

# INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Bulletin of the Provisional International

Contact Commission

Volume 6 No. 11

10 cents

D  
E  
C  
.  
1  
9  
4  
4

## CONTENTS

### **Military Principles And -- Capitalist Decay Roots Of Bureaucracy International Notes**

---

Issued by the Revolutionary Workers League for the International  
Contact Commission.

Affiliates

Leninist League of Great Britain

Central Committee of the Red Front of Greater Germany

Revolutionary Workers League of the U. S.

Mail address of publishers

**DEMOS PRESS**

708 N. CLARK STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Labor Donated

# MILITARY PRINCIPLES AND CAPITALIST DECAY

The present imperialist war brings forth a maze of contradictory concepts, which certain governments try to stimulate in order that the common people may not be able to obtain order out of chaos and understanding out of lying reports. Sun Tzu in his book, "The Art of War", written 500 BC says, "all warfare is based on deception." And unless one has a very clear picture of the war beforehand and knows the real reasons for the military conflict, he can make no sense out of the war communiques. Usually it is from five to twenty years after the war before the people really know the truth about it.

When Clausewitz correctly stated that "War is a mere continuation of politics by other means" he revealed the basic relation of the political-economic struggle with the military struggle. Unless we are able to penetrate behind the lies and deception of both sides, unless we are able to see the dynamics of the economic struggles and their ultimate solution in military conflicts, the smokescreen of patriotism, God, nationality and justice are only ruling class weapons for mass mob psychology. As long as economic conditions make wars inevitable the use of these emotional arousers are necessary toward the state's ends.

The present imperialist conflict is no exception to the rule even though its make-up is more complicated with the Soviet Union and Stalinism on the allies' side of the struggle. We have been told many times by many different writers that the present war leads back to the first world war. And some say, all we need is more drastic steps against Germany and we will not have any third imperialist war. Such talk is stupidity or deception. It is true this war has its roots "in the last war" but not as these writers would have us believe. The most important factors are not even considered.

## FINANCE CAPITAL AND WAR

It was the conflict of the financial capitalists of the leading imperialist powers over the world's raw material, markets and financial spheres of influence, that led to the military struggle of World War I. But it was not brought to a successful military conclusion. Not because the measures against Germany were not harsh enough; not because England and France proceeded to divide up the world's raw material and markets; not because American isolationism hampered the leading United States imperialists--no it was because the Russian Revolution cut short the imperialist war. The imperialist war was turned into a civil war.

This "old" truth must be kept in mind and repeated over and over again; because this will be the "new" truth very soon, when the present imperialist war will be turned into civil war. The pattern of civil war is not for tomorrow. It is already here, but in its embryo stage. Its development, as a concomitant of imperialist destruction is inevitable. And when it becomes a full blown struggle, born out of capitalist decay and conflict (with both imperialist camps as its mother and father) the imperialists will turn on their "new born" and attempt to suppress it.

Nor can we jump from 1914 to 1939 and ignore history in between this period. In this time there were over three dozen defeated social revolutions and over two dozen military conflicts of capitalist nations. These are the mile-posts one must follow to see why we have the second imperialist war.

Have all of the good bourgeois democrats forgotten that the leading capitalist nations of the world put Fascism into power in Italy, with Mussolini at its head, in order to hold in check the proletarian revolution? All over the world the good bourgeois and social democrats gave their support to these measures against the "Reds". Have we forgotten that it was the capitalists throughout the world who supported Chiang Kai Shek in the smashing of the Chinese Revolution? It was on the basis of the defeat of the Chinese Revolution that Japan was able to launch her drive for the conquest of Asia and the Pacific.

#### FASCISM AND "DEMOCRACY"

Have we forgotten that it was the "good" capitalists of the world who helped Hitler and his gang from 1923 to 1933 to put down the "Red" menace? It was on the basis of the defeated German revolutions that Hitler was able to start his conquest of Europe.

Have we forgotten the Spanish Civil War, where Italy and Germany made a direct frontal attack on the Spanish Revolution; while France, the Soviet Union under Stalinism, England and the United States carried out a flank attack on the Spanish Revolution? The defeat of the Spanish Revolution heralded the beginning of the end--the preparation on a giant scale for the second imperialist war.

In all these situations the "democrats" and reactionary elements openly supported the national fascists against the workers and oppressed masses. And in all of these cases the bourgeois democrats and the social reformists paved the way for these fascists. Their policy led to the strengthening of the fascists and reactionaries on a world scale; strengthening of Fascism first against the workers and oppressed masses, and second against the bourgeois democrats, whom fascism used to finance its movements against the working class. The bourgeois democrats and the social reformists

will go down in history as the most vacillating, stupid and jelly-like leadership the world has ever seen.

The military victory today is in their reach, but these bourgeois-democrats will lose the peace; a peace that the pattern here outlined already sets the mold, a basic struggle between fascism and communism, between world capitalism and a socialist commonwealth.

