

# WORKERS INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Organ of the Revolutionary Communist Party  
Fourth International

Vol. 7. No. 5 ----- August, 1948

## COMINFORM DISPUTE DOCUMENTS *from* JUGOSLAVIA

Nationalised Industry and Workers'  
Management by Leon Trotsky

LEON TROTSKY = 1879-1940

*Sixpence*

# EDITORIAL STATEMENT:

THE dispute between Yugoslavia and the Cominform is of tremendous significance for the world communist movement and the working class as a whole. But the Stalinists are conducting the campaign with the usual lack of democracy. The case of the Yugoslav Communist Party has not been presented, apart from malicious distortions. In a genuine communist discussion all the important documents on both sides would be presented to the membership and the working class so that an objective and serious judgement can be made of the issues involved.

While the Fourth International does not agree with the methods of Tito, any more than with the methods of Stalin, Gottwald or Pollitt, we consider that it is of the greatest importance to the labour movement, and that they should have an opportunity to read at least extensive extracts from the material presented by the Yugoslav Communist Party. For this reason we make no apology for devoting a great part of this issue of "WORKERS INTERNATIONAL NEWS" to the documents of the Yugoslav Communist Party, despite the fact that they are not Trotskyist documents.

Neither in the statements of the Cominform, nor in those of Tito, is the real essence of the conflict brought out openly. The cause of the dispute is not the "theoretical" heresies of Tito, which he has effectively answered and indeed, turned against his accusers. The real basis of the dispute is, of course, the fact that Stalinism demands absolute domination and subjection of all the satellite countries. Stalinism demands control to the last detail in these countries, as in the Communist Parties of the world. It cannot permit any form of independence or national autonomy. The same policy applies which Stalinism bureaucratically enforced in the national republics of Russia, despite the nominal independence which the Eastern states assume. Dimitrov and the Bulgarians apparently had a secret agreement with Tito preparing the way for a South Slav Federation. But under pressure from Moscow, Dimitrov came to heel and the agreement was repudiated by the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee. Tito, who has a stronger base, refused to come to heel.

The international Stalinist campaign against the Yugoslav Communist Party is assuming a scope which resembles in many respects the lies and slanders systematically disseminated against Trotskyism by the Stalinists for two decades. The Yugoslav leaders are now declared to be "spies", "agents of imperialism", and are likened to Hitler and Mussolini in methods and "fuehrer" complex, ad nauseum.

However, the most important thing that has emerged from this discussion is the condemnation, out of their own mouths, of the methods of international Stalinism. The Yugoslavs have brought out very effectively the methods of lies, distortions and vilifications to which the Stalinists resort in their endeavour to discredit opponents.

On the other hand, for the first time, the Stalinists reveal the technique which the bureaucracy employs to maintain totalitarian domination. The most instructive episode at the Yugoslav Conference was Micunovic's reply to the assertions of the Stalinists that the whole Conference was rigged, that there was no democracy, and that any communist opposition would be immediately jailed. He quoted Stalin's reply to the Left Opposition in 1927 which set the example for such activities. Stalin replied precisely with threats of terror against "anti-Party" elements. The Yugoslav leaders say in effect, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. As they ironically put it, if it is true now it must have been true then.

In their criticism of Tito, the Stalinists are compelled to use similar arguments which the Left Opposition brought against the Russian Communist Party in its degeneration, the rigging of conferences, the lack of democracy, the terror against oppositionists. But the same situation exists in Yugoslavia as exists in Bulgaria, and particularly in Russia. The method of the Yugoslavs was the same as the method of the Russian Stalinists: adulation of the leader, unanimous decisions by all units, threats against all who dared to dissent.

Interesting to note is the desperate endeavour of the part of the Yugoslavs to arrive at a compromise with Stalin. Despite the fact that the whole international campaign issues directly from Moscow, and is the direct responsibility of Stalin, no attack was made against Stalin. On the contrary he was held up as the authority and his portrait appeared with Tito's at the conference. Savage criticism was directed against Stalin's spokesmen in other countries, but not against Stalin himself. The line of the Yugoslav leaders was: Russia first with its "Bolshevik" leadership, and Yugoslavia next.

Tito wishes to reach a compromise, but on the basis of national autonomy without direct interference from the Russian secret police and direct control by the Russian bureaucracy. In this, every revolutionary worker will support the right of the Yugoslavs to self-determination and national autonomy against the bureaucratic centralisation of the Great Russian bureaucracy, despite criticism of Tito's regime.

This quarrel has torn the veil from the real visage of Stalinism. Its bureaucratic totalitarianism as against the democratic centralist methods of Leninism-Trotskyism is brought out sharply. Because of the effects of this dispute on the rank and file of the Communist Party and on the working class as a whole, it is of inestimable importance to publish the point of view of the Yugoslavs.

# JUGOSLAV C.P. CONFERENCE

## FOR INFORMATION:

EXTRACTS FROM THE TELEGRAPHIC AGENCY OF JUGOSLAVIA'S  
REPORT OF THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE  
JUGOSLAV COMMUNIST PARTY

Belgrade, 26.7.48.

### Extract from Stefan Metrovic's Speech.

"It has already been said that there is not and cannot be any theoretical dispute of principle between our Central Committee and the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (Bolsheviks) as their ideological basis is common - Marxism-Leninism. If therefore, from the theoretical aspect we analyse the resolution from beginning to end, if the principles which guided and are guiding our Party, the principles of our recent and present practice are compared with the principles of this resolution - of course, excluding its moral and political aspect - that is slander against our Party, also a question of principle - then the resolution and this campaign launched against our Party on the grounds of this resolution, are deprived of every genuinely revolutionary and generous aim.

"Having further noted that factional strifes in our Party had been eliminated only in the summer of 1944 and that 'practically all members from Comrade Tito right through the Party had taken part in this strife, 'Comrade Rakossy proceeded to give his 'Marxist analysis' of the functioning' of our Party in the war.

"Numerous Yugoslav Communists were partizans, that is a member of the Party and a soldier all in one. And through practically four years of fighting they got used to military methods. So it is only natural that the demands of the partizan struggle reflected their specific features and life. In the circumstances of the partizan struggle it is most often difficult to resolve matters by means of detailed and exhaustive consultation or conferences. Instead came orders and Yugoslav communists got accustomed to accept orders. And thus it was natural that in the now fierce struggle there was little time to study communist theory and extend Marxism-Leninism to the Yugoslav conditions. This was felt all the more acutely since, after the liberation, according to statements of the Yugoslav comrades, there were only 4,000 members of the Party who were members before the war. Thus it is only a percontago of 400,000 members of the C.P. of Jugoslavia who were members before the war, namely, 99 new members in every one hundred members!"

. . . . .

Extract from Speech of Veljko Micunovic

What happened? There are no 'healthy' elements, nor could there have been any in the Yugoslav C.P. Supporters of the resolution opened a fierce fire on our Congress and 'discovered' even worse things contrary to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism in the field of the ideology, organisation and tactics of the C.P. of Yugoslavia. I quote some of their words. 'Communists cannot recognise the coming congress of the C.P. of Yugoslavia nor its decisions as valid because the election of delegates was carried out under a reign of terror and the proof of this are the reprisals against Hebrang and Zujovic. Also such nonsense as the following was produced; 'Such a congress whose composition is forged and picked out in advance among the most trustworthy and loyal followers of the nationalist policy can only prove the unanimity of the nationalist aspirations of the group in the Politburo of the Central Committee which has cut itself adrift from the Party.' (this was written by Comrade Charpentier in the 16th issue of 'For Lasting Peace'.)

