weak, delivered to famine and to widespread poverty, the party was still always able to afford the luxury and liberty of tendency and group, to the point of not even breathing a word of an "interdict" in the programme of 1919. But now that the USSR has become the first military power in the world and the second industrial power; at the moment when it is supposed to be engaged in the triumphal construction of communism, "group spirit" becomes a mortal danger which it was neither in 1917 or 1918, 1919 or 1920. Understand who can...

The Krushchevian thesis would be more coherent if it had at the same time defended the Yugoslavian position according to which the Party must also wither in accordance with the withering away of the state and classes, and since the party is only the advanced detachment of a social class, the proletariat, if the party withers, factions, groups, tendencies, wither also. But Krushchev affirms the contrary: in the degree that classes and the state wither, « the role of the party increases ». (p. 143). Since class antagonisms no longer exist this role can only increase in the domain of economic, cultural, and scientific control. But why should the « construction of communism » be menaced if in the cultural sphere the « non-figurative group » struggles with the partisans of « socialist realism » at all level and within the party? Why should the triumph of socialism be threatened by a vehement discussion involving two or three « fractions » on the utility or not of constructing at Bratsk a huge barrage... before the industries which consume electric energy have been built? How can « free, detailed and public discussion » of all the economic and cultural problems be possible if on the one side, there is a group of men held together by a strict discipline disposing of all the levers of power, and on the other side only isolated individuals who have no right to organise themselves, even temporarily, even for the length of a single discussion, to make their point of view accepted? Is it not obvious that this system, in spite of the democratic formalism in which it is closed, remains that of *bureaucratic centralism*? Is it not clear that there will be no genuine *re-establishment of the sovereign power of the soviets* until the freedom to establish groups and tendencies is established within the directing party and the liberty to constitute other parties (or groups) in the framework of soviet legality and on the basis of the constitution is allowed in fact?

The programme of 1919 was discussed freely at the IXth Congress of the party. The USSR was in mortal danger. Nevertheless discussion was entirely free, divergences were expressed, passionate debates took place. But was there a real discussion at the XXIIth Congress? This is a very precise test. No one can really believe that on the thousand problems raised by the «draft programme» — for example on the idea that democracy remains while the state withers — there is no difference among the hundreds of thousands of its cadres. Would any one dare to express differences of opinion at the Congress? Would he be given the chance? Clearly, the democratic clauses of the draft programme is eyewash and the real task re-establishing soviet democracy is far from being resolved in the Soviet Union. The question has not even been posed.

The bureaucracy and the pressure of the soviet producers.

Finally the last pressure, not yet realised, still potential, since the «draft programme» does not reflect it, but which is decisive for the future of the Soviet Union: the pressure of the best qualified proletariat in Europe and the most numerous in the world, *to take in its own hands the management of enterprises created by its own hands, with its own sacrifices and thanks to its own intelligence.*

Here lies the supreme contradiction in the whole political policy of the «draft programme». The soviets are «democratised». The administration is «democratised». The party, the unions, the Komsomols are «democratised». *But a possible democratisation of industrial management is not even mentioned.* Even the few modest rights given in the last few years to the unions to supervise the bureaucratic management of the economy are not referred to. On the contrary the bureaucracy says in effect «It is necessary for us to remain in power for twenty years yet to fulfill all our promises».

The «draft programme» speaks it is true on three occasions about the «participation of the masses in the management of enterprises»: on page 77, at the end of the chapter which deals with the economic tasks to be achieved; on pages 89-90, where it is a question of the increased role of the «organisations of the base» in the elaboration of draft programmes and of the local organisms in «economic planning»; and on page 110 where it is a question of unions as a «school of economic management». The most striking element in these three passages is their extreme vagueness. There is no concrete proposal which envisages any institutional modification, involving any change in the system actually in being. There is a striking contrast between these insignificant formulas and the concrete proposals concerning the soviets, the «social organisations» and the Party. Even more:

there is no question of «collective direction» in the enterprises, there is no question of associating the unions in this control, this is totally passed over in silence on the list of unions obligations, and the only practical formula used is the following «It is right to promote to leading posts the best elements in the factories» (p. 91). That is all; it is little enough. Many workers think it is little. Some even will say it. Many will say it, sooner or later.

Since workers councils have been created in Yugoslavia as soviet organs of the management of the economy, the bureaucracy displays veritable neurosis on this question. A neurotic repression because it is necessary to oppose this system, whatever might be the advantages and results. A guilt complex also, since Lenin — and the programme of 1919 — are very explicit on the matter, and it suffices to compare the two to see clearly where lies the revisionism when not even for the future a communist society where the difference between manual and intellectual work will have disappeared... is there suggested the producers management of production.

If there is today one transitional demand which is vital side by side with that for the reestablishment of freedom for tendencies and freedom to demands a return to democratic management of create other soviet parties, it is that which enterprise by the creation of workers' councils who at first participate in management until they have finished their apprenticeship, before taking complete control, and by introducing within these councils the same principle of rotation which has been introduced into the soviets and the directing organisms of the party and the «social organisations».

Assessing the balance of all these pressures, this «programme» is not a definitive document; it will see numerous transformations, modifications and refutations in life and practice, in the USSR as in the rest of the world. Differentiation in the international communist movement has given rise to no less than four tendencies: the «Chinese» tendency; the Krushchev tendency; the Yugoslav tendency and the trotskyst tendency. Other tendencies will arise. Each approves certain parts of the «draft» — or at least the evolution which they imply — just as it rejects others. Discussion among these tendencies will continue to be favoured by the evolution of events whatever the efforts of the bureaucrats to prevent discussion. At the conclusion of these debates there is for us trotskysts only one possible conclusion: **A FRANK, SINCERE, COMPLETE RETURN TO THE PRINCIPLES OF LENIN, WHICH ENRICHED BY EXPERIENCE, REMAIN MORE THAN EVER THE ONLY SURE GUIDE FOR THE WORLD VICTORY OF SOCIALISM.**

20 September 1961.

THE REPERCUSSIONS OF THE 22nd CONGRESS OF THE CPSU

Resolution adopted by the International Secretariat

The XXII Congress of the CPSU has opened a particularly acute phase in the crisis of Stalinism. As an assembly of dogmas, Stalinism is kaputt dead; no one in the Communist movement behaves strictly as a stalinist of the old type, since even the Albanian CP has broken at least two rules sacred to Stalinism, the unconditional fidelity to the tactical zigzags of the soviet bureaucracy and the total absence of all public discussion with the official leadership of the CPSU. However, Stalinism, rather than a system of doctrine, is a distortion of the doctrine and policy of Marx-Leninism, in the service of the bureaucratic caste which has usurped political power in the USSR. In this sense, Stalinism still exists, via the process of destalinisation, in so far as this destalinisation is only a desperate attempt on the part of the soviet bureaucracy to maintain power, before the mounting forces for soviet democracy in the USSR itself and the entire world revolution. In doing this, the bureaucracy, independently of its intentions gives a new impulse to all the revolutionary forces which sap its own power over the proletariat of the USSR, over the "people's democracies" and over the international communist movement.

This new acute phase in the crisis of stalinism takes two particular forms in a dialectical interaction one upon the other:

A) By making these revelations, this time publicly, on the crimes of Stalin which went beyond the secret revelations of the XX Congress; in revealing that Stalin since the death of Lenin, had violated the established democratic norms; in revealing publicly the provocational character of the death of Kirov; in placing the origins of the "cult of personality" in the year 1933-34, Krushchev has given a powerful argument for the judicial revision of the Moscow Trial and for the judicial rehabilitation of the whole Bolshevik Old Guard, with Trotsky at their head. It is certain that in the USSR itself and in all the Communist parties of the world, voices demanding the rehabilitation of those unjustly accused will multiply, and that in deciding to open a judicial enquiry on the details of the murder of Kirov, the soviet bureaucracy will have more and more difficulty in escaping these rehabilitations, already prepared for by the erection of the monument to the victims of the stalinist terror and by the removal of Stalin's body from the Mausoleum in the Red Square.

The efforts of the bureaucracy will now concentrate on the refusal of a *political* rehabilitation

of the Bolshevik Old Guard and above all Trotsky. But in doing so, the bureaucracy will be faced more and more with the demand to discuss publicly, and openly, the ideas of the Oppositions, to republish their works, to examine their points of view in the light of past events, all of which will lead the crisis of Stalinism onto a higher plane, a political plane.

B) By making public the difference between the CPSU and the Albanian CP — and by this clash the difference between the CPSU and the Chinese CP — Krushchev has favoured a new and rapid differentiation between and among the PCs. At present outside our tendency, there are now three different political tendencies which can be seen within the communist world: the Krushchev tendency, the Chinese and the Yugoslav tendencies. Within these tendencies a whole series of differentiations can be observed, that of the Italian CP, that of the Albanian CP which is not the same as that of the Chinese CP and that of the Polish CP which has begun to reappear after the long "ebb" which followed the "Polish October" of 1956. The French CP has publicly opposed itself to the Italian CP. The Cuban CP defends positions on the nature of the Cuban state which differ from those of other Communist Parties. An extreme case of public differentiation is certainly that of the majority of the Indian CP which has publicly allied itself with its own bourgeoisie against the Chinese CP on the latest border incidents.

These differentiations can only be accentuated.

II

This new acute phase in the crisis of Stalinism can be explained in the last analysis by the acceleration of the revolutionary process as much in the workers states themselves as in the colonial countries, accompanied by an aggravation or a sharpening of the class struggle in many Imperialist countries (Belgium, Great-Britain, Italy, France).

In the USSR for the first time since the coming to power of Krushchev, a *political pressure from below* has been added to that of the consumers on the government. Demonstrations of a spontaneous nature stemming from political disagreements implicit or open with the dominant fraction of the bureaucracy have been multiplied; a strike at Odessa; student demonstrations on the arrival of the "marchers for Peace"; demonstra-

tions around the poet Evtouchenko; ideological discussion within the party against the rule which forbade momentarily the formation of fractions; demands to pursue destalinisation etc. This pressure has not only been powerful within the youth, students, and intellectuals, *but also within the Party itself.*

In the countries and movements embarked on the colonial revolution, the illusions of peaceful coexistence, the prattling on the "spirit of Camp David", the general orientation of the soviet bureaucracy towards an alliance with the colonial bourgeoisie, its passivity in relation to the Algerian Revolution — besides that of the French CP — the miserable fate of the Egyptian CP and of Iraq as a consequence of the catastrophic policy dictated by the Kremlin; the unimportant role or no role at all played by the Algerian CP or the Cuban CP in the two momentous revolutions which have unrolled in these countries — all these are signs of a refusal to utilise the enormous potential of the colonial revolution in favour of the world socialist revolution. These multiple attempts to restrain, even to stop this revolution, have provoked discussions and an increasing discontent within these parties and countries, for whom the Chinese party has made itself in part the interpreter, and these have exerted an enormous pressure on the dominant stratum of the soviet bureaucracy. Even within the state, which this bureaucracy controls, even in Moscow, the courageous anti-imperialist activity of the colonial students of Lumumba University has led on several occasions to public skirmishes with the bureaucratic apparatus and even with the police as was the case in the last demonstration before the French Embassy in favour of the liberation of Ben Bella.

The interaction between the revolutionary tide in the USSR itself, the evolution of the world revolution and the effects of this twofold development on the CPSU and the world CPs, now gives the crisis of Stalinism more and more the appearance of a permanent, explosive process, advancing by leaps and bounds, and subject to sensational transformations. Whatever the attempts of the bureaucracy to stop this process, as after the XXth Congress, the chances of their succeeding grow less and less.

III

Why has Krushchev taken the enormous risk of the revelations of the XXIInd Congress and the public conflict with the Albanian CP? Even acknowledging the fact of his personality which displays an adventurist streak in most spheres, it is impossible to explain this tactic, full of extreme dangers for the soviet bureaucracy other than by the difficult political situation in which the pre-

sent master of the Kremlin finds himself: he finds himself caught between a double opposition, the one representing the opposition of the dynamic, progressive, young revolutionary forces in soviet society, and in the communist Parties, and the other representing the opposition of the most conservative and the most retrograde forces of the bureaucracy which oppose themselves more and more bitterly to the innovations which Krushchev has outlined in a number of spheres.

It is the power of this double pressure, to which no doubt is joined that of the military caste (it has never accepted the reduction of the military budget and forces of the last years) which has driven Krushchev into a desperate choice, in order to prevent his enemies allying against him. This coalition was favoured by the persistence of the agricultural crisis and notably by the relative failure of the "virgin lands" experiment which he had sponsored. His policy had two main planks: in the international sphere a sharpening of tension in relation to Imperialism (Berlin crisis, return to nuclear testing, 50 Megaton Bomb), with the object of disarming the critics who reproached him with making concessions to Washington; in the sphere of internal policy, a renewed destalinisation which was the most suitable manoeuvre to guarantee him a large mass basis and to isolate his soviet and international adversaries by presenting them more or less as "accessories" of the crimes of Stalin or as partisans of a return to Stalinist methods, which the soviet masses wish to avoid at all costs. But by acting with this audacity and so prolonging his power, Krushchev has at the same time opened a whole series of dykes surrounding the power and privileges of the soviet bureaucracy. Through these breaches the flow of revolutionary criticism can find a path with more and more chance of provoking powerful echoes among the soviet masses. And if Krushchev presents himself before the masses for the moment anyway as the hero of destalinisation, it will not be long before the denunciations of the role which Malenkov played in the purge in Armenia, of the denunciations of the role played by Kaganovitch in the purge among the railway workers leads to the insistent demand: who organised the purge in the Ukraine...

After his arrival in power, Krushchev was enabled to stem the revolutionary tide in the USSR at the level attained at the XX Congress, above all thanks to promises (in part moreover realised) to raise the standard of life of the soviet citizens. His first intention was to contain the pressure at the XXII Congress at the same level, by promising the workers the solution of all their problems... in twenty years. It was to be a treaty in exchange for which, the soviet people was called upon to tolerate the power of the bureaucracy

for the whole period of "the construction of Communism".

But the pressure of the masses showed itself too strong to be contained at such a level. So it was necessary to widen the breach and pursue destalinisation. Krushchev is without doubt hoping to find a new cushion. Will he succeed? In any case it is unlikely that he will obtain the breathing space of five years as was the case in the period between 1956-1961. With the aid of the pressure of the international revolution, it is very probable that the soviet proletariat will advance in a few years rapidly on the road of the political revolution which must overthrow the bureaucracy as the dominant caste.

