

# INTERNAL BULLETIN

VOL. VI; No. 5

September, 1944

15¢

Issued by  
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY  
116 University Place  
New York City

## CONTENTS

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| Why We Publish All the Plenum Material,<br>by the Political Committee. . . . .                   | Page 1 |
| International Resolution (First Draft of Plenum<br>Resolutions Committee, October 1943). . . . . | 1      |
| Proposed International Resolution as amended<br>by Morrow . . . . .                              | 14     |
| Morrison Amendments. . . . .   | 20     |
| Letter from Cassidy. . . . .   | 24     |
| The Morrow Document, By Lydia Bennett . . . . .  | 26     |
| Supplement to Discussion Article on Morrow<br>Document, By Lydia Bennett . . . . .               | 31     |

## WHY WE PUBLISH ALL THE PLENUM MATERIAL

We are including in this bulletin all of the material that was placed before the October 1943 Plenum of the National Committee dealing with the International Resolution. This material provided the basis for the Plenum discussion which was elaborated in the resolution published in the December 1943 issue of the Fourth International (republished in the Internal Bulletin, Vol. VI, No. 3.)

The documents presented are identified as follows:

- (1) The original resolution as submitted by a sub-committee of the Political Committee to the Plenum for discussion and decision.
- (2) The additional paragraphs embodying amendments submitted by the resolutions sub-committee.
- (3) Proposed amendments by Morrow.
- (4) Proposed amendments by Morrison which were accepted by Morrow who withdrew his own amendments in favor of the Morrison amendments.

We are issuing these Plenum documents only as a concession to the demand of Comrade Morrow who insists that the various drafts and amendments which were discussed by the Plenum be published. The National Committee has never withheld any documents essential to a rounded pre-convention discussion and in this case we are even issuing documents which in our opinion are unnecessary. We do so in order to sweep aside any unfounded charge of suppression of documents which could only serve to sidetrack the fundamental political issues that may be in dispute.

We do not think these documents are essential to the clarification of the issues, the education of the party membership, or as an aid to the party rank and file in arriving at a correct point of view. On the contrary, we feel that such a procedure will confuse more than clarify by cluttering up the discussion with preliminary and tentative documents parts of which were rejected, other parts withdrawn, and parts incorporated in the final draft of the International Resolution as adopted by the Plenum.

The party constitution provides that, between conventions, the Plenum of the National Committee is empowered to issue resolutions establishing the party position on various questions. The process under which such resolutions take form is as follows:

- (1) The Political Committee designates a resolutions committee to submit a draft resolution which is usually written by an individual comrade, discussed, amended, altered or elaborated by the resolutions committee and then submitted to the P.C.
- (2) The resolutions committee draft is then discussed by the Political Committee which makes any further changes it deems necessary.

(3) The preliminary draft, as amended by the Political Committee, is then submitted to the National Committee meeting in Plenary session where, after further discussion, amendment and action, it becomes the position of the party subject to the approval of the national convention.

It thus becomes obvious that the position of the National Committee cannot be established on the basis of preliminary drafts, of which there may be a goodly number, but only on the basis of the resolution as it finally appears after full discussion in the National Committee.

This procedure is an integral part of the operation of the democratic process in the collective leadership of the party. In this way not only does the entire National Committee exercise its right to place its own stamp upon the resolution, but the party itself gets better resolutions in the end. That is also why the Leninist principle of democracy, which guides our actions in the collective leadership as well as in the ranks of our party, gives the best political and theoretical results.

What political purpose can be served by insisting upon the publication of all drafts as well as the final resolution? The subcommittee which was responsible for the first draft of the Plenum resolution did not and would not contend that its text was final and perfect. Certainly it is not to the discredit of the individual authors of the first draft if they concurred in strengthening and clarifying the resolution, to say nothing of rectifying any omissions or mistakes, etc. They are to be commended rather than condemned for showing that they had the capacity to learn from the debate of the full Plenum.

Such collective leadership and methods can only strengthen the assurance of the party members that the Plenum of the National Committee really leads the party, and leads it more wisely than any individual could. Everyone on the plenary leading staff makes his contribution to the task at hand and, according to his capacities, plays a role in the final result. The strength and solidarity of the National Committee depends upon this ability of its individual members to work together.

Political Committee

~~#####~~

First Draft of Resolution as Submitted by the  
Resolutions Committee to Plenum in October, 1943.

INTERNATIONAL RESOLUTION

(Draft)

(1) This plenum of the National Committee meets one year after the Tenth National Convention of the Socialist Workers Party. The Political Resolution unanimously adopted by that convention set forth the basic position of the Fourth International and the Socialist Workers Party on the imperialist war and the tasks of the proletarian world revolution.

(2) Everything that has happened since has operated to confirm our Marxist analysis of the world situation and to reinforce our political and strategic conclusions based upon the revolutionary conviction that the workers in alliance with the peasants and colonial peoples will prove capable of overthrowing capitalism and organizing the foundations of an international socialist society of peace, security, human solidarity and unbounded progress.

(3) The course of events during the past year can be summarized in four major developments of historical significance. These are: (1) the downfall of Mussolini and the collapse of Italian fascism, signaling the beginning of the Italian, and consequently, the European revolution; (2) the growing preponderance of Anglo-American military power over that of the Axis camp, which has already exposed Wall Street's aspirations to replace Nazi Germany as master and oppressor of Europe and thrown into bold relief the counter-revolutionary role of American imperialism on the world arena; (3) the colossal victories of the Red Armies and the widening rift between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-American allies; (4) the formal dissolution of the Comintern.

Lessons of the Italian Events

(4) Italian fascism which set out to rejuvenate tottering Italian capitalism over the broken bones of the revolting workers and peasants utterly exhausted itself within two decades. The murderous regime which its leader boasted would build a new Roman Empire hardly lasted long enough to celebrate its twentieth anniversary. The workers and peasants simply refused to fight, to work, or to sacrifice for the fascist state which gave them nothing but oppression, misery, starvation and broken promises. The middle classes lost all confidence in the corrupt, incompetent, vainglorious Bonapartist gangsters headed by the mountebank Mussolini. Finally even the ruling classes, the capitalists, landed proprietors, the Church, the Royal Family, the military caste and part of his own governing clique found it expedient to dump Mussolini in the hope of saving themselves from complete catastrophe. With the

entire people in opposition, the African Empire lost, the national economy bankrupt, facing occupation by two superior hostile armies, "fascism, at the end, broke apart like a rotten apple." To this epitaph Marshal Badoglio added: "Not the slightest resistance to the change was met even from any of the 7,000,000 belonging to the fascist party proper."

(5) This annihilating collapse of Italian fascism pricks like a soap-bubble all those theories spawned by the renegades from Marxism that fascism is some new form of managerial or bureaucratic-collective society destined to replace capitalism and bar the road to socialism. It is now clear that these pretentious theories really represented a special form of intellectual capitulation and adaptation to fascism. The Italian experience has once for all demonstrated that fascism is essentially the political instrument of monopoly capitalism in its death agony.

(6) The crumbling of fascism in Italy provides further evidence of the bankruptcy of bourgeois rule. All the repressions, pretensions, and demagogy of their fascist mercenaries did not enable Big Business to stifle the class struggle and prevent it from developing. On the contrary, under the iron lid of fascism the class frictions generated enough explosive pressure to blow the regime to bits.

(7) The Italian workers exhibited the irrepressible power of their class in modern society. Fascism had smashed all the mass organizations of the Italian workers, their unions, cooperatives and political parties; murdered, imprisoned, exiled their best leaders; excommunicated revolutionary ideas and forbade their expression; chained the workers to the bosses through the totalitarian state; isolated them from the rest of the world. Nevertheless, the defeated and atomized proletariat gradually reassembled their forces, lifted themselves to their feet, resumed their struggle for freedom and bread; brought forth new leaders out of their ranks; and moved to settle accounts with their oppressors at the first favorable opportunity.

(8) Mussolini signed his death-warrant by dragging the Italian people into the imperialist adventure of the Second World War. After three years of torture and horror, the masses began to revolt. Workers and peasants in uniform refused to fight, deserted, retreated or surrendered. The industrial workers of Milan, Turin, Bologna went out on strike. Gigantic peace demonstrations were staged in the streets and squares of the principal cities.

(9) Terrified by the rising revolt of the people, by the total bankruptcy of fascism, and by the prospective invasion of the Anglo-American armies, the possessing classes, headed by the monarchy and its military aides and inspired by the Vatican, hastened to depose Mussolini and set up a military-monarchist dictatorship in

place of fascism. By a timely coup d'etat these palace conspirators hoped to forestall the people's revolution against the detested fascist gang.

(10) But their removal of Mussolini provoked the most unintended and contradictory consequences. Instead of dampening the rebellious spirit, this move enormously heightened the revolutionary mood and spurred the masses to more daring actions. No sooner did the news of Mussolini's downfall become known than the pent-up revolutionary feelings of the people manifested themselves with titanic force. The people poured into the streets in continual joyous demonstrations; they hunted out and vented their wrath upon the fascist vermin; opened the prisons and liberated the political prisoners; exulted in their newly-regained freedom. They demanded an end to the war. Parties came out from underground, trade unions arose, a free press was established, workers and soldiers councils were organized, and fraternization began. Returned exiles and liberated political prisoners took their places at the head of the masses. Through a series of militant strikes the workers addressed their demands to the Badoglio government.