#### HAVES AND HAVE-NOTS

Even though the capitalists of the world used Italy, Germany and Japan in their respective spheres as reactionary police forces to hold in check the masses; these powers were slowly arming themselves for the new struggle "for the redivision of the earth". It must be remembered these three powers were "have nots" and while being used by the "have" powers to hold off the social revolutions, were nevertheless, plotting against the "haves" for their share of the earth and as a reward for service rendered against the "reds".

This was not a process of psychological forces or desires and plots and counter-plots. This was a process of material forces, of the economic weight of the "have nations": United States, England and France, using their economic power as pressure against the "have nots" and as pressure to pass off the crisis of capitalist decay upon the weaker nations and the workers and oppressed masses.

The mighty economic weight of American imperialism enabled her to be the main material driving force for the second imperialist war and at the same time enabled her to conceal this behind the most astute pacifist and non-belligerent actions.

Does anyone think that these leopards will change their spots? Their talk today about the war to end wars, the "last war", and a lasting peace, was heard over and over again during the first imperialist war. Without a fundamental economic change that will give the workers and oppressed masses their just rights, no words, no matter how well sounding, can accomplish the task.

With few exceptions this war is not much different from the previous war. The basic difference is not in principle, but in other things. This war is a greater war in destruction of men and material. It is a greater war of space and speed. It is a greater war in the fact that all of the scientific advancements have been used for the destruction of the enemy. The airplane and greater mechanization are not problems of principle but of men and machines and space and time, tactics and strategy.

#### "PRINCIPLES OF WAR"

Just what do we mean by principles of war? A famous French writer on military questions, Marshall Maurice De Saxe, in his book, "My

Reveries on the Art of War" says, "All sciences have principles and rules; war has none." "The great captains who have written of it have given us none." "Extreme cleverness is required even to understand them."

There is much truth in what Marshall Saxe says. It is true that the great writers of military struggles have presented no principles, yet many of them use the word principle over and over again. Most of the military text books mix up principles with tactics and strategy and where they do speak of principles they are merely speaking of tried and tested tactics and strategy of war.

But it is false to assume from this that there are no guiding principles that lay down and determine the framework of all military operations. Here we have one of the most confused bits of historical information in any field of human operation: military warfare that speaks of principles, talks of principles but does not present any principles. Here we have a field of human operation, warfare, that is decisive often in the life and death of a nation and countless people, but none of the writers have presented any principles and Marshall Saxe openly admits this. Yet we maintain there are definite principles that envelope and determine the military tactics and strategy. An understanding of these facts will help us understand war in general and this second imperialist war in particular.

Consider what Napoleon said about war. "Plan of operation. I never had a plan of operation. I advance in the center of my battalion secure in the knowledge that wherever I encounter the enemy my superior power of maneuver will enable me to defeat him." This statement sounds as though it rejects principles, strategy and tactics and planning, but a close reading of the sentence will reveal otherwise. What the thought really states is that Napoleon never went into battle with a cut and dried ready-made plan of action, something that was pulled out of a book and "conditions made to fit it". The sentence speaks of "my superior power of maneuver." That is a plan; it is a plan that decides victory in ADVANCE of the actual battle.

"My superior power of maneuver" covers a multitude of plans and conditions. What Napoleon correctly left open is the tactics and strategy to use in the battle with the enemy once his spies and general knowledge from all other sources enables him to use this superior power to maneuver to the greatest advantage.

#### MILITARY LEADERS

Clausewitz writes, "As recently as the revolutionary war we find many men who proved themselves able military leaders, yes, even military leaders of the first order, without having had any military education." This is true in many cases. Lenin and Trotsky

and their conduct of the Russian revolution which beat back intervention on countless fronts and smashed the rule of the exploiters within, reveal this. Even though they were not trained at these military academies of the exploiters they proved their worth. This will help us throw light on the subject of principles. Clausewitz in advice on the art of war says, "We need not study much history for the purpose we propose. The detailed knowledge of a few individual engagements is more useful than the general knowledge of a great many campaigns. It is therefore more useful to read detailed accounts of diaries than regular works of history."

"For the aim of historians," says Clausewitz, "rarely is to present the absolute truth. Usually they wish to embellish the deeds of their own army or to demonstrate the concordance of events with their imaginary rules." "They invent history instead of writing it."

One only has to go back to the first world war and consider how historians have written history up to the second world war without a proper explanation of the dozens of capitalist wars and social revolutions, to realize this point.

"War is nothing else but a mutual process of destruction." says Clausewitz. He continues, "War, therefore is an act of violence intended to compel our opponents to fulfill our will." "Violence arms itself with the inventions of art and science in order to contend against violence." "And the use of physical power to the utmost extent by no means excludes the cooperation of intelligence." This is well stated, but it still does not give the cause and the reason for war. We must understand that wars are fought by people ONLY through STATE POWER, as an instrument of state power that controls and determines the will of the people. Those who oppose it are taken care of in different ways as are the enemies in war.