"Twenty years ago the 15th Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B) which was prepared at the height of the struggle of the Party against Trotsky and other anti-Party elements contains the following reply by Comrade Stalin concerning the preparations for the Congress made by Comrades Zinoviev and Trotsky, these two are clamouring that we are preparing the congress by means of reprisals. How odd it is that they can see nothing except reprisals. Can it be that the decisions of the Central Committee and the central control committee on the discussion, which were taken more than a month before the Congress are not, in your opinion, preparations for Congress, or are they? What about the constant discussion in basic organisations and other Party organisation which have been lasting already for three to four months? How else can the growth of activity on the part of the Party masses and their study of the most important questions of our policy be termed if not a preparation of the Party masses for the Congress? Who is to blame here if Party organisation in this matter do not support the opposition? Obviously the opposition itself is to blame."

"In this connection, Comrade Stalin addressed these words to the opposition also. 'They protest against the arrest of disorganisers who have been expelled from the Party for anti-Soviet work. Yes, we are arresting them and we shall go on doing so if they do not cease undermining the Party and Soviet authority.' (stormy applause).

"There is no doubt that both the slanders by Trotsky's opposition and Comrade Stalin's reply should be borne in mind by certain people who are slandering the Fifth Congress of the C.P. of Yugoslavia. The arguments of the slanderers of today are no more valid than those of the opposition of 20 years ago either about the electoral procedure or about the basic principles of communist responsibility, conscience and ethics. What else can be said of such malicious attempts to discredit our Fifth Congress as a result of the failure of the 'healthy' elements to appear. Those who make these

accusations must know that our Fifth Congress was prepared publicly before the eyes of the entire Party and country through general party discussions on the most important questions of our Party policy. They must know that delegates to our Congress were elected by secret ballot in the proportion of one delegate to 200 members of the party. They must know that the Fifth Congress was hailed as a great event, not only by our Party but also by the working class, the youth and all the working people of our country, who gave, in its honour new examples of working heroism. They know that Congress delegates were greeted by tens of thousands of Party members and working people in all parts of our country, who in the course of seeing them off to the Congress, gave them instructions on what stand they were to take on all questions including the Information Bureau's resolution. (applause).

"In spite of all this, attempts are being made today to discredit our Fifth Congress with arguments which no longer have any connection with Marxism or with Leninism but are merely senseless propaganda, more vicious than any that has hitherto been flung against our country by international reaction."

Referring to the allegation of Trotskyists methods, Meeunovic said: "The Trotskyist methods are being used by those who have set themselves the impossible aim of proving that our party is a terrorist and conspiratorial military clique. Such methods are used by those who have the audacity to write, as the French 'Humanite' has done, that the Fifth Congress is a mob of people herded together by police methods sitting under the protection of planes and bayonets.

"Trotskyist methods are being resorted to by those who state that our free homeland which is building socialism is on the road to degenerating into a bourgeois and fascist state. In this connection, Comrade Charpentier wrote that our Central committee was aiming to build socialism with the aid of Anglo American imperialism.

The organ of the French C.P. used the evidence of Zivko Topalovic a former Yugoslav police and court spy, a war criminal who has been sentenced by our Peoples courts to 20 years of imprisonment, to pass judgement on the Yugoslav C.P.

"This is clear to everyone in Yugoslavia today, and sooner or later this will also be clear to the other side. It will be clear there were unfortunately certain communists, various well-known opportunists, Trotskyists and other capitalist spies who were talking and writing, were being organised by reaction in order to deep on still further the rift in the present anti-imperialist camp, and to create as much confusion as possible in this camp."

-4-

Extract from speech of Mosa Pijade.

Today's "Borba" publishes an article by Mosa Pijade in which he states that the Information Bureau's resolution was to play the role of a document of international working class movement in the defence of the purity of the principles of Marxism-Leninism from the party which 'betrayed' them.

However, the lack of principle of the resolution is obvious from the very contents of the resolution. From the untruths and obvious

contradictions which it contains, from the injustice done to the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, the peoples of Yugoslavia and their achievements accomplished precisely under that leadership which was subject to this unscrupulous, ruthless attack. This lack of principle not only struck the masses of our Party membership but also Front members and nearly all citizens of Yugoslavia. No-one in the country asked himself whether the accusations of the Information Bureau were true because their falsity was apparent. People only asked themselves: At what do these attacks aim, did they not think what effect they would produce?

Thanks to their blindness, the leadership of some Communist Parties, members of the Information Bureau have digressed, allegedly in the name of the defence of the purity of revolutionary principles to the road of untruths and slanders on which they are increasingly losing all sense of measure and usual morals not to speak of Communist morals. We are witnessing that in this affair, the press of some Communist Parties is sinking to a vocabulary and methods used by the reactionary press, that it is utilising outright fabrications, consciously distorting actions, consciously misleading the working masses.

The leaders of fraternal parties in various countries knew very well, for example, that we have not even to date been officially informed about the Information Bureau's resolution, that it has not even been submitted to our party by the Information Bureau, but that we had to get it from agency reports. They wanted to hide it from us as long as possible, in order to gain time, to elaborate upon "criticism" against us before we had time to reply. After the Information Bureau's meeting at which the resolution was passed, the whole copy of the paper 'For Lasting Peace, for Peoples Democracy' was already reserved on the whole front page and half of the second page for the resolution and editorial. But this was the way it remained even when the editors had the text of the resolution, although there were no obstacles to it being printed. In the meantime it was already being printed in "Borba".

But whereas we published the Information Bureau's resolution as soon as it came into our hands, not one single organ of the parties of the Information Bureau has to date made public the statement of our Central Committee. Who then conceals facts from its members, who prevents objective discussion of the 'dispute' before the masses and who evades it, we or our 'principled critics'?

On the same morning when the papers in Belgrade published the resolution of Belgrade students condemning the Information Bureau's resolution and approving the attitude of our Central Committee, the organ of the Czechoslovak party published a false reported fabricated by an American woman journalist that Belgrade students had risen against our leadership. "Humanite" and "Co Soir" have been competing with each other in bringing base fabrications on various agreements between Yugoslavia and imperialists.

One copy of "Humanite" contained these titles: "Washington Promises New Aid to Tito"; "Tito Asks for 500 million Dollars from International Bank and Signs Trade Agreement in London". "Humanite" further carried a report of the de Gaullist paper "Paris Presse" to the effect that negotiations were being conducted in Washington for the inclusion of Yugoslavia in the Marshall Plan and goes on to say: "These facts testify to the strengthening of economic ties between Yugoslavia and Anglo-Saxon powers". "Humanite" is not ashamed of smearing its glorious tradition by publishing such slander taken from a de Gaullist paper against a brotherly party which it wishes to 'save' for the democratic front, or of interpreting simple business affairs between states as crossing of Yugoslavia to the camp of the imperialists, forgetting that both Poland and Czechoslovakia negotiated and received a loan from the same international bank and also forgetting that Poland had practically at the same time as Yugoslavia concluded a business affair with Britain by a sum several times greater, which, by the way, is just as it should be.

"Do the French leaders think that we should renounce our own gold and foreign trade on an equal footing, simply so as not to give them the chance to say that we have sold ourselves to the imperialists?"