(11) These developments disclosed the indubitable features of a genuine revolutionary uprising in which the masses directly intervene as an active and decisive force in the determination of events. This stormy movement threatened to sweep over the heads of King Victor Emmanuel and his Marshal Badoglio and upset their new monarchist-militarist government which had succeeded fascism. To prevent any further political overturns to the left, all the forces of reaction combined against the insurgent workers and peasants. Badoglio decreed martial law, forbid public assemblies of more than three persons, took measures to drive the workers back into the factories, shot and jailed their leaders, censored the press, duplicating all the practices of Mussolini's dictatorship.

(12) While trying to beat down the revolution in the first weeks, Badoglio dangled the prospect of peace before the war-wearied Italian people. He utilized against the workers the military forces both of the Nazis and of the Anglo-American bloc with whom he was negotiating terms for collaboration. Badoglio and his generals permitted the Nazis to occupy Northern Italy while Anglo-American planes bombed the revolutionary centers of Milan, Turin and Bologna.

(13) These military-monarchist plots against the revolution were facilitated and shielded by the policies of the Socialist, Stalinist and liberal parties which abused the confidence of the masses. Instead of arousing and organizing the people for the overthrow of the Badoglio dictatorship and the creation of a Workers and Peasants Republic, these compromise parties held the workers back from struggle; advised them to trust the new government; and wait until peace and liberty were bestowed upon them by the King and Badoglio in alliance with the Anglo-American forces. This combina-

tion of repression and deceit enabled the ex-accomplices of Mussolini to arrest the development of the revolutionary conflagration and to flee when ready into the embrace of the Allies.

(14) After ruining the country, the utterly reactionary possessing classes have helped convert Italy into a battleground for the rival imperialist camps. Whichever side they may deal with at the moment, both sections of the divided bourgeoisie side with the foreign oppressors against their own people. While Mussolini calls upon the Italians to die for the resurrection of fascism and for nazism, the King and Badoglio solicit them to die for a military-monarchist dictatorship and for Anglo-American imperialism.

(15) The cynical conduct of the Italian ruling classes confirms the great political lesson taught the workers by the French bourgeoisie after the fall of the Third Republic. The capitalist class cares nothing for democracy, national independence or the welfare of the masses. Profits, power, privileges and property are their sole concern. Whenever their political predominance and their social and economic interests are imperiled by the proletariat, the possessing classes are capable of unlimited crimes against the nation and the people.

(16) The Italian workers and peasants can find their way to peace and freedom only by tearing political and economic power out of the hands of the capitalists and uniting with their fellow workers of Europe in a war against them all. The revolutionary fighters of Italy have already performed deathless deeds. They were the main force which toppled Mussolini and his rotten regime. They gave a magnificent rehearsal of the forthcoming Europe-wide proletarian revolution. They inspired with fresh hope and courage the masses of all Europe.

(17) But the Italian workers, isolated and caught between the armies of the rival imperialist camps, have been temporarily driven back on the defensive. They were not given time to organize their own strong Marxist party. The treacherous Stalinist and reformist leaders therefore had a free hand to restrain and disorient the masses. The Axis and Allied armies are now, each in their own way, striving to finish the work of strangling the revolution.

(18) Despite betrayal and bloody repressions, the Italian workers fight on. They thereby serve notice that the Italian revolution still lives. The continued resistance of the workers under the prevailing adverse conditions gives assurance that they will resume their forward march as soon as the opportunity presents itself.

(19) The sequence of events since the fall of Mussolini has shown the interconnection between the Italian revolution and the European revolution. The further course of the Italian revolution is bound up with the course of the European, and especially the

German, revolution. The heroic actions of the Italian workers have kindled revolutionary sentiments and ideas throughout the continent and shaken regimes from Madrid to Berlin and Budapest. The subsequent unfolding of the maturing revolution elsewhere in Europe will in turn impart a powerful new impetus to the temporarily defeated Italian revolution.

(20) The developments in Italy have posed point-blank all the major problems of the European revolution. They have confirmed the Marxist conclusions that the only revolutionary social forces are the workers in alliance with the peasants. The only kind of revolution the working class can and will lead is the socialist revolution. The only alternative to the continued rule of monopoly capitalism is the Workers' and Farmers' Government based upon Workers, Soldiers and Peasants Councils.

(21) The decay of capitalism and the acuteness of class conflicts forbid another extended period of bourgeois democracy for war-torn Europe. While interim regimes modeled after the Weimar Republic may be set up here and there as by-products of uncompleted revolutionary movements, they must by their very nature prove short-lived. They must either give way before the conquest of power by the revolutionary workers or the military-police dictatorship of the capitalist counter-revolution.

(22) The proletarian revolution may begin in one country, but no European country can make its way out of the war and the catastrophic crisis of contemporary civilization by itself alone. A victorious revolution in any single European country would immediately be compelled to defend itself from military attack by the imperialists and would have to appeal for international proletarian aid by revolutionary means. In the ensuing struggles, it would not be possible to maintain the outlived and arbitrarily drawn borders of the existing national states and the proletariat has no interest in attempting to do so. The national state which once provided the historical arena for the development of the productive forces has long since become a reactionary fetter upon them. The unpostponable historical task of the European peoples is the revolutionary destruction of the reactionary national state and the creation of the Socialist United States of Europe. Peace, security and prosperity can be assured only by the economic unification and socialist collaboration of the free nations of Europe. The only power capable of solving these tasks is the revolutionary proletariat. The central unifying slogan of its fight is "The Socialist United States of Europe."

(23) Europe, today enslaved by the Nazis, will tomorrow be overrun by Anglo-American imperialism with identical aims. The entire combined forces of the European proletariat will be needed to organize and lead the people in revolutionary struggle against their oppressors. The slogan of "The Socialist United States of



Europe" will serve as the great rallying cry of unity against the counter-revolutionary schemes of the Anglo-American bloc to colonize, exploit, Balkanize and dismember the European continent. This slogan will inspire and guide the European workers in their struggle for power. Through the Socialist United States of Europe -- and not otherwise -- they will achieve their economic unification, fraternal solidarity, social and cultural progress. Only on this basis will ruined and shattered Europe be lifted to its feet again and rise to new heights.

#### The Counter-Revolutionary Role of American Capitalism

(24) In his last great document, "The Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution", Trotsky predicted that "only the United States is destined to surpass the German murder machine." This preponderance, first felt in the aid extended to England, has everywhere begun to assert itself with increasing force. The industrial, financial and military power of the United States has become the decisive factor in the inter-imperialist struggle for world domination.

(25) Washington's diplomatic dealings and political acts during the past year have served to expose the pretense that this war is being waged to defend democracy against fascism and to extend the "Four Freedoms" throughout the world. They have disclosed the real reactionary character of the war aims of Washington which have been dictated by the drive of American Big Business for political mastery and economic monopoly of the world.

(26) The slogan of "the war for democracy against fascism" was considerably tarnished from the outset by the inclusion of the Vargas, Batista, and other despotic governments in the "United Nations" coalition; by demonstrative friendship for the butcher Franco of Spain and Dictator Salazar of Portugal; by the wooing of Petain, the patronage of Otto of Habsburg and various European monarchs-in-exile. Today the deals with Darlan and Badoglio outline in precise terms the counter-revolutionary policies and imperialist aims of Anglo-American capitalism.

(27) The deal with Darlan, the executioner of Vichy and Hitler's collaborator, was designed to maintain French imperial relations, to win the allegiance of the French capitalists, the colonial governors and military caste. The old system of colonial oppression and super-exploitation remains unchanged; neither the African natives nor the French colonial workers have acquired democracy through Anglo-American occupation.

(28) In Sicily AMGOT kept at their posts all but the most notorious and hated fascist officials as well as the same police. The people are forbidden to carry on political activities; the press is controlled. "The fascist label is removed," cables the

N.Y. Times reporter, "but the same men carry on the same functions."

(29) This policy has been climaxed by the deal with Marshal Badoglio and King Victor Emmanuel, who supported fascism for more than twenty years and whose sole backing comes from the industrialists, bankers and big landowners. Roosevelt and Churchill are using their armies and resources to prop up this military-monarchist dictatorship, detested and distrusted by the Italian masses. They do not want the Italian people to have a government of their own free choice for fear that such a regime would make inroads upon capitalist property and power.

(30) The policies pursued by the Allied leaders in North Africa, Sicily and Italy demonstrate that their backing of the ultra-reactionary forces are neither accidental deviations nor "military expedients" but flow from a calculated plan which is dictated by the interests and necessities of the Anglo-American imperialists. They provide a preview of the Anglo-American program in Europe. These capitalist powers aim to impose new forms of servitude upon the European peoples. They propose to crush all manifestations of revolutionary independence by the European workers and to set up military-monarchist-clerical dictatorships under the tutelage and hegemony of Anglo-American Big Business. They have concluded an alliance with the world-general staff of reaction and obscurantism, the Vatican, to promote the realization of their counter-revolutionary schemes.