#### WAR AND STATE POWER

And the state is an instrument of the ruling class. There has never been a state nor will there be a state that does not represent CLASS interests. It makes no difference how intelligently or how ignorantly these class interests are expressed. It is nevertheless an instrument of the ruling class used against other classes. In normal peace time this state instrument is used against the oppressed classes within and the other class states without; and in times of open military conflict the state organizes all forces even more firmly for national unity against class unity.

Unless the art of war is properly connected up to the question of state power and of which class rules (regardless of what types may be in office as the state officials) little or no real progress as to the principles, strategy and tactics of war can be understood.

Let us consider some important strategical and tactical questions that are often listed as principles. These examples will present a general idea of the line of demarcation between principles and strategy.

"The strategy of offensive pursues the aim of the war directly, aiming straight at the destruction of the enemy's forces, while the strategy of defense seeks to reach this purpose indirectly." Here Clausewitz lays down a broad generalization of defensive and offensive strategy. Yet these questions are listed as principles. We must look behind these means-to-the-end to locate the principles concerned.

One must keep in mind that when we are dealing with offensive and defensive strategy or tactics we are not speaking of two opposite and exclusive conditions; such a concept is sure to be fatal. Offensive and defensive strategy or tactics are merely two sides of one problem, two aspects of means to ONE END. Here we at least reveal a theoretical connecting link with something more important. Naturally this is the principle connection that gives life to any strategy or tactics, but its nature is more political than military.

An important aspect of the two-sided ONE problem is revealed in this quotation from Clausewitz, "A swift and vigorous assumption of the offensive is the most brilliant point in the defensive."

#### STRATEGY AND TACTICS

Continuing on the problem as to means to an end we have the following clear statement of strategical problems, "The theory of warfare tries to discover how we may gain preponderance of physical forces and material advantages at the decisive point. As this is not always possible, theory also teaches us to calculate moral factors; the likely mistakes of the enemy, the impressions created by a daring action."

Clausewitz presents the following factors that will facilitate if not lead to victory.

"The advantage of ground.

"The surprise, either in the form of actual attack by surprise or by the unexpected display of large forces at certain points.

"The attack from several quarters.

"The assistance of the theatre of war by fortresses and everything that belongs to them.

"The support of the people.

"The utilization of great moral forces."

Our military expert should have stated that in addition to these important factors the concentration of the greatest amount of men and material, trained men and the most modern war material that can cover the greatest space in the least possible time is the key to victory on the battle field. Not just a supply, but a continual stream of the same kind of men and material if the first is used up.

But in war as in all other struggles men and material in itself is not enough. We also need capable and audacious leadership. But even the most capable leadership can not forever stand up against even a clumsy enemy who can pour in more men and material.

Likewise, a capable leadership with plenty of men and material has great odds to overcome if the enemy is inferior, but has considerable area in which to retreat, in which to keep an army intact no matter how much territory is "lost", such as China and Russia in the present conflict.

"I close these observations", says Clausewitz, "with the principle which is of highest significance, and which must be considered the keystone of the whole defensive theory."

"Never to depend completely on the strength of the terrain and consequently never to be enticed into passive defense by strong terrain." Although he calls this a principle, and it is only a first ~~strategic~~ <sup>strategical</sup> problem, it is nevertheless of the highest importance. It is one of the many blunders the French General staff made in relation to Germany in the present imperialist conflict.

Again we list a key strategical problem that is second nature to a good General. "Never bring all of our forces into play haphazardly and at one time, thereby losing all means of directing the battle; but fatigue the opponent, if possible, with a few forces and conserve a decisive mass for a critical moment. Once the decisive mass has been thrown in, it must be used with the greatest audacity."

The brass buttons who thrive in between wars grow old and conservative, as all history proves, while the Generals who are made on the battlefields are the audacious men who get things done. Here again, it is false to counterpose careful, conservative generals to radical "reckless" generals. Both would lose. The quality that wins is a combination of these two factors, as the above problem would indicate: where a general must know how many forces to throw at the enemy to wear the enemy down while conserving large forces one minute, only later at a decisive minute to throw all into the battle for a final show-down. This concept combines those factors that are so essential.



## WRITINGS OF 500 BC

Let us consider the wisdom of Sun Tzu. He laid down some of the most important strategical and tactical questions of war over two thousand five hundred years ago.

"It is the rule in war, if our forces are 10 to the enemies' 1, to surround him.

"If 5 to 1, to attack him.

"If twice as numerous, to divide our enemy into two.

"If equally matched, we can offer battle;

"If slightly inferior in numbers, we can avoid the enemy;

"If quite unequal in every way, we can flee from him.

Here we have a fairly good example of a rounded axiom for offensive, defensive strategy.

"In battle, there are not more than two methods of attack--the direct and the indirect; yet these two combinations give rise to an endless series of maneuvers. The direct and indirect lead one to each other in turn. It is like moving in a circle, you never come to an end. Who can exhaust the possibilities of their combination."