Is it necessary to give more examples of the lack of principles of those who charge us with the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism? Well then, here are some more. The organ of the Information Bureau on the anniversary of the Communist Manifesto published an article by editor Judin in which he said: "At the same time, Yugoslavia which was until recently a colony of Anglo-French capital, a semi-agrarian land, having embarked upon the path of socialism is achieving such successes in the economic and political development that the time is not far distant when she will begin to outrace Britain". And they now call us conceited, we who never said anything like this.

Or let us take the question of the National Front. Everyone knows what we are being scolded for here. But this same Judin in the same article says: I repeat on February 15th this year: "The new concrete aspect of the idea of Marxism-Leninism on the unity of the working classes with the majority of working people is to be found in the lands of peoples democracy. This idea is most consistently developed in Yugoslavia where in the Peoples Front 7,000,000 people are united (note: Judin forgets to give them class differentiation - Pijade), that is, nearly the entire adult population. The Peoples Front is not an ordinary coalition but a social-political organisation of peoples in which the leading role is played by the working class, headed by the Communist Party. Bulgaria's Fatherland Front is also turning into a social-political organisation of the entire people."



"Everyone could read in the programme of our Party, Stalin's name alongside those of Marx, Engels and Lenin. But member of the Central Committee of the Party of Hungarian Workers, Josef Rovai asks us: 'Is it slander or a fact that the programme of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia makes no mention of Stalin's name?' We reply most emphatically, it is slander! Or are we reproached for 'Turkish-terrorist' methods, whereas those who defend the correct Party methods from us, arrest Jugoslavs in Hungary who refuse to sign a condemnation of our Party and withdraw the parliamentary mandate from the representative of the Yugoslav national minority, not to speak of similar actions in Albania.

"But these examples do not demonstrate only the lack of principles but also the fact that the resolution of the Information Bureau resulted in the leadership of some Communist Parties inducing their press to utilise the falsehoods and slanders against a fraternal party which up till now, together with its leadership, they esteemed so highly. This is perhaps the gravest and most negative result of the resolution. Do such leaders of fraternal proletarian parties realise what this means for our proletariat and all our working masses when they are faced with such an unexpected and incomprehensible phenomenon? And what if one day the Party masses of these parties and working masses who are under their influence, realise that the lies and calumnies were mobilised by their leadership against the Communist Party of Yugoslavia which was so respected by these masses?

"The Information Bureau's parties organs did not publish even the shortest extracts from the draft of our party programme, and in certain countries did not even mention it. But then the Italian comrades say our programme is hypocritical, because - we have no intention of implementing it! Is there anything more unprincipled than this? Probably there is. The leader of the Hungarian Party Rakossi says that we convened our Congress in a hurry and 'scribbled' our programme. Here then are methods which are as far removed from the Party spirit as earth from Heaven whereby these defenders of Marxism-Leninism think to liquidate a leadership to which they untiringly came during the last three years to learn something.

"This is how things stand more or less on all questions which the Information Bureau's resolution has set out before the public. All its untruths and slanders are being 'elaborated' in the press in some parties and in the speeches of their leaders.

"While the resolution quite unjustly accuses our leaders of wanting to construct socialism without the support of Communist Parties of other countries, without the support of countries of peoples democracy, without the support of the USSR, of thinking that Yugoslavia does not need help of these revolutionary forces - the 'elaborators' go even further. Georgui Dej, Secretary General of the Rumanian Workers Party writes in the latest issue of "For a Lasting Peace, For Peoples Democracy": "Socialism cannot be built in a country or in several countries without the help of the USSR and against it, without the aid of peoples democracies and against them, without relying on the international workers movement and against it, as is asserted by present day Yugoslav statesmen." Can one go any further in distorting the truth?

"This then, is the 'ideological' side of the resolution, these are the features of 'principled criticism' which we are asked to accept as comradely and principled criticism, on the basis of which the 'sound' elements in our party are to revolt against the

party and state leadership, in order to satisfy certain heads of other parties who arrived in their free countries in planes with pipes in their mouths and who for four years, four times daily vainly called the masses to struggle via the radio, while we won freedom on foot, with arms in hand, driving the enemy out and meeting with the Red Army, army to army, an auxiliary with the main army, one million with many millions, but liberating, and revolutionary both of them, both with a five pointed star on their caps. And on the basis of such 'principled criticism' we are to confess to crimes which we did not commit.

"Is there anyone to whom it is not yet clear that the resolution of the Information Bureau, by the results which it has brought about, has revealed itself to be a great historical blunder and mistake. It is difficult under these conditions to escape the impression that the campaign against the Communist Party of Yugoslavia conducted in such a manner aims at least temporarily, at shattering the high prestige which the peoples of Yugoslavia have won in the world through their heroic struggle, through their revolution, whereby they overthrew the rule of the bourgeoisie and set up a rule of the working peoples headed by the working class under the leadership of the C.P.Y, the working clan and rapid tempo of socialist construction:

"After everything we have set out, we can say that the resolution by its contents and arguments, its whole history and particularly the manner in which it is now being publicised, represents a new phenomenon in the international working class movement. It leaves the impression of unprincipled factional grouping of leaderships of several communist parties for the struggle against one communist party and precisely that one which after the All Union Communist Party (B) has made the greatest advance towards socialism."

"Such a situation cannot prevail because such actions are incompatible with the interests of the international proletarian movement. Will the leaders of the Information Bureau parties succeed in quickly disengaging themselves from this strange race for the destruction of dearly paid for achievements of the international working class movement? This at the moment is not so easy to presume, but it must be so and will be so. We shall lose neither patience nor firm faith in this."

... ..

EXTRACTS FROM TITO'S SPEECH

In the large Congress hall decorated with busts of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, a portrait of Marshall Tito, countless flags and slogans, 2,344 delegates have assembled.

A little after 8 a.m. members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee headed by Marshall Tito entered the hall. All the delegates rose to their feet and with enthusiastic and long applause greeted the leaders of the C.P.J. The hall echoed with cheers: "Long Live the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia", "Tito-Party", "Hero-Tito", which became a long unanimous chant.

At the beginning of his report Tito said: "Nearly 20 years have gone by since the Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. This is a unique example in history of the working class movement; but when in this report I set forth through what difficulties our Party had to pass, then it will be easier to understand why Congress of our party could not be held for so long. This, the Fifth Congress of the Communist Party is taking place under special conditions, under conditions of the radical social transformation of our country, under conditions of the construction of socialism in new Yugoslavia..."

After outlining the conditions of illegality:

"Marshall Tito, the formation of of the Supreme Headquarters of the National Liberation partizan detachments of Yugoslavia at the meeting of the Central Committee held on June 22, 1941, as well as the development of the uprising throughout Yugoslavia during the first months of the liberation struggle.

"The basic line of our Party, already at the beginning of the liberation struggle was, 1. for the successful development of the uprising it was in the first place necessary to destroy the apparatus of the old authority which the enemy had succeeded in placing completely at its disposal. The destruction of the gendarmerie, police, municipal councils and archives, etc, was the task of the partizans besides attacks on forces of occupation, and this proved efficacious, since the forces of occupation thus lost their stronghold in the villages and smaller localities. Everywhere the partizans destroyed the old authority and forces of occupation were prevented from plundering the peoples.."

Tito dealt at length with the role of the partizans in the struggle against the Germans:

"The second task of our Party which derived from the first, from the struggle for the liberation of our country, was the creation of a peoples authority, beginning with the National Liberation committees and so up to the Anti-Fascist Council of the National Liberation of Yugoslavia. Without such peoples authorities even today we cannot imagine the realisation of brotherhood and unity of our peoples."