(31) The Allies cannot afford to sanction the slightest democracy in Europe. Their armies have come, not to liberate, but to subjugate the continent. The Allies shrink from encouraging popular democratic movements of liberation because they fear that these would release the powers of the working class and flow toward the channels of socialist revolution. Roosevelt and Churchill understand that it is not in the cards to establish stable "democratic" capitalist governments in Europe today. Given free scope, given their democratic rights, the European working class will not require overly much time to organize its revolutionary party, and to overthrow all of its capitalist oppressors. The choice, from the Roosevelt-Churchill point of view, is a Franco-type government or the spectre of the socialist revolution. These movements of emancipation can develop and conquer, not in collaboration with Anglo-American forces, but only in struggle against them.

(32) By their attempts to replace the Nazis as the masters of Europe the Allied imperialists will thereby transfer to themselves all the consequences which prevented Hitler from "pacifying" the continent. The burning hatred of the European peoples, now directed and vented against their Nazi oppressors, will be turned tomorrow with intensified ferocity against Yankee imperialism.

(33) The greatest contribution American revolutionists can make to the fight for socialism in Europe is to expose these counter-revolutionary aims; struggle relentlessly against them; arouse the American workers against the reactionary program of Big Business and awaken sentiments of solidarity with their hard-pressed class brothers in Europe and all other parts of the world.

#### Significance of the Soviet Victories

(34) The prodigious vitality of the October Revolution is strikingly demonstrated in the Red Army victories over Nazi imperialism. While France and Italy, victors in the last war, crumpled before invading armies, the Soviet Union stood up under unprecedented defeats and losses and flung back the assault of the mighty Nazi military machine. The superior powers of resistance and recuperation of the USSR flow essentially from the fact that the proletarian revolution, which was crushed in France and Italy, conquered in the Soviet Union.

(35) The unbreakable will to struggle and high morale of the Soviet armies and peoples refute those renegades who, recoiling against the crimes of the Stalinist bureaucracy, deserted the workers' state in its hour of mortal peril. They gave up the Soviet Union for lost at the very moment when the state which issued from the October Revolution was about to exhibit unprecedented defensive powers in the supreme test on the field of battle.

(36) The USSR, by virtue of the social foundations laid down by the October revolution, still remains a workers' state in fundamental contradiction with world imperialism. The reactions of the Allies to the Soviet successes and their repercussions among the capitalist rulers of the neighboring countries once again shows that the imperialists, at least, recognize this fact. The prospect of further Red Army advances has terrified rather than encouraged the "democratic" capitalist world and produced a growing breach between the Kremlin and its Anglo-American allies. Despite Stalin's subservience, the subsequent development of this division can and must lead to an open break, and eventually to armed conflict, between the USSR and Anglo-American imperialism.

(37) The "enigmatic" character of Stalin's policies which so perplexes bourgeois commentators is explained by the contradictory position of the Soviet bureaucracy which conducts its reactionary nationalistic policies upon the social foundations of a degenerated workers state encircled by imperialism. Stalin's nationalist outlook impels him to bargain with the imperialists for territorial and strategic concessions on the periphery of the USSR at the expense of the betrayal of the international proletariat. The inevitable consequences of such a treacherous policy have already been demonstrated by Stalin's dealings with Hitler. No sooner had Stalin's ally, Hitler, conquered Western Europe than he hurled his might against the Soviet Union.

(38) Stalin's Anglo-American allies cannot act otherwise. Once established in a dominating position upon the European continent, they, like Hitler, would of necessity seek to surround and strangle the USSR in order to crush and dismember the Soviet Union, restore capitalist private property, and open up a vast new field of resources for imperialist exploitation.

(39) Stalin is aware of the perils to the USSR implicit in the conquest and consolidation of Europe by the Anglo-American imperialists over the prostrate body of Germany. His foreign policy can appear to be temporarily effective only if Europe is divided between conflicting camps which can neutralize each other and permit him to maneuver between them. A decisive victory of one over the other can only be followed by war against the USSR.

(40) The Soviet Union could frustrate the imperialist designs of the Anglo-American war-camp and secure itself against attack, by stimulating and supporting revolutionary uprisings of the European peoples. But the Moscow ruling caste will no more dare to pursue this course against its present allies than against Hitler. A victorious proletarian revolution in any major European country would soon spread across the borders of the USSR; arouse and heighten the self-confidence of the Soviet masses; regenerate the October revolution and doom the hated Kremlin clique.

(41) Stalin's policy, bankrupt through and through, consists in seeking a middle way between these two principled lines. On one hand, he sets up "Free Germany" and "Free Poland" Committees and supports the Yugoslav Partisans and similar movements as counterweights to Anglo-American influence. He plays with the hopelessly utopian and reactionary program of reconstituting pseudo-democratic regimes upon a capitalist basis with a "friendly" orientation towards the USSR.

(42) But Stalin cannot turn back the wheel of history. It is impossible to set up a new series of Weimar Republics in Europe. Either the socialist revolution will triumph throughout Europe or the helpless continent will become the victim and vassal of Anglo-American imperialism. Either the Soviet Union will secure itself in alliance with the European proletariat or it will be eventually destroyed by the imperialists. There are no other alternatives. The Stalinist bureaucracy is doomed in either case. It is not a new "class" as renegades and philistines denominate it, but a parasitic caste, transitory in nature.

(43) Those professional defeatists who foresee only a repetition of the Spanish events in Stalin's political maneuvers in Europe ignore the vast difference in conditions between the Spanish revolution and the coming European revolution. A pre-war revolution in the corner of Europe could be isolated, strangled and sold out as

part of the Kremlin's diplomatic maneuvers. A continental revolution cannot be harnessed by any bureaucracy, including the Stalinist, or permanently held down by any imperialist power, including the Anglo-American.

(44) These defeatists ignore above all the independent revolutionary action of the masses and assign them a purely passive role as though Stalin and the Anglo-American imperialists were two gangs of butchers cutting up a dead carcass. The task of revolutionary fighters is to arouse the masses for action in their own name, independently of Stalin and the imperialists, not to speculate, as passive observers, on their designs, and still less to take for granted the success of these designs.

(45) Another deal by Stalin with the German ruling class would bring only a temporary respite in preparation for another installment of the war. Stalin's attempt to crush the European revolution would, if successful, mean the installation of Anglo-American military power on the borders of the USSR poised for military intervention. There is no solution for the contradictions of Stalinism any more than for the contradictions of imperialism.

(46) The decisive power in Europe is the revolutionary proletariat. Upon this fundamental social force we Trotskyists stake our hopes and base our policy through all the twists and turns of Stalinist and imperialist diplomacy.

#### The End of the Comintern

(47) Stalin's dissolution of the Communist International ends the career of an international workers organization which once, under Lenin and Trotsky, was the vanguard of the world proletariat and the hope of all the oppressed. The history of the Comintern since 1924 under Stalin is a record of degeneration and capitulation which has inflicted the most disastrous defeats upon the world working class.

(48) The successive steps in this process of degeneration after Lenin's death embrace the promulgation for the first time in 1924 of the theory of socialism in one country; the bureaucratization of the Comintern and all of its parties; the expulsion of the Bolshevik-Leninist opposition, first in the Russian party and then internationally; the capitulation of the German Communist Party, with its 600,000 members and its 6 million voters, without a fight to Hitler fascism in 1933; the systematic betrayal of the proletariat of the world in the interest of the diplomatic policy of the Kremlin; the murder of the Old Bolsheviks; the assassination of Trotsky; the betrayal of the proletariat in the second world war, first to Hitler and then to Roosevelt and Churchill.

(49) Stalin's cynical repudiation of internationalism and

international proletarian organization renders the greatest ideological service to capitalism which aims to keep the workers divided along nationalist lines and to dupe and enslave them with nationalist illusions and prejudices. The renunciation of internationalism is the renunciation of the basic principles of scientific socialism. Ever since the Communist Manifesto of 1848 proclaimed "Workers of the World Unite!" the Marxist movement has taught that the emancipation of the workers could only be achieved by their common action on an international scale. The First, Second and Third Internationals were all originally organized to promote the class unity of the workers on a world basis in struggle against the capitalist system for the creation of socialism.

(50) The Third International was born out of the experiences of the last World War, 1914-1918. From the first day of its birth it taught the necessity of international solidarity and fought every variety of national self-inclusiveness. Now, a quarter of a century later, when the bankruptcy of capitalism and its system of national states has developed into its death agony, in the midst of a second world war which threatens the existence of civilization, Stalin and his traitor gang tell the workers there is no need of international cooperation and organization.

(51) The formal burial of the Comintern does not signify the end of Stalinist intervention in the world labor movement. The Stalinists still retain their organizations, their GPU apparatus and connections and remain as always the cynical agents of the Kremlin's foreign policies. The Italian events have shown the capacity of the Stalinists for perverting the struggle of the workers, demoralizing and betraying the working class. The struggle against the false policies of the degenerate servants of the Kremlin remains one of the most important tasks of the revolutionary vanguard in Europe and the rest of the world.

#### The Coming Triumph of the Fourth International

(52) The Third International which has been buried by Stalin in shame and disgrace nevertheless left behind the greatest treasures for the future. Its founders, Lenin and Trotsky, belong to us. Their teachings, their example, their traditions are ours. The record of the long internal struggle from 1923 of Trotsky and his co-thinkers and disciples is the basic literature upon which the new generation which is destined to lead the revolution will be trained and educated. The first four Congresses of the Comintern produced documents which are the basic program of the movement of the Fourth International.