"Therefore, just as water retains no constant shape, so in warfare there are no constant conditions." Here again we have a brilliant exposition of strategy and tactics, as means to an end. Here again as in offensive and defensive strategy we have the same problem as two sides of one problem, and not two different sets of strategy and tactics. Sun Tzu was a dialectician in his own right.

Above all Sun Tzu understood: "that in war victorious strategy seeks battle after victory has been won, whereas, he who is destined to defeat first fights and afterwards looks for victory." Here we have a problem of strategy, not of principles and the question of the war as a whole. If each battle and each strategy is planned on this basis then not only victory in battles but victory in the war is assured; or a capable retreat, so one can return tomorrow and give better battle.

Frederick the Great stressed, "The greatest secret of war and the masterpiece of a skillful general is to starve his enemy." This has always been a key factor in all wars; blockades and counter-blockades are immediate objectives of many important battles; just like by-passing forces and bottling them up, later to return for decisive battle when their supplies are depleted.

Sun Tzu says, "The art of war is of vital importance to the state. And on this point everybody will agree but few seem to realize the full implications of the sentence. For if they did, we would have a better exposition by writers who are military experts, who speak of this and that "principle" of war and conclude their books without even listing one principle. Instead they call strategical and tactical problems principle problems.

#### PRINCIPLES OF WAR

If one returns to fundamentals and then traces his steps from these basic landmarks, little trouble will be encountered: -- That history is a history of class struggles. That the state is an instrument of the ruling class used to keep in subjection the other classes. That in those states that exist upon the basis of the exploitation of man by man, the state becomes an instrument not only to be used against the exploited within the state, but against other groups of exploiters dominating other states in the society of nations.

War as a continuation of politics by other means is a means to this end and is subordinated to the concepts and interests of the ruling class. The basic principle that the ruling class has to maintain state power is not changed when they go to war, nor does another set of principles take the place of the principles of the ruling class in war different from those applied in peace. The forms change but the principles of both war and peace remain the same.

The art of war and the strategy and tactics of war are subordinated to and flow out of the principles of the ruling class that dominates the state power which is in conflict. It is no accident, nor a bureaucratic measure, that places the King, the Prime Minister or the President as the commander-in-chief over the military generals. It is no accident that the governing body of the state, no matter what it may be called, retains its power over the military arm of the state in peace and war.

It is a different question if and when the military arm takes power away from the political arm. This is a political revolution and the new group proceeds to place themselves in the civil offices the deposed held.

When one wants to find the principles of war one must find the principles of the class that dominates the state. These are the principles that determine the outlines of the military strategy and tactics.

#### CLASS PRINCIPLES IN ACTION

What "military" principle for instance would prevent a hard pressed Southern army from arming the Negro slaves to use them against the

Northern army? No military principle enters here; it is class principles of the slave-owners. Their war was fought to retain and extend the slave system. To arm the slaves would run counter to their very plan of state domination. But here and there in the North former slaves could be used in military operations.

What "military principle prevented the King from arming the people? None whatever. Under different military relations the arming of the people is a progressive and powerful military step. But for the Feudalists of yesterday the arming of the people would be equal to suicide. It was a principle of class rule of Feudal masters against serfs. But in Russia under Lenin and Trotsky the arming of the people was a most decisive military step against the exploiters from within and without, because the principles of state power had changed completely. Lenin and Trotsky and the Soviets represented the rule of the exploited majority against the exploiter minority.

What "military" principle demands that De Gaulle disarm the people who took over Paris and drove out the German Fascists? The class rule, not military principles of the French bourgeoisie against the French workers and peasants that is the reason.

What principles decided when and where the "second front" would take place in Europe? Not military principles, but class principles of United States and England. Their class aim was to use the second front against the rising social revolution, wherever and wherever Hitler's gangs could no longer protect private property rights.

Edward Murrow in May 1943 said the "Triumph of allied arms in Europe will not bring peace, but revolutions. And the course of these revolutions will be determined by whose armies are where." This is a carefully guarded statement. To be more exact it should be stated the other way around as far as the time element is concerned. When and where the fascists are unable to control and the social revolution seems to be getting out of hand then and there the Allied armies will land and take over. This is decisive; what Murrow says merely follows.

Why did England spare men and material for a Greek campaign while these same forces used in Italy would be sufficient to drive Germany out of northern Italy? You can hunt the military annuals forever and never find an answer. But go back to class politics and class principles and then you will see why this strategy was carried out.

In Greece, the social revolution was developing, as reports clearly reveal. The Greek guerrillas not the British drove out the Germans. But the British want to keep the Balkan area around Turkey free from the advancing Soviet troops. They take over

where the Greeks hold free territory and place in power capitalist Greeks against the worker partisans. They protect their life-line to India against the Soviets at the same time.

