

THE

# MARXIST

**M  
a  
y  
  
1  
9  
3  
9**

**EDITORIALS**

**May Day**

**Stalin-Hitler Rapprochement ?**

**THE ECONOMY OF THE  
SOVIET UNION**

**IS A FOUR POWER BLOC IN  
EUROPE POSSIBLE ?**

**LUDLOW BILL - MASK FOR  
SOCIAL PATRIOTISM**

**WORKERS CONTROL OF  
PRODUCTION - Supplement**

**5 Cents**

---

**FOR A NEW COMMUNIST (4TH) INTERNATIONAL**

# FIGHT

- For Workers Control of Production!
- For independent working class action!
- For the Class War — Against Imperialist War!
- For the six hour day, five day week with no reduction in pay!
- For work relief at trade union wages!
- For Workers Control of Relief Funds!
- For Adequate Cash Relief!
- For the unification of all trade unions on a class struggle policy, with industrial structure!
- For democratic rights; for the right to organize, strike and picket!
- For the coordination of free education and practical vocational training for all youth; for equal pay for equal work; for independent relief for all youth equal to the adult!
- For full economic, social and political equality for the Negro masses!
- For immediate complete independence for the Colonies and protectorates of the U. S.!

**FOR A WORKERS COUNCIL GOVERNMENT!**

**FOR A NEW COMMUNIST (4th)  
INTERNATIONAL!**

---

---

## THE MARXIST

Formerly the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Theoretical organ of the Revolutionary Workers League of the U. S.

5 cents a copy

— 50 cents a year

Published monthly by  
1904 DIVISION STREET  
Printed in the United States

— The Demos Press  
Chicago, Ill.  
— Voluntary Labor

# The Marxist

Vol. 5 No.2

May 1939

## BUILD THE "MARXIST"

One of the special points on the agenda of the Third Convention of the League was the press. (A report on the convention will appear in the FIGHTING WORKER, May issue; the political documents have already been published. An enthusiastic response was accorded the appearance of the MARXIST, monthly theoretical organ appearing now in printed form.

The issuance of the MARXIST in printed form, instead of the mimeographed FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, has made it possible to triple and quadruple the circulation of the publication. Workers and readers have written in greeting the appearance of the new organ and welcoming its material.

The MARXIST will attempt to deal with theoretical and political questions of moment as they arise in the labor movement.

In the small space of eight pages this will not be an easy task. The only way to overcome this shortcoming is to BUILD THE MARXIST, increase its circulation, get subs, and enable us to add more pages. This is YOUR task as well as ours.

Help build a theoretical journal of Marxism. Send in your sub. Contribute what you can. Make the MARXIST grow!

## MAY DAY

May Day is the great historic day of struggle for workers' rights. But May Day 1939 finds the workers of the world in a state of despair and confusion, disorganized in the face of growing oppression and starvation.

Never has the need for militant workers' action been so urgent as today — with the continued decay of the first workers state under the blows of the Stalinist bureaucracy and world imperialism, with imperialist

war becoming an ever growing threat.

The workers must organize NOW under the banner of irreconcilable class struggle. Build the new world party of Communism!

Class against class! Fight against the war moves of the imperialists, "democratic" and fascist!

Class against class! No support to the New Deal in its starvation of the unemployed and its drive toward war!

Class against class! For the social revolution which alone can halt the new imperialist slaughter!

Workers of the world! Unite to smash the chains of rotten capitalism! Build your class organizations in readiness for workers power! For workers control of production for Use, for the new workers society!

## STALIN — HITLER RAPPROCHEMENT?

In a Moscow speech before the first National Party Congress IN FOUR YEARS, Stalin himself gave the lie to the "peace maintaining" policy of collective action by the democracies. No longer are French and British "democratic" imperialisms the sole means of preserving peace; now it is these very powers who are attempting to "instigate a war between Russia and Germany over the Ukraine." Hitler, says Stalin, has no such bad intentions, and those who say so are mere warmongers!

Faced with the collapse of the policy of collective security in Europe, Stalin is now learning the acrobatics of straddling the fence. His threat to jump to Hitler's side is a "warning" to the democracies not to exclude the Soviet Union from their plans as they have done hitherto.

