

# WORKERS INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Theoretical Organ of Workers' International League 4th International  
Vol. 5. No. 5. JANUARY, 1944. THREEPENCE

## *In this Issue :*

THE ANTI-FASCIST  
MOVEMENTS IN  
ITALY *Felix Morrow*

OUR TASKS IN  
THE COMING  
REVOLUTION

*Ted. Grant*

FROM THE ARSENAL  
OF MARXISM

IT IS NECESSARY  
TO BUILD THE  
COMMUNIST PARTY  
AND THE

INTERNATIONAL  
ANEW. *Leon Trotsky*

# The Anti-Fascist Movements in Italy

*By Felix Morrow.*

*Reprinted from the "American Fourth International."*

## THE SOURCES OF OUR INFORMATION

It is important for the advanced American workers, hungering for the facts about what is now happening in Italy, to realise that all present sources of information are extremely meagre and unreliable. This fact in itself has political implications and it is instructive to examine these sources of information.

Of the dispatches in the bourgeois press here, the only intelligent ones were those from or based on the writings of the neutral Swedish correspondents residing in Italy; but the Badoglio censorship put an end to that after the first week. The dispatches since then from the Swiss border are obviously written by men ignorant of the political composition of the anti-fascist movement. For example, they refer to "Giustizia e Libertà", - the Justice and Liberty group (now in the Action Party) as the "left wing coalition of all the parties"; designate right-wing trade unionists like Buozzi and Amadeo as "anarchists" and "lib-

eral socialists" (in reality the "liberal socialist revolutionary movement" is the name adopted in the recent period by left-wing Justice and Liberty groups); speak of the Stalinists as "extremists" when actually they are on the right wing of the movement; and apparently do not consider it important to transmit the texts of such party documents as do come into their hands—the important Manifesto of the Socialist Party was published in "Libera Stampa" of Lugano (Switzerland)) but appears never to have been sent to the press here.

To the crimes of omission and commission of the reporters in Berne, one should add the policy of their editors and of the O.W.I. here. There is much interesting material transmitted here by the O.W.I. and released for publication but which is not printed. Examples: a letter from Benedetto Croce, the liberal philosopher, published August 10 in "Giornale d'Italia" and released here August 17, obviously indicating his belief that the workers want an end to capitalism and his fear that civil war is coming; almost daily

reports of freeing of well-known workers' leaders; the rather astonishing text of the August 16 decree, which goes so far in a demagogic attempt to conciliate the masses as to confiscate (on paper) "the real and personal property belonging to persons who, having filled public office and exercised political activities during the period from October 28, 1922 to July 24, 1943, achieved a rapid and large increase in their estate for which justification is not rendered; the official Stefani news agency's frank and almost daily admissions of big strikes and their effectiveness. Do these omissions of material available to them indicate that the bourgeois newspapers are going even further than the O.W.I. in concealing the depth of the revolutionary ferment? In addition, O.W.I. itself does not make public certain material which it gathers, particularly statements and documents of the workers' parties in Italy which indicate fear of the reactionary consequences of an Anglo-U.S. dictated peace. So much for the limitations of bourgeois sources of information.

The Stalinist press is the only other one which receives telegraph and wireless dispatches from abroad. At first glance these Berne and Moscow dispatches seem very useful; they purport to give the statements and activities of the five principal anti-fascist parties, said to be functioning in a close coalition; however, as we shall soon see, we can take them only as expressing the Stalinist line, and not even as indicative of what the Communist Party workers and sympathisers are actually doing.

The dishonesty of the Stalinist press reports are matched by the conspiracy of silence of the Social-Democratic press: the "Jewish Daily Forward", and its child, the "New Leader". They have access to O.W.I. material from which we are shut off, and undoubtedly have also received certain material from the Socialist Party of Italy. But they do not publish the fact that the Italian party does not take their line of 100 per cent support of the "democracies", nor the undoubted fact of collaboration between the Socialist and Communist parties—the latter fact does not comport with backing the Antonini-Generoso Pope bloc.\* "Nazioni Unite", organ of the republican Mazzini Society, has perhaps even better sources of information than the Social Democrats (some of its principal figures went "abroad" some time ago, it is announced, which means with Washington's collaboration), but is often silent about matters embarrassing to Washington. The Social-Democratic Italian-language weekly "La Parola", does not go along with its brothers in supporting Generoso Pope; but like them is an apologist for Washington. The Italian-language anarchist papers, relics of a dead movement, have no avenues of information.

Such are the extreme limits of our present sources of information. One might, of course, take the little authentic information and, in the manner of the scientist reconstruct, a pre-historic animal from a few bones, attempt to provide a complete reproduction of the present situation in Italy. Unfortunately the analogy with the anatomical sciences is only a metaphor. In 1931 during the first months of the Spanish revolution, there was neither war nor censorship and letters came with some regularity, yet Trotsky was constrained, in writing from Prinkipo about the events, to say it was like playing chess blindfolded. At this moment we are in the position of not knowing the value or the disposition of many of the men on the Italian chessboard. It is within these limits

that we must attempt to analyse the events in Italy:

### THE ELEMENTAL MOVEMENT OF THE MASSES

Spokesmen of the various political tendencies are claiming credit for the revolutionary strikes and demonstrations but, with all due consideration of the activities of the underground groups, the stormy movement of the masses bears the marks of an elemental movement from below.

What was the actual state of organisation of the anti-fascist parties on the eve of the fall of Mussolini? A pamphlet dated September 1942, written by spokesmen of one of the principal tendencies, the Action Party and the Justice and Liberty groups, spoke of "wide-spread propaganda", an underground press "on an unparalleled scale", the holding of political meetings, "combat groups formed in nearly every town and village", and "a strict co-ordination of all these units." (In justice to the Action Party in Italy, one should note that these claims were made by emigres here and not in its underground press.) Similar assertions were made by the Stalinists.

If these claims were true, then it was a new phenomenon in history. All other revolutions which have broken out under conditions of illegality of workers' organisations have been elemental movements of the great masses without benefit of organisation. Czarist repression was not totalitarian: between 1912 and 1914 the Bolsheviks had a legal press under a thin disguise, and even during the war there were legal workers' fraternal (insurance) societies; yet we know how small were the underground parties of Russia on the eve of February 1917, and how little influence even the Bolsheviks had on the revolutionary strikes and the insurrection which toppled the Czar. Likewise in Germany in 1918, where the Spartacists were illegal but many close to them were in the legal Independent Socialist Party and the revolutionists had at their disposal part of the apparatus of the legal trade unions, the November revolution was essentially an explosion of the masses undirected by the parties. It is unlikely that, under the conditions of totalitarian repression in July, the underground parties had achieved by July 1943 more organisations than the workers' parties in February 1917 and November 1918.

The years of underground propaganda and activity are, of course, not only the indispensable means of training cadres for the future mass parties, but are also a leaven

among the masses as a whole. But it is significant that the Action Party's underground press, sole source of information about a great strike in March of this year of 50,000 Turin workers, makes no claim that the party led it. We have certain rueful admissions of the class enemy, as in the Pope's speech of June 13, when he complained that revolutionary handbills were being distributed and "propaganda is circulating . . . especially among the working class, that the Pope wished the war." But these facts do not mean that the underground parties led the mass movement in the great strikes of July 26-28. All underground experience hitherto indicates that the party cadres which are actually organised are too small, when the revolutionary situation develops, to assume leadership of the mass actions. Among the leaders whom the workers throw up for the first strikes and demonstrations are individual party members, but neither the situation nor previous preparation enables the latter to act as part of their organisation. If that was true of the best organised revolutionary party in history in February 1917, it was undoubtedly far more true of the reformist and centrist parties of Italy.

After the initial explosions create broad areas in which the parties are enabled to come above ground and operate semi-legally under the protection of the mass movement, the masses come more and more under the control of the parties. The small cadres emerging from the underground are clothed with mass

\* Indicative of what the Social Democrats consider fit to print is this incident. The day following Mussolini's fall, the "New Leader" wired several persons for statements, among them Margaret De Silver, the widow of Carlo Tresca. Her statement sought faithfully to interpret what Tresca would have said at this moment: he would not be "unaware of what the Allies would be up to in the matter of suppressing any real revolution. And he would have fought against the enemies of the revolution. Maybe that is why he is not here. For the fact is that the ex-fascists who are scrambling on to the New Deal bandwagon are the most serious threat at the moment, including such people here as Generoso Pope and straddlers like LaGuardia. . . Maybe the people of Italy, if they succeed in their terrible struggle, will be the ones to do the job of avenging Carlo's memory, the job which people in America seem incapable of accomplishing, to our disgrace." Despite its request for her statement the "New Leader" refused to publish it for "reasons of the welfare of our movement." Margaret De Silver's answer was: "I should have known that a paper willing to push aside any implied criticism of the New Deal's prosecution of the war, and a paper that takes Generoso Pope seriously, would not print my interpretation of what Carlo Tresca would now be thinking of the Italian situation."

recruits. We can well believe the report from Berne in the very first days after the fall of Mussolini that thousands are joining the Socialist Party daily; it is undoubtedly true as well of the other parties. But speedily though the parties grow in a revolutionary situation, much of the mass movement, strikes, demonstrations, clashes with police and troops, etc., still occur undirected from above. Workers in a given city achieve results which, perhaps, not even a revolutionary Marxist party, thinking in terms of a national and international perspective, would advocate attempting. A typical example of this appears to have occurred in the Italian city of Como, according to a dispatch from Zurich:

"... municipal authorities of Como had announced their city wanted nothing to do with the war and 'henceforward will be a hospital town,' open only for charity.