The "liberation" of northern Italy, industrial-proletarian Italy, will add more weight to the proletarian revolution in Italy. The Italian capitalists who now hold power through Anglo-American domination fear the proletariat in northern Italy and hope they will not tip the scale to a full fledged revolution that the Allies will not be able to cope with. The "liberation" thus proceeds slowly. This war strategy is based upon class principles. We could give countless examples in this and all other wars.

#### CIVIL WAR AND IMPERIALIST WAR

It was Alexander the Great who said, "The wolves never concern themselves over how many the sheep are."

As long as the people remain sheep this will also remain true. But let the people arm themselves, as they are doing in the European and Asiatic countries. Let these people start establishing workers and peasants councils and then we can show the wolves who is master of the state.

The principles that Marx and Lenin laid down for the working class are an example of the principles that govern OUR class war, in "civil" peace, in imperialist war and in civil war. The exploiter classes have their own principles for their own class interests and the defense of their own state power.

The formula that was born since the first world war--That the bourgeois democrats fear the proletariat a thousand times more than they fear the fascists-- it just one of the many class formulas that reveal the principled trend of the military strategy and tactics of the capitalists of the world. The formula that centrism is revolutionary phrases and reactionary actions, is another formula that reveals class politics of principled considerations--which in the end will determine strategical and tactical problems of civil war.

The revolutionary Marxists must learn the art of war, the strategy and tactics of war, subordinated to the principles of our class interests and our state power.

Class education, ruling class education understands this as well as we do, even though their military colleges ignore it. They are forced by minority class circumstances to keep silent on the principles of military strategy and tactics.

Regardless of military academies the revolutionary Marxists who study military strategy and tactics and then coordinate them with the questions of principle (historical materialism) are able to

surpass the "generals" in any campaign where they have an equal footing; as did Lenin and Trotsky, and other capable revolutionary leaders of their respective countries.

Yesterday we emphasized the relation of the second front in Europe with the developing social revolution. And even the lying capitalist press and radio reports more than confirm our thesis.

Today we emphasize the strategical line, based upon our principled understanding of the problems below the imperialist conflict; that an allied victory over Germany will not mean the defeat of fascism. The Allies are not fighting fascism, they are fighting German imperialism. They are working with fascist nations and fascist elements in more than one part of the earth.

Only a social revolution can defeat fascism.

11-6-44

READ AND SUBSCRIBE TO

## THE FIGHTING WORKER

Popular Organ of the THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE, U.S.A.

Affiliated to THE INTERNATIONAL CONTACT COMMISSION.

The Fighting Worker contains popular analysis of national and international events; featured articles on economics; and interesting columns of comment.

Subscription rates are \$1.00 a year. Single copies 05¢.

Bundle orders of 10 or more sent to you postage paid at the rate of 01¢ a copy. SPREAD THE FIGHTING WORKER!

Order from DEMOS PRESS, 708 N. Clark St., Chicago, Ill.

# THE ROOTS OF BUROCRACY

Ever since the Russian Revolution the bourgeoisie have been feeding the masses a fairy tale to the effect that "Bolshevism means burocracy". "Violence leads to dictatorship and tyranny", etc. Re-inforced by the monstrous crimes of Stalinism and by some adherents from within the ranks of the proletarian movement and intelligentsia (Norman Thomas, Sidney Hook, Max Eastman, James Burnham, etc.) the 1944 edition of this lie reads that "Bolshevik methods of violence and revolution lead directly to a system of totalitarianism similar to that of Fascism". The bourgeoisie and the reformists have drawn a heavy white line across the social map. One section they label "democracy" and the other "totalitarianism." This artificial and thoroughly false nomenclature is dished out with the single purpose of hiding the fact of the class struggle; it is merely an elaboration of the "great man" theory of history: in those places where "good" men rule we have "democracy", and where "bad" men, addicted to violence and revolution, rule, there we have "totalitarianism".

There can be little doubt that this theory has made great strides with large sections of the working class. Look at the murders, frame-ups, exile, and tyranny of Stalinism, we are told. Aren't they the fruits of Lenin's theories of Bolshevism? Don't they confirm that Communism is but another form of permanent violence and overlordship? What we need, say the bourgeoisie is "democracy", and the reformists parrot these remarks with the "new" assertion that what we need is "democratic socialism", as opposed to "totalitarian socialism", a la Stalin.

In a similar vein twenty-seven years ago, that renegade from Marxism Karl Kautsky, attacked the Russian Revolution. It wasn't "democratic". It used "force" instead of "democracy". But Mr. Kautsky's brand of "democracy" made its appearance one short year later in Germany, and it ended in one of the most brutal slaughters of the proletariat in history, the many murders by Noske and Scheidemann.