About the past Stalinist policy in Spain and France with its class collaborationist People's Frontism, the Congress has

(Continued on page 4)

# The Economy Of The Soviet Union

One of the most important disputes in the labor and scientific movement today is the question of the type of economy that exists in the Soviet Union. The Stalinists claim they have established socialism and are rapidly proceeding toward communism, while many ultra-lefts and reformists claim that a form of capitalism exists in the Soviet Union. Both are wrong. The capitalist mode of production was overthrown in backward Russia by the October Revolution, and although under Stalinism the Soviet Union has been degenerating back toward capitalism, the fact remains that its economy is not capitalist. Likewise, despite the progress in this backward country toward planned economy and in economic development, in comparison to capitalist countries, this in no way denotes socialism.

A comparison of the fundamental factors that distinguish one mode of production from another will clearly reveal the true character of Soviet economy. The decisive factors to consider in determining the mode of production are: the property relations, the kind of production, the character of labor, the character and the process of the accumulation and disposition of the surplus, and the basic contradictions within the economy.

## CAPITALIST ECONOMY

Capitalist economy is distinguished from all other economic systems by the totality of the following factors:

- a— its property relations: private ownership of the means of production.
- b— production for the market, rather than the hand tool self-sufficiency production under feudalism, or the production for use under a Workers State. In other words under capitalism there exists commodity production and the anarchy of production as a whole.
- c — wage labor, instead of the serfdom of feudalism, or the social labor of socialism.
- d — surplus value: ownership of the means of production, capitalist private property, enables the capitalist class to receive all of the surplus value produced by labor in the productive process, over and above the general subsistence wage

paid to the working class, despite the fact that the exploiting class as such contributes nothing to production.

e — the basic contradiction is between socialized production and capitalist private appropriation.

## SOCIALIST ECONOMY

Socialist economy is an economy of the future, after the overthrow of world capitalism, after a period of transition economy, after production has surpassed the capitalist level and has been completely reorganized. It is distinguished by:

a — social ownership of the means of production, instead of private ownership as under capitalism, or ownership through the workers state as under transition economy.

b — production for use and highly planned economy, instead of production for the market and the anarchy of the profit system.

c — social labor instead of wage labor, with social bookkeeping for labor time to replace the wage-money system.

d — a surplus for society as a whole instead of the surplus value going to the exploiters.

e — the contradiction between socialized production and capitalist appropriation will be eliminated and replaced with social ownership, and in its place a new and higher contradiction will develop. Not a new contradiction of the exploitation of man by man, but a higher stage of the contradiction between Man and Nature, with Man playing a more dominant role than hitherto in harnessing the forces of Nature.

## TRANSITION ECONOMY

Neither one of these systems exists today in the Soviet Union. What exists there is Transition Economy. Generally speaking, a transition economy has elements of both capitalist and socialist economy, and in that sense represents a contradiction of the two. But speaking concretely of the Soviet Union, the Soviet economy is wracked with two additional contradictions which blur its content and warp it out of its true proportions. First, the fact that the social revolution, culminating in state

power in a BACKWARD link of the world capitalist chain, is conditioned by its "natural inheritance", a fact which must be taken together with the isolation of the revolutionary Dictatorship and the failure to date to extend that revolution to one or more advanced capitalist countries. Second, the contradiction of the Stalinist bureaucracy arising within the proletarian dictatorship, and through its false anti-proletarian policies internationally and internally changing the forward direction of development of the Transition Economy BACKWARD from socialism to capitalism. The basic theoretical premise of the Stalinist policy is the nationalist theory of "socialism in one country", running diametrically counter to the Marxian policy of the extension of the October revolution as the "long lever", and the rapid industrialization of the Soviet Union as the "short lever."

Therefore, in considering this particular transition economy we must not only consider its contradictory position in relation to capitalism and socialism, but also its character of a backward economy in which the proletariat has seized state power, and the Stalinist policy which has brought about a transition economy in decline.