IV

The attempt of the soviet bureaucracy to place its crimes purely at the door of Stalin, and to obscure a Marxist socio-economic critique by the subterfuge of the denunciation alone of the "cult of personality" is doomed and can already be regarded as having failed. More and more, in the communist parties of the entire world, including that of the USSR, the question is posed: how were these crimes possible and why was it necessary to take more than twenty or twenty five years to denounce them? At the last central committee of the POUP (Polish CP), Oskar Lange posed the question of a Marxist explanation of the "cult of personality" and he asked the "soviet comrades" to provide an explanation. Gomulka mentioned the isolation of the USSR and its backward state. In the document of the Secretariat of the Italian CP, the necessity for an explanation is equally underlined with the same demand addressed to the CP of the USSR.

The publication of a long editorial in Pravda of the 22 November 1961 devoted in part to a polemic against the idea of a "degeneration of the USSR" which is in fact spoken of quite openly in different milieux of the Italian CP, particularly among the young, proves that here and now this debate has begun within the CPSU itself. The manner in which this debate is developing allows the Fourth International to intervene with all the weight of its experience and of its revolutionary Marxist position on the nature of the Soviet Union. The world Trotskyist movement is the only one to offer the explanation of Stalinism according to the rigorously scientific criteria of Marxism Leninism. It is the only analysis which sees the phenomenon of Stalinism as a social phenomenon explicable by the contradictions of Soviet society.

It is not by chance that the editorial of Pravda only polemicalises with those who conceive the "degeneration of the USSR" as implying the re-establishment of capitalist property in that coun-

try. It is easy to refute this argument. But it would be otherwise more difficult for the bureaucrats to refute the explanation of a political counter revolution which has occurred in the Soviet Union, on the basis of the new mode of production introduced by the October Revolution, in the same way that the Thermidorian counter revolution originated in the course of the French Revolution, without this implying a return to the Ancien Regime. For it the editorial writer of Pravda affirms that a single man cannot radically modify the social and political regime of the USSR, how can a Marxist admit that the assassination of hundreds and thousands of people, the liquidation of all the Bolshevik Old Guard, the liquidation of the leadership of the Red Army, events which caused terrible harm and suffering to the USSR, events of a social dimension (expressing thus social conflicts), are simply sequels of the "cult of personality" which mysteriously arose, simply "regrettable incidents" and not the product of an extreme degeneration of the political regime, a degeneration whose nature has been laid bare?

The Trotskyist analysis of the bureaucratic degeneration of soviet power will arouse more and more interest, will find more and more echos within the CPs, particularly within the workers states and the USSR itself. This will be our major contribution to the discussion now in process in these countries, a contribution which will powerfully combat any tendency towards revisionism and defeatism in relation to communist principles; maintain intact the whole Marxist Leninist heritage and give a principled and political reply to all those problems which are posed in the workers states at the present stage.

V

The idea of the "Guide-State" of the world proletariat; the idea of the "iron monolithism" of the world communist movement — two eminently revisionist and anti-Leninist ideas elevated to the level of dogmas in the Stalinist epoch — have been transformed now in an unexpected manner against the soviet bureaucracy. They have led to a more and more rapid and chaotic differentiation in the international communist movement, to the development of centrifugal tendencies which, in so far as the distinction and separation between party and state is always denied, run the risk of threatening the political, economic and military alliance between the workers states. In the absence of a genuine communist International, having a structure founded on democratic centralism the outbreak of any ideological discussion — absolutely normal and inevitable among communist parties — ends rapidly in a rupture

of unity in action. In the absence of a healthy internal life, of a genuine proletarian democracy and freedom for the various tendencies, this discussion ends in opposition between national bureaucracies, between the CPs of the different countries, each bureaucracy maintaining the fiction of "monolithism" within its own party. While the present currents would seem to be international in scope, and all the important communist parties contain in their ranks representatives of these different currents, bureaucratic centralism stifles all the minorities within the parties and gives to the necessary international discussion, the harmful and dangerous aspect of a quarrel between states or nations. This situation will be aggravated so long as the world communist movement will not put into practice a frank and complete return to the principles of Leninism which include:

1) The suppression of bureaucratic centralism and its replacement by Leninist democratic centralism which implies the right to form tendencies. The reestablishment of entire freedom of discussion, of a real regime of proletarian democracy within all the communist parties, with the regular appearance of Internal Bulletins besides Open Discussions in the public press so that a genuine ideological and political discussion can develop periodically.

2) The organisation of an International discussion in the communist movement on all controversial questions, past and present. The organized participation at this discussion of the opposition communist currents who have been excluded from the CI and from various communist parties, notably above all the Fourth International, who first denounced the crimes of Stalin. The publication in the USSR and in all the workers' states, the circulation within all the communist parties, of all the materials and platforms of the opposition within the CPSU, above all of the Left Opposition, of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev, and the opposition of Bukharin.

3) The preparation of a world congress of the communist movement which will lay the basis for the reconstitution of a Communist International founded on Democratic Centralism and on proletarian democracy, with the participation of all the parties and communist currents without any exclusions.

4) The admission of the principle of a precise distinction between the tasks and duties of communist parties, the frank and public discussion between allied parties with a unanimous effort to reestablish the necessary alliance, on a basis of equality, between all the workers' states, and above all between the USSR and Peoples Republic of China. The abandoning of all discriminatory meas-

ures of economic sanctions in regard to the Yugoslav, Chinese and Albanian People's Republics.

In defending this platform, Trotskyists, conscious of their responsibilities, are acting not to defend narrow fractional positions but for the cause of communism, the workers' states and the world revolution as a whole.

Their proposals to organise the discussion and resolve the world crisis of communism are the only ones which, while striking a decisive blow at the soviet bureaucracy and at the various national bureaucracies, take into account the preservation and strengthening of the cohesion among the workers states, the reinforcing and not the weakening of the unity of action of the workers movement and of the international communist movement.

VI

The dynamic of the discussion which has been opened up in the international communist movement tends to raise all the problems to re-examine all dogmas, to put into question all the aspects of stalinist policy. We Trotskyist can encourage a discussion as large, as general as possible, firmly based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, leaving no question, no mystery, no problem unexplored on the grounds that it is "too explosive" to be discussed. The young communist generations in the whole world, are demanding imperiously that the truth be told. The revolution has nothing to hide from them.

This discussion poses all the fundamental problems of communist politics. It transcends by this fact, very largely, the debate between the stalinists and the Yugoslav communists, between the Khrushchevites and the Chinese communists, debates which have a more conjunctural character, more limited to a specific zone of the communist programme. That is why, without excluding the possibility of tactical alliances to gain advantage on specific issues, above all within the communist parties themselves, the task of Trotskyist is above all that of showing in this debate their own programmatic solution on all controversial questions.

The necessity for such an attitude stems especially from the ideologically heretogeneous character of the currents in process, which are not yet clearly defined and limited and which in general combine very advanced positions on certain questions with conservative and retrograde positions on others. More exactly the reciprocal positions adopted today on the question of destalinisation, by the soviet bureaucracy and the chinese bureaucracy, can be explained by the different pressures which these two bureaucracies are faced with in the same way that the Chinese bureau-

cracy adopts a more advanced position in relation to the colonial revolution. The latter bureaucracy is particularly under the pressure of this revolution, but experiences it indirectly, above all through its international situation and in the worsened objective conditions of enormous tensions in the social forces in China, which are hardly of a nature to encourage a bureaucracy to enter the path of destalinisation.

Krushchev on the contrary undergoes more and more the pressure of a modern proletariat, the second in the world in number and in status and without doubt the first in general culture and political level, all of which pushes the soviet leader on a different path when he is obliged to make concessions.

1) In relation to the Krushchev tendency, we will give a critical support to its struggle for destalinisation against the more conservative tendencies but at the same time demanding that the whole truth be told, that all those guilty be denounced, that the rehabilitation of the victims be public, complete and individual, without leaving any case in doubt, beginning with that of Trotsky himself. At the same time, we will pursue our revolutionary criticism in relation to this tendency, by denouncing the power and privileges in the USSR itself, by defending the whole programme of the anti-bureaucratic political revolution in the USSR (workers councils, reestablishment and expansion of a real soviet power, recognition of the right of several soviet parties to exist, democratic reorganisation of planification, ceiling for salaries of party members etc.) We must continue in the same way our revolutionary criticism of the Menshevik conciliationist policy in relation to the colonial revolution emanating from the Krushchev faction. We must continue our revolutionary criticism of the strategy of Krushchev, which in basing itself on an illusory "peaceful coexistence" — not without adventurist oscillations — in the struggle against the threat of war from Imperialism does not place emphasis on the mobilization of the working masses in the Imperialist countries, the colonial and semi-colonial countries, and in the final analysis on the overthrow of capitalism in its main citadels.

2) In relation to the Mao-Tse-Tung tendency, we give it, as in the past, critical support where it defends a sharper attitude in relation to Imperialism and the colonial bourgeoisie, where it gives real support to the revolutions in process (Algeria, Laos), above all where it abandons the whole stalinist conception of the "revolution by stages" in the colonial countries and advances empirically, in its own way, towards the theory of the permanent revolution. At the same time, we maintain our revolutionary criticism in regard to its inadmissible and unprincipled defence of the

Stalinist regime, which is moreover in contradiction with certain positions taken up by the Chinese CP itself in 1956-57. We criticise the pronounced bureaucratic aspects of its own regime in China, we demand a frank and full return to proletarian democracy and to the Leninist regime in the Chinese CP and a general and free discussion, within this party, on all the questions debated within the international communist movement. While supporting the just criticisms of the Chinese CP in relation to the inadmissible policy of the reduction of soviet economic aid to China (the commercial exchanges between the two countries diminished by more than 35% in 1960-61), we criticise at the same time the excesses of the rhythm of the "leap forward" and demand a critical, democratic examination in a Leninist spirit of the present economic orientation, in the light of the difficulties of the two recent years, and of the whole problem of the sacrifices which can be borne by the Chinese people on the path of a rapid industrialisation of the country.

3) In regard to the Yugoslav CP, we give it, as in the past, a critical support on the question of workers' councils and on the more democratic administration of the economy in general, while criticising the pronounced bureaucratisation of the party, the opportunism of its foreign policy, its attitude to the colonial revolutions and to the colonial bourgeoisie in particular, and demanding also a return by this party to the organisational methods and principles of Leninism the organization of a genuine Soviet State, founded on real proletarian democracy with the recognition of the right to exist of several tendencies and soviet parties.

4) As regards the Italian CP, we support the objectively positive stand of certain of its attitudes in so far as it encourages destalinisation, legitimizes in practice the right of tendencies and the variety of parties after the conquest of power, while criticising vigorously its opportunism on questions of internal policy, its inability to define a revolutionary road towards socialism in contemporary Italian society, and completely rejecting its conception of "polycentrism", against which we uphold the idea of a Communist International founded on democratic centralism and the widest proletarian democracy.

5) In regard to the Albanian CP and the Molotov group in the USSR, while denouncing the extreme bureaucratic character of these tendencies, the crimes of which they have been guilty or which they are committing still in Albania, we demand that their documents and platforms — notably the letter of Molotov to the CC of the CPSU — are made public and submitted to inter-

national discussion. We are and remain adversaries of administrative elimination in relation to this tendency as in relation to every tendency in the workers' movement. We are and remain opposed to every foreign, bureaucratic-military intervention to settle the fate of the Enver-Hodja clique. His elimination can only be the work of the urgent and necessary political anti-bureaucratic revolution of the proletariat and toiling masses of Albania themselves.

Everywhere we must make known as widely as possible internationally, those correct positions adopted on any particular question by a communist party with a view to accentuating the general evolution of the crisis of Stalinism. Everywhere we must defend Leninist principles, so that we become known as the most principled, the most responsible, the only inheritor of Leninism within the International communist movement, the only tendency capable of giving an overall solution to the problems which at the present stage are being posed to International workers' movement.

VII

Our practical intervention in the discussion within the communist movement and in the crisis of Stalinism must be more particularly concentrate on specific aspects of the question according to the conditions in each country, according to whether the communist movement has already embarked or not upon the discussion and at what level the discussion has reached.

In a general way, the questions of the rehabilitation of the Bolshevik old guard, in particular of Trotsky, the revising of the Moscow Trials, the rehabilitation of all the victims assassinated by the GPU outside the frontiers of the USSR (Andres Nin, Leon Sedov, Ignace Reiss, Rudolf Klement, Erwin Wolf and the numerous victims of the GPU in Spain) have occupied the most important place in the first phase of our intervention. They will continue to play an important role in parties such as the French PC or the British CP, which have not yet explicitly admitted the "judicial rehabilitation" whereas the Italian CP has practically done so. The explicit admission of the Italian CP cannot however take the place of a judicial revision and a formal rehabilitation.

As the discussion progresses however more fundamental ideological and more precise political questions will transcend the first plane of our intervention in the crisis of Stalinism. These questions are notably the following:

1) The marxist explanation of the "cult of personality", that is to say of the bureaucratic degeneration of the USSR, and the discussion of

the political positions defended by Trotsky and trotskyism since 1923.

2) The definition of a Leninist policy in relation to the colonial revolution (for the CPs of the workers' states and the Imperialist countries) and in the colonial revolution (for the CPs of the colonial and semi-colonial countries).

3) The definition of a Leninist policy in the struggle against the threats of an Imperialist war and in relation to the specific threat of nuclear arms which casts its shadow over the future of humanity.

4) The defining of a revolutionary policy for the overthrow of capitalism in the Imperialist countries themselves, based on a correct analysis of the objective situation of these countries and of the situation of their working class and of their workers' movement.

5) The defence of the principle of the democratic centralist communist International and of our Leninist conception of the relations between communist parties on the one hand and between workers states on the other.

6) The reestablishment of the freedom to constitute tendencies within the communist parties.

7) The defence of our programme for the reestablishment and expansion of soviet democracy and proletarian democracy in the workers' states as outlined in the document "Decline and Fall of Stalinism" adopted by the 5th World Congress of the Fourth International.