(53) Out of the Third International, long before it died and was buried, came the initiating cadres of the Fourth International. The Fourth International is today the only International. It alone carries on the progressive traditions of the First Two Internationals and the work of the Comintern in its first years. The critical test

of the war has destroyed every other international grouping except the Fourth International. Nothing and nobody can dissolve this International, the heir of the Communist International of Lenin and Trotsky. Today the numbers of the Fourth International are small but they exist in every important country. They are bound together by common principles and a common goal. Their ideas are correct, their program represents historical necessity, their victory is assured.

(54) Under the banner of the Fourth International, World Party of the Socialist Revolution, the workers and colonial peoples will emancipate themselves from capitalism, fascism and war and create the socialist society of peace, freedom and plenty for all mankind.

#####

#### ADDITIONAL PARAGRAPHS FOR INTERNATIONAL RESOLUTION

(21A) The Trotskyist parties everywhere have the basic duty to expose and fight against the illusions that stable bourgeois-democratic regimes, which have lost their material foundation, can be restored in Europe. They must wage irreconcilable warfare against the reformist and Stalinist parties, and their perfidious "Peoples' Fronts" which attempt to limit the struggle of the workers to this reactionary-utopian program. The Fourth International has long ago foreseen the emergence of this question in the first stages of the downfall of fascism and has spoken explicitly in regard to it. The program adopted by the Founding Conference of the Fourth International (1938) affirms that "once it breaks through, the revolutionary wave in fascist countries will immediately be a grandiose sweep and under no circumstances will stop short at the experiment of resuscitating some sort of Weimar corpse."

(21B) The same program makes clear the value and necessity, as well as the limitations and subordinate character, of democratic slogans as a means of mobilizing the masses for revolutionary action. "Such slogans at certain moments can play a serious role. But the formulas of democracy (freedom of press, the right to unionize, etc.) mean for us only incidental and episodic slogans in the independent movement of the proletariat and not a democratic noose fastened to the neck of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie's agents (Spain!) As soon as the movement assumes something of a mass character, the democratic slogans will be intertwined with the transitional ones; factory committees, it may be supposed, will appear before the old routinists rush from their chancelleries to organize trade unions; soviets will cover Germany before a new Constitutional Assembly will gather in

of the war has destroyed every other international grouping except the Fourth International. Nothing and nobody can dissolve this International, the heir of the Communist International of Lenin and Trotsky. Today the numbers of the Fourth International are small but they exist in every important country. They are bound together by common principles and a common goal. Their ideas are correct, their program represents historical necessity, their victory is assured.

(54) Under the banner of the Fourth International, World Party of the Socialist Revolution, the workers and colonial peoples will emancipate themselves from capitalism, fascism and war and create the socialist society of peace, freedom and plenty for all mankind.

~~#####~~

#### ADDITIONAL PARAGRAPHS FOR INTERNATIONAL RESOLUTION

(21A) The Trotskyist parties everywhere have the basic duty to expose and fight against the illusions that stable bourgeois-democratic regimes, which have lost their material foundation, can be restored in Europe. They must wage irreconcilable warfare against the reformist and Stalinist parties, and their perfidious "Peoples' Fronts" which attempt to limit the struggle of the workers to this reactionary-utopian program. The Fourth International has long ago foreseen the emergence of this question in the first stages of the downfall of fascism and has spoken explicitly in regard to it. The program adopted by the Founding Conference of the Fourth International (1938) affirms that "once it breaks through, the revolutionary wave in fascist countries will immediately be a grandiose sweep and under no circumstances will stop short at the experiment of resuscitating some sort of Weimar corpse."

(21B) The same program makes clear the value and necessity, as well as the limitations and subordinate character, of democratic slogans as a means of mobilizing the masses for revolutionary action. "Such slogans at certain moments can play a serious role. But the formulas of democracy (freedom of press, the right to unionize, etc.) mean for us only incidental and episodic slogans in the independent movement of the proletariat and not a democratic noose fastened to the neck of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie's agents (Spain!) As soon as the movement assumes something of a mass character, the democratic slogans will be intertwined with the transitional ones; factory committees, it may be supposed, will appear before the old routinists rush from their chancelleries to organize trade unions; soviets will cover Germany before a new Constitutional Assembly will gather in



Weimar. The same will be true of Italy and the rest of the totalitarian and semi-totalitarian countries." In all the developments of the military struggle and the shifts on the war fronts, in all the twists and turns of imperialist and Stalinist diplomacy, the revolutionary militants need not the search for "new formulas" and improvisations but to resolutely adhere to their program which was written not for a day but for this whole epoch of wars and revolutions.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL RESOLUTION  
AS AMENDED BY MORROW

(1) ---- (19) -- Same as in original.

Problems of the European Revolution

(20) The decay of capitalism and the acuteness of class conflicts forbid another extended period of bourgeois democracy for devastated Europe. Interim regimes modelled on the Weimar Republic may be set up here and there as by-products of uncompleted revolutionary movements. But they must by their very nature prove short-lived. They must give way either to the power of the revolutionary workers or to military-police or fascist dictatorships.

(21) The proletarian revolution may begin in one country, but no European country can make its way out of the war and the catastrophic crisis of contemporary civilization by itself alone. Peace, security and prosperity can be assured only by the economic unification and the socialist collaboration of the free nations of Europe.

(22) The slogan of "the Socialist United States of Europe" is the central slogan against the counter-revolutionary schemes of the U.S. bloc to dominate the European continent. Only on the basis of the Socialist United States of Europe will ruined and shattered Europe rise again and reach new heights.

(23) The fact that the economic pre-conditions for an extended period of bourgeois-democracy in Europe have disappeared does not, however, put an end to the role that bourgeois democracy can play to stem the advance of proletarian revolution. Just as fascism served to halt the masses, so bourgeois democracy will now attempt to disorient the revolutionary struggle against fascism. When no other shield can protect them, the forces of capitalism retreat behind the protection of the democratic republic. This phenomenon will in all likelihood appear in our epoch as it has in previous periods.

(24) Tomorrow, if necessary, the Badoglio regime will concede general elections just as it had to concede factory committees. It is of course the masses who wrest these democratic rights from their oppressors. But the oppressors understand also the necessity of sanctioning these democratic rights when they have no alternative.

(25) The Italian events indicate that after the collapse of fascism the bourgeoisie is prepared to evolve in the direction of a bourgeois-democratic government. In all likelihood the collapse of Nazism will likewise witness an attempt by the German bourgeoisie to save its rule by hiding behind bourgeois-democratic forms.

(26) This stratagem of the European bourgeoisie will be aided at the beginning by the inevitable revival of democratic illusions among considerable sections of the masses. The intensification

of national feeling in Europe as the result of the struggle against Nazi occupation, a progressive sentiment at the given moment, nevertheless can serve to feed democratic illusions about "new governments of the people" after the collapse of Nazism.

(27) In Germany, Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, etc., new generations have grown up without any knowledge of bourgeois democracy and without active participation in political life. After the collapse of fascism and military dictatorship, these masses must go through a certain body of experiences before they will understand that their needs cannot be satisfied within the framework of the democratic republic.

(28) The principal parties which emerged after the fall of Mussolini were the Communist, Socialist and Action (liberal) parties. Since they were ruthlessly persecuted by the fascist regime, these parties were not held responsible by the masses for the decades of fascist rule. Nor could the masses test the program of these parties under the conditions of totalitarian oppression. Programs can be tested only in the course of mass activity, i.e., only after the collapse of totalitarianism and military dictatorship. Hence it is to be expected that both Social Democracy and Stalinism, as well as centrist and liberal-democratic parties, will emerge throughout Europe as the principal parties of the first period after the collapse of the Nazis and their collaborators.

(29) The foregoing variant could have been avoided only by the growth of mass parties of the Fourth International during the past decade. However, conditions proved too unfavorable for such a development. Under the persecution of the bourgeois "democrats," the Nazis and their collaborators, and the Stalinists, the forces of the Fourth International had to be gathered together on the European continent under the most fearful conditions. Only the most heroic struggle of the small cadres of the Fourth International enabled them to survive, and even to grow, under these conditions. That they did survive and grow is the most eloquent verification of the correctness of the program of the Fourth International.

(30) All the objective conditions for proletarian revolution exist in Europe. What remains lacking is the subjective condition -- revolutionary Marxist parties leading a majority of the workers. The revolution is impossible -- or is doomed -- unless it is led by a revolutionary Marxist party. We must warn our European comrades that the problem of building the party is still before them. Even amid the gigantic convulsions which will follow the collapse of Nazism, the slow task of educating cadres will remain central.

(31) In general, only cadre elements will be directly recruited by our program and central slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe. To win the masses will require linking ourselves with them as we find them, with all their inexperience and illusions. We must show them that we share their hopes while differing on how to achieve them. Our task is rendered all the easier by the fact that democratic demands as a whole have a revolutionary character today in Europe, if seriously fought for, because the bourgeois

governments cannot satisfy them. The Trotskyists must appear as the most resolute fighters for democratic demands; freedom of assembly and elections, freedom of the press, trade unions and political parties, etc. Our transitional demands -- for jobs and social insurance, workers' control of production, etc. -- are certain to play a major role.