#### **TRANSITION ECONOMY IN DEVELOPMENT TOWARD SOCIALISM**

Transition economy developing toward socialism represents a system where the ownership of the means of production and the decisive section of economy have been expropriated from the expropriators and are now in the hands of a Workers State. It is neither the private property relations of capitalism nor the social ownership of socialism. Production for the market gives way to the first steps toward PLANNED ECONOMY. Planning cannot overcome the material reality of a backward economy the day the plan is presented, but through planned economy lies the only road possible to achieve socialism. Wage labor is carried over, but the increase in production is shared with the workers, their standard of living must rise with the increased productivity. The surplus, instead of being the property of individuals, the private owners of the means of production, belongs to the Workers State to be utilized for international and internal steps

toward socialism. Socialized production and Workers State appropriation replace private appropriation. The economic balance sheets must reveal a greater share to the workers with increased productivity, a development of economy TOWARD SOCIALISM, a decline in the capitalist sectors that have been carried over, and an international application of the policy of socialism.

#### **TRANSITION ECONOMY IN DECLINE**

Transition economy under Stalinism, with a growth in the capitalist sectors, with great breaches for private capitalist development, with revolutionary betrayals and nationalism instead of internationalism, has been undermined until today it stands on the brink of capitalist restoration. There has been a growth of a bourgeois stratum to a challenging position within the bureaucracy. The Constitution of Stalinism has legalized this whole process.

In property relations, however, the decisive sections of the means of production and the monopoly of foreign trade still remain in the hands of the State. The basic aspects of the new property relations established by the October revolution, although undermined by Stalinism, still stand.

The planned economy has been warped by the Stalinist bureaucrats. Much of their paper victories are washed out in economic realities. Bureaucratic orders cannot replace the initiative of the masses arising out of a greater participation in the administration of economy. The advances made have been in spite of Stalinism. Stalinism represents planned economy, but false plans, incompetent, bureaucratic plans. Commodity circulation is making inroads, together with an increase in commodity production rather than its decline. Wage labor is accompanied by increased speed-up and an increased degree of exploitation. The surplus is controlled by the Stalinist bureaucrats for their own interests against the interests of the class. There is a re-development of the contradiction between socialized production and PRIVATE APPROPRIATION.

The relation of the economic foundation of society to its super-structure (state, laws, ideology, culture, standard of living, etc.) has a direct and inner-connection. In

historical development the economic base is decisive. But once the superstructure is developed and exists as a material condition, it reacts upon the economic structure within the framework of the mode of production. In the Soviet Union under the first period of transition economy developing toward socialism the superstructure also revealed this progressive development. But under Stalinism and transition economy in decay all aspects of social life of the superstructure reveal disintegration, even to the elimination of some Soviet developments and the outright return of bourgeois norms instead. The Communist Party, the trade union movement, other workers organizations, the soviets, laws, education — all have undergone a process of disintegration under declining transition economy.

### **FASCISM AND TRANSITION ECONOMY**

Ultra-lefts compare the "capitalist" economy of the Soviet Union with the totalitarian fascist states. But what they overlook is the basic economy of the Soviet Union. They confuse form and content.

The ratio of the increase of the means of production for productive purposes in the Soviet Union, despite its isolation and despite Stalinism, is unparalleled in the history of capitalism, even in the progressive stage of capitalism, and even in such nations as the US. Fascism represents "organized" starvation for the masses despite the increased production for war. Fascism organizes economy to RESTRICT production (except in war industries) and to retire more and more of the means of production.

In Spain the Anarchists thought that "free economic communes" were possible under the Capitalist State. No steps were taken to smash the bourgeois state, rather their leaders entered the bourgeois government together with the reformists. The same error the Anarchists make in the political sphere — that the capitalist state can immediately be replaced by "free" communes — the ultra lefts and reformists make in the economic sphere. They do not conceive of a transition economy, a contradiction of capitalist and socialist economy, as a necessary stage between the two. They think only in terms of EITHER capitalist economy OR socialist economy, and consequently fall into the trap of fighting progressive transition economy and sup-

porting the capitalist state against Soviets.

### **EXTEND THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION**

The overthrow of capitalism in one or more advanced countries can still save the Soviet Union from destruction. It will give the working class a decisive position in the relation of forces in world politics; it will give the internal weight in the Soviet Union to the workers, who will be able to carry through a political revolution against Stalinism and liquidate the counter-revolutionary forces; it will again start planned economy on the road TOWARD SOCIALISM.

With democratically controlled workers councils again re-established, with an armed working class in every factory and every council to insure this control, the Dictatorship of the working class AGAINST THE EXPLOITERS can carry out its historic mission.