The International Secretariat calls upon all the sections of the Fourth International, all Trotskyists of the entire world to act with the greatest audacity, ardour and enthusiasm in this battle for the Bolshevik-Leninist heritage, in this struggle to regenerate the world communist movement. The possibilities for the triumph of our ideas, for the strengthening of our organisations and for their fusion with a large communist vanguard, with large workers vanguards are greater than ever in the past. All Trotskyist must intervene in a resolute manner, so that the possibilities can be effectively exploited. They should prepare for 1962 a great world congress of revolutionary and Trotskyist unity, which will constitute a real pole of interest and attraction for the thousands and thousands of communist militants who throughout the world are asking questions to which only the Fourth International can offer coherent, satisfactory and revolutionary solutions.

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

5 December 1961

THE PROSPECTS OF THE STRUGGLE IN SOUTH AFRICA

by RICHARD HUGHES

The problems of the South African Revolution are problems of enormous magnitude. Often the very magnitude of these problems are used as an excuse to deny the possibility of a revolutionary struggle, particularly when seen against the background of the present conditions. But revolutionary marxists can never look at things simply as they are at the present moment, but try to see their potential development.

The most obvious and often-quoted obstacle to a successful revolutionary struggle is the existence of a three million White population, as against the ten million Africans and two million Coloureds and Indians. The South African White Republic has a modern and well-equipped army, as well as a tradition of "commandos" among the Afrikaaners. In addition of course there is the complete suppression of the Africans in this regard. There exists no experience in modern warfare, no tradition of military discipline among the Africans.

The obvious comparison is with Algeria, where there existed a French population of one million, where the Algerians had the possibility of military experience, even in the complications of guerrilla warfare. The Algerians were not under such heavy political and social restrictions as the Africans.

But the anti-revolutionary argument neglects the difficulties that the White South African Government faces. They have not the armed backing of a powerful Imperialism such as French Imperialism, which could put almost a half a million troops into Algeria, independent of the economic condition of Algeria itself. In South Africa they will have to rest on their own resources, which even if every able-bodied South African was put into the army, would fall far short of what France could do in Algeria.

There exists also the myth of the Herrenvolk giant who has tremendous physical ability. It is part of the mythology of the strong, independent Voortrekker, who lived, like the American frontiersman, in the simplest way, with a gun always at his side. But it is as alien to the present South African White population as is the frontier tradition to the American bourgeois. The Whites form a privileged class, who scorn manual labour, and have a psychotic fear of the Black. On the other hand, the hardship and poverty of the African, his very oppression, will give him, as with all oppressed classes and races, an unbelievable heroism and ability to withstand terrible suffering. The Herrenvolk, despite all its brave words, will fall far short of its own mythology.

On the other hand of course we cannot underestimate the strength that the ruling class has at hand. We must therefore warn against adventurism. It will only be possible to overthrow the power of the ruling class by the highest possible level of military, political and organisational preparedness. It is essential to be certain of survival after the first blow, and that can only be assured, as much as it is possible, by the degree to which the movement is organically linked with the workers, but particularly we believe with the peasants, both in the Reserves and on the White farms. Other factors that enter into such considerations are the launching of the struggle on a nation-wide basis, and the combination of all the forms of attack: both sabotage and guerrilla. This task of linking with the peasantry and workers poses primarily the political and organisational necessity.

But it is equally essential to see that the three factors

of organisational, political and military preparedness are interconnected, and that what is desired is the optimum combination of these three factors, which will in turn give the optimum results. That is that the launching of the military campaign at the correct time, together with the essential degree of political and organisational preparedness, can together produce the optimum results. It would be incorrect to pose the task of organising the maximum politically and organisationally, before considering the military aspect. First, because the pre-revolutionary period in South Africa today excludes the successful organisation of the masses with purely general and organisational slogans, without the interweaving of this with the military aspect, and its active preparation. And second, because the political climate rapidly changes in such a situation, where a resolute, well-organised leadership can ensure the rapid spread of a revolutionary uprising and its eventual success. That is the lesson of the revolutionary struggles in the past twenty years, particularly in the colonial revolution. Given the initial momentum which can be sustained through the initial phase of the struggle, and the combination with the peasantry in their guerrilla struggle, and with the workers, all this can ensure success.

The argument against the possibility of the success of a revolutionary struggle poses the unity of the White Nation as a great obstacle. But within the fundamental unity for the maintenance of repression and privilege, there exists elements of disunity which we must take cognizance of, and which, if correctly used, can weaken the ruling-class. There is in South Africa basically two White Nations, the Afrikaans and the English-speaking. The "Jingoists", centred largely in Natal, are extremely hostile to the Afrikaaner, that is in second place to their hostility and fear of the Africans. There is a small section however which places their hatred of the Afrikaaner above their fear of the Africans. This extreme Jingoists section has given serious consideration to the armed struggle and sabotage of the present government, particularly since South Africa left the British Commonwealth. The trial of the group in Natal, and the press rumours of other groups preparing underline this possibility. A revolutionary marxist movement must seek to use these differences in every way possible, without of course endangering the support of the oppressed masses. In other words, we must seek as our first consideration the revolutionary unity of the oppressed, and as our second, the disunity and division of the oppressors.

There is also the division between the Progressive Party which wants the qualified franchise extended to the educated Africans, and the rest of the White population. In the recent elections, the Progressives gained over 60,000 votes, and won one seat, that of Houghton, which takes in Johannesburg's wealthiest suburbs, and where very few workers live. The formation of the Progressive Party, under the auspices of Harry Oppenheimer and the Chamber of Mines, reflects the desire of an important section of the English capitalist class in South Africa to prepare the ground for some compromise solution, precisely at the stage of a revolutionary uprising. As well there exists the Liberals whom we have analysed previously, and part of whom will come to an active participation in the revolutionary struggle. It would be necessary for the leadership of such a struggle to also be prepared to try and use the difference between the Progressives and the conservative forces to the advantage of the revolutionary

struggle, while mercilessly exposing their real role to the masses.

The Afrikaaner nation is a product of only recent years, when as we have mentioned already, the Afrikaaner bourgeoisie sought to use it as a method of gaining power. In reality, Afrikaaner nationalism is a hollow shell built around a number of religio-political myths, to cover and support the semi-feudalistic repression of the African nation. The adoption, was as well a self-defence mechanism to give the Afrikaaner the determination never to leave his country, to fight to the death. In this dual aim the Afrikaaner leaders have succeeded and a myth has become a reality. There is nevertheless a small number who will not fight for what they more and more see as a myth.

This Afrikaaner nationalism has taken hold of the Afrikaaner worker and farmer, and has obscured the class division between them and their own capitalist class. It has of course been doubly reinforced by their desire to keep their privileged position, and this has been done by the Afrikaaner nationalist government through Job Reservation. The White working class is more a reservoir of fascist stormtroopers than fighters with the Africans for liberation.

The unity of the Whites then has a few important cracks which must be widened as much as possible.

As well, the sceptics often raise the question of the geographical isolation of the country. It is true that there is no sympathetic nation on its borders. The British Protectorates provide some haven, but they lack connection with the sea. This poses many problems, but problems which are only thereby a little more difficult. Besides we must be prepared for any eventuality in Mozambique, where Portuguese Imperialism presents a weak chain in the imperialist domination of Southern Africa. This isolation however underlines the need to forge a revolutionary unity of all the oppressed people in Southern Africa, where the nationalist movements are increasingly being faced with the necessity for armed action. Drawn to South Africa by the needs of the Rand Gold Mines, the oppressed have a common basis for unity.

The question of South West Africa is also important and as provided a question which the United Nations could use if they wished to intervene. This barren, semi-desert area has a total population of a little over half a million. The struggle of the people of the territory against the German occupation in the carve-up of Africa led to a campaign of extermination by the Germans which seriously reduced the population of the various tribes. The struggle of the people, led by SWAPO (South African Peoples Organisation) and SWANU (South West African National Union) has been sidetracked into the UNO. But there is the possibility that the people will join any struggle started in South Africa, although the small size of the population in the territory as well as its backwardness makes an independent struggle without the active support of the South African struggle as a whole difficult to foresee.

WORLD IMPERIALISM, THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN REVOLUTION.

We mentioned earlier the importance of South Africa in the world economy as the largest single producer of gold. Gold has been a very important stabilising factor in the South African economy. But in a revolutionary struggle it might be its Achilles heel. It is doubtful if world imperialism, headed by US Imperialism, would stand by and see any serious curtailment of its gold supplies. Rather they would risk active intervention, and here they could envisage the employment of the UNO as the agency the Imperialists would use. This would have a number of

favourable effects for the Imperialists as they would appear in the light of liberators, as well as ensuring that their interests were preserved. But of course Imperialism is well aware that any such intervention would open up a tremendous surge of African hopes and demands, and that they would in their present weakened condition find it difficult to contain the results of their intervention. Further, considering the difficulties they had with Tshombe, they would find a much bigger task in the Afrikaaner nationalists. All in all, it is obvious that it would be only a last desperate effort to save the situation that they would intervene, and even then they may not feel strong enough to do so. In any case they are vigorously preparing the ground for at least, a political intervention in the South African crisis, with the aim of preventing a workers' state emerging in South Africa. In fact, the whole tactic of Imperialism, with Congo as its centre-piece, is to ensure its domination over Africa, and prevent the emergence of a workers, state on the African continent. In the confines of this strategy, we cannot definitely rule out an intervention by UNO in South Africa, at the crucial period. It is necessary therefore that the cadres of the Revolution clearly understand the role of UNO.

CONCLUSION.

South Africa today is on the brink of new, revolutionary struggles. In all the organisations of the people in South Africa, at one level or another, the revolutionary roads are being discussed. It is the hope of the author that this article will be taken as a contribution to that discussion.

In conclusion, we shall summarise some of the more important conclusions we wish to draw from this discussion, which will go towards the formation of a programme. It is the belief of the author that there will emerge, as there has indeed already, in all the organisations of the people, tendencies seeking a revolutionary road.

These tendencies have and will seek the road to action. But it will depend on the degree to which there is the optimum combination of military, political and organisational preparedness to decide which tendency will become the dominant leadership. In particular, it will depend on the degree to which the tendencies will be able to link up with the peasantry. As well it will become increasingly obvious that there will be the need for revolutionary unity, for the revolutionary united front, based on the peasants and workers. The slogan of the revolutionary workers and peasants united front will be of increasing importance.

At this period to mobilise the masses, particularly the peasants, it will be found necessary to offer them a clear programme for the establishment of a revolutionary workers and peasants government, which will establish the basic democratic demands around which they are struggling: the full franchise, freedom of movement, reallocation of the land, free education, etc... It will be found necessary to explain very carefully to them how guerrillas can defeat the modern resources of the White Army, and the unity in the struggle of the workers and peasants.

In the city, again around the basic slogans of democracy and national liberation, a struggle will develop along side that in the countryside probably based upon sabotage groups at first, (as already has appeared) and attacks on police and military installations. Particularly in the city efforts to divide the White population as much as possible must be made, and so purely racist attacks must be avoided as much as possible.

There will have to be strenuous efforts made to activate the other oppressed minorities, particularly in the towns where they predominate.

There should be every effort made to promote the revolutionary unity of all Southern Africa.

The logic of the Permanent Revolution will burst through very rapidly in the South African Revolution, which necessitates a leadership which has the highest possible consciousness of this, so as to make the necessary adaptation.

The South African Trotskyists, and all Revolutionary Marxists, will play their role to the fullest in the revolutionary situation developing. This necessitates the clearest political awareness of the tasks facing them and therefore the frankest possible discussion, and the willingness to intervene in the revolutionary situation without the least sectarianism, and with the utmost revolutionary audacity combined with the greatest Marxist judgement. The historic task waiting the South Africa Trotskyists is a great one, it is nothing less than the participation in the leadership of the South African Revolution and the establishment of the South African Socialist Republic.

22nd. December, 1961

POSTSCRIPT.

As the final copy of this article was being written, there were signs in South Africa of a new upsurge, with the use of sabotage, or the preparation for its use by a number of groups. We have mentioned the sabotage of December 16th. As well there is the report in the Rand Daily Mail of the 20th December, of 20 Pan-Africanists being trained in Egypt, the existence of the National Liberation Committee, which is largely white in its membership, has engaged in minor acts of sabotage, probably as a trial. There is also the claim that four separate sabotage groups exist in Natal and one in the Transkei, probably based on the Kongo. There may well be even more... which would make eight, nine or ten groups functioning separately with sabotage in mind, and a few of those with the clearer consciousness of the need for a guerrilla struggle. The need for a revolutionary unity is becoming pressing.

All the above developments verify the general line taken in this article though somewhat earlier than the author had hoped.

THE DECISIVE HOUR OF THE ALGERIAN REVOLUTION

(A letter written by M. Pablo to the FLN from prison in Amsterdam)

Dear comrades, dear brothers of the FLN.

I address this letter to you on the day after the condemnation of Sal Santen and myself to fifteen months imprisonment for "illegal" activities on behalf of the FLN.

The Algerian revolution is now virtually victorious. The last delays and manoeuvres of Imperialism can retard the hour of liberation but the latter is certain and relatively near.

This victory is above all the work of the Algerian workers and peasants who for seven years have not spared their blood, with immense and multiple sacrifices.

In seven years of atrocious war, the Revolution has spread its roots deep in the Algerian people, and the FLN—the national revolutionary leadership which this people has produced—has developed into a formidable politico-military organisation of the masses, with international connections.

This victory is equally the result of the material and moral aid received from the Arab masses, from the African masses, and from the workers states, from China, from Yugoslavia and the other "people's democracies".

The international revolutionary context, the new balance of forces established already on a world scale for many years has not ceased to evolve against Imperialism, enormously favouring the victory of the Algerian revolution.

Groups, at first rather small, but growing larger and larger in the European and French workers movement have contributed equally to this victory. Certainly in this sphere, the European workers' movement, still led by the traditional socialist and communist parties has shown and still shows great slowness in general, by comparison with the revolutionary struggle of its brothers in the colonial countries. This can be seen clearly in France not only with the shameful attitude of the SFIO, as executioner of Imperialist policy and principal supporter in the workers' camp of the Gaullist dictatorship, but equally in the attitude of the French CP to the revolution both during its first years and even now where it contents itself with a purely verbal opposition to De Gaulle and the pursuit of the war in Algeria.