(32) If the war ends with U.S. imperialism dominating sections of Europe by such direct means as AMG and military occupation, the democratic demand for national freedom is certain to have as much significance in the struggle against the "democracies" as it has had in the struggle against Nazi occupation. The revolutionary character of the national question under such conditions -- its democratic character tending to pass over to a proletarian-revolutionary content -- is to be seen in the partisan movements of Yugoslavia, Greece, etc.

(33) In general, as against the pseudo-democracy of the bourgeoisie and their Social Democratic, Stalinist and centrist collaborators, we must become the protagonists of the most thoroughgoing democratic demands. Only in this way can we demonstrate to the masses, through their own living experience, the content of workers' democracy -- the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Socialist United States of Europe.

#### The Role of the U.S. in Europe

(34) The role of U.S. imperialism as the attempted subjugator of Europe is clearly indicated. The economic interests of U.S. imperialism drive it to nothing less than world mastery as its aim, including mastery of Europe. It must control Europe as against (1) other imperialisms (2) the Soviet Union and (3) the proletarian revolution.

(35) For this task the U.S. requires allies in the various countries. No force is too reactionary for it; the Vatican, Otto of Habsburg, Darlan-Giraud, Horthy, the royal houses of Greece and Yugoslavia, Franco and Salazar, the Rumanian camarilla, etc., etc.

(36) The kind of resistance that U.S. imperialism will meet from other imperialisms is indicated by the debacle of its French policy. It attempted to foist Darlan-Giraud, the most docile agents it could find, upon the French people. But this proved impossible even before the intervention of the French masses. The Gaullists, representing French imperialism but backed by national feeling and the Stalinists, were able to thwart Washington's plan. Roosevelt was compelled to come to terms, on an unstable basis, with the Gaullist-Stalinist forces. French imperialism is certain to resist Washington domination even more forcefully when France is re-conquered.

(37) Britain as yet feels less than the Gaullists the need to resist U.S. penetration, thanks to Britain's role as the most-favored junior partner of U.S. imperialism. Nevertheless the alarm in British capitalist circles concerning U.S. shipping and aviation expansion in the post-war period, the British-U.S. open difference

of interests in Argentina, etc., indicate that British imperialism also will attempt to find another road than subservience to America's plans for Europe.

(38) The resistance of French and British imperialism will impel Washington to lean the more heavily on the ultra-reactionary forces in the smaller countries and on the Vatican. It is certain, as its support of Franco, Salazar and Badoglio demonstrates, that Washington will go far indeed in its attempt to foist clerical-monarchist cliques on the nations of Europe.

(39) This tendency is dictated to Washington by the fact, which the imperialists understand no less well than the revolutionists that the narrowing base of European economy under imperialism provides no stable basis for bourgeois-democratic republics. Any bourgeois-democratic republics which would be established would become arenas for decisive struggle between the proletarian revolution and the imperialist world. Since they would be relatively more favorable arenas for the workers than dictatorial regimes, Washington will do all it can to foster fascist and military dictatorships.

(40) Nevertheless Washington will in all likelihood soon find itself compelled to "sanction" democratic regimes in Europe for the same reasons which impel the Italian and German bourgeoisie in this direction. Naked military force alone is insufficient to achieve the aims of U.S. imperialism; it must also resort to deceit, i.e., bourgeois democracy. The pressure of the American and British masses will also push Washington along this line.

(41) Systematic exposure of the reactionary role of U.S. imperialism in Europe will arouse the American and British masses to oppose the activities of their governments. This task is an elementary duty of revolutionary Marxists in the U.S. Their work will, in turn, be enormously facilitated if their comrades in Europe correctly conduct mass struggles for democratic demands which will be understood and sympathized with by the American and British masses.

(42) The prodigious vitality of the October Revolution is strikingly demonstrated in the Red Army victories over Nazi imperialism. While France and Italy, victors in the last war, crumbled before invading armies, the Soviet Union stood up under unprecedented defeats and losses and flung back the assault of the mighty Nazi military machine. The superior powers of resistance and recuperation of the USSR flow essentially from the fact that the proletarian revolution, which was crushed in France and Italy, conquered in the Soviet Union.

(43) The unbreakable will to struggle and high morale of the Soviet armies and peoples refute those who, recoiling against the crimes of the Stalinist bureaucracy, deserted the workers' state in its hour of mortal peril. They gave up the Soviet Union for lost at the very moment when the state which issued from the October Revolution was about to exhibit unprecedented defensive powers in the supreme test on the field of battle.

(44) The USSR, by virtue of the social foundations laid down by the October revolution, still remains a workers' state in fundamental contradiction with world imperialism. The reactions of the Allies to the Soviet successes and their repercussions among the capitalist rulers of the neighboring countries once again shows that the imperialists, at least, recognize this fact. The prospect of further Red Army advances has terrified rather than encouraged the "democratic" capitalist world and produced a growing breach between the Kremlin and its Anglo-American allies.

(45) Nevertheless, despite present signs that this breach is growing, an agreement between the Kremlin and the Anglo-U.S. imperialists is not excluded. If Stalin permitted the Nazis to conquer Europe with the aid of the Stalin-Hitler pact, he can likewise surrender the initiative to the "democratic" imperialists for a period. Now, as before, Stalin pursues his fundamental policy; defense first and foremost of the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy. The Kremlin shares with the imperialists fear of the proletarian revolution in Europe, which would inspire the Soviet masses to oust the reactionary bureaucracy. As in previous decades, the Kremlin may now decide it has more to gain by collaboration with the imperialists than by accentuating differences.

(46) We must give due weight not only to the fundamental political factor (Stalin's nationalist-conservative policy) making for an agreement as the aftermath of the Moscow Conference, but also to the material factors which combine with that political factor: the gigantic extent of the devastation of the Soviet Union by the Nazi invasion, the loss of ten million Soviet lives, the relatively-untouched condition of the Anglo-U.S. armies and material, the continued superiority of U.S. over Soviet production, etc.

(47) These material factors would play a minor role were the Soviet Union led by revolutionary Marxists. The Soviet Union could frustrate the designs upon Europe of the Anglo-U.S. imperialists and secure itself against eventual attack, by stimulating and supporting proletarian revolutions throughout Europe. But the Moscow ruling caste cannot pursue this course against its present allies any more than it did against Hitler. Hence these material factors constitute powerful pressure upon Stalin to come to terms for the next period with the Anglo-U.S. imperialists, despite his knowledge that the imperialists would utilize that period to consolidate themselves on the European continent for an eventual assault against the Soviet Union.

(48) On their side, the Anglo-U.S. imperialists also have weighty reasons for coming to an agreement with the Kremlin. The alternative -- a German-Soviet peace soon -- is a frightening specter in Washington and London; they will go far to avoid it. In addition to these immediate military considerations, the Anglo-U.S. imperialists understand very well the value of the services of the Stalinists to imperialists who are allied with the Kremlin; they know that without the Stalinists it would have been well-nigh impossible to crush the Spanish revolution.

(49) In either case, whether the Kremlin breaks shortly with the "democracies" or comes to further terms with them, its policy will remain the same national-conservative one. In either case, too, we remain defenders of the Soviet Union in spite of the Kremlin's reactionary policies.

(50) Whether to improve its bargaining position within a U.S. - British - Soviet alliance or as a counterweight to it, in either case the Kremlin seeks to bind to itself bourgeois regimes for long-term collaboration. The most notable examples are the Benes and Gaullist governments. In return, the Kremlin places the Stalinist-dominated working class movements in subordination to the bourgeoisie of those countries. Essentially this is a continuation of the counter-revolutionary Popular Front program.

(51) The Red Army victories have brought the Soviet Union a prestige among the European peoples unparalleled in recent years. Progressive consequences flow from this fact: the imperialists will not find it easy to isolate the Soviet Union, and the admiring peoples will tend to emulate the Soviet overthrow of private property. But until the Soviet masses succeed in overthrowing Stalin and his clique the prestige of the Soviet Union is appropriated by the parasitic bureaucracy. The power and ideological influence of Stalinism will not wane under these conditions. The Italian events have shown the capacity of the Stalinists for perverting the struggle of the workers, demoralizing and betraying the working class. The Stalinists are the principal organized force today in the European working class. We must warn the workers against the terrible dangers which Stalinism holds in store for them. The European proletariat must never again permit Stalin to crush a revolution as he did in Spain.

#### The Partisan Movements and Stalinism

(52) The developments in Yugoslavia and Greece have demonstrated the revolutionary opportunities arising out of the war and the revolutionary capacity of the European workers and peasants. As a result of military defeat and the consequent collapse of the old governments, new revolutionary possibilities opened in these countries and were seized upon by the masses. The struggle of the masses took the form of national resistance to the foreign invader.

(53) The Greek and Yugoslav partisans exhibit the indubitable features of mass revolutionary movements. Their resistance to Nazi occupation is carried on independently of and against the "legitimate" Yugoslav and Greek governments and the supporters of those governments. The partisans set up their own elective governing bodies in territories reconquered from the Nazis, drawing into them authentic representatives of the workers and peasants. They expropriate property and land of rich collaborators of the Nazis and turn them over for use to peasants' and workers' committees, thus exhibiting a tendency to go beyond capitalism. These features of the partisan movements dictate to revolutionary Marxists support of those movements as against the "legitimate" governments' forces.