"All factories in the city working for the Italian Army have been forced to cease production, and all troops, including Army staffs, have been removed from the town." ("New York Times" August 27.)

The audacity of it—one city deciding to quit the war and putting the army out! Bloody reprisals by Badoglio would be certain—if the city remained isolated.

As the masses strike, demonstrate and clash with the police and military, learning the extent of their strength by action; the masses in one city notifying, as it were, the masses in other cities of their readiness to join together to destroy their common oppressors, they also learn the limitations of their elemental movements. Despite all they have done, the war still goes on. The masses become increasingly aware of the need for something more: really co-ordinated action on a national scale, and a definite plan to fight for peace and freedom; the need, that is, for a general staff of the masses, a party. More and more the further unfolding of the revolution will depend on the parties, their programmes and their immediate slogans, and their relations with each other.

What the various parties are at present advocating is extremely difficult to ascertain from the meagre reports available. However, we do know the programmes which these parties advocated during the preceding years. Let us attempt an outline of the physiognomy of the principal parties. What follows is based not only on the relevant literature but on discussions with in-

formed persons representing or adhering to the various parties.

The parties will make their way into the masses now primarily through the older workers and agricultural labourers who remained loyal to the socialist and communist tradition and experience of the pre-fascist period. No new parties are emerging as yet. The reason for this was explained by the Founding Conference of the Fourth International (1938): "It is extremely difficult for workers in fascist countries to make a choice of a new programme. A programme is verified by experience. And it is precisely experience in mass movements which is lacking in countries of totalitarian despotism." Nevertheless, the significant body of experience which the party cadres had with their parties during the fascist period is likely to speed the development of new parties. Perhaps the best basis for analysing the parties is to sketch briefly the history of the movement since the last war.

#### THE FIRST CHANCE: SEPTEMBER 1920

The Socialist Party emerged from the war as the sole party of the workers and agricultural labourers, thanks to the fact that, unlike most of its sister parties of the Second International, it did not turn chauvinist. During the Turko-Italian war in 1912, the party had expelled some chauvinists; others seceded in 1914; the party maintained a semi-pacifist anti-chauvinism, as a result emerging in 1919 with great prestige, growing from 50,000 members in 1914 to 216,000 in 1919 while the party-led trade unions grew from 320,000 to 2,250,000 (the figures are Zinoviev's at the time). In 1919 it voted adherence to the Third International and its delegation participated in the Second Congress (July - August 1920).

But within the party remained a reformist wing led by Filippo Turati, and opportunist trade union leaders; and the party leadership resisted expelling them despite the insistence of the Comintern. Vacillation on this question proved to be fatal to the revolution.

In September 1920 came the great test. When the employers refused to grant the economic but far-reaching demands of the workers (including workers' control of production), they occupied the factories. In Turin and other places occupation was followed by the workers continuing production as if they were forever finished with the capitalist class; attempts to oust the workers failed; barricades were erected and the workers prepared

for civil war. Serious observers of various political tendencies agree that the Socialist Party had sufficient authority among the workers and peasants to carry the strike forward into a political general strike and a successful insurrection. True, Italy had no coal and little bread, and would have had to face outside capitalist intervention at a moment when Soviet Russia was still fighting Pilsudski's armies and the German revolution was lagging. But revolutions must be made when the masses are ready, and cannot be postponed to await improvement of external conditions. There were risks; and defeat would come in the end if the Italian revolution did not create a response elsewhere in Europe. But the situation in all Europe was revolutionary. Above all, the alternative to making the Italian revolution was to let the masses down, to deprive them of the hope of a fundamental social change, to abandon them to passivity and demoralisation. Subsequent history proved that those were the only alternatives.

The reformist leaders of course opposed the road of revolution. The outstanding leader of the party, Serrati, returned from the Second Congress in Moscow at the height of the revolutionary crisis. The pressure of the reformists plus his own vacillations turned the tide. The party permitted the trade union leaders to arrange a "compromise." As the workers retreated, the bourgeoisie regained self-confidence and the fascists whom it financed pressed forward. It was only after the evacuation of the factories that the fascists were able to recruit on a mass scale.

There is considerable evidence to prove that the revolutionary elements in the party, on the basis of patient and pedagogical criticism of the party leadership's conduct during the September struggle, could have won the great majority of the party. A few months later, however, at the Livorno Congress early in 1921, the left elements prematurely split away, under the leadership of the ultra-left anti-parliamentarian Bordiga, to form the Communist Party. After they left, the Livorno Congress adopted a resolution stating: "The Congress reaffirming its adherence to the Third International hereby refers the entire conflict to the coming Third (Comintern) Congress and pledges itself in advance to abide by and execute its resolution." The hasty split in the face of the party's continued affirmations of loyalty to the Comintern obscured the fundamental lessons of the period. The split shifted the relationship of

forces in the party in favour of the reformists, and the Communist Party did not grow appreciably. This was the paralysing situation during the critical period between spring 1921 and Mussolini's assumption of the premiership in October 1922.

That same month Serrati at last expelled the reformists at the party's Rome Congress; the reformists, now attempting to find a *modus vivendi* with Mussolini, were now quite willing to go, openly boasting that they had stayed in the party to prevent the revolution. Serrati now sincerely sought to bring the party back into the Comintern; on December 31, 1922 it accepted the decisions of the Fourth Comintern Congress for re-unification; and, indeed, for some years thereafter continued to proclaim its desire for a united party adhering to the Comintern. Actually, however, during those years the party kept moving to the right in the demoralised atmosphere after the fascist victory. Serrati had no cadres to back him comparable to those outside in the Communist Party; in the leadership he stood well-nigh alone; his associates (Pietro Nenni, whom he had given control of the party organ, "Avanti", Angelica Balabanoff etc.) had hardened into a centrist current which successfully opposed him. They ousted Serrati from control and he returned alone to the Comintern (he died in 1925).

Meanwhile the infant Communist Party, while formally abandoning its anti-parliamentarism and opposition to democratic and partial demands under Comintern pressure, in practice failed to follow the policy of united fronts against the fascists. The net result was that many workers, however critical of the Socialist Party, could not see the formalistic intransigence of the communists as a real alternative. This fact was recorded in the general elections of April 1924 when, as noted by the Comintern "Inprecorr" (it proved to be its last months of honest reporting), the Socialist Party proved it still had the support of hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants.

#### THE SECOND CHANGE: THE MATTEOTTI CRISIS

Then came the second great test of the Socialist Party, when the murder of Matteotti by the fascists precipitated a profound crisis lasting from mid-1924 into 1925. The fascist regime was isolated. Against it appeared arrayed well-nigh all Italy; a considerably part of the bourgeois press joined the socialists and communists in the outcry

against the regime. The bourgeois-democratic parties, the Popular (Catholic) party, the Socialist Party and the rightist unitarian socialists (Turati and Matteotti's party) formed the Aventine coalition. But the anti-fascism of the coalition was limited to parliament and journalism; Mussolini skilfully let them exhaust the ferment and themselves in talk—then began systematic repressions again in 1925 and outlawed the opposition parties in 1926. Its failure to seize its second chance left the Socialist Party discredited in the eyes of millions of workers and peasants.

But where was the Communist Party during the crisis? It was still small, thanks to the premature split; but, according to the claim of "Inprecorr", in the 1924 elections it had polled more votes in most of the industrial towns (except Milan) than the Socialist Party, electing 17 deputies. True, the communists correctly refused to enter the Aventine coalition, branding it as a purveyor of democratic illusions when fascism could be overthrown only by violence; true, the communists also by various formal proposals attempted to draw the socialists out of the coalition and into a proletarian united front for a general strike, etc. But upon closer examination it is clear that the Communist Party was already then being paralysed by intervention from the rising Soviet bureaucracy in Moscow. One will search in vain in the Comintern documents of 1924-25 for a serious analysis of the Italian crisis and the tasks of the communists: it was the period when Zinoviev was leading the "struggle against Trotskyism" and "Bolshevisation of the parties", i.e., among other things purging them of the revolutionists who would not submit to the Soviet bureaucracy. In the most crucial weeks of the Italian crisis, articles in "Inprecorr" condemn Bordiga for "defence of Trotskyism". The last legal National Conference of the Communist Party of Italy, in January 1926, is occupied with the crushing of Bordiga; instead of a sober analysis of the lost opportunity of 1924-25 it produces boastful reports of party progress in "Inprecorr". The party's previous reputation for impractical intransigence now merges with the stigma of narrow-minded intolerance of dissident but genuinely revolutionary, loyal and morally impeccable communists.

In emigration the leadership of the Socialist Party split in the late 'twenties, Nenni and others reuniting with the unitarians (reformists) to call themselves the Socialist Party and return to the

Second International. The others (Maximalists) lived on in exile after a fashion, publishing "Avanti" in Paris, and vanished as an organised tendency when the war broke out; their one remaining group today, in Argentina, is anti-war. The Socialist Party of course came out for the "democratic" war and its London delegation is indistinguishable from the most chauvinistic social-democratic exiles.

A minority under the leadership of Pietro Nenni, close collaborator of the Stalinists in the Spanish civil war, defied the Stalin-Hitler pact and took up an "anti-war" position; its Stalinist inspiration was indicated when it turned chauvinist after June 22, 1941. Nevertheless, its "anti-war" position until then appears to have been more akin to the revolutionary sentiments of the socialist workers in Italy and the Nenni group gained a certain prestige during that period. When the majority leadership was bottled up and prevented from functioning in Vichy France, Nenni claimed to speak for the party, consummating various "pacts" with the Stalinists. At some point the majority appears to have declared the expulsion of Nenni who now, however, emerging from a short stay in an Italian prison, is presented by the Stalinists as the official spokesman for the Socialist Party. This claim is central to the Stalinist picture of a five-party coalition whose line is indistinguishable from that of the Stalinists.