---

## **Stalin-Hitler**

(Continued from page 1)

NOTHING to say. The bankruptcy of this policy has been so glaringly revealed that all the bureaucrats found it easier to remain silent on these questions.

Behind the back-turning on Britain and France looms Stalin's and the American C. P.'s open boot-licking of the Roosevelt administration. What new betrayals of the workers these leeches have in mind in return for an alliance with Roosevelt and the perpetuation of the bureaucracy only time will reveal. But both the policy of yesterday and the "new" policy of today are a betrayal of the Soviet Union and the world proletariat to the predatory conniving of world imperialism.

---

In the Resolution on the New Communist (4th) International (MARXIST, April, 1939, page 7), under the point "Centrism cannot be reformed", the sentence "Unification with a left centrist force..." should read "Unification with a centrist force moving to the left..."

---

### **FIGHT AGAINST THE ROOSEVELT WAR PLANS.**

# Is a Four Power Bloc in Europe Possible?

Since they were supplanted by the United States in the sphere of world markets and world economic domination, the British have been struggling to obtain a four power bloc (England, France, Germany and Italy) under British domination to be used against American imperialism and against the extension of the October Revolution. Every attempt toward this end so far has failed. Four power "agreements" have been made by these powers time and again, up to and including Munich, but none of these represented a REAL four-power bloc. Each agreement that "solved" certain difficulties only revealed greater antagonisms among these European imperialists.

## A 4 POWER BLOC AGAINST THE WORKERS.

Unity of action against the danger of a proletarian revolution by these four powers has been carried out more than once. The latest instance was the Non-Intervention Committee, which did its share in strangling the proletarian revolution in Spain, when these imperialists used Stalinism and its control of the Soviet Union and the Third International to do their dirty work. This kind of four power bloc has been and can be realized. But in such actions against the workers the antagonisms among the four powers are not eliminated; on the contrary this very unity of action against the working class leads to an increase and sharpening of the antagonisms.

The Munich conference enabled Germany and Italy to gain at the expense of the Anglo-French bloc, but this did not bring any closer the realization of the British aim of a Four Power Bloc. On the contrary, the "Munich Pact" enabled Germany to challenge England for leadership of any possible bloc. The German-Italian gains in Eastern Europe and in Spain, the Japanese gains in Asia, and Britain's Palestine difficulties, to say nothing of the Italian demands on France for colonies and the internal class storms in France, have created new difficulties in the way of the British four power bloc.

## THE ROLE OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM . .

American imperialism has aided the European imperialists in keeping the October revolution at bay; but such aid was always a two-edged sword, which was also used against Great Britain. The might of the Dollar was the great statesman of the United States in Europe to disrupt every attempt of England toward domination of Europe, either through the League of Nations, which she tried first, or through her drive for a Four Power Bloc under present day conditions in which power politics has replaced the Versailles set-up.

Of the four imperialist powers in Europe, Italy and France, due to their economic position cannot be considered as capable of achieving a position of dominance over the other imperialists. England holds the most favorable position for leadership, but since Munich she has been seriously challenged by Germany. Therefore, only Germany or England could lead such a bloc.

## WHY THE REAL FOUR POWER BLOC CANNOT BE REALIZED

The realization of the Four Power Bloc would mean that these powers in Europe have isolated the strongest imperialists — the American imperialists. With its gold reserve, its industrial base and geographical and military position, U. S. imperialism will be able in the future, as it has been in the past to disrupt a European bloc against it. The economic might of American imperialism gives her a key role in world alignments; if necessary she can buy off or otherwise intervene in the life and relations of this or that nation.

A Four Power Bloc would mean that the two largest colonial Empires, Britain and France have found a "solution" with the two most powerful "have not" imperialists. In other words a Four Power Bloc would mean that Germany comes under the domination of England, or England comes under the domination of Germany (and Italy and France under the domination of the whole).

At present Germany is excluded as the

leader of the four imperialist powers because of her internal weakness and contradictions. She could obtain this leadership only AFTER a victory in a new imperialist war. On this basis the Four Power Bloc is excluded BEFORE a new imperialist war.