(54) The Kremlin seeks to control these partisan movements (1) in order to coordinate their activities with those of the Red Army against the Nazis, (2) to strengthen the hand of the Soviet Union vis-a-vis the "democracies" and, (3) eventually most important of all, in order to channelize these revolutionary movements to limits satisfactory to the Soviet bureaucracy. The Kremlin's aims in channelizing these movements are not as yet precisely determined but will depend in large part upon the further outcome of its relations with the "democracies." Meanwhile, in order to win control of them, the Kremlin is compelled to support the partisans' program (land, elections, etc.) If Anglo-U.S.-Soviet collaboration continues beyond the war, the Stalinists will undoubtedly throw their weight openly to the re-establishment of capitalist regimes in Greece, Yugoslavia, Poland, etc. If there is an open break between the "democracies" and the Soviet Union, the Kremlin may seek to nationalize property in Yugoslavia and other Balkan areas and rule them either through puppet governments or by direct incorporation into the USSR. In the case of nationalization, revolutionary Marxists will of course support that step while warning the masses against the Kremlin's bureaucratic-totalitarian repressions.

(55) The aim of revolutionary Marxists is to free the partisan movement from subordination to the national-conservative policies of the Kremlin. The partisan movement cannot retain its present unstable character; it must either go back toward capitalism or forward to socialism. For the independent Soviet republics of Yugoslavia, Greece and Poland! The partisan masses have accepted the control of the Kremlin because they do not know its counter-revolutionary character but think it represents the October revolution. We must prove to them that the struggle for the extension of the October revolution can be waged only under the banner of the Fourth International.

(Paragraphs 56-58 same as 52-54 in original resolution).

#####

#### MORRISON AMENDMENTS

(1) The first 23 paragraphs of the original resolution as they are, with the proviso that Morrison will still have the right to propose certain minor changes in expression, etc., after going over them.

(2) The addition of paragraph 23 of Morrow's document, with the following changes; In the third line, after "can" add the word "possibly"; and in the last line, after the word "capitalism" add the three words "may seek to"; and strike out the last sentence of that paragraph.

(3) Add paragraph 24 of Morrow's document.



(4) A new paragraph 25, as follows; The Italian events indicate that after the collapse of fascism the bourgeoisie is prepared to evolve in the direction of a bourgeois democratic government in order to prevent the socialist revolution. We do not exclude the possibility of the transfer of power to the workers immediately following the fall of fascist dictatorships. It is necessary for our comrades to take this possibility into consideration at all times and hence to put forward the slogans of Creation of Workers Councils and All Power to these Councils as soon as the masses begin to move against the fascist regime or any regime which may follow as a result of a coup d'etat such as occurred in Italy. But we must also recognize the probability that the bourgeoisie will make a serious attempt to save its rule by means of bourgeois democracy and the temporary success of such an attempt because of the treachery of the social reformists and Stalinists, the lack of a revolutionary party, and the insufficient political development of the working class.

(5) Add Morrow's paragraph 26, with the exception that; in the 5th line of the paragraph strike out "a progressive sentiment at the given moment nevertheless"; strike out "inevitable"; and in the first line change "will be aided at the beginning by the probable revival, etc." to "may be aided, etc."

(6) Add Morrow's paragraph 27. In the fourth line, strike out the word "must" and substitute the words "may have to."

(7) Add Morrow's paragraph 28, but in the second line from the top on the next page, "parties will not be held responsible" insert "by a large section of the masses for the decades of fascist rule."

(8) Add all of paragraph 29 of Morrow's document.

(9) Change paragraph 30 to read: (Retain the first sentence as it is). Then, continue, "What is lacking is revolutionary Marxist parties without which the success of the proletarian revolution is impossible. To our European comrades we emphasize that the problem of building the party is their main task, a task which amid the gigantic convulsions that will follow the collapse of fascism, can be accomplished in a very short period."

(10) Paragraph 31 of Morrow's document; Strike out the first sentence. Retain the second sentence, then continue as follows: "Towin the masses will require linking ourselves with them as we find them with all their experience and illusions. We must show them that we share their hopes while differing on how to achieve them. Our task is rendered all the easier by the fact. . . because the bourgeois governments cannot satisfy them." Then add the following: "Appearing before the masses with the fundamental slogans of the Socialist United States of Europe and All Power to Workers Councils, the Trotskyists must also show themselves as the most resolute fighters for democratic demands." Then, follow up this sentence with the demands as mentioned in Morrow's document; "Freedom of assembly and elections; freedom of the press, trade unions and political parties, etc." These demands should be intertwined with our transitional

demands -- For Workers Control of Production, Social insurance, etc. Then add: "and all of them connected with our fundamental slogans of Socialist United States of Europe and All Power to the Workers Councils."

(11) In paragraph 32 of Morrow's document; Retain the first two lines; "The democratic demand for national freedom is certain to have very great significance in the struggle for the proletarian revolution." Strike out the rest of the section.

(12) Strike out paragraph 33 of Morrow's document.

(13) The next section of Morrow's document should be substituted for the Committee's resolution on "The Role of the United States in Europe" -- paragraphs 24 through 33 of the Committee's resolution to be substituted by paragraphs 34 through 41 of Morrow's document.

(14) In the next section in the Morrow document on "The Significance of the Soviet Victories and its Aftermath", retain paragraph 34 of the Committee resolution.

(15) Retain paragraph 35 of the Committee's resolution except in the second line, on the assumption that the word "renegades" refers to the minority, remove the word "renegades."

(16) Leave in paragraph 36 of the Committee resolution.

(17) Leave in paragraph 37 of the Committee resolution.

(18) In place of paragraph 38 of the Committee resolution, insert paragraph 45 of the Morrow document, but strike out; "nevertheless despite present signs that this breach is growing", and continue "an agreement between the Kremlin. . . etc."

(19) Add from Morrow's document paragraphs 46, 47, 49, 50, and 51, with the following change in paragraph 51: in the second to the last line, "But until the Soviet masses", -- strike this out and substitute the following: "At present because of the victories of the Red Army the prestige of the Soviet Union has grown tremendously but unfortunately it has been misappropriated by the parasitic bureaucracy." In the next sentence add the word "temporarily", so it will read as follows: "The power and ideological influence of Stalinism has been strengthened temporarily." Then, as a substitute for the balance of Morrow's paragraph 51, insert the following: "As a result, we must recognize a serious danger to the coming European revolution. The Stalinist bureaucracy will either help the capitalist democracies in the attempt to crush the revolution by force or, if the revolution assumes too great a sweep to be crushed, it will attempt to gain control of it in order to save its own rule. What Stalin has done in Spain he will try to repeat in other countries of Europe. The Continental European revolution will surely offer stronger resistance than the Spanish proletariat, but the danger to the revolution from the Stalinist bureaucracy is very great and we must constantly warn the masses to struggle against this danger."

- (20) Include paragraph 46 of the Morrow resolution.
- (21) Strike out paragraphs 38 through 45 of the Committee resolution.
- (22) Strike out the whole section on "The End of the Comintern" in the Committee resolution. Retain the section on the "Coming Triumph of the Fourth International."
- (23) Retain paragraphs 52 through 55 of the Morrow document on "The Partisan Movements and Stalinism."

~~#####~~

LETTER FROM CASSIDY

July 23, 1944

I have seen so little of our press that I cannot say what is the present stand of Polcom on most of the political questions disputed at the plenum. On one important one we remain as far apart as ever, if one is to judge from the Militant's June 10th editorial, "Allied Plans in Europe". Nothing is more fatal in politics than doctrinairism; the clinging to a formula which life itself has outmoded. The doctrinaire editors of the Militant insist on repeating the formula, already clearly untrue last October, and now absurd; "The choice, from the Roosevelt-Churchill point of view, is a Franco-type government or the spectre of the socialist revolution."

I shall not repeat at length what I said in last year's speeches and documents on the fact that "choice" includes not only what Roosevelt and Churchill initially desired, but also what they now and in the future desire, or have to agree to. They wanted Darlan-Giraud. They would have preferred, perhaps, to stick to Giraud. They were unable to. They had to choose to deal with De Gaulle, compelled to do so by the pressure of the French underground movement. Is the Gaullist movement a "Franco-type government" or is it not? If it is not -- and I can hardly believe that Polcom will say it is, then Polcom's formula about the "choice" of "Franco-type government" must be dropped.

Another example; the June 10th editorial says Churchill "came out unequivocally in support of military and police dictatorships. He spoke in glowing terms of the Badoglio government..." This was Badoglio's second cabinet, constituted with the support of the six bourgeois-democratic and workers' parties. Did the Militant comment on the significance of the change from Badoglio's first cabinet -- which could correctly be called a police and military dictatorship -- to the second, which was something quite different? I fear the Militant did not, thanks to the "Franco-type" formula by which it is ridden. In the Marxist lexicon, what is a police and military dictatorship? It is a regime which (while free press and unions etc. exist) does not have the support of the political organizations adhered to by a majority of the politically active population. Could this be said of the second Badoglio cabinet. No, it was supported by the parties of the majority of the politically active population of Allied-held Italy. On the basis of what had happened already then, I was able last October to predict the further development of this tendency toward bourgeois-democracy. One excellent comrade recently thought I was refuted by the fact that the second cabinet, like the first, was headed by Badoglio. Since then Badoglio has been pushed out altogether. But even had Badoglio remained, the key to the character of the government would be what parties support it. Both Badoglio's last government and the present one have the support of the parties which betray the masses, which

deceive the masses, but which, nevertheless, at this stage lead a majority of the masses, including the workers and peasants. Is there a Procrustean bed in the Militant office on which the formula "Franco-type government" can be stretched to include the Italian government? I doubt it.