#### THE SOCIALIST PARTY TODAY

However, the actual line of the Socialist Party in Italy today appears to be somewhat different, not in basic principles, but sufficiently in formulation and direction to belie the Stalinist picture.

The Stalinist line is 100 per cent for unconditional surrender to the "democracies" and complete uncritical support of them as "liberators"; silence on the question of overthrow of the monarchy as an institution; "removal"—not overthrow—of Badoglio, and "abdication" of Victor Emmanuel, i.e., replacement by another king.

The Socialist Party, on the other hand, issued a Manifesto a week or so after Mussolini's fall, which speaks quite differently. The text we have is incomplete, but the cuts in it (and the translation) were made by a pro-Ally source, hence the differences with the Stalinists may be even more pronounced in the unavailable original. The translation states:

"1. A major factor in the political crisis which precipitated Mussolini's overthrow was the opposition

of the large popular masses to both dictatorship and war. Fascist leadership had crumbled under the threat of popular insurrection. A majority of the members comprising the Fascist Grand Council became panic-stricken and opportunity shrank from the danger of any internal revolutionary upheavals as well as from the consequences of a military defeat by sacrificing an already discredited dictator, along with some of the symbols of fascism, and by turning their power over to the military caste. There was no dynastic hand in the foregoing movement: the fascist King merely obeyed the injunction of a fascist majority.

"2. The Badoglio government does not mean the liquidation of the fascist dictatorship. It merely represents the extreme attempt to save the monarchical state, the empire and the present social structure. Behind the facade of military dictatorship are gathered many elements vital to fascism; some of them have been strengthened. The Badoglio dictatorship is fascism minus Mussolini . . .

"3. In all the fundamental problems underlying the Italian crisis there really exists the closest solidarity among top ranking military, the dynasty, the capitalist and fascist leaders. Badoglio cannot give the people anything else. Badoglio served Mussolini loyally during twenty-one years of fascist tenure.

"The attitude of the Socialist Party before the new government cannot therefore be doubted: we are as emphatically opposed to this new government as we were to fascism.

"4. Some ancient liberal and conservative elements to whom Badoglio has entrusted the management of all leading Italian dailies and other public offices in an effort to simulate a return to constitutional rules and regulations, were never part and parcel of any popular anti-fascist movement. . . . Dynamic liberalism in our country today is represented by those daring elements who are continuing in the tradition of Gobetti and Rosselli. With these elements the Italian Socialist Party is eager to collaborate both in the current struggle aimed at the liquidation of whatever is left of the fascist party, as well as tomorrow in the reconstruction of an Italy which is truly democratic in a modern sense.

"5. It behoves us to fix in the mind of international opinion the true character of the demonstrations, and the strikes staged since the overthrow of Mussolini. For those movements were not the result of any despair or mutiny because of war horrors, but rather the clear-

cut manifestations of sheer rejoicing on the part of a people who had finally emerged victorious over their internal enemy. . . . When it became apparent that Badoglio was committed to a continuation of the war, and in safeguarding as much of fascism as possible under the circumstances, then all popular demonstrations and accompanying strikes surged into a resumption of the fight until complete victory is won over the internal enemy.

"6. The Socialist Party is avowedly committed to the immediate cessation of the war. This, however, is not to be construed that the socialists will later accept just any kind of peace terms; nor does it mean that the socialists will accept any kind of abuse without protesting or reacting against it. Throughout this war we asserted most energetically the independence of our political struggle from that which certain nations have been waging against fascism. We shall not tire from vindicating the rights and vital interests of the Italian people, even if this should mean being at odds with the ruling circles of the United Nations. . . . We do not hesitate to state most frankly that the Italian fascist monarchy deserves a demand for unconditional surrender from its adversaries. . . . But we appeal to the democratic forces of British, American and Russian public opinion, with whom we feel morally allied, and urge upon them at the peace conference the representatives of democratic and republican Italy be summoned, and with them terms be discussed as based on the pledges contained in the Atlantic Charter.

"7. Recent events have once again proved the incapacity of the old Italian ruling class to establish any relations other than those of brutal force and terror between itself and the Italian people as a whole. The historic task confronting us all is the setting up of a democratic republic in Italy.

"8. In order to unite all efforts in the prosecution of the struggle and give them maximum efficiency, the Socialist Party proposes that all other opposition groups begin immediately their work of propaganda and, in view of the general strike, prepare to achieve the following objectives: liberation of all prisoners and political internees; cessation of the war; suppression of the monarchy; freedom of the press; political organization along syndicate lines."

It is clear the document remains within the limits of bourgeois democracy and support of the "democratic" war. Nevertheless, it differs with the Stalinists in (1) calling for the overthrow of the monarchy—

which is entirely unacceptable to the "democracies"; (2) suspecting the peace aims of "the ruling circles of the United Nations"; (3) making the distinction of "the independence of our political struggle from that which certain nations have been waging against fascism"; (4) seeking close collaboration only with those "in the tradition of Gobetti and Rosselli"—which means principally the Action Party and the Justice and Liberty group—and only perfunctorily referring to uniting its efforts with other groups. Particularly significant is that it is lukewarm not only to collaboration with the Stalinists but also to the oppositional Catholic democratic groups; this indicates that the latter are not considered a serious force today, for the Socialist Party would be unlikely, with its perspective limited to a bourgeois-democratic republic, to have any principled reason for opposing collaboration with the Catholics. On the other hand the Stalinists, seeking to remain within the limits acceptable to Roosevelt and Churchill—including retention of the monarchy—make much of the Catholics and other rightist-democratic elements as part of the "national front" in order, as in Loyalist Spain, to use them as a conservative counterweight against the workers' organizations.

Thus, in certain ways, the reformist Socialist Party today appears to the left of the Stalinists.\* Once again the policies of the Communist Party make possible the continued preservation and indeed growth of the Socialist Party which, in turn, is certain to play no less a reactionary role than Stalinism in the further development of the revolution.

#### ACTION PARTY AND "JUSTICE AND LIBERTY"

The victory of Mussolini in 1925 starkly illumined the bankruptcy of the traditional socialist and democratic parties and the impotence of the Communist Party, and inevitably gave rise to a widespread yearning among intellectuals and students for something "new" in anti-fascism. As might be expected

\* As we go to press, the September 1 "Nazioni Unite" publishes the complete Italian text of the Manifesto. There are two significant additions not in the English translation: the Allies are described as fighting the fascists "for other reasons" than those of the Italian anti-fascists; and a paragraph is devoted to explaining that the military defeat is so complete that it is impossible for a new government to fight on for a better peace. We can be sure this reflects widespread suspicion of the war and peace aims of the "democracies."

the "new" turned out to be very old indeed. Individual terrorism, expression of the despair of the petty-bourgeois democrats, appeared: there were at least four attempts to assassinate Mussolini in 1926. "Combat organisations" of students sprang up. In Sardinia, Emilio Lussu founded the Action Movement, with no other ideology than armed violence against fascist armed violence. Carlo Rosselli, Gaetano Salvemini and other established illegal newspapers which preached "offensive and not defensive action", in other words without a serious perspective. The nature of this tendency has just been summarised very well by Nicola Chiaromonte:

"For these men, irrespective of their political credo (and many of them, at the beginning, would have been embarrassed if asked to give a strict account of their ideas), the first and fundamental act was a mute oath, given to none but themselves and of which only their intimate friends were aware, never to give up, never to have anything in common with 'them'. The second act was, when they came to the question of 'what to do', a full realisation that no matter how many people regarded them with sympathy and respect, they were essentially isolated. 'Einzelgaenger' who didn't even know where they were going, but only what they were going away from."

Their desire to oppose fascism was expressed in various heroic but futile gestures and between 1926 and 1929 thousands of them joined the communist workers in the prisons. Especially dear to their hearts were the spectacular airplane flights of Bassanesi and Dolci over Milan in July 1930 and of Lauro de Bosis over Rome in 1931, dropping revolutionary leaflets; and various new attempts against Mussolini's life. But, as Chiaromonte adds, the efficiency of the repression began to make itself felt:

"Until then, the question had been 'how to do it?' Around 1930, for many people, the most distressing problem became 'what to do?' meaning by that, what to do that could make sense in a situation in which as the regime became stronger and stronger, the people felt increasingly helpless and frightened, and the ground for any kind of effective political opposition seemed completely to disappear." ("New Republic" August 30.).

Meanwhile, up to about 1928, the Communist Party had been correctly explaining to these people that "offensive action" under the given

conditions was an absurdity. The necessary task was to train cadres in Marxism, firmly grounded groups of leaders, who would understand that patient and slow methods were required to gather the vanguard of the workers together, sink roots in the masses in the factories and on the land, and prepare for the inevitable financial or military catastrophe of the fascist regime, or a revolutionary explosion elsewhere in Europe, which would create the opportunity for overthrowing the regime. The Marxist perspective, as time passed, showed itself infinitely superior to the spectacular but pointless gestures of the petty-bourgeois rebels, and more and more of the youth turned toward the Communist Party.

Precisely at this juncture came the "third period" formulas from Moscow: no united fronts with other opposition groups; characterisation of the socialists as "social-fascists", anarchists as "anarcho-fascists"; etc.; and a perspective identical with that with which the petty-bourgeois rebels were tiring and turning away from: "offensive" action. Had Moscow deliberately sought to perpetuate the independent existence of the confused petty-bourgeois anti-fascist movement it could not have invented a more efficacious device than the "third period".