On the other hand, England holds a more favorable position in relation to the other three. Nevertheless Britain is an empire in decline, and is in no position — in fact far less now than under the Versailles Treaty — to dictate terms to Germany and Italy. If England could not realize this Four Power Bloc when flushed with victory in the war and the defeat of Germany, it is all the more out of the question today with Germany a rising force. Only by and through another imperialist war could England even hope to realize this bloc as a REAL BLOC.

To lay down the thesis that the four power bloc is already consummated, or even possible under DECAY capitalism, with the present international relations, is to state that THE MAJOR STEPS TOWARD THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE UNDER CAPITALISM HAVE ALREADY BEEN ACHIEVED. If the four leading imperialist powers of Europe can “solve their internal contradictions”, which create the antagonisms, and therefore, can consummate a real Four Power Bloc — if this were possible it would enable the leader, England, through France and the other imperialists to “organize” European Capitalism.

As it stands today each European power is in the contradiction of being unable to move out too far on a world scale before “solving” its internal and European antagonisms.

The United States of Europe under CAPITALISM is impossible. Every attempt since the World War (Wilson, Versailles, Briand, etc.) proved a total failure.

European capitalism, although only a

part of world capitalism, is one of its basic and most developed parts. To lay down a thesis that the nations of Europe can “solve” their antagonisms peacefully through a Four Power Bloc, to be used for world domination, would mean that the capitalists have found a solution for the basic contradictions of the capitalist mode of production, and could therefore, not only solve the problem peacefully in Europe, but extend it internationally. This super-imperialist concept is not new. The theoreticians of the Second International and other imperialist apologists, lick-spittles of white European imperialist domination of the world, have formulated the concept of super-imperialism. The Four Power Bloc concept is based on the same false ECONOMIC concepts, even though the FORM of the structure proposed is somewhat different.

#### UNITY AND CONFLICT

In decay capitalism there is greater unity of the imperialists against the proletarian revolution. No one denies such four, five, or six power blocs. We have witnessed them on more than one occasion. But such fire-brigade “unity” of the imperialists can not be extended to elimination of the antagonism within the framework of capitalism between socialized production and private capitalist appropriation, between organized production in the factory and anarchy of production as a whole, between productive forces and markets, and so on.

The capitalist fear of war (in Europe) is their fear of a proletarian revolution. This fear has its roots in economic reality, a reality that makes every “solution” in Europe a new open door to greater contradictions carrying mankind toward a new imperialist slaughter.

The United States of Europe (a Soviet Europe) is possible only through the socialist revolution.

February 25, 1939.

—o—

---

---

**AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS OF  
THE EXPLOITERS — FOR THE DEMOCRATIC  
RIGHT OF THE WORKERS AND OPPRESSED!**



# Ludlow Bill - Mask For Social Patriotism

The Ludlow amendment for a referendum on "foreign" wars comes up again as imperialism hurtles toward the second world carnage. While Roosevelt and the New Deal forces and supporters oppose the amendment and demand a free hand for their pro-war propaganda and armament expenditures, an opposing group of the boss class forces, led mainly by the imperialist "isolationists" and the pacifists, stands behind the amendment.

Ham Fish, Ludlow, a group of prominent senators, the Farmer-Labor Partyites, Progressives, Pacifists, Lovestoneites, Trotskyites, and what not have all indicated their support to this or a similar amendment. Each group has its own reason for this support, often in violent conflict with the position of the other groups. Even many of the "right wing" Democrats and Republicans will probably make use of it as a blow against Roosevelt.

While Roosevelt aims at a unified labor movement on the basis of class collaboration behind the New Deal program and its war drive, he will be unable to win many of the militant elements in the labor movement behind such an open program. There is a danger that the Ludlow amendment will derail many of these forces from arriving at a healthy opposition and fill them with the opium of pacifism and democratic illusions.

## ONLY "AGGRESSIVE" WARS

The amendment is limited specifically to foreign and "aggressive" wars. It provides no "right" to vote should the Western Hemisphere be "attacked." Its distinction between aggressive and defensive wars is the old, old swindle that has been used to secure working class support for the slaughter-fests of the exploiters. What imperialist war has not been a defensive war to the bourgeoisie? What bourgeoisie has ever participated in a war except for the most humanitarian purposes, in the best interests of civilization?

Despite their opposition to the war drive, practically all the supporters of the amendment support in one degree or another the gigantic war appropriations of

the administration. Even the Pacifists and Thomas Socialists are against only a "super" navy and "aggressive" armaments!