It is this frankly treacherous and fundamentally opportunist attitude of the major organisations representing the proletariat, which has forced a number of militant workers and revolutionary intellectuals to envisage means and forms of aid to Algerian revolution of an exceptional nature and which cannot possess the same aspect and the same content as in the case of a genuine revolutionary action by the masses.

The fact remains however that these initiatives and activities of a confined vanguard in France and elsewhere have been valuable, awakening workers and democratic opinion in France and in Europe of the Algerian question and stimulating reactions from larger sections of the population.

This can be seen today with the increase of protest in France and even in Algeria against the continuance of the Imperialist war and the more powerful response in favour of the Algerian revolution which has developed in the European capitalist countries.

The French trotskysts and the whole IVth International, as you are well aware, have since the beginning of the Revolution, contributed, modestly it is true, to this evolution.

Some among us, with dozens of other militants and intellectual revolutionaries, both French and European, with

various political orientations, at the danger of losing their life and undergoing imprisonment have already shown their attachment to the Algerian revolution and beyond that to the colonial revolution in general.

Certainly these sacrifices are nothing in comparison with the enormous sacrifices undergone by the Algerian people. But if I mention this, it is simply to explain that we have some small right to speak to you frankly, as sincere friends of the revolution, on the eve of total liberation.

You will have before you a major choice. What are you intending to make of the victory of the Revolution?

In 1954 the Algerian people rose as a mass movement for the primordial objective of national independence, liberation from Imperialism.

For seven years, the struggle has been waged by the major forces of the peasantry, the workers, the "intelligentsia" without precise social differentiation. These social forces once brought on the scene have determined the dynamics of the revolution and have realised their consciousness in a profoundly agitated and revolutionary national and international context.

It is not only the harsh consciousness of a nation which has been forged in this struggle. In however confused a way, in differing degrees, the social strata who have supported the revolution and the war, the peasants of the mountains and of the villages of Algeria, the agricultural proletariat, workers and "intelligentsia" of the Algerian cities and in metropolitan France itself have become aware of their own social aspirations and ideals which now largely transcend the framework of national independence, pure and simple.

The revolution began inevitably in the form of a National Front.

In its first phase, beliefs, customs, traditions have played even a progressive role in developing and reinforcing the consciousness and national solidarity in face of Imperialism, coming from nations such as Tunisia and Morocco who, despite independence are still in submission to feudal-capitalism.

However imperceptibly moved by its own dynamics, the Revolution has raised itself to higher levels. Today after seven years of war against the main forces of a powerful Imperialism, the spirit of the Algerian masses has been strongly affected by the ideas, the aspirations, the dominant socialist, and revolutionary ideas of the epoch. No one can overlook this fact of capital importance for the future of the Revolution.

The latter is developing at the moment in a world of incredibly radical, profound and accelerated transformation. The recent progress of science and technology in the spheres of atomic energy, automation, and space research have pushed back the frontiers of the actual and potential power of humanity beyond all previous imagination. Man has the material power to produce abundance, to raise and transplant mountains, to make deserts flourish.

This new industrial revolution which opens the way to a new civilisation, materially possible and necessary for the first time in the history of humanity, is combined with prodigious political and social changes.

There is thus an interaction between these two processes, destined to coalesce at a higher level of development.

The material and military power of the URSS, of China, of Yugoslavia, of the other workers states, has not ceased to increase and impress its seal on world production and

on the balance of forces between Imperialism and the nascent socialist world.

This increasing power interacts with the formidable evolution since the last world war of the struggle for liberation from nations formerly yoked to Imperialism.

Consider the changes since the Algerian revolution in Africa. This continent, formerly the most backward, is now involved from one end to the other in a revolutionary upheaval extending to the most primitive peoples of the forest and the tropical jungles.

From Egypt to Morocco, from Nigeria to Tanganyika, from North Africa to South Africa, through Mali, Guinea, Kenya at the threshold of its revolution, the Congo, Angola "New Algeria" — the whole African continent is a prey to a revolutionary fever. This will continue until total and effective liberation from Imperialism and the social, economic and national restructuration of this region.

In this historic process, the heroic struggle of the Algerian people has played and continues to play a very considerable role of which it is not yet fully conscious.

In the Middle East the revolutionary fever is no less profound, whether it be in Turkey, or Iran where the Shah and the feudal capitalist comprador class attempt desperately at the last hour to delay the inevitable explosion, or Iraq, in midstream under a Bonapartist regime a la Kerensky, unstable, and transitory...

The deterioration of the situation in the Far East for Imperialism is perfectly illustrated by the progress of the revolution in Laos, in South Vietnam, the vigour of the workers movement in Japan and in Indonesia, the chronic crisis in South Korea.

It will not be long before the Revolution makes further progress in this part of the world, more and more dominated by the shadow of Red China.

As for Latin America, the success of the Cuban revolution in the immediate proximity to the United States, citadel of Imperialism, literally in the "Jaws of the monster" is particularly significant... This success illustrates the new balance of forces established on a world scale between Imperialism and the world socialist revolution, and signifies, historically speaking not only the beginning of the Latin American, but equally that of the North American revolution — that is of the Pan American socialist revolution.

The revolutionary impetus which is affecting the masses of Latin-America and the instability of the feudo-capitalist regimes are notable throughout almost the whole continent. In reality only the lack of parties and of audacious revolutionary leaderships who can draw intelligently and boldly upon the revolutionary potential of the peasant and worker masses of all these countries and areas of the world retards an ever greater acceleration of the revolution.

Naturally we have to bear in mind the delay of the advanced capitalist nations of Western Europe and of North America, in comparison with the changes and the revolutionary progress in the colonial, semi-colonial countries and the workers states.

But the economic euphoria which is at the base of the relative social stability of these countries is fragile and conjunctural. The prosperity of these countries has developed and maintained itself for several years — once the reconstruction following the second world war was completed — on the basis of a complex interaction of three essential factors: the phenomenal increase in productivity thanks to the scientific and technological progress which characterises the present "industrial revolution", the exploitation to the advantage of the industrial sector of each country, of the peasantry, and the exploitation of the colonial and semi-colonial nations by the body of the industrial nations.

The increase of productivity has allowed the simultane-

ous increase of real wages and of accumulated reinvested capital.

The exploitation of the peasantry of each industrial nation and of the colonial and semi-colonial nations by the body of the industrial nations has maintained the high level of profits of the industrial sector while securing for it the necessary market for its expansion, for the realisation of accumulation.

However as this in the last analysis means that the peasantry and the colonial and semi-colonial countries are experiencing a relative impoverishment, and that the capitalist economy is burdened with the heavy expenditure entailed by armaments which is constantly inflationary, the downturn in this economy and financial crisis are equally in the long run inevitable. The downturn is already visible, as much in the case of the USA and Canada as in England, from which at the moment the other capitalist nations, with Germany at their head benefit.

The weakening on the other hand of the various currencies, including the dollar and the real threat of a world financial crisis, illustrate perfectly the fragility of the present capitalist prosperity. In reality, the capitalist world, with the United States at its head has entered into irrevocable economic and military decadence, a process destined to be accelerated irreversibly. Each year will bring striking proof of this.

It is in such a world of revolutionary transformation that the Algerian revolution reaches its hour of victory, its hour of decision.

Imperialism and its external and internal allies are alive to the danger of seeing the Algerian revolution take the "Cuban" road that could proceed to profound social, economic and political transformations which would give Algeria a socialist structure.

In Cuba similarly, as in Algeria, the revolution is based essentially on the struggle of a revolutionary army recruited from the peasantry and was conducted in the absence of a Marxist revolutionary party. Yet this revolution has advanced in its actions and its achievements much more rapidly and with greater audacity than the timid communist parties in their political programmes.

It is to the interest of French Imperialism and its "bourgeois" allies of various sorts outside and within Algeria and its revolution, to "embourgeois" in some way the revolution and to contain it within the limits compatible with an Algerian capitalist regime allied with Imperialism. This is the object at which de Gaulle, the Americans and all the feudo-capitalist forces of the American and Arab countries plus the "bourgeois" elements within Algeria itself, are aiming in this decisive period.

The wealth of the Sahara, the financial "aid" of France for the proposed "industrialisation" of Algeria under the Constantine Plan, the presence of European "elites" in Algeria, the Algerian emigration in France, all these aspects of the Algerian problem are evoked as an illusion and a mirage of a better future, to direct the solution in a bourgeois and pro-Imperialist direction.

Will you be tempted to fall into such a trap?

In brief Algeria at the hour of victorious revolution has the choice between a solution a la Tunisia or a la Cuba.

"Bourgeois" Tunisia is a country which has found its formal national independence but which has resolved none of its fundamental problems: real independence in relation to Imperialism, solution of the agrarian problem, industrialization, abolition of unemployment and illiteracy, liberation of women. It remains a feudo-capitalist underdeveloped nation, an ally and subject of Imperialism.

Cuba, on the contrary, a little country almost in the "Jaws of the monster" with one blow, has been genuinely freed from Imperialism, has resolved the agrarian problem, embarked on major plans for industrialisation, and the

complete abolition of unemployment and illiteracy, and the liberation of women.

By this fact, this little country has already obtained an international significance and has placed itself in the vanguard of the great Latin-American revolution and even — historically speaking — of the Pan American revolution. Cuba thanks to the intelligence and the supreme audacity of the bold leadership of the revolution has entered the historic path of nascent socialism.

An equally unique achievement is possible now for the Algerian revolution. In entering upon the socialist transformation of Algeria, it would place itself in the leadership of the inevitable Arab and Pan-American revolution.

Do not argue that this is difficult or impossible, by drawing upon arguments borrowed from the arsenal of the ideologists of Imperialism, of capitalism, of opportunism.

The true solution of the fundamental problems of the Algeria of tomorrow cannot be found outside a socialist solution.

The best lands in Algeria, stolen by Imperialism are to be found in the hands of rich colons and Imperialist enterprises. The communal lands and individual plots which remain to the Arab Algerians are limited, have poor soil and are inadequately cultivated due to lack of financial, material and technical assistance.

But the vast majority of the Arab Algerian population is composed of peasants with or without land.

These masses were and remain the essential force of the revolutionary army and of the revolution.

The latter cannot refuse or even delay giving the land to the peasants without betraying them.

Such a policy requires the annulling of peasant debts, the confiscation of the land of the rich colons and of the Imperialist enterprises, the distribution of a part at least of the reconquered lands to the poor peasants and landless peasants, the cooperative exploitation of other lands belonging to the state by the democratic collective of the agricultural workers, the consolidation of communal lands, and financial, material, and technical aid from the state of the peasants.

But this radical agrarian reform will have no future if it is not combined with the diversification and reorientation of the agrarian economy and the intensive industrialisation of the country according to a plan.

Algeria is a rich nation in itself even without the Sahara. By including this region which contains extremely valuable raw materials for a great and rapid industrialisation, Algeria can face this problem with confidence and vigour.

The financial means necessary for such an economic plan would be furnished by the productive investment of the profits from the nationalised imperialist enterprises, aid from the workers states, the surplus from the labour of the at present enormous unemployed sector of the population, the exploitation of the riches of the Sahara.

But it is for the State to mobilise and organise all these resources on the basis of a predominantly nationalised economy and according to a long term plan. An essential aspect of this policy whose validity is widely recognized, by bourgeois specialists on the economic development of the underdeveloped nations, is the state monopoly of foreign trade.

It is significant that a number of the most qualified specialists from Myrdal to Higgins have abandoned the classical theories of "laissez faire" and "spontaneous equilibrium" of the liberal capitalist economy in favour of a planned development for the underdeveloped nations, propelled and in great part controlled by the state, including measures of nationalisation, of agrarian reform, monopoly of foreign trade... Certainly there can be no question in the case of Algeria or any other nation of an

orientation towards an autarchic and totally nationalised economy from the start. Such an orientation would only retard for a whole period the necessary raising of the level of life of the masses and provoke dangerous social tensions.

The planned economic reconstruction of the country must profit as much as possible from the resources of the world market, including the use of foreign capital if the latter is granted for the purposes of economic development on a long term basis and under advantageous conditions.

Neither is it a question of proceeding immediately to the collectivisation of agriculture, and to the complete nationalization of industry, commerce, and the various crafts. Such a policy would have the result of lowering the level of productive forces which should on the contrary be raised speedily and throwing important social layers into opposition to the regime. What is necessary and sufficient at the beginning is that the state nationalises the key banking, industrial, agricultural and commercial enterprises, that it fixes a maximum size for land acquisition by individual peasants, without the right of resale, and that it forms a monopoly of foreign trade. The extension of the nationalised and planned economy to those sectors available to private exploitation should be done gradually according to the material and technical possibilities provided by the state and the maturing of the consciousness of the masses.

It is in the framework of such a total conception that the question of the Sahara and that of relations with the European minority and France can find a solution. The Algerian state should promote the exploitation of the Sahara with the nearby African states and also with French capital under a specific form which would preserve Algerian sovereignty on Algerian Sahara and the preponderant control of the Algerian state. The latter should be equally disposed to arrange preferential long term agreements with France so that this country may contribute to the economic development of Algeria, thanks to financial aid and contracts for equipment from French factories and enterprises. This is a possible formula of association, reciprocally advantageous between ex-metropolitan and liberated countries.

Such aid — which excludes political ties, misdirected investment and scandalous profits bleeding the recipient of "aid" — would not only benefit the liberated countries, but would guarantee full employment to the workers of the ex-metropolitan countries.

Such a rearrangement of the relations between Algeria and France would easily resolve the problem of the European minority in Algeria by the maintenance on a footing of complete equality all the elements desirous of accommodating themselves to the structure of the new Algerian state and eventual indemnity to those whose property is expropriated, and indemnity shared jointly by the French and Algerian governments from the proceeds of exploiting the Sahara. But the longer Imperialism delays its departure from Algeria and the hour of liberation, the risk of losing the advantages of such solutions grows greater.

For such radical reforms in structure to be possible, it is necessary to form a new state power, organ of the Algerian workers and peasants and of their revolutionary army. This authority must be based on the democratically elected organisms of the Councils, Committees, in the villages, towns and regions, a constituent National Assembly, a government responsible to Councils, Committees and Assembly. The various representative organs of the politico-military administration which have arisen during the revolution should serve as the embryo political power of tomorrow.