This "left" turn explains the renewed vitality of the petty-bourgeois movement, which found its main organisational form founded by Carlo Rosselli and Emilio Lussu after their famous escape from the Lipari Island prison in August 1929. Its first manifesto condemned the "constitutional-moral" limits of the anti-fascism of the traditional parties, and declared itself to be "a revolutionary movement, not a party", uniting republicans, socialists and democrats", to fight for "liberty, the republic, social justice". As if finding it necessary to explain how a movement with such utter poverty of ideas could play a major rôle, the latest official history of "Giustizia e Libertà" writes: "Although the anti-fascist combativity of the Communist Party attracted many youth, its attack of depreciation against the other oppositions and against that same culture (civilta') the destruction of which was provoking a national insurrection of moral conscience and new revolutionary functions, prevented the Communist Party from assuming the function of complete successor of the oppositions."\*

\* "Movimento di Giustizia e Libertà", June 1943 Manifesto of the North American Federation of G.L., 1133 Broadway, New York.

This movement was sufficiently dangerous to the fascist regime to impel Mussolini to assassinate Carlo Rosselli near Paris in June 1937. Despite its confusionism, the movement had important insights. During the Ethiopian crisis, it was the only tendency other than the Trotskyists which insisted that anti-fascism should not support sanctions by the "democracies" against Italy but should base itself on internal struggle against the regime. Many of its best comrades fell in the civil war in Spain, where the Italian anti-fascists became legendary for their superiority in combat with Mussolini's conscripts; in a confused way but in the correct direction it protested against the conservative "defence of the Spanish republic" based on dependence on the "democracies", and called for independent "defence of the Spanish revolution". When the "left" line of the "third period" was followed by the Stalinist crimes of the Popular Frontist period, it hardened the determination of the elements around "Giustizia e Libertà" to steer clear of Stalinism, although politically they stood not far from the Stalinists then, and again when the Nazi invasion of the U.S.S.R. swung the Stalinists back to the "democracies".

It is known that now the groups of "Giustizia e Libertà" have entered the Action Party founded by Lussu, himself a founder of the former organisation. In 1931 Trotsky characterised this general tendency as left-democratic, with its nearest counterpart, perhaps, the Social Revolutionaries of Russia. During the last ten years it has taken on a little more socialist colouration, perhaps, but remains "classless", i.e. petty-bourgeois, with considerable overtones of old-fashioned national patriotism. Its principal immediate difference with the Stalinists is probably on the monarchy, which it continues to insist on overthrowing.

#### THE STALINIST LINE IN ITALY TODAY.

As reported in the "Daily Worker" and the weekly "L'Unita del Popolo", the Stalinist line is breath-taking in its crudity. It is reported in Moscow's "Inter-continent News" (I.C.N.) dispatches from Berne as ostensibly the line of an illegal radio, "Milano Liberta'", speaking for a five-party coalition (the others are Socialist, Action, Christian democratic and "liberal reconstruction"); and undoubtedly there is a certain amount of collaboration since all the parties limit themselves to the perspective

of a bourgeois-democratic revolution but we have no right or reason to take the Stalinists' word that the others share responsibility for the formulations attributed to the alleged coalition.

In the crucial eleven days between Mussolini's dismissal on July 25 and August 4, the Stalinists did not call for the ousting of Badoglio and the king. On the contrary, they praised them for dismissing Mussolini:

"We greet all those who, understanding the will of the nation, helped ban the tyrant by action from the top." ("Daily Worker, July 28.).

Those who protested an Anglo-U.S. deal with Badoglio were answered as follows by the foreign expert, James S. Allen:

"Badoglio is a new phenomenon. He is not Petain. He is not Darlan.

"He is not only the Badoglio of the Ethiopian campaigns . . .

"He is the man who in this transitory but swift and decisive moment of national resurgence is confronted with the imperative national will for peace . . .

"Civil war can be avoided if Badoglio makes peace . . .

"Thus, to raise the slogan of 'No deals with Badoglio', under any circumstances, even if this would mean knocking Italy out of the Axis immediately . . . is to befuddle the whole issue." ("Daily Worker, July 31.).

The same Allen had to explain, five days later:

"When it became clear that Badoglio simply was playing for time . . . the approach towards the Badoglio government of both the Allied governments and the anti-fascist front in Italy changed. The five-party coalition first increased direct pressure upon the regime and when this failed to produce results called for its overthrow." ("Daily Worker, August 5.).

The word "overthrow" was thus used for a few days, and there was even an I.C.N. dispatch from Berne of a call to "arming the people." However, another I.C.N. dispatch, this time much more authoritative because from Moscow, corrected the hot-headed Berne reporter and established the precise line as follows:

"The next day (August 4) the opposition launched the following slogan—'removal of Badoglio, the abdication of the King and the formation of a national government for peace.'" ("Daily Worker", August 23.).

And this has been the Stalinist line since then: removal—not revolutionary overthrow—of Badoglio, and abdication of the king, i.e., not

the end of the monarchy but replacement of Victor Emmanuel by Crown Prince Umberto and his nominating someone else for Badoglio's place.

The same Moscow dispatch explains why the Stalinists at first "did not project an immediate veto of the King and Badoglio", because:

"It would have been folly to place as their chief objective on the 26th the struggle to overthrow Badoglio and force the King to abdicate. Nobody would have understood such a slogan.

"In the eyes of the most enlightened people, the King and Badoglio seemed to have been Mussolini's grave-diggers."

As we have seen, "the most enlightened people" included the Stalinists, with their praise of Badoglio's "action from the top" and his role as "a new phenomenon".

The principal function of the "government for peace" would be unconditional surrender to the Anglo-U.S. forces, who are recommended by "Milano Liberta" as follows:

"The democratic countries demand nothing of the Italian people, nothing of the Italian nation . . . What they demand is the capitulation of fascism and its accomplices . . . Therefore, the democratic armies who are advancing with this programme are our allies, our friends." ("Daily Worker", July 30.).

It is hard to believe that these dispatches describe the line as it is actually purveyed to the bombed workers of Milan. In all probability the formulations of the dispatches are for foreign consumption only, for whatever the Stalinist functionaries are, they are not so stupid as to repel the masses whom they seek to influence. Not that the line as actually carried out in Italy is less treacherous; but it is probably more clever.

### THE CONTRADICTION IN ITALIAN STALINISM

It must be recognised that Stalinism is not only attempting to betray the Italian revolution, but has a powerful capacity to do so. Undoubtedly the principal political cadres in the proletariat belong to the Communist Party. The party has the prestige of having borne the brunt of the underground struggle, as a bitter opponent of Stalinism has recently testified:

"But, for all the barrenness of what was going to be their various 'lines' in the following years, for all the absurdity of their tactics, for all the hatefulness of their discipline, nobody can deny

to the men in Italy who called themselves Communists the honour of having been the most stubborn, unflinching and ruthlessly persecuted of those confraternities of stoics who guarded for twenty years the future of the Italian people." (Nicola Chiaromonte, "New Republic", Aug. 30)

It could not fail to be so. Under fascism the Communist Party members and sympathisers could not learn the truth about the counter-revolutionary role of Stalinism elsewhere; nothing comparable took place in Italy where Stalinism always remained in opposition to the regime; and of course they would not believe what they read in the fascist press. To them the party remained the Leninist movement it had been in 1922. One should add the fact that the Comintern's party, always able to finance activity and literature, was far more attractive to underground activities than the Socialist Party which secured only occasional starvation rations from its sister parties outside.

But if upon emerging from underground, the party has the best cadres of the proletariat at its disposal, that is not to be recorded as a source of strength for Stalinism for an indefinite period. Unlike the functionaries who in emigration became corrupted and willing tools of Stalinism, the party ranks who remained to suffer in Italy are not Stalinists. Indicative of the moral calibre of the Italian communists is the fact that even as late as 1931, when the apparatus of all the other parties of the Comintern had been completely Stalinised, there could still be an important split in the Italian leadership on the question of Trotskyism. Three members of the Political Committee—Blasco, Feroci and Santini—became Trotskyists.

One could not expect their example to be followed by the ranks, for they had access to outside information and political literature which the average underground member could not have. Even more significant, therefore, is the fact that many communists, though failing to learn the true character of Stalinism, developed a strong distrust of the Comintern through their experiences with it. Orders from Moscow or Paris, issued by light-minded bureaucrats trying to "produce", often resulted in disastrous consequences. Typical enough of the 1930's is the appearance of a Comintern functionary in an industrial city with leaflets calling for a general strike. The small local cadres of the party, painfully built over a period of years, would protest that the leaflet distribution

would mean nothing except the destruction of the party cells, but would carry out the order. Seized and imprisoned for long terms, they would compare experiences with other communists: the party cells in Mussolini's prisons, as in those of the Czar, were schools of Marxism. A discussion would lead to general agreement of a communist cell that the Comintern orders had been wrong in a given instance; that would in turn lead to deeper probing into the Comintern programme for Italy. Thus the jails trained many communist dissidents. Those who had the moral courage to fight fascism would not knuckle down to what they believed wrong in the party. Some of these were expelled or left, but perhaps even more of them were still in the party when Mussolini fell.

Thus there is a deep contradiction within the Stalinist organisation. On the one hand it is clothed with great moral prestige. On the other hand those who provided it with that moral credit are unlikely to go along with the Stalinist policy as it changes from the oppositionism of the past 21 years to

support of an Allied-sponsored regime. So long as the struggle in Italy remained underground, Stalinism could identify support of the "democracies" with the struggle for peace and freedom of the past decades. But it is a very different thing to paint the Anglo-U.S. forces as liberators when AMGOT is already operating in Sicily (not to speak of what will happen if it attempts to rule the advanced workers of northern Italy as it rules the Sicilian peasants!); and when Roosevelt and Churchill find their Darlan—perhaps Badoglio himself—and insist on retention of the monarchy.