The June 10th editorial speaks also of the preparations of a "similar set-up" in Yugoslavia. Does this mean that the government now formed with the support of the Stalinist-led Partisan movement is a police and military dictatorship? Yesterday, if I mistake not, our press recognized that the Partisan movement had the support of the majority of the masses in Yugoslavia. Assuming they still for the present continue that support, and we have no reason to assume otherwise, can one call the government they support a military and police dictatorship?

Why, let the Polcom explain why, it must cling to this demonstrably false formula. Does it make its proponents more revolutionary? On the contrary, the formula fails to prepare our comrades (if our European comrades took it seriously; fortunately I doubt that they do) for the revolutionary struggle against bourgeois-democracy, which bids fair to be the main problem in Europe, rather than the main problem alleged by Polcom, that of "Franco-type governments". And as bourgeois-democracy comes to the fore, we seem to be in the impossible position of having staked our fate on the prediction that capitalism will stand or fall in defense of "Franco-type governments". Would it were so! That capitalism had only this feeble weapon in its arsenal! But it is not so, and we must speedily learn to analyze correctly the arsenal of the class enemy.

\* \* \*

2. The existence of "heated" argument in the Committee (mentioned in the document).

3. The failure of the Committee to formulate a unanimously acceptable resolution before the final adjournment of the Plenum.

4. The veracity of statements made in the article, or a disclosure of detailed information not publishable without endangering the security of the party.

I view the raising of any one of these considerations in connection with this document either as simply wrong or actually damaging to the intellectual and organizational health of the party. An examination of each of them is imperative so that a repetition of the mistake made in this case is prevented.

1. The fact of disagreement. It is impossible for me to conceive of a political party -- representative of the vital, constantly mutating needs of any class in our present society -- in which disagreement will not occur in the leading and therefore most politically conscious and experienced bodies. (Unless Stalin's "monolithism" is proof to the contrary; and his methods of assuring unanimity of thought are notorious and, to put it mildly, not acceptable to a Bolshevik party. Even Hitler seems currently to be having trouble with his "monolithism.")

Consider the circumstances under which the October Plenum took place; the invasion of Africa and Italy by the United Nations had been effected; Mussolini had been driven from power; fascism had fallen to pieces in its oldest stronghold; the masses of Italy had risen in rebellion against the governmental and social forms under which they had suffered for more than two decades; the problem of the creation of the instrument of revolution -- the Bolshevik party -- was posed as an immediate imperative for the proletariat of Italy. In other words, the Plenum met at a moment -- the first of its kind in the history of our present party -- when the question of the physical and ideological preparation of the masses for revolution lay on our doorstep. Here was the beginning of the historic test of our ability to apply in terms of the concrete needs of a revolutionary moment the body of our theory, the inestimable wealth of which we could now realize and demonstrate.

How is it conceivable that anyone can ask a body of people, some of them engaged for a quarter of a century in an unrelenting study and application of revolutionary theory, to come together at such an historic moment and display such unanimity of opinion on the application of that theory that a resolution drafted by three people should be acceptable without modification and discussion by the entire body? If that were possible and good, then it was a wasteful thing for the party to spend its energies summoning the Plenum at all; then a small committee in the Center could publish the final formulation of the party resolution in the press without even submitting it to a vote of the National Committee. If that were possible and good, then the entire Leninist principle of democratic centralism is a lot of wind!

I don't know how other members may feel, but I should be deeply chagrined if I knew it were possible for the leading body of a Trotskyist party to meet under these circumstances and find no occasion for argument and disagreement; such a party in my opinion would prove itself historically defunct. And I should not be ashamed to let the party know if disagreement existed.

2. The existence of "heated" argument. It seems that many members of our party confuse heated argument over political matters with personal quarreling. I challenge anyone to mention the name of any revolutionist worthy of the appellation who did not "heatedly" insist upon the validity of his analyses and theories! How dare anyone propound theories of social change, which inevitably require self-sacrifice and suffering on the part of many, many people, if he is so dilettante about them himself that he will not argue "with heat" for their correctness!

Do you doubt that there was "heat" -- and plenty of it! -- in the Central Committee of the Bolshevik party of Russia when the motion for the seizure of power was made by Lenin, and Zinoviev and Kamenev voted against? Do you doubt that there was "heat" over the discussion of policies at Brest-Litovsk, with Lenin and Trotsky (both impeccable Bolsheviks) on different sides? Are you going to agree with Stalin that Rosa Luxemburg was not a great revolutionist because she dared have "heated" arguments with Bernstein and Kautsky -- and Lenin?

Is it a disgrace for the party to hear that its leaders are men so fervently devoted to their ideas that they will become "heated" in argument over the incorporation of these ideas in a programmatic resolution of the party?

3. Inability to complete final draft of resolution before adjournment. This, in my opinion, can be entirely disregarded as a valid argument for withholding the document from circulation. In the formulation of a resolution of such importance as the one under discussion, it is quite usual that, after thorough discussion in the leading body, it is handed to a sub-committee for redrafting. Contrary to being a sign of weakness in the party, such a procedure is an indication of a deeply responsible attitude on the part of the Committee.

4. Veracity or disclosure of information. This argument has absolutely no place here. All of the circumstances related are accurately reported as far as I know and there is nothing in the document which should not be published to the membership out of concern for the security of the party.

These considerations, however, are in my opinion all only secondary. The argument I regard of prime importance in connection with this incident is one which contends that this document, as well as Comrade Morrow's original set of amendments, should have been immediately published to the party and the Committee's failure to do so was not in the best interests of the political development of the party ranks.

In my opinion there is nothing either in Comrade Morrow's original set of amendments to the draft resolution nor in the document presently under discussion which constitutes a challenge to any of our fundamental theory; although insinuations to this effect were made at the Plenum, no amount of urging brought one shred of proof. And I say that even if -- I shall go further and say, especially if -- this were true, the two documents should have been circulated to every member of the party, together with the party resolutions. In my opinion the education of the party demands this.

How does the leadership of a Bolshevik party go about the serious business of formulating a political position when an historic event demands it? Does it go into a seance and emerge, after some kind of mysterious rite, with the Word of God? Is it possessed of some kind of esoteric quality of discernment miraculously bestowed upon it by a high vote at the convention? Or is it a body of revolutionary scientists who come together, with their varied experiences and backgrounds and degrees of theoretical development, to discuss the problem at hand in the light of Marxist principles of analytical method? Now indeed, grey theory must take on the green of life.

What better way is there to educate the membership than through the dissemination of the arguments of the party leadership in arriving at a policy? How better can an interest in the mastery of revolutionary theory be aroused than to show in life itself the meaning of these ordinarily dull and difficult principles? Is there anything detrimental to the morale of the party to have the membership see what circumstance is considered of prime importance by one party leader and how another can believe some other factor to be of greater importance -- and how they can both be proven partly wrong and partly right (in the true dialectic way)? Is there anything more enriching to the intellectual development of a worker in the party than to engage vicariously, through the reading of party documents of this sort, in the delicate and inspiring business of weighing one social and political factor against another in a living revolutionary complex and welding a steel Bolshevik program from the correct integration of a great number of historical factors -- and from the rich and divergent experiences and ideas of the members who make up the leading body? Is there any better way to encourage a rank-and-file member of the party to have the courage to think on political matters, than to have him see that nobody in the revolutionary movement -- not even Marx or Engels or Lenin or Trotsky -- was born with a "B" for Bolshevik on his chest; that everyone in the movement learns from everyone else and that one bourgeois adage which is worthy of retention after the revolution is that "the only man who never makes a mistake is the man who never does anything?"

Our Marxist movement is being constantly assaulted by its very noisy critics with the false accusation that we are either a willingly blind mass saying an habitual "amen" to the opinions of a single man or that we cling with sterile rigidity to a "set of dogmas" used as a substitute for thinking. Is there any better way of scotching such canards than to permit public discussion of such matters as the one dealt with here within the ranks of the party at least? (I shall go further and say that in this case I see no reason why the



discussion of this resolution should not have been made public in our press).

In my opinion the handling of this document and of the Morrow amendments to the draft resolution had a deleterious effect organizationally upon the party. Consider the preposterous position in which Committee members found themselves in reporting to the branches on the Plenum deliberations. We had to state that such "heated" argument took place that the Plenum lasted a whole day longer than scheduled, that we hardly got beyond the first point on the agenda before the Plenum terminated its sessions -- and could not tell what had been the essence of the discussion! I myself cannot conceive how a conscientious member of the National Committee could bring himself to make such a report, but I heard two members do so. What has resulted? Not one single politically developed member of the party has been able to accept the crippled reports presented in October. There has always been some unhealthy air of mystery surrounding the deliberations of the party at that Plenum. Can anyone argue that this state of affairs contributes to a heightening of party morale? Never!

Now the party will have to discuss this document and the Plenum discussion will come out into the open in the party for the first time. I get no comfort out of the fact that this has come as the result of treachery on the part of one of our members and the cheap political shenanigans of a rival organization.