"After the termination of the war the Communist Party was faced with no less important tasks. The bourgeois class as a result of its treacherous role had lost not only the confidence of the broad masses of the people in Yugoslavia but also during the war in the armed struggle suffered a decisive defeat. The efforts of the King and the London Government who, through Subasic and Grol, with the support of international reaction, endeavoured to frustrate the realisation of the great achievements of the national liberation struggle, had been spoiled. A Constitution which was adopted by the Constituent Assembly in January 1946 legalised the achievements of our liberation struggle, legalised the national rights of all peoples of Yugoslavia, legalised genuine democratic rights of all the peoples of Yugoslavia. In this way the organisation of the new Yugoslavia as a State of a new type was consummated, and now it was necessary without hesitation to enter upon the reconstruction of the country. With unprecedented elan and speed this task also was carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party, a task without which it was impossible to enter upon the planned development of Yugoslavia. All this made it possible already in the process of reconstruction, to undertake an enormous job - the realisation of the Five Year Plan for the industrialisation and electrification of our country."

"I wish here only to underline that in our country there is no reason for pessimism with respect to our possibilities in fulfilling the Five Year Plan. I want to underline that we made no mistake when we decided to build socialism in our country because it is possible to do so, and this has already been confirmed by the results achieved so far in all fields of activity... that is our great task whose fulfilment would make life for the peoples of Yugoslavia happy, prosperous and much more cultured than it is today."

"Comrades! Concluding my report I consider it necessary to deal, even if briefly with the Information Bureau's resolution, with the monstrous charges against our Party and its leadership, as well as with the wild campaigns and insults directed against our country from various quarters and that from where it was least expected."

"What of our Party and its leadership all of a sudden committed to raise such false charges which not only every member of our Party but every citizen knows to be untrue? What of our country done all of a sudden for such a drastic campaign to be started against it? Let us see how things stand. Do any real

"That, comrades, is not only an attack against our Party leadership. It is an attack against the unity of our Party, an attack against the hard won unity of our peoples, that is a call to all the destructive elements to destroy everything that we have been building up to now for the happiness of our peoples: that is a call for civil war in our country, a call for the isolation of our country.

"We consider it a very great insult when the resolution accuses us of turning away from the Soviet Union and countries of peoples democracy, that we are nationalists and not internationalists, that we have renounced the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. I will reply only to these three charges.

"In our post war foreign policy we have always shown full unanimity with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, and that because that policy corresponded and corresponds to our country's interests, to the interests of peace..."

After dealing with the establishment of the closest possible economic as well as political and cultural relations between Yugoslavia and countries of peoples democracy, and the conclusion of treaties which were "done at our own initiative and nobody had compelled us to do that", Tito said:

"Furthermore, those who attack us today, and those who are leaders of the Communist Parties precisely of those countries which we aided the most, should have at least so much honesty not to use such false, terrible slanders as for example - that we are nationalists, that is that we are no longer internationalists, etc. Is writing off the 25,000,000 dollars reparations to brotherly Bulgaria, writing off the largest party of our peoples property plundered by the Bulgarian fascists in Yugoslavia and the extension of a brotherly hand to the Bulgarian people, passing over all that happened in the past - is this nationalist? No, nobody in the world can say that this is nationalism. This is something quite different, profoundly international, humane, selfless, desiring that this material sacrifice of war-devastated Yugoslavia which our people were making to Bulgaria, serves as a proof that we are forgetting all the evils inflicted on them in the past, and that they are extending not only a brotherly hand, but also material support to the brotherly Bulgarian people. This policy of brotherhood and forgiveness was advocated among our peoples by the leadership of the C.P. of Yugoslavia, which is today so shamefully slandered and abused by the leaders of the C.P. of Bulgaria.

"Furthermore, it is a well-known fact that in 1946 we had a great drought and a poor harvest, but that we nevertheless had answered the appeal of the Bulgarian comrades and gave 2,000 wagons of grain at a time when people were dying of hunger there, and when in our own country it was difficult to ensure the population's food supply. We placed no conditions, we did not ask when this would be returned to us, but we let it go and waited two years for the harvest to be good in their country, and then they started to return it to us. The Party leadership, that is our Government gave this grain at the expense of our working people. But our working people gave this voluntarily to those who needed it. Is this nationalism? No, this is internationalism in practice, and not merely in words. (Prolongued applause)

"We acted in the same way towards Poland, in 1947, and towards Czechoslovakia to whom we gave over 15,000 wagons of wheat, although our peoples were nearly starving even this year too. We gave it to them because they asked us, because they were in a situation still more difficult than we were. And what are the representatives of these countries doing today at the Information Bureau session, signing a resolution in which it is farcically reproaching us that we pursue an incorrect policy of our population's food supply? They speak of some grain tax, etc, which represents a simple deception of people abroad,

since everybody knows in our country that we have no grain tax and that it has not been introduced at all in our country. . ."

"Nevertheless, their ill-intentioned charges are completely groundless. They forget that in 1921-22 the leadership of the Soviet Union headed by Lenin had to introduce NEP, the so-called New Economic Policy, among other things also because of difficulties which arose in supplying the population with foodstuffs in the Soviet Union and that even as late as 1929 in the USSR. Why then are not the difficulties which we face recognised? Is it not most unloyal on the part of all these signatories of such a resolution? And on the other hand, does not the aid which we gave at a time when it was hard for us to do so, represent internationalism, internationalism in practice, in deed and not in mere words? Do those who now unjustly attack us not think that they will one day have to blush when their people ask them why they have not spoken the truth?"

"Every man in our country knows that capitalism is not flourishing in our country, but on the contrary that socialism is being built - at a considerably rapid pace at that. Everyone, not only in our country but also outside, knows that in the post-war period we achieved enormous successes in the construction of our country. Every member of our Party, not only every Party member but also every citizen knows the legal status of our party which it won with rifle in hand in the great liberation war against the forces of occupation and those who forced it into illegality in 1921.

"On the one hand we are accused of being opportunists, that we permit the growth of capitalism in the villages, that we consider peasants as a whole as being the main factor in the construction of socialism, that we are proceeding along the road to the restoration of capitalism, that is to say, we are turning new Yugoslavia into a bourgeois state, and on the other hand we are accused of pressing hard and ordering peasants about - as some of these super-Marxists are now writing. Now, shortly, everything is being invented in order to create greater confusion among their masses when they cannot make them believe in these unfounded charges. Further, it has been asserted that we are building socialism at too rapid pace, that we are promulgating decrees and laws overnight, etc. Lastly, they are rebuking us for the same things that Milan Grol and our entire reaction in the country and abroad have already rebuked us for doing. (laughter)

"It is surprising that in this resolution we have been rebuked for hiding from our masses the All Union Communist Party (B)'s criticism of our leadership attributing that we were afraid of the masses. No, we have not been afraid for ourselves to publish it, but we were afraid lest this would excite even the smallest indignation against those who had been unjustly accusing us. The signatories of the resolution know very well we could not publish the letter sent by the All Union Communist Party (B) and marked 'strictly confidential.' But still, in spite of this, the signatories of the resolution are now attributing this to us as a crime.

"Comrades, if those who are accusing us wanted in this way to blacken us in the eyes of the proletariat of other countries, to drag our leadership and our party through the mud, then they have succeeded in this only partially and for a short time. Truth must out because it is composed of indisputable facts which cannot be hidden for long from the proletariat of other countries. (prolonged applause) In any case, the majority of people who took part in making the charges contained in that resolution represent countries which are far behind Yugoslavia in their post-war development. Would it not be wiser for these critics to criticise themselves and their own work, because there are in their own countries shortcomings and errors in abundance and in all possible forms. (laughter). But perhaps for that very reason they needed to blacken our leaders, our Party and our country.