There is a small percentage of members in countries like England and the U.S. who have stayed with the Communist Party throughout the course of its degeneration. One must remember, however, that they adapted themselves to Stalinism over a long period of time: Trotsky seemed mad to them when he predicted in 1928 that Stalinism would end in chauvinism. In Italy, however, in many cases it will be as if a communist of 1922 would be confronted with the Stalinist line of 1943. One can predict with con-

fidence that the cadres of the new revolutionary Marxist party will come from among these communists and the youth they will train.

There should be no illusions: Stalinism will wreak great havoc before it is overcome. But in addition to the fundamental contradiction in the ranks of the party which we have noted, it is also important to realise that neither this party nor the other parties as yet control the mass movement. It remains in large part elemental and explosive. Before Stalinism succeeds in channelising it, the movement will in all probability topple many things and create an arena of workers' democracy in which the revolutionists breaking with Stalinism can fight for the minds of the masses. After 21 years of totalitarianism, there will be widespread resistance among the workers to the Stalinist totalitarian methods. Difficult days lie ahead for the revolutionary-Stalinist-totalitarian methods. Difficulties of success. Above all they and the revolutionists everywhere on the continent have on their side the terrible urgency of transforming the European shambles into the Socialist United States of Europe.

# Our Tasks in the Coming Revolution

*Speech of TED GRANT at the 1943 Conference of W.I.L.*

"I think that the Conference today is proof of the fact that we have travelled quite a good distance since our last Conference of 14 months ago. The number of delegates, the fresh forces we have at the present time, the fact that we are meeting when the campaign against Trotskyism on the part of the bourgeoisie seems to be on the order of the day—all this indicates the gravity, and the necessity for ourselves, as the vanguard, if we are to be the vanguard of the working class, to take stock of the period through which we have passed in the last 12 months, and of the days, and years, momentous days and years, which we believe lie ahead of us in the coming period.

This document sets out to put, as Comrade Trotsky has expressed it, to put in the plainest and most condensed form possible, the basic

principles and basic ideas, the underlying conceptions that form our theoretical understanding, and our theoretical attitude towards world events, and towards the tasks of history which are posed in front of the working class, and in front of all toiling humanity at the present time.

The Conferences which we hold are not at all like the Conferences of the I.L.P. and the Stalinist Party, which are held at an exceedingly low level, in which agitational and demagogic speeches are given from the platform. We have to examine events from a world point of view, to take into account the whole world movement of history itself. We have to examine our conceptions, our programme, our programme in the light of events, and on that basis to restate the fundamental propositions and ideas of Marxism, if, as we believe, they

have been proved to be correct in that period.

The first point made in the resolution is the fact that basically the conceptions of Bolshevism and Internationalism, as developed by our movement, have been proved correct through the course of the experience of the last decades, and in particular through the course of the experience of the present world war. In the last world war, Lenin had to reformulate the basic ideas of Marxism, and even harden and sharpen them out in correspondence with the changed relationship of forces.

We know that Marx, in the period of the Franco-Prussian War had actually supported one group of the bourgeoisie against another group of the bourgeoisie, because of the relatively progressive nature of the tasks of national unification which faced Germany, but that



Lenin looked at the first world war as proof of the fact that capitalism was now an outmoded system, that it had ceased to play a progressive role in the development of society, and the development of mankind, and from that analysis Lenin and the Bolsheviks came to the conclusion that it was impossible to support any group of the bourgeoisie.

We see that that conception, which has been developed by Lenin and Trotsky, was proved to be correct in the events which followed during and after the last world war. It came at a time when the proletariat was relatively immature, was not yet in certain senses subjectively prepared for the carrying through of the tasks which society had imposed on its shoulders. As Lenin had foreseen this immaturity was expressed in the fact that even in Czarist Russia, the overwhelming mass of the people supported their own imperialists.

The crime of the last world war exacted its retribution in the revolution of 1917, and the world revolutionary wave which followed in 1917-1921. We know that only the Russian proletariat succeeded in solving the problems with which they were faced, nevertheless the fact that this world revolutionary wave affected the entire mass of the population in almost every part of the globe in itself was proof of the fact that capitalism had become a brake on the development of the productive forces, and that it was now the task of the proletariat to inaugurate a new order of society. The national state was completely outmoded by the development of the forces of production.

We know that the period which followed the last world war, despite the calculations of Lenin and Trotsky, was not followed by a series of successful revolutions, as it should have been, and that the main responsibility for the epoch of reaction, of terrible distress, of terrible failures for the world proletariat, rests on the outmoded leadership of the working class, of the Second International on the one side, and the Third International on the other.

During this period, the armistice period, we had, for international socialism, for those who remained true to the tradition of Marxism and Bolshevism, an exceptionally difficult period, a period when they were swimming against the stream, when there was no possibility to do anything else but to prepare the theoretical basis for the formation and building of the new International. We can say, in a certain sense, that mankind has had to pay the price of this new terrible

slaughter of the peoples, in the last four years, as a means of preparing, no longer the material basis—that has already been prepared in the decades after the last world war, (and a ready world society relatively, if not absolutely, was materially prepared for the socialist revolution)—that the new defeats and new destruction was necessary, in a certain sense, because of the failure of the old leadership of the working class to train and build up the working class to prepare them to fulfil their historical mission.

The world bourgeoisie regarded the war with horror and dismay. It was their absolute impasse which forced them on to the road of a new slaughter of the peoples, despite the fact that the leadership of the bourgeoisie recognised clearly the consequences which would flow from the movement in the direction of a new world war.

As a consequence of the terrible shocks which the proletariat has received even with the Italian working class prostrate, the German working class prostrate, the greater part of the world faced with terrible defeats, when this war began we have an entirely different psychological attitude on the part of the masses from that at the outbreak of the last world war. It was greeted with dismay and distress, nowhere in any part of the globe was any great enthusiasm for capitalism manifested, or any support for the ruling class, in Britain, Germany or any other country. The masses of the people had to be dragged to the slaughter, and could only be pushed, precisely because they could see no other course, because for the time being, they saw no other way out than support of their own ruling class.

The terrible period of reaction through which mankind has passed during the last 20 years, perhaps the worst in the history of the working class, all this resulted in the degeneration of those who did not base themselves in full on the strength of the proletariat and its forces, those who looked with irony, with distrust, with scepticism to the proletariat. The Stalinists, the Labour leaders, the Burnhamites, all claimed at one time to stand on the platform of world revolution; all turned and pointed to the apparent apathy and sheepishness of the working class, who in the first, second, third, and apparently fourth years of the war were completely passive.

We know that the Old Man had believed that the second world war would not last so long as the first, because the revolution would come. This was falsified by events, and

sceptics have taken this as proof of the incapacity of the working class. The revolutionary Marxists, although our forces were small, although we had been subjected to the terrible pressure of the reaction, in building up our forces—and we can say that this war is a result of the immaturity of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat—nevertheless, we and we alone understand the profound process of change that was taking place within the ranks of the apparently apathetic and cowed working class.

Looking below the surface, we can see that a similar process, except now on a world scale, was taking place as took place in Russia after the defeat of 1905. The revolution was defeated, and for a number of years, reaction raged. The Bolshevik party and all the forces of the working class were shattered. It took a number of years before they could recover, and by 1912-14, they had moved forward once again in the direction of the revolution of October.

So, on a world scale, we can see the same process taking place underneath the whip of reaction. We can see that the mass of the population of the entire globe was pushing forward in the direction of revolution, that the events of the war were preparing the way for a new revolutionary upsurge, a new swing on the part of the proletariat, which would dwarf even the wonderful revolutionary wave of 1917-21.

If we examine the question from the point of view of exactly what forces are at the disposal of the bourgeoisie on a world scale, if we examine the question from the potentialities which the bourgeoisie possess to solve the world crisis, the death agony of capitalism, what do we see? During the course of the war itself, all the forces are being speeded up for a mighty wave of revolt on the part of the masses. War, as well as revolution, has always been the locomotive of history. Despite this, the bourgeoisie on a world scale has been compelled to place the proletariat in a position where they can be revitalised and renewed. Millions of unemployed, demoralised by years of reaction and defeat, have been placed either into the Army or into industry. The proletariat, the living force of the revolution, has been renewed and revitalised in the course of the war.

The middle class, too has been under the impact of war. The concentration of capital into a few giant monopolies, observed by Lenin in the last world war, has reached almost its greatest pitch in this.

It is gathering up speed. The middle class is being ruined, not only in the countries of the west, but even in India. In Germany, under the brutal regime of Hitler, the middle class has been practically wiped out, the very class which provided a basis for Fascism. In Britain, an acceleration in its ruin is now taking place.

The contradictions which compelled the imperialists to go to war, far from finding a solution, are actually aggravated. Britain entered the war to maintain her failing hold on her empire, to retain the markets of the world. The result has been that she has lost everything. That is not only the plight of Britain. The productive forces of America alone have increased at least 30 to 40% during the course of the war. The same applies to other countries. For world imperialism it is impossible to solve the contradiction between the productive forces, and the national state and private ownership of the means of production.

From a psychological point of view, during the course of the fourth year, a turning point has been reached in the war, in the revolution in Europe, and we might add, in the revolution in Britain. We get the situation where, after 20 years of Fascism, and the rule of monopoly capitalism in Italy, in 48 hours the Italian proletariat has shown its strength, the Italian proletariat has shown its potentialities. Overnight, Soviets have appeared in Italy, a workers' militia has appeared, the masses have moved instinctively in the channels of revolution. It is merely the first break in the chain of world capitalism. It is just the beginning.