But the key to all the political and social future of Algeria lies for practical purposes in the future of the FLN.

The FLN has developed as a recognised leadership in the very struggle and revolution of the Algerian people. From this point of view it has acquired a prestige and an immense influence which it will retain in every way for many years. The FLN has developed as a politico-military organisation sui generis, a unique front of all the elements and tendencies of the Algerian people struggling for the essential objective of national independence.

But in reality the FLN has been practically transformed during this struggle into a political organism through which is expressed the dynamism and the aspirations of the Revolution.

It is high time that the FLN transformed itself effectively into a party political structure with a better articulated and more clearly defined political and social programme.

This programme must be that of a socialist, revolutionary and democratic party. It is only in so far that the FLN becomes a revolutionary socialist party that it will know how to express adequately the ideas, the ideals, the aspirations of the worker and peasant masses of the revolution, and so not betray them.

On the other hand it is only in the degree to which it operates as a democratic party that it will maintain legitimately its monopoly of political power, in the first phase at least of the Algeria of tomorrow. To be democratic means to allow the free confrontation of ideas and tendencies within the organisation, which reflect inevitably in the case of the single party, the ideas and tendencies, heterogeneous from the cultural and even material and social standpoint, of the popular forces at the base of the revolution.

This monopoly of the single party should not prolong itself however by preventing the existence of other parties who adhere to the fundamental conquests of the Revolution and operate within the constitutional framework of New Algeria. By accepting this, the single party will owe its justification entirely to the confidence of the masses and not to the monopoly of the state by this party. Such a monopoly could lead to the bureaucratisation of the party and the state and to the degeneration of the popular regime issuing from the revolution into a dictatorship of the single party over the masses and even of the leadership of this party over the party itself and the masses. During the first transitional phase, it is possible that the revolutionary party, obliged to make certain compromises with Imperialism and to deal with the destruction inflicted on the nation plus the lack of cadres plus the low cultural level will disregard certain of these rules. But it is of primary importance for the revolution that these principles are clearly defined and proclaimed by the revolutionary party and that the latter does not identify itself with the policy day to day of empirical compromises by the state or justify this policy.

It remains for me in closing this letter to treat this last question: that of the pressure on the Algeria revolution of the customs and beliefs inherited from the past.

This heritage is certainly a heavy burden on all these peoples and particularly on peoples who have passed from centuries old feudalism to Imperialist domination. Customs and beliefs express the accommodation of the masses to the mode of a particular social regime and from this point of view contribute in a certain degree to organize more economically the life of the individual and of the family within the community and to safeguard ethnic cohesion. It does not prevent this situation being a retarding factor on the evolution of this particular society which essentially benefits the dominant native and foreign ruling classes and castes.

In Arab society for reasons which belong to the structure and the historical evolution of this society, the weight of customs and beliefs, particularly those of religion remain

very great. The revolution cannot suppress by a stroke of the pen all this and open individual and social life to the knowledge and the rational organisation at the level of the demands of the XXth century. To abolish and combat effectively anachronistic, barbarous and irrational customs and beliefs, including religion, it is necessary to extirpate material and cultural backwardness, the division of society into classes, to approach the level of a world communist society. Therein is the music of a very distant future.

The revolution cannot administer a superior culture by propaganda alone — certainly very necessary — and by the forbidding of such and such a practice by individuals or by families in the absence of an adequate material level and of a natural cultural maturity. To intervene bureaucratically in the life of the individual or of the family to "reform manners" administratively, would risk on the contrary perpetuating their force and throwing into opposition to the regime a number of backward elements and strata. As long as social reality is characterized by material penury, low cultural level, absence of real democracy for the masses, the latter will maintain their customs and their beliefs and will always find in religion a consolation for the defeats of real life, for their unsatisfied aspirations and hopes, for their ignorance of the world of nature and society.

But to make a pretext on the other hand of this weight of the past to halt the Revolution halfway, to retard the decisive structural reforms and accept compromise solutions would be an unpardonable fault. On the contrary it is necessary to exploit the immense enthusiasm of the Revolution at its moment of victory when the enthusiasm is still vibrant, when the energy, the will, the aspiration of the masses for a radical change in their human condition is extremely vigorous, so that with one leap they can jump decisive stages.

The Revolution should declare religion and religious practices a strictly private affair.

The Revolution has already achieved a considerable amelioration of conditions for the young and for women within the ancient patriarchal family. This is the just tribute paid by the Revolution to the role they have played, to the immense sacrifices made by these masses. The victorious revolution must consolidate and amplify this amelioration, particularly in relation to women by liberating them in a genuinely economically, socially, sexually. The impetus which such a programme and such achievements of the Algerian revolution would give to the revolution in the Maghreb, to the entire Arab nation and to Africa would be an incalculable historic landmark. It would be particularly effective in the Maghreb pivoting around an Algeria flanked by Tunisia and Morocco, countries formally independent but submissive to a feudo-capitalist, pro-western, pro-imperialist regime. It would stimulate the whole Arab nation which extends from Morocco to Iraq and which is seeking unity via intermediary federative forms. Until now this unity has been prevented because of the geographical dispersion of the Arab nation, the diversity of social structure, the historic evolution of its various components, and the role of world Imperialism. There is no doubt however that historically this unity is the essential task of the socialist Arab revolution, of which the Algerian revolution should be glorious and decisive beginning.

The panafrikan consequences of the Algerian socialist revolution would be no less important and historic. In Black Africa, in particular, we are dealing with a primitive peasant society, still profoundly marked by tribal economy and customs, yet revolutionized by the penetration of imperialist merchant capital. The native peasant and bourgeois merchant strata are generally limited and much less important than the analogous strata of the Arab nations of the Middle East, Egypt, Tunisia, and Morocco. In these countries which have secured their independence, the state

apparatus is in many cases still embryonic and their social destiny remains undetermined. Everything still depends on the state power. Their social basis, largely composed of poor peasants and detribalised elements who have entered the use to which these politically limited elites will put the towns, plus the revolutionary impulses from the present international context impell these elites towards a nationalised, planified, socialist economy. On the other hand the native bourgeois or potentially bourgeois elements plus Imperialism impell them towards a comprador capitalist regime in the image of the evolution of the Latin American nations since their independence.

The division already outlined between "reformist" Africa hinging on the present governments of the Ivory coast, of Senegal, Nigeria, Liberia, and "revolutionary" Africa whose axis is Guinea, Mali and even in part Ghana is characteristic of these tendencies. The choice which the Algerian revolution will make at its hour of victory will effect tremendously the immediate destinies of the whole of Africa.

Neither can one underestimate the influence which the Algerian socialist revolution would have on those European states bordering the Mediterranean. The dictatorships of Franco and Salazar are already shaken by the actions of the colonial revolution in Africa, in Cuba and in Latin America. The victory of a Algerian socialist revolution and its after effects could well precipitate their downfall.

Even in France, the heroic struggle of the Algerian people has acted as a powerful stimulus which has reactiv-

ated the workers and revolutionary movement in this country, hindered the consolidation of the Gaullist dictatorship and beyond that, checked the march of Fascism. There is no doubt that the victory of the socialist Algerian Revolution can become the prologue to the French socialist revolution, so illustrating the intimate dialectical relation which exists at present between the historic march of the colonial revolution and the revolution in the advanced capitalist nations.

History in its dialectic unforeseen by the classic thinkers of Marxism has made its own the precept of the founder of Christianity: "The last shall be first".

There is the awesome historic destiny dependant on the decision of the Algerian revolution at its hour of victory. What will you do with this victory?

Consider the unique example given to revolutionaries by the extreme audacity, the profound intelligence of the Cuban leadership which has understood the direction and the opportunities of history in the present epoch.

Do not hesitate a single instant on the path to follow, do not subordinate at any price the future of the Revolution to the fetish of an abstract unity of the nation or of the party.

Raise boldly the banner of the Algerian socialist revolution and history will grant you a tremendous prize, an immortal favour.

Do not retreat, under any pretext in face of this task.

18 July 1961.

AN OPEN LETTER TO FIDEL CASTRO

by MICHEL PABLO

Dear Comrade Fidel Castro

Dear Comrades of the 26th July movement

I am writing to you from the cell of my prison where I have been held already for thirteen months, awaiting the verdict of the Tribunal which is just considering the case of Comrade Santen and myself, both accused of "criminal" activities in favour of the FLN and the Algerian Revolution.

I have had the immense pleasure recently of reading here, one after the other, two admirable books, C. Wright Mills' "Listen Yankee" and L. Huberman and P.M. Sweezy's "Cuba, Anatomy of a Revolution".

It is significant that the best books so far written on the Cuban Revolution have been written by Americans.

It is in my opinion a supplementary proof of the historic meaning of the Cuban Revolution, already grasped very clearly by some intellectuals of the liberal or socialist left in the United States; that the Cuban Revolution is not only the beginning of the Latin-American Socialist Revolution, but historically speaking of the North American Socialist Revolution, in short of the great Pan American Socialist Revolution.

This already gives the measure of the immense significance and dynamics of the Cuban Revolution.

The IVth International was among the first to grasp the dynamics of the struggle and the victory achieved by the heroic 26th July movement over Batista, to follow, understand, and welcome each successive stage of the Cuban permanent socialist Revolution.

To make known and to defend the Cuban Revolution among the toiling masses of the whole world, and more particularly among the Latin American and North American workers, was and remains for the IVth International a primordial task to which our militants have applied themselves with all their ardent revolutionary energy.

That is why I address you frankly, being a member of an organisation historically prepared by its ideas and experiences to understand easily and completely the Cuban Revolution, and devoted totally, and unconditionally to defend it, arms in hand against reaction and Imperialism.

From everything that I have known before my arrest, about yourself and the 26th July movement, about the manner in which you have led the heroic struggle against the bloody dictatorship of Batista, about the first achievements of the revolution, and in all that I have followed about the course of the revolution since my arrest, I am convinced that we are in presence of a revolutionary socialist leadership of a high intellectual and practical quality. In everything, that you have done until now and that you are doing at the present time, you belong in fact to the line of great revolutionaries who have known how to discover, assimilate, interpret and develop marxism in a creative and profoundly revolutionary manner, such as Rosa Luxembourg, Lenin, Leon Trotsky, and as in certain fields, the revolutionary Yugoslavs and Chinese.

For Marxism is not the dry, schematic codification of dogmas and citations from the classics, interpreted in an opportunist or simply stupid fashion by those who once in power, institutionalize marxism in order to justify all the practices of the state and the interests of the bureaucratic caste which they represent, as was the case with Stalin and Stalinism.

Marxism is the flexible and open method of real social knowledge and revolutionary action oriented towards social-

ism and communism, which excludes no truth acquired in whatever domain and which is nourished constantly from the creative experience of revolutionary practice, eternally new and unique.

Personally I have admired and appreciated a great deal the revolutionary and anti-dogmatic manner, often of a very original order, with which you have embarked upon and resolved important, fundamental questions in the struggle for power. That is the road of true creative Marxism.

The manner in which you engaged in armed struggle against Batista by basing yourself on the poor peasantry, the profound comprehension which you have shown in the formation of the partisan army, its intimate liason, and fusion with the revolutionary peasant masses is of capital importance for the whole of Latin America.

This path will be sure to overcome the schematic and sectarian prejudices still existing in the ranks of revolutionary marxists who in practice underestimate the capital importance of the organisation of the guerillas based on the revolutionary peasantry in order to initiate armed struggle against pro-Imperialist reaction, to strengthen at each step this struggle, to stimulate, and to activate the proletariat of the towns and to weld them closer to the revolutionary peasantry.

It is in the extreme audacity which you have demonstrated in this sphere by leaning on the support and the energy of the revolutionary peasantry that there is to be found one of the fundamental lessons of the Cuban Revolution for the whole of Latin America.

This example might reorientate the revolutionary forces in Latin America, some of which at least having fallen under the influence of the communist parties, have lost themselves in endless opportunist manoeuvres in the search for a hypothetical "national bourgeoisie" supposedly "revolutionary" in character and have counted upon its alliance and even on its leadership. Instead they should discover the immense revolutionary force of the peasantry or landless peasantry, base themselves upon it and rejecting resolutely bourgeois hesitancy, hurl themselves ardently with extreme audacity into real organisation and revolutionary action involving armed guerilla warfare.

The victorious march from the Sierra Maestra to the Havana of the Cuban Revolution is particularly significant.

As for the general march of the Socialist Revolution in our epoch, the classical marxist diagrams have been reversed, the Revolution progressing from the periphery composed of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples towards the centre occupied by the advanced capitalist countries and the Imperialist citadel of the United States last of all. Thus in a number of countries the proletarian and socialist revolution can begin and progress leaning for a whole period essentially on that wing of the peasantry which stimulates and supports the struggle of the proletariat in the towns where are to be found the principal and better equipped forces of the enemy.

Certainly the peculiarities of each country influence the development of the revolution and impress on it a unique mould, affecting amongst other things the method of uniting the towns and the country in a common struggle.

But the specific character of the process can only be understood against the general background of the Cuban revolution, at least for a whole series of countries controlled by Imperialism with analogous class structure and geographical features.

Personally I have equally admired the method you

have adopted to meet the problems of the economic and social reconstruction of the country after some initial inevitable stages.

I am referring to the orientation which you have given to the economy and the solution applied to the agrarian question.

If it is true as W. Mills has affirmed among others, that you are not thinking at all of an autarchic Cuban economy, unilaterally based for a long period on the prior and almost absolute development of heavy industry, but of an economy largely open to the possibilities of the world market and based on the equitable and harmonious relations between heavy industry, light industry, agriculture, you are without doubt on the right path. This question is of capital importance, particularly for the political evolution of the Revolution.

Such an orientation signifies first that Socialism can immediately benefit the peasant and worker masses of Cuba, raising modestly it is true but constantly their standard of life, in place of sacrificing the present active generation to a future generation.

It means equally that an harmonious economy can be built which will avoid the enormous discrepancy still existing in the USSR between industry, heavy industry in particular, and agriculture.

Equilibrium in the relations between heavy industry, light industry and agriculture means not only the healthy political development of the country by the constant elevation of the standard of living of the masses, but also the healthy economic development of the country, by avoiding "bottlenecks" in one or other branches of the economy at a later stage and their multiple politico-economic consequences.