Comrades , from all sides they are trying to teach us the A B C of Marxism-Leninism, and in doing so these teachers are charging through open doors and bringing out quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, notwithstanding the fact that we had put into practice these quotations a long time ago and that we are still using them. They are now denying that we are Marxists-Leninists. Then, on what basis did we, that is to say our Party, achieve such tremendous results? Did we in 1941 start the life and death struggle on the side of the Soviet Union on the basis of Trotskyists' conception or out of loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, that is to say, to the theory that had been put and is being put into practice in the U.S.S.R. under the leadership of Comrade Stalin? Logic tells us that we entered the struggle because we were Marxists-Leninists not only in words but in deeds."

"Comrades, the untrue accusations of the Information Bureau's resolution and the slander campaign abroad against our Party and our country as a whole, our Party with this, has been faced with the most difficult trial in its history. No other Communist Party except the All Union Communist Party(B) would be able to withstand such blows without falling to pieces like a house of cards,

"Of course this trial will expose all those in our Party who do not belong to such a steeled Communist Party as ours. They are individuals, weaklings and unhealthy hostile elements who have so far been concealing themselves in our Party, such as for example were Zujovic and Hebrang. Usually such persons raise their heads in days most difficult for the Party and in various ways act openly against the Party thinking that their desired moment has arrived. They usually drop out and will inevitably drop out of the chariot of revolution because they are harmful not only for our Party and our country but also for the further correct development of socialism generally.

"In this as well we shall remain unrelenting, consistent, as we have learned to be from Lenin and Stalin. Comrades, I have tried in this rather long report to achieve that our Yugoslav cadres acquaint themselves as much as possible with the development and work of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, to learn of its weak and positive aspects. If I have succeeded in this, if I have among other things succeeded in depicting in what an enormous role our Party's unity played in attaining its successes, then I have achieved much, because only the destruction of fractions and the creation of the unbreakable unity of our Party has made it possible for it truly to become the vanguard of the working class and in 1941 to place itself at the head of the peoples of enslaved Yugoslavia and to direct in the liberation war the struggle to victory over the occupiers and domestic traitors. . ."

"In conclusion," said Marshall Tito, "comrades, I would like to stress that we will work with all our forces to improve relations between our Party and the All Union Communist Party (B). We hope that comrades, leaders of the All Union Communist Party (B) will give us a chance to prove here on the spot everything that is incorrect in the resolution. We consider that only in this case and in this way would it be possible to establish the truth."(All delegates rose - great applause).

The conclusion of Marshall Tito's report was greeted by delegates with cheers and applause which lasted for several minutes, and chanting of "Long Live Central Committee of Yugoslavia" and "Tito-Stalin."

. . . . .

CLASS STRUGGLE IN JUGOSLAVIA

Belgrade, 12.7.48

Today's "BORBA" publishes an article by Vljko Begovic on the charges of the Information Bureau that the Communist Party of Yugoslavia is severing with the Marxist theory of classes and the class struggle.

The practice, itself, writes Begovic, the class struggle which evolved and is evolving in increasingly sharper outlines in the countryside, demonstrates the existence of class differentiation, it shows that in our country there is not and cannot be a peaceful evolution of capitalist elements in the villages into socialism.

There are countless Party and State documents, articles, speeches, laws, decrees and regulations which show how the Party is waging a class struggle in the villages. Chairman of the Economic Council, Boris Kidric wrote in "COMMUNIST" "We must expect from the exploiters elements in the private sector a fierce struggle against the peoples economic interests, against all the endeavours made by the state and cooperative sectors in the interests of the broadest masses." This was in the October 1st issue, 1946.

In "COMMUNIST" of September 3rd, 1947, Edvard Kardelj wrote: "As long as we continue to have capitalist elements in our economy, and we still have, although their role is steadily lessening, it would be illusory and very mistaken to speak about the disappearance of the danger of capitalist development of cooperatives, that is that agricultural cooperatives of the old type will automatically tend towards socialism..."

Agrarian reform not only liquidated remnants of the landed estates but liquidated capitalist ownership of the land in the countryside. The law of agrarian reform expropriated not only large holdings of over 25 to 30 hectares but also reduced the holdings of rich peasants to from 20 to 30 hectares arable soil. The law prohibits the purchase of land beyond this limit while preventing speculation of land buying up of land from poor peasants by the richer ones.

The article then points out that in Poland the maximum areas which did not come under agrarian reform was 50 hectares while in Western Poland this figure is even 100 hectares, that in Czechoslovakia and Rumania the maximum amounts to 50 hectares and law on agrarian reform in Hungary has not affected even 400 hectares estates. This shows who among us has gone furthest in curbing capitalist elements in the countryside.

According to tax assessments in 1947, farmsteads with a yearly income of 16,000 dinars made up 59% of all farmsteads and paid 10.7 per cent of the total income tax. Farmsteads with an income of from 16,000 to 50,000 dinars made up 32.1% of the income tax, while farmsteads with an income of over 50,000 dinars made up 8.2% of all farmsteads and paid 54.2 of the total farmers income tax.

Last year peasants owning one to three hectares of land were bound to hand over 250 kilograms of grain per hectare, those with three to ten hectares of land 310 to 690 kilograms, those possessing 15 to 20 hectares have to hand over 1,100 kgs while those with over 20 hectares gave 1,300 kgs of grain per hectare. The decree of the buy up of grain for 1948 adheres to the same line.

The Information Bureau resolution states that the Yugoslav leaders after criticism by the All Union Communist Party (B) hurriedly issued a new law on grain taxation of farmers for which no preparations were made and which can only disorganise the supplying of the urban population.

This shows how poorly and incorrectly the comrades in the Information Bureau are informed on measures which are being carried out in our countryside. There exists no such law on grain taxation of farmers nor has it a connection with the law on grain taxation in the U.S.S.R. A decree on the buy up of grain for 1948 was confused by the Information Bureau with a law on grain taxation. Neither was this decree issued in a flurry or under the influence of criticism from outside because every year since 1946 a decree on the buy up of grain has been announced.

A system of tied prices has also been introduced to check speculating tendencies of rich peasants and to help the supplying of working peasants with industrial goods. Tied prices enable the peasants to exchange their surpluses for industrial goods under favourable conditions. A ceiling has been fixed for wealthy peasants up to which they can sell grain on the basis of tied prices. Wealthy peasants, moreover can sell only determined products at tied prices while poor peasants can sell all their produce and even such as vegetables, fruit and hay at tied prices.

That capitalist elements are limited in their exploiting tendencies is also shown by the fact that they cannot alone dispose of their farm machinery during nor can they lease it to poor peasants because machines are mobilised for the execution of agricultural work plan in the countryside.

The Information Bureau's resolution also contains the charge that we aim at the direct liquidation of capitalist elements, at the liquidation of Kulaks as a class. This is then branded as non-Marxist and an adventurist policy of our Party. This charge is followed up with proposals on the course which we are already following. As for the quotations in the resolution which should serve as proof that we are not following this course, we can only say that these quotations mean nothing. Such as they are, taken out of their context, they speak of the goal set up by the Communist Party of Yugoslavia - the liquidation of capitalist elements in Yugoslavia.