The Stalinists, oriented on the New Deal, go down to the line with it, backing Roosevelt 100% in the opposition to the amendment. These pro-war agitators support the armament budget and are dissatisfied with the New Deal only in that it does not drive faster and harder for war.

## "VOTE" AGAINST WAR

No referendum, not even a referendum on ANY war in which the US may be involved, can serve the interests of the working class. The idea of a "vote against war" is based on the illusion that democracy exists in imperialist America, that the masses can really use the democratic institutions to express and carry through their struggle against war, their desires for better conditions, work, plenty, security and happiness.

But the bourgeoisie controls the means of propaganda, the radio, press, schools, movies, and so on. It will loose a flood of propaganda and patriotic sentiment that will engulf the nation. With the imperialist propaganda mills rolling day and night, with the violent suppression of working class rights and workers revolutionary organizations, of what value will be a vote on the eve of the war — if we are foolish enough to believe that the bourgeoisie will at all bother to conduct a vote. The masses "voted" against war in 1916 when they elected Wilson. A few months later American workers were dying on the battlefields and shooting down their brothers. This is a never to be forgotten lesson.

To teach the masses to place their faith in a referendum as a means of preventing war is to betray the struggle against war. Revolutionary class action before and during the war is the ONLY weapon that the working class can use in its struggle. Referendums, disarmament conferences, arbitration courts, collective security pacts, are so much dust in the eyes of the masses, a screen behind which the imperialists prepare for the coming war and secure the support of the disoriented masses.

## PARLIAMENTARY PLANE

Bills and parliamentary activity as a whole, even when conducted under the leadership of the revolutionary Marxian organization and its representatives in Congress, can at best be only a subsidiary aspect of the class struggle activity of the working class. But bills put forward by bourgeois reformists and politicians cannot aid the working class. To put the struggle on this axis makes the working class a tail to the reformists. It derails the class struggle from the economic and class plain to supporting or opposing this or that BILL. All the "labor" legislation of the bourgeoisie, passed under pressure of the working class, has been used against the working class as soon as the bourgeoisie was strong enough to do so. The Sherman "anti-trust" laws in the '90s were used against trade unions in an attempt to break them up as trusts in restraint of trade.

The Mahoney bill in Minnesota, (supported by the Trotskyites), that the state government open up and finance certain factories to be run under "workers control," proposes workers control under the capitalist state, within the framework of capitalism. It is a trap for the working class, taking it off the road for a real struggle for workers control of production for use — a struggle which can be carried on only with a simultaneous struggle against the capitalist state, for its overthrow and the establishment of a workers council government.

This holds true a 100% in relation to taking the struggle against imperialist war away from the point of production, out of the factories and unions, and putting it on the parliamentary plane.

## OPPORTUNISM IN ACTION

The Trotskyites, in the February issue of their New International in 1938 came out against the Ludlow amendment. But by 1939 they had changed their tune. Under pressure of the right wing and of Trotsky from Mexico the Trotskyite "Socialist Appeal" (Feb. 10, 1939) states: "...The people must and shall demand the right to decide their own fate... for a popular referendum on war!" In the April 4, 1939 issue of the Appeal we find "Supporting the Ludlow amendment with necessary ex-

planation and criticism affords us a real opportunity to expose Roosevelt, the Stalinists and all other advocates of a war to save capitalist profits."

A year ago the Trotskyites launched a vicious attack on the opportunism and class collaborationism of the Lovestone group who supported the amendment. Today the Trotskyites are close to the open reformist position of the Lovestoneites. The Trotskyites call on "class conscious workers to take the lead in mobilizing the workers behind the Ludlow amendment..." Those who talk about "exposing Roosevelt" by telling the workers to support a fake pacifist amendment, by putting the fight against war on a parliamentary plane, are building a bridge to reformism, to outright social patriotism when the war is declared.

Not parliamentary activity, and fake pacifist referendums at that, but working class organization and action based on an independent class struggle line is the way to fight imperialist war. Revolutionary Marxists fight imperialist war on the basis of the line of revolutionary defeatism.