Hitler can see the foreshadowing of his own fate in the fate of Mussolini. We can see that the factors making for the world revolution for the success of the proletariat, has reached a new stage of development, far more mature and developed than 25 years ago. With the coming fall of Hitler, the revolution in Germany, what possible basis will the bourgeoisie have in Europe? In all Europe today there is not one single army, including the British, which can be relied upon for the purpose of counter-revolution. In the world there is only one that can be relied on, and that probably only for a short time, and that is the army of American imperialism. Every country, every single nation in Europe will be defeated. We get the whole character of the epoch, of the change in the social relationship, revealed in the fact that mighty imperialist states change sides with no more

ceremony than a Balkan principality would have done in the last world war. France and Italy have changed sides. Every country will be defeated.

Even if we assume that the Allies succeed with the aid of the Stalinist counter-revolutionaries, in imposing their will on Europe, what will be the outcome? The American and British soldiers will be fired by the European revolution. Even today with all the forces of repression, at his disposal, Hitler cannot prevent 100 illegal newspapers in the small countries of Europe. How can the bourgeoisie hold down Europe?

And that is not all their problem. They still have Asia to deal with. There is a psychological preparation for revolution on the part of the proletariat in Asia. Once the revolution begins, it will spread from one country to another, from one continent to another. There is no possibility whatever for the stabilisation of capitalism, on a permanent or semi-permanent basis.

One of the main factors in the revolutionisation of Europe and the world is the wonderful resistance and victories of the Red Army, victories for the ideas of the October Revolution, testimony of the strength of October which still remains in Soviet Russia today. These victories, which world imperialism did not count on, pave the way for tremendous revolutions in Europe, and the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy as well. The revolution will inevitably sweep over the frontiers into the Soviet Union, and the masses there will soon deal with the corrupt bureaucracy which has now gone over to the position of pure Bonapartism, where they lean on the military club ("Marshal" Stalin) and the spiritual club (the restoration of the Church), based on the backward masses of the peasantry, to hold the working class in check.

Revolution for Asia is inevitable. In the first stages, in Europe, the gangsters of Stalinism and Social Democracy, who paved the way for reaction, will inevitably find themselves at the head of the masses. That is according to the laws of history.

Events repeat themselves, in that sense we will have a repetition of events after the last world war, but now on an entirely different basis. It is sure that it will not be long-lasting. The Social Democrats split, and prepared the way for the regeneration of the vanguard in the Communist International. The Communist International will be raised to the crest of the wave in Europe—that is the most likely

development—but the misunderstanding of the masses that these people represent Communism will soon be dissipated, and the C.P. will split into pieces, paving the way for the Fourth International, paving the way for the conquest of power by the workers of the world.

When we turn to the situation in Britain we see that the British working class, and we, as its vanguard, have been exceedingly lucky in the favourable development of events. We can say without a shadow of doubt that in Britain today there is the most favourable outlook for revolution in any country in Europe, or the world. In Britain today, all the objective conditions for the possibility of the conquest of power by the proletariat are actually in existence at the present time. While we are meeting, we see a strike wave up and down the country, and if we are to understand the significance of the strike wave, if we are to understand the significance of the development of events here, we have to turn our attention to the developments that were taking place before the war.

At last year's conference we pointed out how already before the war had begun, the British proletariat was moving in the direction of the social revolution, was moving towards civil war, and towards the conquest of power, and we based this on certain small strikes taking place at that period. In every single case, the T.U. bureaucracy, who had become integrated into the capitalist machine lost complete control of the development of events, lost control of the working class. In every case, the working class instinctively took the correct steps.

The sober bourgeois press at that time, with ourselves, were the only ones who understood the significance of these events. Immediately they issued a warning to the Union bureaucracy that unless they restored control, unless they could keep their men in check, then they would have to resort to other methods. The war itself apparently interrupted this development of events. In this war, up to the present year, we have had less strikes, less industrial disputes on the part of the working class than took place in the last imperialist war. There was a complete lull in the class struggle—or that seemed to be the position on the surface, but the very calm, the very fact that the masses were not moving in the direction of struggle was far from indicating the strength of British Imperialism, that we were in for a period of stable conservative development, but that the period we were entering was entirely opposite.

If we examine the reason underlying, why the mighty working class was so quiescent, one of the reasons is that the conditions of the working class as compared with the last world war are probably much better. At the other side was the fact that the mass of the workers, with their hatred of Fascism, could not see any other alternative, that the treachery of the Labour bureaucrats in going over to the side of the capitalists, and later the treachery of the Stalinists, imposed exceptional difficulties in the way of the movement of the working class.

But already with the victories and the improved position of Britain, we get the situation that the mass of the working class have taken the victories of the Red Army and even the British victories, as their victories, in the sense that it frees their hands for the struggle against the enemy at home. It is an interesting fact that as Britain has gained victories, at a time when in the last war it would have been a period of chauvinist intoxication, the masses have moved against the ruling class.

Today we have a series of strikes; the biggest since the general strike of 1926. The working class is girding itself for the struggle against the bosses. The strikes in Barrow and the Clyde, all this indicates the profound process of change, the fundamental change in the psychology of the masses. There is not one single industry in which the working class is not seething with industrial unrest. Not only that, the material basis of British Imperialism is shattered beyond hope of repair; they are the satellite of American imperialism. As the workers begin to sense that the war is approaching its close, they are not particularly concerned about the struggle against Japan, the masses are preparing for the mighty industrial sweep which will push completely into the background the struggles of 1926.

On the other side, the middle class is completely ruined, and is even looking towards the left, looking towards the social revolution. Common Wealth is an indication of the complete failure of the working class leaders to give a lead to the middle class, in their tremendous push towards the left. That process is taking place in front of our eyes today. The ruling class has less basis in the mass of the population than at any other time in history; even during the General Strike, they could still rely on a large section of the middle class.

The middle class is moving towards the revolution. The whole

character of social relations is completely changed. For 100 years, the mighty Tory Party has stood like a rock, a rock of reaction, remaining while the Liberals were shattered. In Britain today, the basis for conservatism is finished. It rested on Britain's privileged position among the nations. Britain is now a second-rate satellite of American imperialism, and with this we see a complete change in the psychology of the masses. The Tories are losing support in bye-elections, not only in industrial areas, but also in the rural constituencies. It is possible that in the post-war General Election, Churchill might succeed in getting a snap victory, and gain a majority for a National Government or the Conservative Party. That is not excluded, but even if that should take place, it will not alter the course of events. All that it will mean is that the struggle will immediately assume an extra-parliamentary form. Such a Government would not last one or at the most a couple of years.

Even to talk about Fascism in the coming period would be ridiculous. The ruling class has no basis for setting up reaction. That is if the leadership came forward with a fighting policy. The Gallup Poll reveals that there is a Labour majority, in spite of the reactionary policy of its leadership. Inevitably the Labour leaders will be taken by the scruff of the neck, and thrust into power by the masses.

But the position is even better than that, because this movement is only taking place because the mass of the working class do not see, and do not have any real alternative. We get the amazing development of events that there is more hatred for the Union bureaucrats and the labour leaders, among the ranks of the advanced workers today than at any period in history. The moment the Labour Party comes to power will be already its period of decline, of splitting and breaking up. There is more socialist consciousness, a more radical attitude on the part of the masses than at any other period in history. The armed forces are more revolutionary, look more to the working class and socialism than even the ranks of the working class themselves. That class-consciousness is expressed in the fact that in relation to the Negro and Indian questions we see solidarity between the Army and the working class.

We have a victorious Army in North Africa, and Italy, and I say, yes, Long live the Eighth Army,

because that is our army. One of our comrades has spoken to a number of people who have had letters from the Eighth Army soldiers, showing their complete dissatisfaction. We know of incidents in the Army, Navy and other forces that have never been reported, and that it is impossible for us to report. It is OUR Eighth Army that is being hammered and tested and being organised for the purpose of changing the face of the world. This applies equally to all the Forces.

But we have been given an even greater gift than our comrades on the Continent. We are far more fortunate in the sense that long in advance, before the revolution has begun, Stalinism has revealed itself as a dread disease, the syphilis of the working class. To tens of thousands of workers, whom we have not been in connection with and are not in connection with at the moment, its counter-revolutionary role has been revealed by its strike-breaking attitude. The militants have been inoculated against this disease. This gives us an opportunity to train and prepare. The Stalinists will still gain, but the votes they have are not votes for Stalinism, but for communism, for the revolution. In the more backward strata they will play a tremendous role in the period opening up. The I.L.P. is gaining tremendous support as a reflection of the radicalisation of the workers.

The I.L.P. will reveal its centrist nature, show that it is incapable of facing up to events, as they have already shown in regard to the Italian Revolution. From their ranks we will gain tremendous forces.

Industry is the key to the situation. Bevin and the Trade Union bureaucracy have already given testimony to the correctness of our point of view, in the fact that already in the initial stages of the Militant Workers Committee, they are threatening action against it, and against us. They remember the experience of the last world war. Perhaps even more than their masters, they have recognised the danger of such a movement for them. Bevin thinks he will destroy the movement by arresting and battering down the strikers; we know that it will have the opposite effect. It is certain that we will gain our best supporters among the industrial militants. That will be the recruiting ground.

The most encouraging and important point of all—when the war began we were an entirely insignificant sect. No-one noticed or bothered about us. We were still in

the stage of complete isolation from the masses. That has completely altered. Today we are a tendency, a significant tendency in the life of the working class. The attacks of the Stalinists, the Labour leaders and the bourgeoisie reflect the fact that our small forces have succeeded, to a certain extent, in orienting themselves correctly and integrating themselves into the movement of the working class. Whether repression will be imposed upon us, or we can succeed in maintaining our organisation as a legal organisation, and our leadership without arrest—in the long run this will not make the slightest difference.