The Five Year Plan and the concrete measures which the Party is undertaking in the countryside indicate that we are out to curb capitalist elements in the villages, to help the small and middle peasants, that we have given priority to industrialisation and electrification of our country which will serve as a basis for the socialist transformation of the village, that we aim at strengthening the alliance of our workers and peasants, at developing agricultural cooperatives from their lowest to their highest forms and at securing in them a lead for poor and middle peasants.

Today in our country, agricultural cooperatives number over 2,200,000 cooperative members and about 10,000,000 consumers, there are in our country 910 working cooperatives which number 46,560 farmsteads. We have erected and are erecting factories which supply agriculture with implements. The first tractor plant is under construction. Such a line and such a tempo have nothing in common with the adventurist undertakings but represent a line of Marxism-Leninism in the socialist transformation of the countryside. This line has proved right in practice and that is why we shall stick by it.



We also know that there exist deficiencies in our country and that something even better can be done. But to prove this one must be well versed in the concrete situation in our country, one must know the relation of class forces - and therein precisely lies the weakness of the resolution.

An analysis of the line of our Party in the construction of socialism under specific conditions cannot be made outside of our country, on the basis of the Information Bureau supplied by factional and slandering elements, on the basis of the opinion of diplomatic officials and other individuals, nor can it be made on the basis of excerpts from speeches. Such an analysis should have been made in another manner, in the manner taught by Marxism-Leninism. Such an analysis and criticism would have been of benefit to the Communist Party of Yugoslavia because it would have revealed the true mistakes and errors in as much as they exist. This would have been of benefit to other countries of peoples democracies which are building socialism and finally : would have been a contribution to the theory and practice of the construction of socialism and the contribution to unity of the countries of new democracy in building socialism.

. . . . .

EXTRACTS FROM DJILAS' REPLY TO CERVENKOV

"SZABAD NEP" and others assert that Yugoslavs consider they do not need help of the USSR and other democracies in the struggle for the construction of socialism, that Yugoslavs think that the construction of socialism in a country is possible without and even against the USSR. We have already replied to this as to a piece of nonsense behind which lie are concealed intentions probably similar to those of the Albanians - to 'convince' the Yugoslavs of the erroneousness of their views through practical measures.

The question of the possibility of building socialism in one country surrounded by capitalism has already been worked out by Comrade Stalin. Comrade Stalin's teachings show that such a construction is possible in a country but not in every country. Such a country was the U.S.S.R. But comrade Stalin does not say that the U.S.S.R. was the only such country. But to pose the possibility of the construction of socialism in a country without the cooperation of the Soviet Union and other democratic countries is just as absurd as the absurdity that other socialist countries can leave a socialist state alone in the face of imperialism. This is absurd because Lenin's law is correct that socialist economies of different countries must draw close to one another, must link up and not be separated. This closeness can develop solely on the basis of mutual cooperation, by taking into account the historical specialities and the degree of development, on the basis of voluntary agreement and mutual confidence.

Accordingly, when the USSR exists as a country in which socialism has been built it is in our opinion possible to build socialism in any other country if that country, owing to its geographical position, is not prevented by the imperialists from maintaining normal connections with the USSR. This construction and cooperation must pass through definite phases in their development. It is therefore a question of forms, of tempo, of the mode of construction, of the mode of co-operation and not the possibility of construction of cooperation. This drawing close of socialist economies is a law and no one can therefore violate it for long. Unyielding life will have its way

and will finally compel human minds to comply with it if they do not agree with it.

However, the question is raised whether Yugoslavia is a country which can, with its own forces and even if not aided by other countries, build socialism. We shall give no reply to this question because cooperation with other countries already exists. It would be strange if other countries of socialist economy were to force Yugoslavia to prove whether it could or could not build socialism alone.

Had anyone said: In Yugoslavia the rate of construction is too speedy, Yugoslavia might for the sake of general socialist aims have renounced to one or other thing, that of course could have been discussed. But such a method is not employed. Something is thought out obviously in contradiction with Leninism and attributed to be a conception of the Yugoslavs and then this is followed up with a polemic."

"...At one of our party meetings at which the Information Bureau's resolution and the reply of our Central Committee to it were discussed, a party member rightly remarked on the total absurdity of the resolution, saying, 'we are asked to admit that we are spies and we refuse to do so, then we are not Marxists-Leninists.'

Had anyone come and said: The election of party organs should move more rapidly in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, more should be written on party life, party life should be set forth more publicly, even under present conditions the party should come out more to the forefront as compared with the Peoples Front, etc - that could have been discussed. But the critics do not assert this, they say: The Central Committee of the C.P. of Yugoslavia is creating a sectarian-bureaucratic Kulak party, immersed in the Front, while meanwhile carrying out administrative-adventurist nationalisation on the basis of Bukharin's theory on peaceful evolution of capitalist elements into socialism. This of course is stupid and untrue.

On this basis, as well as on the basis of other similar assertions one can only quarrel and not discuss. It is nothing but defendants dock for espionage, treason, and similar, and not the basis for discussion and criticism among communists. Discussion on such becomes futile. That is why we could not go to the Information Bureau meeting and not because of the Central Committee's nationalism. Right up to the time the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia said that it could not conduct discussion on such a basis in the Information Bureau, there had been talk of everything except nationalism. Only after that did nationalism become the central motive."

"...Our critics like to speak of 'crisis in Yugoslavia', of 'difficult days which Yugoslavia experiences.' In fact they are not thus polemicising with us but with themselves, with their own weaknesses. There is no crisis in Yugoslavia. The Unity of the Communist Party, the unity of the working class, the unity of the people was never greater. How do our critics explain the fact that all Yugoslavia take just the attitude of their Central Committee? No doubt because they were deceived by the Central Committee? Or because the entire working class and entire people have become Trotskyists."

. . . . .

# Open Letter to Yugoslav C. P. —

The following letter was sent to the Communist Party of Yugoslavia by the International Secretariat of the Fourth International.

Paris, July 1st, 1948

To the Central Committee and to all Members of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

Comrades,

We want to let you know that the attention of the entire international revolutionary workers' movement is today centred on the conflict in which you have, for some time, been pitted against the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. and the Cominform.

The official press of the Communist Parties is seeking to engulf you in a flood of slanders and insults. Their conduct is a good example of how proletarian democracy is dragged in the mud by these people who operate from Moscow the entire international machine which is at the service of the Soviet bureaucracy.

But we are not duped by this system of slander campaigns which has in the past destroyed so many previous forces in the labour movement. Because under the worst difficulties, we have never ceased for one moment, ever since Lenin died, to continue his struggle in Russia and in the entire world for the communist revolution, against capitalist and imperialist reaction, and against the Soviet bureaucracy which usurped Lenin's party and the whole Communist International.

We know with what sinister inflexibility the bureaucratic machine in Moscow tries to nip in the bud every aspiration of independence or even a sign of a critical attitude toward itself. This Soviet bureaucracy has nothing in common with the Bolshevism of Lenin and the genuine defence of what still remains of the October conquests in the Soviet Union. The struggle - which has, since 1927, destroyed in Russia the entire Old Guard of the Bolshevik Party of the days of the October Revolution - was led by the Thermidorians of the Russian revolution, who were able temporarily to triumph over the proletarian revolutionary wing of Russian Bolshevism.

Now you are in a position to understand, in the light of the infamous campaign of which you are the victims, the real meaning of the Moscow Trials and of the whole Stalinist struggle against Trotskyism.