The serious question of the "leak" in our organization is still with us. Such a lack of party loyalty as this should be made impossible in our ranks. I don't, however, think it possible for any organization to rid itself entirely of the danger of leaks. A "reliability hypodermic" cannot be administered to every recipient of a party document and the individual member must have within himself so high a degree of devotion to the interests of the party that such an act as this would be impossible to him. I do think it is entirely possible for the morale of the party, especially of the leading bodies, to be of such a quality that matters which actually concern the security of the party can be kept entirely within our ranks. This means that the field of things about which discussion is declared impermissible must be narrowed to its essential limits.

I think it should be realized by the leading committee that the discussion of matters of party policy in respect to historic events cannot be kept down in the party; not if the party is alive! And to place a prohibition upon such matters as the one here at issue is to go out of the way to invite carelessness. I repeat; the National Committee or the Political Committee has a right to declare anything it discusses secret; but it must use discretion in this and must see that every single matter which should be discussed without damage to the party is discussed. (I hope no one interprets me as meaning that every petty detail which comes before the Committee should be made the subject for internal discussion; I am talking about matters of broad party policy and most especially about the particular matter of the Plenum discussion on the Italian events). That is the only way consciously to raise the political level of the party ranks and to inspire an unshakable confidence in the collective wisdom of the party leadership.

August 6, 1944

#####

SUPPLEMENT TO DISCUSSION ARTICLE  
ON MORROW DOCUMENT

By Lydia Bennett

August 13. I am now reminded that there were two reasons given for not presenting the Morrow article of criticism to the party membership:

1. Inability to reverse a Plenum decision.
2. Inopportune moment, due to imminent jailing of our leading comrades.

As far as the first objection goes, this simply shifts the burden of responsibility from the P.C. to the Plenum itself.

In the case of the second objection, I feel that acceptance of this reason casts a very unfavorable light on the status and training of the party membership and serves only to place sharper emphasis upon my general contention; that the responsibility of the leading body of the party is to train the ranks in the technique of political analysis and decision; it cannot look upon the party membership simply as an instrument for applying the decisions of the leading body but must also regard the activity of the ranks as an integral part of the process of arriving at opinions and decisions.

For the last several years it has been commonly accepted by every conscious member that a revolutionary party functioning in this historical environment faces a constant danger of having its leadership handicapped in its functioning if not actually physically removed by the forces of the class enemy. After July, 1941 (two years and three months before the date of the Plenum in question) our party operated in the certain knowledge that our leadership was working against a deadline in its free functioning. In this period, ironically granted us by the slow processes of the law, the leadership of the party should have used every conscious measure to cultivate the general political level of the rank and file by utilizing every possible instrument for training the membership in the methods of Marxist thought and analysis. The preparation of a substitute leadership was the first task of the moment.

Why, then, was the substitute leadership in January, 1944 considered of such remarkably inferior quality that it could not be trusted to organize a discussion on the most important political occurrence of our recent history? And is it possible that the membership could not be trusted at all in this respect, since the reason given by the P.C. implies that the launching of such a discussion would result in some kind of uncontrollable disorder in the party ranks? Does this mean that, had our leadership been more completely and permanently removed from our midst, the party would have come to its end as an organization capable of facing and solving problems of this kind?

The indictment constituted a warning that direct leadership would have to move somewhere else in the party for a short time at least. The disturbing fact that more than two years after this warning, the leadership considered the party incapable of making up its collective mind correctly through discussion on a vital political matter has only one explanation; the party had never been correctly oriented toward the political education of its entire membership. That education is not effected by exhorting the members to read, nor even by supplying reading lists and educational outlines, but by involving the membership directly in the formulation of party policy on fundamental political questions.

Even, however, if one were able to accept the second argument in connection with the Morrow article, certainly that reason did not apply in full force to the publication of the draft resolution presented by the Plenum majority and the Morrow-Morrison amendments. For at the moment of the Plenum the refusal of the Supreme Court to review our case had not been declared and no one in the party believed that the actual jailing would occur as soon as it did (the lawyers spoke confidently of a year or more extension of grace). This would mean that, had the leadership trained itself and the party in the healthy process of party-wide discussion of political matters, the two plenum documents, plus an unlimited number of supplementary articles on the issues under discussion (supplied by other members of the leading body or even by rank-and-file members) would have been automatically prepared and circulated in the form of bulletins, if not actually printed in the public press.

There is further evidence that the failure to bring the discussion of the Italian events to the ranks of the party did not hinge upon the Supreme Court action but sprang out of a general policy in the handling of such important matters. Mussolini was driven from power in July, three months before the Plenum. Disagreement in the analysis of the Italian events was revealed in our party less than a week after the first break in Italy. Morrison wrote a critical article in his column; in Chicago I had a heated discussion in the branch with another member of the N.C. over an evaluation of the events. If the party had been sensitive to the importance of clarification in the face of such a difference of approach and analysis, then a party discussion would be natural and free. (In passing, I should like to remark that one of the reasons why our political discussions when they do arise are so heated is that they are considered abnormal and slightly illegitimate by the bulk of the membership; this circumstance in itself is an index of ill health).

Can anyone cite a good reason why immediate and free discussion should not occur in the ranks of the party over an event of such moment as the beginning of a revolutionary development in a fascist country? What kind of commentary upon the intellectual vigor of the party is it that such discussion did not occur in the ranks but was confined to the limits of the National Committee? How can one account for such apparent unanimity of thought on all details of policy in a revolutionary political body? (I say apparent unanimity because, happily for my peace of mind at least, I know that among the rank-and-file there was some thought and questioning but the

party offered that invaluable manifestation of intellectual aliveness no channel for either growth or correction).

The prime reason for the calling of the October plenum was the formulation of a resolution on the Italian events. The party leadership recognized the existence of disagreement and moved -- correctly -- toward the extended discussion of these differences and an attempt at the formulation of what it would consider a clear and correct document. There is nothing in Bolshevik procedure which forbids the open discussion of a question in the ranks of the party before the leading body comes to a decision. The convening of a plenum of the leading body has in innumerable instances been the result of relatively long and heated discussion within the party which demanded official formulation. Certainly, if the plenum occurs largely as the result of a recognition of disagreement on an important issue (even if it has not been made public in the party), then it is incumbent upon the leadership to acquaint the party fully with the nature of the disagreement and the basis upon which compromise was finally reached.

I wish now to raise my voice here, as I have on several other occasions, against the bringing in of a red herring in the form of "We can't afford to have the party turned into a debating society." There is only one other phrase which can arouse in my soul such homicidal passions and that is the one which goes "Don't you know there's a war on?"

I have been in the communist movement for twenty-three years and I have not yet ever met or heard of anyone in our section of the labor movement who wanted to have a debating society instead of a political party -- never! (There may have been periods when we were in almost complete isolation and did too much talking, but that was not because anybody wanted a "debating society" but because at that moment there was nothing else we could do!) I will go further and say that in my opinion it would be impossible, even if the membership so wished, to turn a political party of the proletariat (based on Bolshevik principles, in the year 1944, in the midst of a world war and on the threshold of the world proletarian revolution) into a debating society. Even ultra-left groups like the Revolutionary Workers League and the Proletarian Party have found it impossible to maintain all their "debating society" characteristics. How much less possible would it be for our party, now actually rooted in the organized labor movement at a moment of imminent mass upheaval! Life itself would frustrate any attempt to "turn our party into a debating society."

In my experience this argument when it is raised generally bears every earmark of an ignorant assault upon the necessity for theoretical clarity before action can be undertaken. I say that when this argument is raised, it becomes incumbent upon the one raising it to prove that argument of the issue in question would be wasteful of party time and would turn the party into a debating society. Is it possible for anyone to believe that a discussion of the Italian events, four months after their occurrence, could turn us into a debating society? Are these events not fraught with political

implication? Are we not organized specifically to discuss the preparation of the revolution when history moves in its direction (and even when it does not)? Haven't we waited twenty-three years to analyze this very moment and these very incidents and on the basis of our analysis, to organize for action?

Now let us look at this danger of "degeneration into a debating society" which hangs so menacingly over our party head. In the two years since the last convention a few important things -- political things! -- have happened; the whole population of the United States has been mobilized, militarily and industrially; North Africa has been invaded and conquered by the United Nations; Italy has been invaded and the beginnings of a revolutionary struggle have occurred; eighteen of our comrades have gone to jail; the Russian armies have swept the Nazi forces back through Europe and established Stalinist domination in a number of places beyond the Soviet borders.

I know that there is not one single event listed here on which there has been complete unanimity of attitude in the party; and I repeat that, contrary to being ashamed to admit such a fact, I find myself reassured upon the state of the intellectual life of the party. On how many of these matters has an organized discussion (not necessarily debate, mind you) been launched by the National Committee? NOT ONE! (Through the medium of an internal bulletin, a heated discussion on the Dialectic got started by accident in some branches, but it was not organized nationally and was called off after short duration).

We are not being smothered in useless discussion. On the contrary, we are facing inestimable difficulty, not to speak of danger, if our membership is not rapidly and consciously trained in the application of the method of Marxism, Leninism and Trotskyism to the problems it faces, locally, nationally and internationally. The importance of the incident of the Morrow document lies only in its epitomization of a general circumstance in the party which in my opinion must be corrected through the concerted attention of every single member from the highest body down.

#####