Wonderful days. Wonderful possibilities open up in front of us. You can feel revolution in the air. That attitude must permeate our Conference. The correctness of our viewpoint should give us confidence

in preparing ourselves for our role in the coming revolution. Whatever its fate may be, it is certain that we can, we must, we will play our part, and stamp our tendency as an influence, as a serious factor in the situation, as an organisation that will play its part in the revolution. When, twelve months ago, we called our thesis "Preparing for Power", this was not a mad gesture. That is the serious problem with which we are faced. The objective situation poses for the British working class the imperative task of taking control. We know that this will transform the situation.

The British working class has the finest fighting forces at the present time. Given a fighting lead, they could push the bourgeoisie aside without resistance. We know that the revolution will not be so easy

because of the treachery of the leadership. But we have the possibility of transforming ourselves into the mass party of the Socialist Revolution into THE organisation of the British working class.

We know the alternative. The fate of France will be the fate of Britain. The very life of the proletariat is at stake. Britain will be destroyed if the revolution does not succeed. A great part of the population will be surplus.

Our Conference, which is far more representative than that of last year, has to go back with the enthusiasm which understanding gives, to prepare to push forward on the basis of our document, and prepare to integrate ourselves with the masses of the workers, as the only guarantee against repression, and to prepare the working class for its historic role in the coming British revolution."

# From the Arsenal of Marxism

**EDITOR'S NOTE:** The official dissolution of the Communist International comes almost ten years after the proclamation by Leon Trotsky that the Third International was dead as the world instrument for the socialist revolution. It was on July 15, 1933 that Trotsky wrote his theses, reprinted below, in justification of this conclusion and the need of building the Fourth International

In his summary speech before the International Commission of Inquiry into the Moscow Trials, on April 17, 1937, Leon Trotsky reviewed his position as follows:


"In the course of the years from 1923 to 1933, with respect to the Soviet state, its leading party and the Communist International, I held the view expressed in those chiselled words: "Reform, but not revolution." This position was fed by the hope that with favourable developments in Europe, the Left Opposition could regenerate the Bolshevik Party by pacific means, democratically reform the Soviet state, and set the Communist International back on the path of Marxism. It was only the victory of Hitler, prepared by the fatal policy of the Kremlin, and the complete inability of the Comintern to draw

any lessons from the tragic experience of Germany, which convinced me and my ideological companions that the old Bolshevik Party and

the Third International were forever dead, as far as the cause of Socialism was concerned." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 475.)

Trotsky's 1933 theses were submitted for discussion to the various sections of the International Communist League (the original name of the Trotskyist organisation) and were adopted by an overwhelming majority. Within a few weeks of their adoption a resolution "On the Need of a New International And Its Principles" was issued under the signatures of the following four organisations: The International Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninist); Socialist Labour Party of Germany (S.A.P.); Independent Socialist Party of Holland (O.S.P.); Revolutionary Socialist Party of Holland (R.S.P.). Of the original signatories to this resolution only the Trotskyists—including a left wing in the Dutch parties—continued the work of building the Fourth International.

The Russian text of Trotsky's 1933 theses was first published under the signature G. Gurow, in the "Bulletin of the Russian Opposition", Nos. 36-37, October, 1933. The translation by John G. Wright is a new one from the original.



**I stake my life!**

**BY LEON TROTSKY**

**DEWEY REPORT on the Moscow Trials**

6p

# It Is Necessary to Build the Communist Parties and the International

THE ORIENTATION TOWARD  
REFORMING THE  
COMINTERN

## Anew

By LEON TROTSKY

From the day it was founded the Left Opposition has set itself the task of reforming the Comintern and regenerating the latter through Marxist criticism and internal faction work. In a whole number of countries, especially in Germany, the events of recent years have revealed with overwhelming force the fatal character of the policies of bureaucratic centrism. But the Stalinist bureaucracy, armed with extraordinary resources, has managed not unsuccessfully to counterpose its caste interests and prejudices to the demands of historical development. As a result, the evolution of the Comintern has unfolded not along the line of regeneration but along that of corrosion and disintegration.

But the orientation toward "reform," taken as a whole, was not a mistake: it represented a necessary stage in the development of the Marxist wing of the Comintern; it provided an opportunity for training cadres of Bolshevik-Leninists; and it did not pass without leaving its mark on the working class movement as a whole. The policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy throughout this period remained under the pressure of the Left Opposition. The progressive measures adopted by the government of the U.S.S.R., which acted to check the offensive of Thermidor, were only partial and belated borrowings from the Left Opposition. Analogous manifestations, but on a smaller scale, could be observed in the life of all the sections of the Comintern.

It should be added that the degree of degeneration of a revolutionary party cannot, as a rule, be established a priori on the basis of symptoms alone. The living verification of events is indispensable. Theoretically it was still impermissible last year to have considered as absolutely excluded that the Bolshevik-Leninists basing themselves

on the sharpening of the class struggle, could succeed in impelling the Comintern to take the road of actual struggle against fascism. The simultaneous attempt of the S.A.P.\* in Germany to assume an independent position did not exert any influence on the course of events precisely because the masses were waiting in the critical moment for the political leadership of their old organisations. In conducting the policy of a faction and educating its cadres on the experience of this policy, the Left Opposition, however, did not hide from itself nor from others that a new defeat of the proletariat, resulting from the policy of centrism, would inevitably acquire a decisive character and would demand a drastic review of our position on the question: faction or party?

### THE CHANGE OF ORIENTATION

The most dangerous thing in politics is to fall captive to one's own formula which yesterday was appropriate, but is bereft of all content today.

Theoretically the collapse of the German Communist Party still left two courses open to the Stalinist bureaucracy: either a complete review of the politics and the regime; or, on the contrary, a complete strangulation of all signs of life in the sections of the Comintern. The Left Opposition was guided by this theoretical possibility when, after advancing the slogan of a new party for Germany, it still left open the question of the fate of the Comintern. It was, however, clear that the next few weeks would bring an answer and there was far too little hope that the answer would be a favourable one.

Everything that has taken place since March 5 (the resolution of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. on the situation in Germany; the silent submission of all the sections to this shameful resolution; the anti-fascist congress in Paris; the official line of the emigre Central Committee of the German C.P.; the fate of the Austrian Communist Party; the fate of the Bulgarian Communist Party, etc.)—all this testifies incontestably that not only the fate of the German Communist Party but of the entire Comintern was decided in Germany.

The Moscow leadership not only has proclaimed as infallible the policy which guaranteed victory to Hitler, but has prohibited all discussion of what had occurred. And this shameful interdiction was not violated, nor overthrown. No national congresses; no international congress; no discussions at party meetings; no discussion in the press! An organisation which was not roused by the thunder of fascism and which submits docilely to such outrageous acts of the bureaucracy demonstrates thereby that it is dead and that nothing can ever revive it. To say this openly and publicly is our direct duty toward the proletariat and its future. In all our subsequent work it is necessary to take as our point of departure the historical collapse of the official Communist International.

### REALISM v. PESSIMISM!

The fact that two parties, the Social Democratic and the Communist, which arose half-a-century apart and both of which proceeded from the theory of Marxism and the class interests of the proletariat, could have come to such a sad end: the one through base treachery; the other through bankruptcy, can engender pessimistic moods even among the advanced workers. "Where is the guarantee that a new revolutionary selection will not suffer the same fate?" Those who demand guarantees in advance should in general renounce revolutionary politics. The causes for the downfall of the Social Democracy and of official Communism must be

sought not in Marxist theory and not in the bad qualities of those people who applied it but in the concrete conditions of the historical process. It is not a question of counterposing abstract principles, but rather of the struggle of living social forces, with its inevitable ups and downs, with the degeneration of organisations, with the passing of entire generations into discard, and with the necessity which therefore arises of mobilising fresh forces on a new historical stage. No one has bothered to pave in advance the road of revolutionary upsurge for the proletariat. With inevitable halts and partial retreats it is necessary to move forward on the road criss-crossed by countless obstacles and covered with the debris of the past. Those who are frightened by this had better step aside.

But how explain the fact that our grouping, whose analysis and prognosis has been verified by the entire course of events, is growing so slowly? The cause must be looked for in the general course of the class struggle. The victory of fascism seizes tens of millions. Political prognoses are accessible only to thousands or tens of thousands who, moreover, feel the pressure of millions. A revolutionary tendency cannot score stormy victories at a time when the proletariat as a whole is suffering the greatest defeats. But this is no justification for letting one's hands hang. Precisely in the periods of revolutionary ebb-tide are cadres formed and tempered which will later be called upon to lead the masses in the new assault.

### NEW REVERSES

Those attempts which were made more than once in the past to create a "second party" or the "Fourth International" emanated from the sectarian experience of isolated groups and circles "disillusioned" with Bolshevism and, in consequence, led each time to failure. We take as the point of departure not our own subjective "dissatisfaction" and "disillusionment" but the objective march of the class struggle. All the conditions of the development of the proletarian revolution imperiously demand a new organisation of the vanguard and provide the necessary pre-requisites for it.

The disintegration of the Social Democracy now proceeds parallel with the collapse of the Comintern. However profound the reaction within the proletariat itself, hundreds of thousands of workers in the whole world cannot fail already today to pose to themselves the

question of the further paths of struggle and of a new organisation of forces. Other hundreds of thousands will join them in the near future. To demand of these workers, a section of whom left the Comintern with indignation, while the majority did not belong to the Comintern even in its best years, that they formally accept the leadership of the Stalinist bureaucracy, which is incapable of forgetting or learning anything, is to occupy oneself with Quixotism and only to hinder the formation of the proletarian vanguard.