The fact that you seem to have understood completely the importance of such an economic development for Cuba, can prove itself to be of vital importance for the evolution of the regime which has emerged from the Revolution.

No less important is the solution given to the agrarian question, particularly with the creation and functioning of the cooperatives.

I have noted the fact, very significant in my opinion, that the agricultural workers of the cooperatives consider themselves to be members of the latter, who participate effectively in its organisation and management and are able to share among themselves a part of the surplus created by the enterprise.

To see that everywhere the workers and direct producers have more and more scope in the organisation and management of the nationalised and planned economy of the country, and do not consider themselves to be simply workers in the service of an abstract and bureaucratic state, is a politico-economic question of capital importance for the future evolution of the regime.

I have also taken careful note of further problems affirmed by W. Mills in his book concerning your pre-occupations and conceptions for the structure and functioning of the state and of Socialist Democracy, for the freedom and development of culture, the struggle against illiteracy, the education of children, etc.

All this, in bold outline appears quite excellent and conforms to the best traditions of the enlightened thought of authentic revolutionary marxism.

One can naturally assume from what has been outlined at the present as conception and first realisation, that the Cuban Revolution will not be slow in discovering the right balance between the necessities of family and private life and the necessary integration in active social collective life, in freeing women from harsh domestic burdens, in encouraging birth control, in improving even the quality of the human material by an intelligent eugenics more and more voluntarily accepted, in liberating artistic and scien-

tific research from all bureaucratic interference and all prejudice.

All this will happen in stages with hesitancy and even mistakes, with detours and retreats — for the construction of socialism is not given, is not codified in any book — according to the material and cultural level attained by the masses and provided that the state is not atrophied by bureaucracy.

It is this last aspect that I wish to emphasise. To give the state a truly democratic structure and to avoid bureaucratic deformations — inevitable up to a certain point during a long period of transition — from becoming preponderant is the crucial problem which faces every Revolution limited to a single country, after the conquest of power and the fundamental social changes effected upon the former social and economic structure of the country.

The Cuban Revolution is still directed from above by the leaders of the revolutionary army who conquered power.

This is a situation until now unique in History, where the seizure of power and the beginning of a Revolution in essence proletarian and socialist has been accomplished in the absence of a Revolutionary Marxist Party and soviet institutions (councils).

It is possible to see in this the manifestation of a new dynamics of the world socialist revolution in our epoch, the result of the new balance of forces established in the world.

The role of the party has been substituted by that of the Revolutionary Army and that of the councils, by different organs resulting from the struggle and events since.

But now it is a question of codifying in some sense the structure of the new apparatus of the revolutionary state.

A party is certainly necessary and a state structure based on the councils, that is to say on organs elected by the masses who wield a real executive and legislative power.

The form of these organisms will be dictated by the specific experience of each revolution and the particular features of each situation.

It seems that you are already engaged in the creation of a Single Party whose framework is naturally founded upon the historic movement of the 26th July and the Revolutionary Army which has achieved victory.

Here indeed is a major step in the consolidation and functioning of the revolutionary regime.

What will this party be and what will be its role? I assume that it will act decisively as a great, profoundly democratic revolutionary marxist party as was that of the Bolsheviks in the time of Lenin.

To the degree that this party fulfills that condition, and permits within itself the free confrontation of ideological tendencies, as in the time of Lenin, this party will enjoy the limitless confidence of the great majority of the people and it can act de facto, in practice as the only viable party, the Single Party.

In this case the eventual conflict of the democratic tendencies within it will be clearly the reflection of the interests and aspirations of the different layers of the toiling masses.

But so that this actual political monopoly is in fact justified by the confidence alone of the masses in this party and not by the bureaucratic control of the state, it will be necessary soon to proclaim the right of existence of every party which places itself within the framework of the Socialist constitution of the country and adheres to the economic, social and political conquests of the Revolution.

This right to exist for other parties so defined is the key for the development of a real Socialist Democracy.

For this right not only justifies the spontaneous confidence accorded the single party, but also the truly democratic character of the organs elected by the masses which will constitute the structure of the new state apparatus.

In such organs: councils, National Assembly, etc. etc. there can be only a real socialist democracy if the free play of different political tendencies is allowed not only locally but also with the right to organise on the national plane.

Without a free political life there can be neither a Political Party nor State political organs.

Free political life means the free confrontation of diverse political tendencies.

The greatest danger which lies in wait for the Revolution after the seizure of power, above all in the countries with a low material and cultural level, is that of the rapid bureaucratisation of the revolutionary party and of the state.

In some cases of extreme danger when the Revolution is assailed on all sides by its enemies, one can certainly conceive that the revolutionary regime resulting from the seizure of power not yet consolidated may be forced to suspend for as short a time as possible the normal functioning of the socialist democracy and to reduce it in practice to the dictatorship of the party over the masses and even of the leadership of the party over the party and the masses. For the practical alternative in this case would be to see the revolution perish.

It is in this sense that what happened in the Soviet Union since the civil war and the Imperialist intervention can be understood.

It is in this sense that Lenin and Trotsky justified to themselves certain measures which they had always considered exceptional, abnormal and ephemeral.

It is for this reason that I cannot agree with certain conclusions which Isaac Deutscher comes to in his book on Leon Trotsky, which is in other respects a work of great value that I have studied with all the attention which it merits.

Neither Lenin or Trotsky ever generalised those anti-democratic practices to which the regime was forced to have recourse — being placed in especially exceptional conditions — and never repudiated their conception of democracy in the party and the proletarian and socialist state expressed in their works.

Lenin and Trotsky far from theorising a posteriori certain practices of the state, openly said that it was a question of provisional, exceptional measures and even of retreats, certainly necessary but no less contrary in a profound sense to the dictatorship of the proletariat, to socialist democracy, to socialism.

And it was Lenin again, one should not forget, who was the first to point out the extreme danger of bureaucratisation and who embarked early on a struggle against this danger and the men who represented it in the party, Stalin at their head.

Without doubt, only the substantial raising of the material and cultural level of the masses is in the long run an effective remedy against the sclerosis and even the bureaucratic degeneration of the state resulting from the revolution.

Hence the extreme importance of a reasonable economic policy orientated from the beginning towards the constant improvement of the standard of living of the masses which avoids throwing the peasantry into obstinate opposition against the regime. Such was the case in the USSR with the disproportion between heavy industry and light industry and the brutal and forced collectivisation of agriculture for 30 years, all in the absence of a market capable of satisfying with low prices the needs of the peasants. This was equally the case in the other European "People's" Democracies — with the exception of Yugoslavia — who retarded far too much the development of light industry and proceeded on the path of experiments born to failure,

with forced collectivisation of agriculture without the existence of a sufficient technical and economic base.

Naturally the destruction and disorganisation which result from civil war, the economic blockade decreed by Imperialism, and the military burdens help towards an uneven development of the economy and impose a heavy burden on the worker and peasant masses for the industrialisation and the equipment of the country.

But what should not happen is the aggravation of the objective unfavourable conditions for the reconstruction of socialism by the errors and the enormous waste of a bureaucracy which tends to develop inevitably in a climate of material shortage and in the absence of effective control by the masses of the state apparatus, which become more and more distinct from the masses.

It is this danger which must be combated from the beginning with extreme vigour to prevent the regime which has emerged from the Revolution degenerating into the Bonapartist dictatorship of the bureaucracy over the masses through the dictatorship of the Single Party, or even the dictatorship of the leadership of the party over the party and the masses.

Such a process is not inevitable and to assert that it is so is an offence against socialist thinking which asserts the opposite.

It is necessary then to think about and be concerned now with all those measures capable of preserving the democratic character of the revolutionary party and of the state resulting from the revolution.

Bureaucratic distortions are inevitable during the whole period of transition, of material shortage and of the low cultural level of the masses.

But it is possible to combat effectively against these distortions, to prevent their invading and dominating the state by means of a real Socialist democracy.

Personally I have arrived at the conclusion for a long time, that if during the crucial period which follows the taking of power, it is almost inevitable that the Revolutionary Party assumes directly power in close collaboration with the organs elected by the masses, it is necessary very seriously to work towards the moment when the party as such can distinguish itself sharply from the state apparatus and the government, as soon as the power is consolidated and the danger on the other hand of bureaucratisation becomes evident and strong.

The party should place before everything its care to remain the political and ideological conscience of the masses and of the revolution, adhering inexorably to its final object, tracing the path to follow, intransigent in relation to principles, always telling the whole truth to the masses.

In such a way the Party will not involve itself with bureaucratically deformed state, although in the last analysis the latter still remains a workers' state, product of the revolution and defending the economic and social bases of this revolution.

The policy of the state by its very nature can only be empirical, compromising with the problems of the day, full of compromises and retreats, using a conventional language in its relations for example with other states, following a policy often basically opportunist.

The party should not subordinate itself to this policy or support it completely without reserve or criticism. It should not theoretically portray it in particular as the practical authentic example of socialist theory and of Socialism. By following that path, as did Stalin in the USSR, the party is absorbed in the state, Marxism is vulgarised to the point of being unrecognisable, and the masses are grossly deceived. It is possible and salutary to envisage that the party establish its relations with the workers' state as also with the trade unions, by remaining in close

contact with the masses and their democratically elected organs on which the state is based, to control precisely with the aid of the masses, this state more efficiently.

In such a case the separation of the government from the principal leaders of the party who constitute its supreme moral capital and that of the entire country, can enormously encourage the masses in their apprenticeship in the control and the management of the workers' state.

As for the mass organs on which the new state apparatus must base itself, these cannot be arbitrarily defined. They are formed according to the peculiarities of each revolution and country. But in their essence they can only be democratically elected, as a kind of council or assembly or a combination of the two forms open to all citizens and if possible with office in rotation, so that the greatest possible number of citizens acquire an apprenticeship in the control and management of the state.

I have been personally struck by the Constitution of Athens by Aristotle which I read in prison and which bears many profoundly democratic traits, characterising the Athenian Democracy in the Fourth century BC.

Certainly this democracy was based on slavery and was limited to a number of free citizens. But what is important is how it functioned for this number, though our epoch being such that which could replace slaves by the machine. Particularly distinctive in this arrangement was the institution of the Peoples Assembly, the very large number of citizens participating in the City Council and the Tribunals, and the allocation of most of the administrative functions among the citizens by the drawing of lots.

Without copying these ancient institutions, the example of Athenian democracy not being unique in history, Socialist democracy can only justify itself if it identifies itself not with an abstract bureaucratic state, remote from the producers and citizens, but only with the mass citizen organisation.

The achievements so far of the Cuban Revolution, the quality and the critical spirit of its leadership permit a more than reasonable optimism on the plane of the struggle against bureaucracy and bureaucratisation.

The national framework of the Cuban Revolution is that of a little country still insufficiently developed.

But its effect is worldwide and particularly decisive for the future of Latin America and even of North America.

The Cuban Revolution benefits from many advantages. It has triumphed without knowing — at least on a comparable scale — the devastations and destructions caused by the Imperialist War which marked the October Revolution and other revolutions since.

By the very fact of the existence and the power of the USSR and of the other workers' states and of the whole block of countries freed from Imperialism in Africa and Asia in particular, the economic blockade of Imperialism cannot have its former rigidity.

The economic aid coming from these countries, the aid including military assistance from the USSR and China have already proved of capital importance for the consolidation and survival of the Cuban Revolution.

The latter also benefits on the other hand from the proximity of countries with the high level of technique and technological culture such as the United States which are important factors for the general culture of the Cuban masses.

Thus already in the first stages of the Cuban Revolution the material possibilities and cultural dispositions take place on a high and promising level.

Upon the leadership of this revolution rests the immense historical task of making the wisest use of these opportunities, for the benefit both of the Cuban and the world masses.

You are perfectly conscious — this can be seen from more than one event — of the immense educative value of your words, your policies, and your deeds.

You are right in this.

In questions such as the orientation of the economy, the solution of the agrarian problem, the new state institutions, the functioning of Socialist democracy, the manner of conceiving freedom of culture, the architecture of houses and towns, the treatment of prisoners and many lesser matters, your deeds and policies are passionately watched not only by the masses of Cuba, but by millions in the American continents and throughout the entire world.

It is in this also that your supreme responsibility lies before history.

Each new step in the Cuban Revolution in whatever domain resounds throughout the entire world.

I mentioned at the beginning of this letter that historically speaking, the Cuban Revolution signifies in my opinion the beginning not only of the Latin American Revolution but also of the North American Revolution.

I believe strongly that the revolutionary effects provoked by the victory, existence and consolidation of the Cuban Revolution especially among the masses of the black minority in the United States, the Puerto Rican workers and other Latin-American emigres in the United States, the poorly paid workers and large sections of the youth and of the intelligentsia in the United States, are already profound and will increase.

Cuba has been in some sense a peripheral territory of the United States but can prove to be its Achilles heel.

The Cuban Revolution is already very popular among the black minority in the United States, which is the principal ferment and the most radical force of the future Socialist Revolution in this country.

Certainly it is the US which is and will continue to be the principal danger for the Cuban Revolution. The abortive revolution of last May showed this conclusively.

Yankee Imperialism has already realised with its keen instinct for self preservation the immense revolutionary effect of the Cuban revolution on Latin America, No. 1 reservoir of the present power of this Imperialism, and even in the long run, for its own country.

On the other hand it has understood that the installation in its immediate neighbourhood, in the "tigers mouth" so to speak, of the first workers' state in its hemisphere, is at once an insupportable affront to its arrogant hegemony, and a striking manifestation of the new balance of forces established in the world arena. Hence its determination to do everything to stop the inevitable progress of the Cuban revolution and if possible to destroy it.

The consolidation and the survival of the Cuban revolution will be the most eloquent sign of the definite decline of Yankee Imperialism and of its open powerlessness before the new balance of world forces. For this reason it is necessary to expect tireless attempts on its part to weaken and defeat by every possible means the Cuban Revolution.

It will be possible in this domain to see how real are the promises given by the present leaders of the Kremlin to give Cuba military aid if attacked by Imperialism.

In the past, in Stalin's time, the Kremlin did not hesitate to encourage a number of revolutions, to use them for the momentary interests of soviet diplomacy and the bureaucratic caste in power in the USSR, and to ruthlessly betray them.

This was the case in particular with the Spanish Revolution of 1936-39, the Greek Revolution and Yugoslav and Chinese Revolutions during and after the last war.