You hold in your hands a mighty power if only you summon enough strength to persevere on the road of the socialist revolution and its programme. This road is also the road of independence from the bureaucratic apparatus of Moscow. Looking for a way out are tremendous forces in the entire world labour movement - now caught in a vise between imperialism led from Washington on the one side, and on the other, the Soviet bureaucracy in the Kremlin, interested solely in keeping its own privileged caste interests in Russia.

Keep up your fight! Deepen the significance of your struggle with Moscow and its international machine! Do not yield to imperialist pressures! Establish a regime of genuine workers' democracy in your party and in your country! Thereby you will contribute immensely to the rebirth of the international workers' movement.

The International Secretariat of the Fourth International, the organisation which unites around its programme of Bolshevism and Leninism, 35 sections on the five continents, wants to address itself in this our first message to you, not concerning those things about which we must be critical of you with regard to your past and more recent course. We wish rather to take note of the promise in your resistance - the promise of victorious resistance by a revolutionary workers party against the most monstrous bureaucratic machine that has ever existed in the labour movement, the Kremlin machine.

We shall presently address to you and to your Congress and to all Yugoslav communists an open letter in which we shall treat in detail with our point of view on the historic meaning of your conflict with Moscow and its Cominform.

Long Live the Yugoslav Socialist Revolution! Long Live the Proletarian World Revolution!

International Secretariat of the  
Fourth International.

. . . . .

# YUGOSLAV C.P. RESOLUTION

The following resolution was adopted was adopted by the Congress, endorsing entirely the reports of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia:

"After hearing reports on the work of the Central Committee of the C.P. of Yugoslavia and after a comprehensive discussion, the Fifth Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia finds: 1. the Central Committee of the C.P. of Yugoslavia in the period from 1937 up to the Fifth Conference held in 1940, definitively consolidated our Party after having purged it of its factionalists, anti-Party and Trotskyist elements, after having strengthened it with new cadres especially from the ranks of the working class and having enabled it as a monolithic force, to become a political factor in our country.

"The reflection of this consolidation, this unity and these firm links with the working masses was the Fifth Conference which was of historic significance in the development of our Party.

"The Central Committee of the C.P. of Yugoslavia, headed by Comrade Tito, from the Fifth Congress fully accomplished all the tasks with which our Party and Central Committee were faced in the course of international events." (applause)

.....

## An Apology

---

We apologise to readers of our press for the non-appearance of the August issue of "SOCIALIST APPEAL." This is due to the sudden rupture of our relations with the previous printer and the necessity to make new printing arrangements.

A few weeks ago, it was brought to our notice by the anti-fascist "43 GROUP" that C.A. Brock and Co. Ltd. were secretly printing material for Mosley and his organisation. As Messrs. Brock have been printing not only our material but doing work for the Labour and left wing organisations generally for many years, this revelation came as a great shock to us. But having investigated and confirmed the fact we immediately severed all connections. This has seriously inconvenienced us, and we have had to miss the August issue of the "SOCIALIST APPEAL". We naturally took this course rather than have any connections with any printer who prints fascist propaganda. We know that our readers will wholeheartedly endorse our action, and we ask them to bear with us if during the next period we should encounter difficulties in the production of the paper.

ORDER NOW!

"STALIN-TITO CLASH"

THREEPENCE

# NATIONALIZED INDUSTRY AND WORKERS' MANAGEMENT BY LEON TROTSKY

We print this article preliminary to a discussion on workers' control and management of nationalised industry, to be commenced in the next issue of "WIN".

EDITORIAL NOTE: In 1938 when the Cardenas government of Mexico expropriated the oil industry from the Anglo-American imperialists, such newspapers as the N.Y. DAILY NEWS (USA) ascribed the act to the influence of Leon Trotsky then in exile in Mexico. This, of course, was untrue. Trotsky had made an agreement, which he scrupulously observed, that in return for asylum he would not intervene in Mexican politics. He was forced consequently to limit himself to stating his position in general on the expropriation. He supported the act, explaining his views in an article dated June 5th, 1938, published in the American "SOCIALIST APPEAL" (now the MILITANT) of June 25, 1938. It was not known that Trotsky had written more fully on another aspect of the expropriation - the placing by the Mexican government of the oil industry under the management of workers.

In April 1946, Joseph Hansen, former Secretary of Leon Trotsky, visited Natalia Trotsky. He also called on friends of Trotsky. Among them was one who had made a study of the expropriation. This friend told about talking with Trotsky for a whole afternoon on the uniqueness of workers' management of an expropriated industry in a capitalist country. Trotsky promised to consider the subject more fully. Some three days later, Trotsky's French secretary called on the telephone that Trotsky had written a short article.

This remarkable article was printed in the "FOURTH INTERNATIONAL" of August 1946. Comrade Hansen examined the manuscript. Typewritten in French, it was undated and unsigned, but the interpolations and stylistic corrections in ink appeared to be Trotsky's handwriting. The style, and above all the method of analysis and the revolutionary conclusions were Trotsky's beyond question. Comrade Hansen immediately had a copy typed and brought it to Natalia. She too is convinced of the authenticity of the article. The probable date it was written can be fixed as May or June 1938.

In the industrially backward countries foreign capital plays a decisive role. Hence the relative weakness of the national bourgeoisie in relation to the national proletariat. This creates special conditions of state power. The government veers between foreign and domestic capital, between the weak national bourgeoisie and the relatively powerful proletariat. This gives the government a bonapartist character sui generis of a distinctive character. It raises itself, so to speak, above classes. Actually, it can govern without making itself the instrument of foreign capitalism and holding the proletariat in the chains of a police dictatorship, or by manoeuvring with the proletariat and even going so far as to make concessions to it and thus gaining the possibility of a certain freedom toward the foreign capitalists. The present policy (of the Mexican government - Trans.) is in the second stage; its greatest conquests are the expropriations of the railroads and the oil industries.

These measures are entirely within the domain of state capitalism. However, in a semi-colonial country state capitalism finds itself under the heavy pressure of private foreign capital and of its governments, and cannot maintain itself without the active support of the workers. That is why it tries, without letting the real power escape from its hands, to place on the workers' organisations a considerable part of the responsibility for the march of production in the nationalised branches of industry. What should be the policy of the workers' party in this case? It would of course be a disastrous error, an outright deception, to assert that the road to socialism passes, not through the proletarian revolution, but through nationalisation by the bourgeois state of various branches of industry and their transfer into the hands of the workers' organisations. But it is not a question of that. The bourgeois government has itself carried through the nationalisation and has been compelled to ask participation of the workers in the management of the nationalised industry. One can of course evade the question by citing the fact that unless the proletariat takes possession of the power, participation by the trade unions in the management of the enterprises of state capitalism cannot give socialist results. However, such a negative policy from the revolutionary wing would not be understood by the masses and would strengthen the opportunist positions. For Marxists it is not a question of building socialism with the hands of the bourgeoisie, but of utilising the situations which present themselves within state capitalism and advancing the revolutionary movement of the workers.

Participation in bourgeois parliaments can no longer give important positive results; under certain conditions it even leads to the demoralisation of the worker-deputies. But this is not an argument for revolutionists in favour of anti-parliamentarism.

It would be inexact to identify the policy of workers' participation in the management of nationalised industry with the participation of socialists in a bourgeois government (which we called ministerialism). All the members of the government are bound together by ties of solidarity. A party represented in the government is answerable for the entire policy of the government as a whole. Participation in the management of a certain branch of industry allows full opportunity for political opposition. In case the workers' representatives are in a minority in the management, they have every opportunity to declare and publish their proposals which were rejected by the majority, to bring them to the knowledge of the workers, etc.