Undoubtedly, in the ranks of the Stalinist organisations, will be found sincere communists, who will greet with fear and even with indignation our new orientation. Some of them might perhaps temporarily replace a feeling of sympathy with one of hostility. But it is necessary to be guided not by sentimental and personal considerations but by mass criteria.

At a time when hundreds of thousands and millions of workers, especially in Germany, are departing from communism, in part to fascism and in the main into the camp of indifferentism, thousands and tens of thousands of Social-Democratic workers, under the impact of the self-same defeat, are evolving to the left, to the side of communism. There cannot, however, even be talk of their accepting the hopelessly discredited Stalinist leadership.

Up till now these left socialist organisations have held against us our refusal to break with the Comintern and to build independent parties. This sharp disagreement has now been removed by the march of development. Thereby the discussion of formal-organisational questions is shifted over to the programmatic-political plane. The new party will rise higher than the old one only if by taking its stand firmly on the grounds of the decisions of the first four Congresses of the Comintern, it is capable in its programme, strategy, tactic and organisation to take into account the terrible lessons of the last ten years.

The Bolshevik-Leninists must enter into open discussions with the revolutionary socialist organisations. As the basis for discussion we shall propose the 11 points adopted by our Pre-Conference (after changing the point on "faction and party" in the spirit of the present theses). We are, of course, prepared to discuss attentively and in a comradely manner all other programmatic proposals. We must and shall demonstrate that principled irreconcilability has nothing

in common with sectarian snobbishness. We shall show that Marxist politics consists in attracting reformist workers into the camp of revolution and not in repelling revolutionary workers into the camp of fascism.

The formation in several countries of strong revolutionary organisations, free of any responsibility for the crimes and mistakes of the reformist and centrist bureaucracies armed with the Marxist programme and a clear revolutionary perspective, will open a new era in the development of the world proletariat. These organisations will attract all the genuine communist elements who still cannot bring themselves today to break with the Stalinist bureaucracy and, what is more important, they will gradually attract under their banner the young generation of workers.

### THE U.S.S.R. AND THE C.P.S.U.

The existence of the Soviet Union, despite the far-advanced degeneration of the workers' state, remains even now a fact of immeasurable revolutionary significance. The collapse of the Soviet Union would lead to terrible reaction in the whole world, perhaps for decades to come. The struggle for the preservation, rehabilitation and strengthening of the first workers' state is indissolubly bound up with the struggle of the world proletariat for the socialist revolution.

The dictatorship of the Stalinist bureaucracy arose as a result of the backwardness of the U.S.S.R. (the predominance of the peasantry) and the tardiness of the proletarian revolution in the West (the absence of independent revolutionary parties of the proletariat). In its turn, the rule of the Stalinist bureaucracy has led not only to the degeneration of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, but also to the terrible weakening of the proletarian vanguard in the whole world. The contradiction between the progressive role of the Soviet state and the reactionary role of the Stalinist bureaucracy is one of the manifestations of "the law of uneven development." In our revolutionary politics we must take this historically given contradiction as our point of departure.

The so-called "friends" of the Soviet Union (left democrats, pacifists, Brandlerites, and the like) repeat after the Comintern functionaries that the struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy, i.e. first of all criticism of its false policies, "helps the counter-revolution." This is the standpoint of the political lackeys of the bureaucracy, but never that of revolutionists. The

Soviet Union both internally and externally can be defended only by means of a correct policy. All other considerations are either secondary or simply lying phrases.

The present C.P.S.U. is not a party but an apparatus of domination in the hands of an uncontrolled bureaucracy. Within the framework of the C.P.S.U. and outside of it takes place the grouping of the scattered elements of the two basic parties: the proletarian and the Thermidorian - Bonapartist. Rising above both of them, the centrist bureaucracy wages a war of annihilation against the Bolshevik-Leninists. While coming into sharp clashes from time to time with their Thermidorian half-allies, the Stalinists, nevertheless, clear the road for the latter by crushing, strangling and corrupting the Bolshevik party.

If without the proletarian revolution in the West, the U.S.S.R. cannot come to socialism, then without the regeneration of a genuine proletarian International, the Russian-Bolshevik-Leninists will not be able, with their own forces alone to regenerate the Bolshevik party and to save the dictatorship of the proletariat.

### THE U.S.S.R. AND THE COMINTERN

The defence of the Soviet Union against the threat of military intervention has now become a task more acute than ever before. The official sections of the Comintern are as impotent in this field as in all others. On their lips, the defence of the Soviet Union has become a ritualistic phrase, bereft of all content. The inadequacy of the Comintern is being covered up by such undignified comedies as the anti-war congress in Amsterdam and the anti-fascist congress in Paris. The actual resistance of the Comintern to the military intervention of the imperialists will prove even more insignificant than its resistance to Hitler. To nourish any illusions on this score is to head blindfolded toward a new catastrophe. For the active defence of the Soviet Union are needed genuine revolutionary organisations, independent of the Stalinist bureaucracy, standing on their own feet and enjoying support among the masses.

The establishment and growth of these revolutionary organisations, their struggle for the Soviet Union, their constant readiness for a united front with the Stalinists against intervention and counter-revolution—all this will have an

enormous importance for the internal development of the Soviet Republic. The Stalinists, insofar as they remain in power, will have all the less opportunity to evade the united front as the dangers, both domestic and foreign, become more acute, and as the independent organisation of the world proletarian vanguard becomes a greater force. The new relationship of forces will act to weaken the dictatorship of the bureaucracy; to strengthen the Bolshevik-Leninists inside the U.S.S.R. and to open up before the workers' republic as a whole far more favourable perspectives.

Only the creation of the Marxist International, completely independent of the Stalinist bureaucracy and counterposed politically to the latter, can save the U.S.S.R. from collapse by binding its destiny with the destiny of the world proletarian revolution.

### "LIQUIDATIONISM"

Bureaucratic charlatans (and their lackeys, like the Brandlerites) talk about our "liquidationism." They repeat senselessly and unconsciously words torn out of the old vocabulary of Bolshevism. Liquidationism was the designation given to that tendency which, under "constitutional" Czarism, rejected the need for an illegal party, for it sought to replace revolutionary struggle by an adaptation to counter-revolutionary "legality." What have we in common with the liquidators? It is far more appropriate to recall in this connection the ultimacists (Bogdanov and others) who fully recognised the need of an illegal organisation but turned it into an instrument of hopelessly false policies: after the crushing of the revolution they posed as the immediate task the preparation of an armed uprising. Lenin did not hesitate to break with them, although there were not a few impeccable revolutionists among them (the best of them later returned to the ranks of Bolshevism).

Equally false in character are the assertions of Stalinists and their Brandlerite lackeys to the effect that the Left Opposition is creating an "August Conference" against Bolshevism." Referred to here is the attempt of 1912, one of the innumerable attempts to unite Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. (Let us recall that Stalin made such an attempt not in August, 1912 but in March, 1917!) For this analogy to have even a shadow of meaning, it would be necessary for us to pose the question of uniting the Second and Third Internationals. There

cannot even be talk of either proposition! The charlatanistic analogy is designed to cover up the fact that the Brandlerite opportunists are trying to curry favour with the Stalinist centrists on the basis of a mutual amnesty, where the Bolshevik-Leninists are posing the task of building the proletarian party on a principled foundation, tested in the greatest battles, victories and defeats of the imperialist epoch.

### ON THE NEW ROAD

The task of these theses is to summon the comrades to cross off the completed historical stage and to sketch out new perspectives for work. But what has been said above does not at all predetermine the immediate practical steps, the concrete changes in policy, the tempos and method of shifting to the new road. Only after a principled unanimity has been secured with regard to the new orientation—and our previous experience permits me to think that such a unanimity will be achieved by us—will there be placed on the order of the day the concrete tactical questions applicable to the conditions in each separate country.

In any case, under discussion now is not the immediate proclamation of new parties and of an independent International, but of preparing for them. The new perspective signifies first of all that talk of "reform" and demands to restore oppositionists in the official parties must be put aside as utopian and reactionary. The day-to-day work must assume an independent character, determined by our own possibilities and forces, and not by the formal criterion of "faction". The Left Opposition ceases completely to feel and act as an "opposition." It becomes an independent organisation, clearing its own road. It not only builds its own fractions in the Social-Democratic and Stalinist parties but conducts independent work among non-party and unorganised workers. It creates its own bases of support in the trade unions, independently of the trade union policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy. It participates in elections under its own banner, whenever favourable conditions for this obtain. In relation to reformist and centrist labour organisations (including the Stalinists) it is guided by the general principles of the united front policy. In particular and especially it applies the policy of the united front in order to defend the USSR against external intervention and internal counter-revolution.  
July 15, 1933.

# PAMPHLETS

*Every worker  
Should read -*

TRANSITIONAL PROGRAMME OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL - - -	6d.
TRADE UNIONS, Trotsky - - - - -	2d.
PREPARING FOR POWER (Thesis of British Trotskyists) - - -	3d.
THE ROAD TO INDIA'S FREEDOM by A. Scott and E. Grant - - - - -	3d.
THE C.P. AND THE WAR - - - - - Look at their Record!	1d.
A.B.C. OF TROTSKYISM Cannon's Testimony in U.S. Labour Trial	6d.
ON SOME CRITICS OF TROTSKYISM By Marc Loris - - - - -	2d.
DOES RUSSIA'S ENTRY ALTER BRITAIN'S WAR? By A. Scott - - -	2d.
I.L.P. AND THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL By Leon Trotsky - - - - -	2d.
WAR AND WORLD REVOLUTION By Leon Trotsky - - - - -	2d.