As you know the Yugoslav and Chinese only succeeded in reality in so far as their leaderships fortunately ignored the advice and directives of Stalin.

For a certain time now the Kremlin has adopted a more militant attitude towards Imperialism, a more positive attitude towards the colonial peoples and their struggles for freedom.

This is an event of historic importance which should be welcomed with open hands if this tendency is consolidated.

Whether this is the reflection of the mounting power of the USSR, of the new balance of world forces, or of the antagonism between the Kremlin and Peking, and of the pressure on the Kremlin from the Chinese Revolution or finally a combination of all these factors, the fact remains that this new orientation of the Kremlin acts at present as an eminently progressive and revolutionary factor in the world arena.

Thus the Cuban Revolution can maintain and develop itself protected amongst other things by the formidable power of the USSR and at any event by that of China.

But the support of the international masses and particularly of the Latin American and even North American popular forces is no less vital for the future of the Cuban Revolution.

For in the long run this future depends on the extension of the revolution into Latin America and the development of the revolutionary wave in the United States.

Consequently, once again the immense importance of the healthy development of the Cuban Revolution, which serves as a formidable stimulus for the revolutionary struggle of the masses in these regions.

Everything which contributes to raise the standard of

life of the Cuban masses, to industrialise the country, to abolish unemployment, to conquer illiteracy, to develop a free culture, to promote the participation of the masses in the political life of a genuine Socialist democracy cannot help but have a tremendous revolutionary effect from one end to the other of the American continents.

You are the pioneers of the Great Pan American Revolution.

Be conscious of the profound significance of this immense historic mission. At the least of your acts or words thousands without number of workers will be ready throughout the world to fight and die in defense of the Cuban Revolution.

Thousands of revolutionaries particularly to the fore those in the Fourth International — in North America, South America and throughout the entire world will make known the achievements and the importance of the Cuban Revolution, prepare its defence against reaction and Imperialism and extend it by revolution in their own countries.

Long Live the Cuban Revolution, vanguard of the Great Latin American and Pan American Revolution.

Long Live the World Socialist Revolution.

From our prison Sal Santen and myself send you, Dear Comrade Fidel Castro, Dear Comrades of the historic movement of the 26th July, our most fraternal greetings.

Go forward, take care of so that you may continue to serve, as magnificently as you have already done, the sacred and immortal cause of the world proletariat and of Socialism.

Prison of Amsterdam 6 July 1961

STALINIST SLANDERS AGAINST PABLO AND SANTEN

The International Secretariat of the Fourth International denounces the slanderous and provocative character of the "accusation" launched at a press conference of the S.S.D. of East-Berlin against our comrades Michel Raptis and Sal Santen, and reproduced later on by various CP papers as « Neues Deutschland » and « l'Humanité ». At the very moment when the 22nd Congress of the CPSU has admitted the provocatory character of the slanders against Trotskyism, when the Secretariat of the Italian C.P. admits that "the juridical rehabilitation of Trotsky" has already taken place, the Ulbricht clique dares to present two valiant revolutionary militants as instruments of the "Gehlen secret service", i.e. as "agents of imperialism".

Amsterdam trial, at which our comrades Raptis and Santen were condemned for aiding the Algerian revolution

has attracted wide attention in the international labor and revolutionary movement. The protest campaign to free Raptis and Santen was supported by thousands of people throughout the world, among which several Labour MPs in Britain, 4 socialist MPs in Belgium, 5 MPs in Indonesia (incl. members of the CP fraction in Parliament), 12 MPs in Bolivia, the president of the CUTch in Chile, the well known writers J. P. Sartre, Jorge Amado, Simone de Beauvoir, Jean Guéhenno, several professors at the Mon. tevideo University etc. etc. The success of this campaign bares witness to the honest revolutionary character of our comrades' struggle and life. The miserable attempt to bring back into life stalinist slanders of the worst kind against them can only discredit the slanderers. The international communist and labor movement must severely condemn them.

MATERIALISM AND THE INDIAN BOURGEOISIE

by C. G. SHAH.

The author was one of the first few intellectuals who reacted to the October Revolution and founded the Marxist movement in India in the early twenties. He broke ideologically and politically with Stalinism, in the late thirties. Today he considers Trotskyism as contemporary Marxism-Leninism.

One of the very significant facts about modern Indian society is the extremely slow rate at which rationalist ideas and scientific materialist culture are spreading even among the educated strata of the people. In spite of the fact that rationalism and materialism, both as philosophies and movements, came into existence about two centuries ago in Europe, India, which has already evolved a modern bourgeois society and has organic political, economic, and cultural contacts with the European countries, continues to remain almost an invulnerable fortress of religio-mystical and obscurantist ideologies inherited from her medieval feudal past. It is true that, even in the European countries, rationalism and materialism are minority philosophico-ideological currents since the capitalist ruling class is afraid of and consequently sabotage the spread of rationalist and materialist ideas among the masses whom it exploits lest their spread among these masses may expose the irrational and un-historical nature of the capitalist social structure in its present stage of its decline and thereby accentuate their will to overthrow it. It is also true that the European bourgeoisie extensively utilizes the press, the radio, the school, the church, and other levers of moulding the views of the exploited classes, to inoculate them with religious and non-religious irrational conceptions and emotions such as would narcotize their growing will to challenge the social system which engenders increasing material and cultural poverty for them, and reconcile them to their class slavery under capitalism. Even during the period of anti-feudal bourgeois democratic revolutions when the European bourgeoisie, a historically progressive social class at that time, was engaged in a historic battle against the outmoded feudal social system, and was evolving, through its ideologues, rationalist and materialist conceptions of Nature and Society as ideological weapons to combat medieval superstition which hallowed feudalism even, during that rising ascending phase of capitalism, the European bourgeoisie felt a class fear of the exploited masses and recognized the necessity of maintaining religion as "the opium of the people". This class need of the bourgeoisie became articulate through Voltaire, when even that audacious critic of medieval religion observed, "If there is no God, it is necessary to invent Him for the masses".

Nevertheless, the fact remains that, in European countries, the bourgeois intelligentsia (Bacon, Hobbes, Locke and others in England; Holbach, Helvetius and others in France) did evolve anti-religious, anti-idealistic and materialist philosophies (though suffering from adulteration of elements of idealism). These philosophies have constituted a permanent and integral part of modern European culture. Further, on the basis of increased knowledge of the natural world through the advance of natural sciences and of the social world, through both historical research as well as the generalization of the practice of class struggle in the contemporary capitalist society, Marx and Engels, outstanding ideological leaders of the proletariat, enriched, deepened and made scientific, the materialist philosophy evolved by their bourgeois predecessors, the materialism of the eighteenth century Europe. Marx and Engels evolved the philosophy of dialectical materialism, which is the synthesis and generalisation into a world outlook of all scientific knowledge, achieved by humanity through practice, of the

natural, social and mental worlds during its existence hitherto.

In India, though a bourgeois society, a bourgeoisie, and a bourgeois intelligentsia emerged and developed, no strong bourgeois rationalist or materialist philosophical movement, even as a minority philosophical current, has grown. An overwhelming proportion of the Indian intelligentsia is immune from any "contamination" of the materialist or even rationalist ideas. The Indian intelligentsia in the mass subscribes to religio-mystical philosophy inherited from pre-modern past India. Incredible as it may seem, a section of it has even live faith in pseudo-sciences as palmistry and astrology.

Almost all outstanding bourgeois intellectuals who work in the field of politics, economics, sociology, philosophy, or natural sciences, are idealists, God-believing. Very few among them have succeeded in liberating themselves from the ancient superstition of the God-idea or have built up a healthy scientific materialist world outlook.

However, though bourgeois materialism has not struck its roots in the soil of Indian society, dialectical (proletarian) materialism is steadily spreading among those intellectuals who have accepted Marxism and are identified with the camp of the proletarian struggle for the establishment of a socialist society. Thus, not bourgeois but proletarian intelligentsia is determined historically to lead the struggle against all medieval superstition and religio-mystical philosophies which are rampant in contemporary India. Just as, in the material sphere, the Indian bourgeoisie repudiated the task of liquidating survivals of feudalism and imperialism (foreign capital invested in India) but seeks compromise with the latter, in the philosophico-cultural sphere, the bourgeois intelligentsia has repudiated the task of combating and extinguishing inherited unscientific and socially reactionary philosophies inherited from the pre-capitalist feudal past, and even endeavoured to regitalize those philosophies (Tilak, Gandhi, Aurbindo, J. C. Bose, and others). It becomes the historical task, in the sphere of culture, of Marxists or proletarian intelligentsia to campaign against those reactionary philosophies of the early pre-capitalist epoch.

The non-emergence of organized powerful rationalist and materialist philosophical movements in India is due to a variety of historical reasons. We will enumerate the chief among these.

First, India, till recently, was directly under British domination. The Indian people felt a natural and healthy hostility against this domination. This hostility, however, instead of being restricted to the economic and political domination of India by a foreign nation, was wrongly extended to whatever pertained to the foreigner. An antagonistic attitude was taken not only towards the foreign ruler but also towards the culture of the foreign ruler. Now, rationalist and materialist culture originated in Europe as a cultural weapon of the European bourgeoisie in its struggle against feudalism. It was created by the intellectual vanguard of the bourgeoisie. Bourgeois rationalist and materialist culture (bourgeois because it considered the bourgeois social system as ideal and immutable, and further, moved within the categories of bourgeois conceptions of the physical and social world) was historically a higher culture than the historically preceding feudal culture. This was the specific contribution of the progressive West European bourgeoisie of the ascending phase of capitalism to the cultural advance of humanity.

The bourgeois leaders of the Indian nationalist movement like Tilak, B.C. Pal, Ghandi, and others, however,

misidentified and confounded the domination of the country by a bourgeois foreign nation like the British with the bourgeois culture of the latter which was historically higher than the inherited feudal Indian culture. They not only condemned "western" domination but also "western" culture which had, within it, valuable scientific elements. They crusaded not only against the foreign rule but also against the superior culture of the foreigners.

This hostility to the foreign rule and the resultant uncritical aversion to the rationalist and materialist western culture felt by the Indian intelligentsia, nourished on the preachings of Tilak, Pal, Ghandi, and others, prompted a good section of it to idealize the backward culture of pre-modern India. It dreamt of a modified revival of ancient Indian culture, its twentieth century edition. This recoil from the rationalist and materialist culture of the West, because it was evolved by a nation which had enslaved and dominated the Indian people, was one of the main reasons why this historically higher culture did not rapidly spread among the patriotic Indian intelligentsia, why even the educated classes remained impervious to its appeal, why the Indian nationalist, instead of assimilating that culture and using it as a weapon against the reactionary ideological inheritance in the form of a mass of mind-deadening superstitions and religious mysticism, actually revelled in day dreams of resurrecting the culture of India's hoary past. He became a national chauvinist in the cultural field declaring that the Indian people armed with the inherited spiritual culture (the religio-mystical culture), the product of their backward feudal phase of existence, will be the cultural leader of contemporary humanity.

National slavery under a western power instigated the patriotic Indian intelligentsia to idealize the backward culture of India's feudal past and made it disorient from the historically higher modern bourgeois culture of the west. The Indian intelligentsia, mainly bourgeois in bulk, apart from the class reason, recoiled also from Marxian materialism which, though it was critical of the bourgeois western culture, had however its genesis in the European social soil.

The second principal reason why, in spite of the development of a capitalist economy and a bourgeois society (basically bourgeois in spite of some feudal admixtures) in India, rationalist and materialist philosophies did not spread among the Indian bourgeoisie or the bourgeois intelligentsia, was the historical weakness of the bourgeoisie and their resultant fear of a socialist revolution of the proletariat which might endanger the existence of the bourgeois social system.

The English and the French bourgeoisie and bourgeois intelligentsia, the pioneer of rationalist and materialist philosophies, developed during the epoch of rising capitalism. In England, Bacon, Locke, and Hobbes were the principal architects of the materialist philosophy which, though it suffered from idealistic errors, was in essence materialist. In France, Holbach, Helvetious, Diderot and others were the heroic founders of the rationalist and materialist thought. The new philosophy was the new world outlook of the rising bourgeois society and was the ideological weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie for its victory over feudalism and its own further development.

In France, the pioneers of the new rationalist and materialist philosophies were the ideological inspirers of the titanic rational (historically speaking) social phenomenon known as the French Revolution which blasted away all reactionary feudal social and political institutions and freed the mind of the French people from the Catholic Christian superstition. The new philosophy was supported by the rising socially and economically powerful class of society viz. the bourgeoisie (the class of enterprising merchants and manufacturers). This class found in rationalism a strong weapon to fight the Christian Church which enslaved the

human mind in the prison of irrational social conceptions such as the Divine Right of Kings, the eternal validity of the decadent feudal system (which stifled the expansion of trade and manufacture), the sacrosanct character of the privileges of the feudal nobles and which, above all, tried to strangle the enterprising and inquiring impulses of man to explore the world and reach a scientific understanding of that world so necessary for the advance of bourgeois trade and industry. The bourgeoisie needed, for the expansion of their trade and manufacture, the development of natural sciences (their use for navigation, for the improvement of technology etc.), the increase of scientific knowledge of the world, the liberation of the people from irrational taboos which feudal religion imposed on them. The bourgeoisie adopted rationalism, even materialism, as its powerful ideological artillery to storm the heights of superstition which the Church spread among the people to make them accept the existing feudal social system.

Thus, the rising French bourgeoisie in its own interest countenanced nationalist and materialist philosophies which the bourgeois intelligentsia evolved and used them as ideological class weapons against the feudal society and the feudal religion. They needed the growth of natural sciences for the improvement of transport and technology so vital for the expansion of trade and manufacture. Feudal society based on a dominant stationary agrarian mode of production obstructed the development of natural sciences and persecuted all scientific endeavour. Since the advance of natural sciences demanded a materialist approach to the world, the French bourgeoisie adopted rationalism and materialism as its philosophico-ideological weapons to combat religio-idealistic philosophy of the official feudal society.

Further, the social and political superstructure of the feudal society subserved the class interests of the feudal nobility. This superstructure impeded free expansion of new productive forces (trade and manufacture). The French bourgeoisie, therefore, supported also bourgeois rationalist ideas evolved by the intelligentsia to expose (exposed within the limits of bourgeois criticism) the irrational character of the feudal social and political institutions based on such principles as birth, divine origin of kingship, sacrosanct character of the autocratic feudal state.