The first thing that suggests itself in answer to all these ravings is the simple fact that there can be no social order in the world today that can exist without FORCE. Force is the handmaiden of all states. Without it capitalism (both in its "democratic" and "fascist" forms) would be wiped from the earth in a very short time. It is certainly a cruel bit of humor to hear the bourgeoisie decry "force and violence" in the midst of the bloodiest carnage in all history. Armed force or the threat of it is the only thing that permits the present minority to remain in

power. Would millions of American boys permit themselves to be drafted into the army, for instance, if it weren't for the threat of police measures against them - FORCE? The bourgeoisie uses FORCE every minute of the day and every day of the week, to remain in power. It uses it on the picket line against strikers, it uses it in the streets to stifle demonstrations for relief and jobs; behind its censorship programs; behind all its limitations of the rights of the masses stands the threat of the police and the regular army.

#### FORCE AND VIOLENCE

The subject of "force and violence" resolves itself thus not into whether it is used or whether it is not used. No, all States, including as we shall soon see, the Proletarian Dictatorship, use FORCE to maintain their class in power. The question is: HOW MUCH force is used, and WHO uses it against WHOM.

The so-called "democratic" powers use relatively less force because they are able to temporarily allay the antipathy of the masses by small reforms; the so-called "totalitarian" powers, on the other hand, no longer are able to grant such reforms because of a relatively deeper economic crisis, and consequently the amount of force they utilize against a hostile populace is proportionately greater. Both types of capitalist DICTATORSHIPS, however, direct their force against - not the minority, the exploiters - but the majority of the people, the proletariat and the small farmers and peasants.

A few historical examples will illustrate the point graphically. In Greece today the government of the British puppet Papandreou has demanded that the Greek guerrilla fighters who actually reconquered Greece from the nazis, in the hopes that they would get land and bread, - that these fighters be DIS-armed. But the Greek X-ists, a Fascist band continue to hold on to their guns which the Greek government does not request them to give up. The Greek "democracy" (!!) you see has no objections to FORCE; it objects merely to the FORCE of the proletariat and peasantry; it welcomes the FORCE of its own class AGAINST the proletariat.

The British Empire is an excellent object lesson of the Marxian theory that it is not a matter of force or no force, but of how much force and against whom. In those sections of the British Empire - like India - where the rate of exploitation is highest, the British "democrats" use brutal terror to keep the hostile masses in check. But in the mother country, where the aristocracy of the proletariat can be bribed off as a result of the super-profits made in India - there the amount of force (while still considerable) is nevertheless somewhat less pronounced. Anyone

who has ever seen pictures of the American marines shooting down helpless natives in Nicaragua, or Mayor Kelly's police in Chicago shooting down unarmed strikers, must recognize the correctness of our theme.

The words "democracy" and "totalitarianism", thus do not denote force or lack of force, but the RELATIVE AMOUNT OF GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE AND FORCE. "Democracy" is generally practiced in countries where the masses are relatively quiescent and where it is cheaper to have less rather than more government control of all spheres of life. "Totalitarian" governments come into being where the masses are in turmoil, preparing for or in the actual process of revolt, and where only extreme and stringent forceful measures can keep the ruling class in power.

### MOVE TOWARD TOTAL CONTROL

But the salient characteristic of modern capitalism is that ALL COUNTRIES are today either fully "totalitarian" or in the process of becoming so. Government interference in the private life of each individual, and government control is growing everywhere. Bourgeois democracy is paving the way for Fascism - in a sense it is growing into it. That there is no FUNDAMENTAL distinction between these two FORMS of capitalist rule has been proven a hundred times in this generation. It was proven when the Spanish Loyalists in June and July 1936, attempted to come to terms with Franco, rather than permit an uprising by their proletariat. It was proven in the relations between France and Germany, where the French "democratic" bourgeoisie from 1934 onwards made one concession after another to Nazi Germany, in the hopes that Hitlerism would become the spearhead against Communism in Europe (including French Communism) and the Soviet Union. It was confirmed by the glorious praise of Mussolini and Hitler by Churchill before this war and the millions of dollars in aid given by the British and American "democratic" capitalists to their German fascist brothers. It was proven by the positive and negative aid given by the British, American and French governments to Franco during the Spanish Civil War and by the praise given to Franco today by Churchill. It was and is being proven daily by the thousand and one links between the "democratic" powers and all sorts of dictatorial ("totalitarian") regimes throughout the world: relations with South American dictatorships like Brazil, the Central American "Republics", the Greek monarchy, the Chinese regime of Chiang-Kai-Shek, etc. etc. "Democracy" and "totalitarianism" (including Fascism) are but two sides of the same coin - and not antipathetical sides either.

One other thing: "democracy" and "totalitarianism" do not in themselves denote the TYPE OF SOCIETY THAT EXISTS. They are meaningless abstractions. There is no such thing as "democracy"; it is



either BOURGEOIS democracy, or PROLETARIAN democracy; or the democracy of the old Chattel Slave Greek Republics. Democracy is a CLASS instrument; it denotes a certain amount of CLASS force. It is a FORM of class rule, whereby the ruling class exercises a minimum of control over the members of its own class and utilizes a minimum of force generously mixed with demagogy, reforms and propaganda, in subjugating the oppressed classes. BOURGEOIS democracy was characterized by the theory of "laissez-faire". It permitted the bourgeoisie a relative freedom from state control in developing its industry, and trade. As the economic structure of capitalism grew stronger, some of the prosperity seeped down to the working classes. The bourgeoisie found it cheaper and more expedient to grant reforms than to use the bayonet constantly. Bourgeois democracy disarmed the masses with these reforms. It had relatively little need for open force, but it was very careful to keep the razor-edged bayonet somewhere in the background ready for use at an instant's notice.