Revolutionary defeatism is the policy of revolutionists working for the defeat of their "own" bourgeoisie and their armed forces, even if it means the "victory" of the "enemy" bourgeoisie. It does not mean simply "being in favor of" defeatism but saying our forces are too weak at present to carry on such activity; it means WORKING FOR the defeat of "our own" bourgeoisie. It does not mean merely changing bourgeois governments (substituting a Labor Party government, for example, for some other capitalist government). It means the defeat of our own bourgeois class and its ARMED FORCES.

It does not mean such a defeat of our own bourgeoisie and its armed forces merely by the action of the working class overthrowing the bourgeoisie; it means also working for the "defeat" of the bourgeoisie even if it means the "victory" of the "enemy" bourgeoisie, with the working class taking advantage of the situation. Revolutionary defeatism is not equivalent to "turning the imperialist war into civil war." Turning the imperialist war into civil war is our aim, revolutionary defeatism is the method and strategy for achieving this aim.

# Workers Control Of Production For Use - Supplement

The Third Convention of the Revolutionary Workers League adopted the following supplement on Workers Control of Production as further material and clarification of the document in the April issue of the Marxist (Vol. 5, No. 1).

The present period in the United States is one of economic breakdown with the resultant instability and tension. The situation can be transformed almost overnight to take on a pre-revolutionary character. It cannot at this stage be considered pre-revolutionary, but neither is it merely a continuation of the previous "normal" development of capitalism.

Under these conditions the slogan of Workers Control of Production for Use can serve as a rallying cry and a lever to set the masses into motion. It is an essential slogan to raise the struggle of the class to the next higher stage; it points the way, yet does not separate the vanguard from the class.

The relationship of the reformist and centrist movements to Workers Control of Production for Use, as pointed out in the last issue of the MARXIST, is one of emasculating its content and distorting its function, of disorientating the class into a capitulation to capitalism in the long run. The key error of the reformist and centrist position is the concept of Workers Control under the capitalist state, under capitalism.

## THE ULTRA LEFT POSITION

The ultra lefts approach the question from the opposite angle, just as false politically. Their errors may be summarized as follows: a) ignoring the capitalist state (as in Spain), failing to understand the relationship of the struggle for Workers Control of Production to the state; b) a separation of the "ultimate" demands from the "immediate" demands — a failure to coordinate the two.

Revolutionary Marxists call for mass action for workers control of production for use (seizure of mines, mills, factories, land, etc.) only in a pre-revolutionary situation, or where the class relations have reached the point where such an action of

seizure will lead into the pre-revolutionary situation. They reject the POLICY of advocating and attempting in every strike and class action in the present stage, to seize mines and factories. Such a policy would be adventurist and would lead to certain defeat for the class.

## TACTICAL APPLICATIONS

It would be false, however, today to oppose under all conditions action of the class toward workers control on an independent working class line. The general breakdown of the economy has its effects in differing degrees in different industries and sections. In some the degree and tempo of breakdown and the level of development of the working class is greater than in others, giving to the slogan of workers control a dual character. Propaganda for workers control under these conditions will, in certain industries and areas before others, be transformed into action. Such mass action can react back to raise to higher levels the propaganda for workers control and turn this propaganda into a struggle for action on a broader scale.

We can propose action today, at least partial, in giant strike waves. In general strikes in a city or industry there will be workers control in handling transportation of milk and foodstuffs, running power plants, communications, and essential hospital services. Such actions would not be workers control of production for use in the full sense. But such actions are valuable, necessary, and unavoidable experiences for the class in that direction. Similar action can also be raised in the unemployed field. In fact, here we can go a bit further — workers control of relief funds, mass action to open the warehouses, etc.

The propaganda character of the struggle for Workers Control of Production for Use today must be concretized at this stage in developing factory committees, defense corps, and other organs as the embryos for the instruments for Workers Control under dual power and the Workers Council Government.

JUST OUT  
Two New Pamphlets

---

# LESSONS OF SPAIN NEGRO SLAVERY

Then And Now

---

**5 Cents Each**

---

---

## Two In One

### BUILD THE "MARXIST"

Contribute your share today! Take advantage of our two-for-one subscription offer — two yearly subscriptions to the FIGHTING WORKER and THE MARXIST, both for \$1.00 — and mail your sub in NOW!

I am enclosing \$..... for the special subscription offer and/or \$..... contribution to the RWL Press fund.

Address .....

Name .....