Thus Europe became the birth place of powerful rationalist and materialist philosophies in the bourgeois phase of social development.

The bourgeoisie, however, was also an exploiting class, exploiting the working masses on the basis of its class ownership of the modern means of production. As bourgeois society, after supplanting feudal society, further developed, the class antagonism between the exploiting bourgeoisie and the exploited proletariat (social manifestation of the basic contradiction of the capitalist economy viz. between the social character of production and individual appropriation) came into greater and greater relief, and the class struggle between these two fundamental classes of bourgeois society, with some zigzags, increasingly sharpened.

The ruling bourgeoisie now needed crude religion as well as refined idealistic philosophy to chloroform the spirit of discontent growing among the working masses. The proletariat was beginning to subject the capitalist social system also to rationalist criticism. It was feeling not merely class inequalities (rampant in the feudal society) but also class distinctions as irrational. It was challenging not only feudal property but also bourgeois property. The proletariat, through its intellectual vanguard, was formulating a proletarian rationalist and materialist class criticism of bourgeois society as the bourgeoisie, through its intellectual vanguard, had formulated in the past, a bourgeois rationalist and materialist criticism of feudal society.

With the growing danger of the socialist working class movement to the capitalist social system, the European

bourgeoisie began to retreat from rationalism and materialism, became pious, churchgoing, and "God-believing", and increasingly strengthened and supported religious and non-religious idealistic philosophies. As Engels remarks:

"The workmen of France and Germany had become rebellious. They were thoroughly infected with socialism... Nothing remained to the French and German bourgeoisie as a last resource but silently drop their free thought... one by one scoffers turned pious in outward behaviour, spoke with respect to the Church... The French and the German bourgeoisie had come to grief with materialism. Religion must be kept alive for the people... that was the only way and the means to save society (bourgeois) from utter ruin".

After its entry into the declining phase of capitalism (imperialism) when the working class movement has assumed formidable proportions and the socialist danger to capitalism has been accentuated, the European bourgeoisie has become still more religious and idealistic in philosophy. While a very small proportion of the bourgeois intelligentsia is ideologically *declassed* and has gravitated to the camp of the most advanced type of materialism viz. (Marxist) dialectical materialism, its great section has moved away to idealism and mysticism. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that the European bourgeoisie, impelled by its class interest, did in the earlier phase of its existence, play a historically progressive cultural role when it developed rationalist ideas and a materialist (though mechanistic) world outlook.

The Indian bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intelligentsia have, however, no glorious materialist tradition in philosophy. From the very inception of their existence, they have held and propagated religious or non-religious idealistic views.

The political leaders of the Indian bourgeoisie like Tilak, Gandhi, and others or its philosophical representatives like Aurbindo, Pal, Radhakrishnan, and others have been staunch antimaterialist in philosophy. They have subscribed to such unscientific conceptions as God, intuition, "Inner Voice" and others.

We have previously mentioned one principal reason for this disorientation from materialism of the Indian bourgeois intelligentsia viz. its error of confounding the domination of India by a western nation with the materialist culture which emerged in the West.

We will enumerate other principal reasons for its antimaterialist recoil.

Materialist philosophy emerged as the generalization of the knowledge of the physical world acquired through the growth of natural sciences. Natural sciences themselves developed rapidly in Europe under the impetus given by the needs of trade and technology on which the bourgeois economy was based and expanding.

In India, though a capitalist economy developed, the productive forces on which it was based (industrial technology, transport and others) were not the product of the endeavour of indigenous scientists or technologists. It was not the bourgeois intelligentsia of India who evolved modern natural sciences or invented modern technology. It was the bourgeois intelligentsia of modern Europe which accomplished this.

The Indian bourgeoisie only transplanted the engineering and scientific knowledge as well as technology (machinery etc.) from Europe where they originated. They created a capitalist industry and economy in India on the basis of the creative achievements of the European bourgeoisie.

Due also to this historical reason, bourgeois materialism did not originate in India.

The other and by far the most significant reason why

modern materialist philosophy neither emerged in India nor was it accepted by the Indian bourgeoisie and the Indian bourgeoisie in the period during which it was born and developed.

As we mentioned previously, even the European bourgeoisie which had a materialist tradition retreated from materialism as soon as the socialist danger to the capitalist social system was unfolded. In India, such danger for capitalism exists from the very outset.

Due to the low development of the productive forces of Indian society (their normal development being obstructed by capitalist Britain) and further due to the exploitation of the Indian masses by both foreign and Indian capital as also by Zamindars, moneylenders, and others, these masses lived in conditions of abysmal poverty. The democratic and socialist danger to the capitalist-landlord system was, consequently, perennial and grave in India from the very early phase of capitalist development.

The Indian bourgeoisie has, therefore, consciously or unconsciously, felt the basic need of maintaining religion as a spiritual prop of the system from the very beginning. It dared not adopt materialism as a philosophical ideological weapon in its limited struggles against imperialism or native feudalism during any phase of its existence.

The political and philosophical leaders of the Indian bourgeoisie have therefore been consistently anti-materialist. The whole socio-economic capitalist-landlord structure is so exploitative that it cannot stand even minimum rational inquiry. Religion becomes more than ever necessary to reconcile the masses to it. The leaders need not, of course, be conscious of the class motif behind their religious and idealistic world outlooks. They believe in those unscientific philosophies impelled, in final analysis, by the exigencies of class survival (the basic interest of a class), by the constant threat of a socialist revolution.

It is, therefore, that materialism is spreading only among socialist intelligentsia who represents the historical interests of the working class and participate in the latter's struggle to replace the capitalist-landlord system with socialism.

The Indian bourgeoisie and its intelligentsia are inveterate antagonists of materialism. The bourgeoisie finances liberally all programmes of religious revival and resuscitation of India's spiritual culture though adapting it to the needs of the bourgeoisie.

In Europe, in the initial phases, the bourgeoisie financially aided the spread of rationalist and materialist ideas. In India, it finances anti-materialist and anti-rationalist movements. This is one of the reasons why these movements advance at a slow tempo in India.

The bourgeois intelligentsia of India is denied the glorious role of being the pioneer or the protagonist of scientific materialist philosophical ideas and the organizer of mass movements against religious superstition. It lacks a vital intellectual indignation at the whole complex of superstitious practices which form the normal life of an Indian. It, in fact, in social life, generally adapts itself to these.

The European bourgeoisie, though an exploiting class, due to historical circumstances, advanced human culture by helping the materialist campaign against religion and idealistic philosophy. The Indian bourgeoisie, due to different historical circumstances in which it lives, conserves these unscientific ideologies.

It is the historical privilege of Marxist proletarian materialists to achieve a cultural renaissance in our country. The whole phase of bourgeois materialist development will be shipped over in the field of culture. From the preponderantly obscurantist and religio-mystical feudal philosophy a leap will be taken to the philosophy of dialectical materialism.

LETTER TO THE 22nd CONGRESS AND TO THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CPSU

by the International Secretariat

Comrades,

In 1937 Leon Trotsky, leader of the October Revolution, a founder with Lenin of the soviet state, creator of the Red Army, threw in Stalin's face:

"The authors of the purges and the monstrous Moscow trials will be covered with obloquy; the Soviet people will erect a monument in honour of their victims".

Today this prediction is verified. At your Congress the first secretary of your Party has promised the erection of this monument; he has commenced to lift the veil from the terrible crimes that followed the assassination of Kirov by the G.P.U.

But the victims of the crimes of Stalin and his lieutenants are not only thousands and thousands of nameless militants, devoted to the cause of Communism and of the working class. Among them are found the most glorious names in the history of the Party, the most faithful companions of Lenin, comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Rykov, Piatakov, Rakovsky, Krestinsky, Smilga, Preobrazhensky, Tomsy, Radek, and above all comrade Leon Trotsky. Their names must be engraved in letters of gold on the monument erected in honour of the victims of Stalin. They must be immediately rehabilitated.

These leading militants of Soviet and international communism were killed in criminal fashion. As well they were scandalously calumniated. All the Communist Party leaders throughout the world servilely, repeated and justified these calumnies. The honour of Communism demands a public, official and complete review of these trials and accusations. This is a matter which concerns not only members of the C.P.S.U. It is a matter for the Communists and workers of the whole world.

We demand the constitution of an international commission of inquiry, composed of delegates of your Party, and of representatives of the international workers' and revolutionary movement, of the Chinese C.P., the Polish W.U.P.P., the Italian C.P., the League of Yugoslav Communists, of the Japanese union organisation SOHYO, of the British union confederation T.U.C., the Italian Socialist Party, the Chilean workers' federation (C.U.T.Ch.), representatives of the Cuban and Algerian revolutions, representatives of all the big tendencies of the international worker's movement, including the Trotskyist tendency.

The International Secretariat of the Fourth International demands to have its testimony heard by this commission, as representing the only Communist current that understood and denounced all the crimes from the beginning, which fought uninterruptedly for the defence and rehabilitation of the victims, for whom you now erect a monument after twenty-five years delay.

We demand that light be shone on all these crimes committed in the U.S.S.R. and elsewhere against militants of the international workers' movement, and that any complicity be not passed over in silence.

At the same time we demand that comrade Natalia Sedova be heard, so that the truth may be exposed on the subject of the murder of Leon Trotsky, and so that the inspirers and executors of this crime may be publicly denounced and punished.

Comrades,

The enormous revelations of the 22nd Congress, amplifying and surpassing those of the 20th Congress does not end a phase of "liquidation of a shameful past". It reopens a period of discussion which will raise all the key questions

of the communist programme, of the construction of socialism, of the international revolution.

You have just publicly revealed all the horror of the Stalinist era. But you continue to refer to what is called "the cult of the personality" to explain this era. This explanation satisfied no one after the 20th Congress. It will be still less satisfying after the latest revelations. For Marxists, phenomena of such scope can only be explained by social factors.

Khrushchev takes up the term "usurper" which Trotsky used when he declared that Stalin had usurped the power to guarantee the privileges of a bureaucratic caste which climbed on to the back of the Soviet proletariat isolated in a hostile capitalist world, and concentrated in his hands control of the economy and of the State.

The Trotskyists have defended this opinion over long years. They denounced the bureaucratic degeneration of the workers' state resulting from this, while continuing uninterruptedly, despite all the crimes committed against them, the unconditional defence of the U.S.S.R. against imperialism.

All communists do not share this explanation, but all feel the need to discuss this problem. This discussion will develop in any case, strongly stimulated by the revelations of the 22nd Congress. In the interests of political clarification, in the interests of the international workers' movement, this discussion must develop freely in all communist parties and above all in the C.P.S.U. All tendencies of international communism, the Chinese C.P., the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the Fourth International must participate in this discussion. This discussion concerning the general problems of Marxist-Leninist theory must be publicly developed, as was the case in the discussion in the epoch of Lenin. The principle according to which these discussions should not be publicly unfolded is totally contrary to the practices and principles of Bolshevism.

In this discussion must be brought out the platforms, books and articles written by the Communist victims of Stalin, above all those of Trotsky and the Left Opposition, and those of Bukharin, publication of which in the U.S.S.R. we demand.

Our organisation demands that this discussion include all the big problems now under discussion in the communist movement, and notably the problems discussed between the Soviet C.P. and the Chinese C.P. Only the imperialist bourgeoisie can profit from the present silence, which permits all kinds of rumours and falsified information to penetrate into the ranks of the communist movement. A frank and public discussion of these divergences, on the other hand, will cement the necessary union of the People's Republic of China, the U.S.S.R. and all the workers' states.

To-day the cause of communism in the world has become invincible. The revolution marches from victory to victory. But this cause will only triumph when its banner will have been cleansed of all the stains of blood and mire, when the usurpatory bureaucracy will have been driven out, when Soviet democracy will have been fully re-established, when the proletarians will have in their hands, in the democratically elected soviets, control of the economy and the State, when it will again be the banner of the International, of the Communist World Revolution.

Long live the immortal heritage of Lenin, which our Bolshevik-Leninist movement has victoriously defended in spite of all opposition!

Long live Communism!

The International Secretariat of the Fourth International -
31st October 1961

Trotsky's rehabilitation requested by 62 Ceylon M. P. s

The following appeal was addressed to Krushchev by 62 Senators and Members of the House of Representatives of Ceylon:

" Your Excellency,

" We, the signatories to this appeal, are all members of the Parliament of Ceylon.

" We have noted in the published proceedings of the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. that it has been officially stated that in the time of the late Josep V. Stalin various leading revolutionaries and others had been falsely accused and falsely declared guilty at frame-up trials of infamous political crimes against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

" We also note with real satisfaction that the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the C.P.S.U. itself have set going processes which will enable the reconsideration of these cases and the rehabilitation, mostly posthumously, of the victims of the terror of that time.

" It is hardly necessary to remind Your Excellency that the most famous of the persons thus condemned in Stalin's time was Leon Trotsky, co-leader with Lenin of the Great October Revolution of 1917 and a principal builder of the Red army. As Your Excellency is aware Trotsky was «tried» in his absence in March 1938 and «convicted» of « Anti-Soviet espionage, diversive and terroristic activi-

" ties for the purpose of undermining the power of the U.S.S.R., accelerating an armed attack on the U.S.S.R., assisting foreign aggressors to seize territory of the U.S.S.R. and to dismember it... »

" Your Excellency is no doubt aware that on the very announcement of the charges against him Trotsky repudiated and denounced them publicly as totally false and also offered to go before an international commission on the footing of an assurance by him that if the commission found him guilty in any respect he would immediately place himself at the disposal of the police authorities of the U.S.S.R. Your Excellency is also no doubt aware that Trotsky did in fact go voluntarily before the celebrated Dewey Commission which after a careful and prolonged investigation accepted Trotsky's positive proof that Stalin's charges against him were false.

" In all these circumstances we appeal to you to cause a public and authoritative revision of the proceedings and the alleged evidence against Trotsky, bringing to bear upon the revision the known established facts which were in no manner referred to at the « trial ».

" Permit us to add that the authorising of such a revision by the Government of the U.S.S.R. will redound enormously to the credit not only of the U.S.S.R. but also of the entire international working class movement.

Yours truly,

23rd November, 1961.