#### WAR AND "DEMOCRACY"

Today, however, all over the world, capitalism is in a deep crisis; the crisis is expressed in the cruelest and bloodiest war in history - THE GREATEST SHOW OF VIOLENCE OF ALL TIME. The war is an attempt by one set of powers to get out of its depression temporarily by stealing the spheres of influence and colonies of other powers. The capitalist powers are too deep in the hole today to be able to grant many reforms to the oppressed. On occasions, when the masses threaten to kick over the traces and revolt, the bourgeoisie may for the moment re-institute "democracy"; but it does so with only a temporary perspective; it permits the sham of "democracy" to exist only until the masses are sufficiently confused, divided and demoralized, and until the bourgeoisie itself can reorganize its open fascist or semi-fascist groups to wage FORCEFUL war on the proletariat.

But bourgeois democracy is now historically passe. It cannot survive this war. The crisis of capitalism impels all capitalist powers to move swiftly to one or another form of "totalitarianism". It is not bolshevism which breeds totalitarianism. On the contrary it is CAPITALISM. Bolshevism, it is true, uses force to defend the working masses from the force of the bourgeoisie; but compared to the force and violence of the present rulers of society it is but a drop in the ocean. Proletarian force has one aim: the establishment of WORKERS democracy - democracy for the majority, rather than for the minority. Bolshevism brings not a lessening of democracy, but, on the contrary, an enormous increase of it.

#### BUROCRACY

But isn't it true, the skeptics will ask, that in Russia today there are no democratic rights at all for the masses? Yes, it is

true. And isn't it true that Stalinism is one of the worst bureaucracies in all history? Yes, that too is true. But all of this must be understood in its historical perspective, not in a vacuum.

Democratic rights and bureaucracy bear a certain relationship to economics. Generally speaking more democratic rights will be granted where economic conditions are fertile, than where they are poor. That is true even under a Proletarian Dictatorship, a Workers' State. There will be more democratic rights for the masses in a Workers' State established in the United States, for instance, than one established in China, where the economic level of the nation is so low - although, of course, there will be infinitely more democratic rights under any form of a healthy proletarian dictatorship than under a capitalist "democracy". (Incidentally the words "democratic rights" are not the same as the word "democracy". Democracy (bourgeois democracy) is a form of government by the ruling class. Democratic rights are privileges gained in a struggle AGAINST the ruling class, including a struggle against its "democratic" form of government.)

Bureaucracy, too, has its class roots. So long as you have private property, so long as you have a class struggle, you will have bureaucracy. The defense of the interests of private property is impossible without bureaucratic machinery. Bureaucracy is the servant of capitalist property relations. So long as the profit motive exists, no matter in how small a form, you will have bureaucrats and bureaucracy - individuals attempting to achieve private gain at the expense of the masses. Behind the bureaucrats there is always CLASS FORCE. Behind the bureaucrats in the American trade unions, for instance, lies the force of the bourgeois state. The labor faker says you can't strike during war time, and if you do strike the Army of police force will be there to enforce the adjurations of the labor faker. He who defends the class interests of a minority must always become - in organizational measures - a bureaucrat. If the majority - the oppressed proletariat - were given equal rights with that of the exploiters (equal rights; that is, in reality, rather than lip service) there would soon be no exploiters. The exploiters and their agents must thus utilize bureaucratic and forceful measures to keep the exploited enslaved. The bureaucracy of the labor faker is only one of the forms. But even in our good reformist and centrist parties, bureaucracy is quite rampant - since the leaderships basically represent the interests of the capitalists and the middle class. Note, for instance, the bureaucracy of Norman Thomas in expelling the Trotskyites some years back. Or the bureaucratic machinery of the zig-zagging Stalinists. Or even the notorious bureaucracy of Jim Cannon of the Trotskyites (who, incidentally, is more polished than Thomas or Browder - but a more capable bureaucrat than either, too.)

## SOVIET DEMOCRACY

Burocracy is an instrument of capitalist property relations - of the profit motive. You will have bureaucrats even under a Workers' State, because you still have capitalist elements and middle class elements. The only reason for the existence of a Workers' STATE is for the liquidation of these capitalist elements. The Workers' State, too, uses FORCE to protect the majority of oppressed from the minority of exploiters. But so long as that minority remains, some of the evils of capitalism, including burocracy, remain with it. In his writings, after the October Revolution, Lenin constantly referred to the presence of burocrats and burocracy in the Communist Party of Russia and in the Workers' State. The large number of these elements is due to the economic conditions of Russia, ravaged by 3 years of war, 9 million dead, starvation, etc. Fortunately in Lenin's time these burocrats were constantly being purged from the Party and State; and they never were able to play a decisive role in Soviet politics.