The participation of the trade unions in the management of nationalised industry may be compared to the participation of socialists in the municipal governments, where the socialists sometimes win a majority and are compelled to direct an important municipal economy, while the bourgeoisie still have domination in the state and bourgeois property laws continue. Reformists in the municipality adapt themselves passively to the bourgeois regime. Revolutionists in this field do all they can in the interests of the workers and at the same time teach the workers at every step that municipality policy is powerless without conquest of state power.

The difference, to be sure, is that in the field of municipal government the workers win certain positions by means of democratic elections, whereas in the

domain of nationalised industry the government itself invites them to take certain posts. But this difference has a purely formal character. In both cases the bourgeoisie is compelled to yield to the workers certain spheres of activity. The workers utilise these in their own interests.

It would be light-minded to close one's eyes to the dangers which flow from a situation where the trade unions play a leading role in nationalised industry. The basis of the danger is the connection of the trade union top leaders with the apparatus of state capitalism, the transformation of mandated representatives of the proletariat into hostages of the bourgeois state. But however great this danger may be, it constitutes only a part of a general danger, more exactly, of a general sickness, that is to say, the bourgeois degeneration of the trade union apparatus in the imperialist epoch not only in the old metropolitan centres but also in the colonial countries. The trade union leaders are, in an overwhelming majority of cases, political agents of the bourgeoisie and of its state. In nationalised industry they can become and already are becoming direct administrative agents. Against this there is no other course than the struggle for the independence of the workers' movement in general, and in particular through the formation within the trade unions of firm revolutionary nuclei which are capable, while at the same time maintaining the unity of the trade union movement, of struggling for a class policy and for a revolutionary composition of the leading bodies.

A danger of another sort lies in the fact that the banks and other capitalist enterprises, upon which a given branch of nationalised industry depends in the economic sense, may and will use special methods of sabotage to put obstacles in the way of the workers' management, to discredit it and push it to disaster. The reformist leaders will try to ward off this danger by servile adaptation to the demands of their capitalist providers, in particular the banks. The revolutionary leaders, on the contrary, will draw the conclusion from the sabotage by the banks: that it is necessary to expropriate the banks and to establish a single national bank which would be the accounting house of the whole economy. Of course this question must be indissolubly linked to the question of the conquest of power by the working class.

The various capitalist enterprises, national and foreign, will inevitably enter into a conspiracy with the state institutions to put obstacles in the way of the workers' management of nationalised industry. On the other hand, the workers' organisations which are in the management of the various branches of nationalised industry must join together to exchange their experiences, must give each other economic support, must act with their joint forces on the government, on the conditions of credit, etc. Of course such a central bureau of the workers' management of nationalised branches of industry must be in closest contact with the trade unions.

To sum up, one can say that this new field of work includes within it both the greatest opportunities and the greatest dangers. The dangers consist in the fact that through the intermediary of controlled trade unions state capitalism can hold the workers in check, exploit them cruelly and paralyse their resistance. The revolutionary possibilities consist in the fact that,



basing themselves upon their positions in the exceptionally important branches of industry, the workers can lead the attack against all the forces of capital and against the bourgeois state. Which of these possibilities will win out? And in what period of time? It is naturally impossible to predict. That depends entirely on the struggle of the different tendencies within the working class, on the experience of the workers themselves, on the world situation. In any case, to use this new form of activity in the interests of the working class, and not of the labour aristocracy and bureaucracy, only one condition is needed: that a revolutionary Marxist party exist which carefully studies every form of working class activity, criticises every deviation, educates and organises the workers, wins influence in the trade unions and assures a revolutionary workers' representation in nationalised industry.

Translated by Duncan Ferguson.

# LEON TROTSKY 1879-1940

By Vincent Charles

Eight years ago, on August 21, 1940 Leon Trotsky, exiled Bolshevik leader, died in a little town near Mexico City. His death was the result of an assassin's blow and the guiding hand that struck it was Joseph Stalin's.

With Trotsky's death, Stalin thought himself rid of his implacable enemy - Trotskyism. Yet today, nearly a decade later, Trotskyism lives on. Stalinism gave birth to many oppositional currents within the Communist movement. There were the Lovestonites in America, the Brandlerites in Germany, and a host of others. For a time, the I.L.P. tried to pose itself as the alternative revolutionary Party to Stalinism in Britain. Trotskyism alone offers the working class a revolutionary alternative to both Stalinism and reformism. Why is this?

The main reason why Trotskyism has survived persecution such as no other section of the Labour movement has ever known, is because, thanks to the genius of Leon Trotsky, on it has developed the task of salvaging Marxism from the shipwreck to which the policies of the Second, and particularly the Third International have led it.

Trotsky has many achievements to his credit. His role during the Russian Revolution of 1905 as President of the Petrograd Soviets; his organisation and leadership of the Red Army; his part in the founding of the Third (Communist) International and its preparing its basic policy documents -- any or all of these were sufficient to ensure him a unique place in history. But his greatest achievement is undoubtedly the fact that almost single-handed he has preserved Marxism in a period when the whole Marxist movement was in retreat and rapidly disintegrating.

Just as Lenin enriched Marxist theory in the epoch of the growth of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution, so Leon Trotsky carried on that work in the period of reaction and counter-revolution which characterised the years after the death of Lenin. Lenin had discerned the early germinations of the bureaucracy in the Soviet Union and had sounded the warning, but he did not live to see the complete usurpation of power by the Stalinist bureaucracy and the effects it had on the first workers' state and on the world working class. To Trotsky fell the task of subjecting to a Marxist analysis those tragic developments of our day - the development of fascism and the tragic policy of Stalinism in Germany, the degeneration of the U.S.S.R. under the bureaucratic Stalinist leadership, the rapid decay of world capitalism leading to the Second Imperialist War, the crisis in the revolutionary leadership of the working class. Without his brilliant analyses of these events, we might have come to an understanding of their portent, but we would have done so much more slowly, more tortuously. Trotsky's theory of "Permanent Revolution" provides the key to an understanding of the development of the European and world revolution.

The "socialists" of the Second International have long ago ceased to pay any attention to theory. The Stalinists content themselves with the most monstrous falsifications of the works of the great teachers. Only the basic works of Leon Trotsky remain the living guide to action.

Trotsky's immense revolutionary experience and authority found its culmination in the founding of the Fourth International in 1938. If the growth of the Fourth International has been less rapid than we anticipated, one of the reasons was because we greatly underestimated the extent to which Stalinism has brought disorientation to the advanced strata of the world working class. Tens of thousands of the best and most militant workers have illusions that Stalinism is communism; tens of thousands have been corrupted, embittered, disillusioned or rendered cynical. Others live on in the vain hope of a regenerated Third International, or desperately, that reformism may at last be vindicated in Britain's Labour Government. The work of rebuilding is painful and slow. We must prepare as Trotsky said, "for long years, if not decades, of wars, uprisings, brief interludes of peace, new wars and new insurrections." How long this period will last will depend on how soon the working class absorbs the lessons of the past three decades, lessons dealt only in the vast and formidable works of Leon Trotsky. It will depend on how soon they find the road to the Fourth International.

For it is the programme of the Fourth International which alone shows the way forward for the working class to the culmination of the task for which Trotsky lived and gave his life -- the complete emancipation of all mankind, the building of the free, communist world.

. . . . .

WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL NEWS is

Printed and Published by Bill Hunter

and is the theoretical organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY,

British Section of the Fourth International,

256 Harrow Road, London W.9, England.