

The Proposed Changes In the Communist Organization

"What becomes of the theory that wars and revolutions are inevitable?"

By Robert Minor

We answer by asking a counter-question: "Does the present situation, the central fact of which is the biggest war of all times, tend to 'weaken' the theory of the inevitability of wars? Let us be concrete. The Tehran agreement is based upon the conviction that the biggest and bloodiest struggle of all time is inevitable now. It is an agreement to reject all thought of alternatives and to go through with inevitable all-out war. This agreement is based on the theoretical and practical conclusion that nothing can substitute for the complete violent destruction of the great military establishments of the Axis.



ROBERT MINOR

Viewed in this concrete way, does Tehran seem to "weaken" the theory of the inevitability of military violence, for the present time, or does it confirm the inevitability?

The questioner doubtless has in mind also the future. Let us be concrete about that, too.

The Marxist theory concerning the inevitability of war is a theory that connects this inevitability with definite epochs of history and limits it to such epochs.

Only the Marxist labor movement brought into the world a clear perspective and a scientific proof that the inevitability of war was limited to historical epochs and could and would be brought to an end. Especially the Marxist-Leninist movement proved that under the conditions of the imperialist epoch that began with this century, wars were inevitable, and that the bourgeois pacifist movement was no more than a support of the imperialist war makers and a blind for their plans.

At the beginning of this series of answers, I spoke of the fact that the problems we face today are without precedent, that the world situation of today is different from all situations that ever went before. I pointed out that the

most colossal change that has come into the world is the establishment of a great socialist state, together with the fact that the socialist state grew to be enormously strong politically and economically and in the logic of its nature proved itself to be a military factor without superior in the world while at the same time devoted by its very nature to every possible practicable elimination of war and the establishment of peaceful cooperation among the peoples.

If already, by the strength that is brought to democracy as a whole by this great new force, when only one great people in a socialist people, the banishing of wars "for many generations" is made possible—are we to consider this a refutation of Marxism? Or reject the achievement? There are some small minds that imagine that the manifest role of the socialist state makes no difference in the general situation, who think that it doesn't affect the question of the inevitability of wars. Such men think—within the narrow circles of their formal logic—that since this is still the epoch of imperialism, and since wars are inevitable under imperialism, therefore there cannot be a long period of many generations of peace established now by Tehran.

But to hold such a short-sighted view would be to overlook precisely the potency of the great new force that has entered into the world and changed the situation.

Because of the existence of the socialist state as a great power, and because it has become possible to form the Tehran coalition, the conditions spoken of as the inevitability of wars does not bind mankind in this generation.

Let us be concrete again. War by whom against whom? At the successful conclusion of this war it will no longer be possible for any sane person to believe that any force on earth can make successful war against either China or any of the states on the European continent, or against the Soviet Union or the United Kingdom. A moment's thought will show that the forces do not exist which could conduct such a war successfully, under conditions of the existence of the agreement of nations to prevent such a war, plus the relationship of national forces throughout the world.

It is equally true that, while the strongest power of both Europe and Asia is a socialist state, there cannot be mobilized a force in either Europe or Asia or both, that could undertake a serious war against the United States. We will leave for later treatment the question of the smaller states of the western hemisphere and the United States.

Now about the inevitability of revolutions. Doubtless the questioner means revolutions in the sense of violent upheavals for the establishment of socialism, since he could hardly mean to raise a question of constitutional struggle.

We do not now have a perspective of civil war in Europe or elsewhere after the close of the present war and the elimination of the Quisling governments from Europe and elsewhere by civil war and coalition war combined.

In the coalition there are all the requisites for an expansion and stabilization of the world market, such as has never been possible under any conditions of the past. Because such a coordination is agreed upon, the heads of the three great powers "are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace"—will "banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations."

We think they are correct.

From the economic aspect as well as the political character of the arrangements made at Tehran and the auxiliary conferences, one derives a perspective of a long period of world peace and internal peace. This cannot but mean a period without violent disturbances and without changes in economic systems of countries unless through peaceful and constitutional procedure. The very strong presumption is against any sudden and violent upheavals for abolition of the capitalist system in the various countries.

But we leave the further handling of it to tomorrow's Daily Worker, in which three questions will be answered together:

"Would civil wars in Europe bring about the collapse of the capitalist system and the establishment of socialism?"

"Why should it be our duty to prevent civil war?"

"Didn't you, yourself, Mr. Minor, quote Lenin as saying: 'Great affairs in the life of nations are settled only by force?'"