Despite all the hardships - economic and political - of the first Workers' State, the masses in Russia enjoyed the greatest amount of democratic privileges in all history under Lenin. The present fakers like Hook and Burnham and Thomas refuse to tell the truth about these early days of the Soviet regime. They omit its salient characteristics.

But under Lenin the working class and the poor peasantry enjoyed the only real democracy for the majority in the whole history of humanity. For the first time in history the oppressed had access to the press - not just theoretical but actual. For the first time in history the masses were given ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY, without which political democracy is a cruel jest. No one was permitted to earn more than 8 times as much as anyone else. All capitalist property was confiscated. The proletarian was given higher rations than any other class. He was given free transportation, free rent, free public utility service, free vacations etc. He was given real and direct representation in his Workers' Council (Soviet). His economic condition, it is true, was not an enviable one; but it was as good as that of the minority - that of the nobility and the bourgeoisie. It was a gigantic step forward from the bourgeois "Democracy" of Kerensky.

Inside the Russian Communist Party, as well as in the various Soviets, freedom of expression (coupled with UNITY IN ACTION - democratic centralism) was a byword. When, during the Brest-Litovsk negotiations Bukharin started a clandestine publication of his position for a "revolutionary war" - a position opposed to that of Lenin for "peace" and to the third position of Trotsky for neither war nor peace - Lenin insisted on an open publication in hundreds of thousands of copies of this position. A dozen or two factions

existed within the Bolshevnik Party during Lenin's time, each accorded full democratic rights. Frequently one or another group was able to defeat the position of Lenin himself, despite his enormous prestige.

#### BOLSHEVISM AND BUROCRACY

Because of the failure of the German Revolution in 1918, because of the Civil War, and because of the economic depredations in Russia in that period, the growth of burocratic forces within the Soviet regime and the Party was an ever-present threat. Only the greatest vigilance and ruthless struggle under Lenin's leadership was able to root such burocrats out of the party and keep burocracy in an indecisive position.

**Bolshevism was the most vicious enemy of burocracy. It was the greatest proponent of democratic rights in all history.**

But the ROOTS of burocracy, of "totalitarianism", developed unchecked in the two decades after Lenin's death. One revolutionary wave after another was beaten back. THESE VICTORIES OF CAPITALISM, OF PRIVATE PROPERTY, WERE THE CAUSES OF THE GROWTH OF BUROCRACY AND OF TOTALITARIAN METHODS WITHIN RUSSIA. The inability of the proletarian revolution to extend itself strengthened the hand of the burocrats and revisionists within Russia; and from a severely controlled indecisive force they were able, under Stalinism, to consolidate into the RULING force within the Soviet Union. The Stalinist machine represented the bourgeois perversion of the proletarian revolution, the undermining of proletarian democracy, and the preparation for eventual capitalist restoration. It was not an outgrowth of Bolshevism which fought such tendencies with an unexampled fury; it was and is the OPPOSITE of Bolshevism.

It was only the growth of the CAPITALIST elements within Russia which brought on the so-called "totalitarianism" of the Stalin regime. Capitalism and only capitalism, is the source of all burocracy, all "totalitarianism". The attempt by a minority to control and exploit a majority can and must lead only to total forceful control.

We face today a choice not between force or no force, but between bourgeois force, Fascism and burocracy, on the one hand, and proletarian defense of its interests, workers' democracy and Communism, on the other. The lie that Bolshevism means burocracy is reminiscent of the thief who runs out of the robbed store yelling, "thief, stop thief", or the pot calling the kettle black. The bourgeoisie and their reformist and intellectual lickspittles are attempting to smear the forces of progress, the proletariat and oppressed peasantry, the Revolutionary Marxists, with their own horrendous crimes.

Let's put this lie to rest once and for all.

# INTERNATIONAL NOTES

Armed mutinies are taking place throughout Canada over the attempt to ship soldiers overseas without their consent. Soldier pickets in British Columbia stopped a whole train from moving on November 28th by threatening to open fire if one of the home defense units in Saskatchewan moved on. Demonstrations and fights are taking place throughout French-speaking Quebec. Hostility to the King government is at fever pitch, and hostility to participating in the war is even greater....

As we go to press a general strike is about to take place in Belgium. The temper of the masses is so bitter against the Pierlot government that even the stalinist and social-democratic leadership of the Trade Union syndicate was forced to call the strike. For days streetcar, post office and telephone workers have been striking and demonstrating. The government - puppet of Allied Imperialism - has banned "gatherings" in typical fascist-style in order to harness the revolutionary aspirations of the masses....

The Italian and London-Polish governments have lost their premiers. Both resigned recently....

In the United States Mr. Roosevelt demands conscription of young men between the ages of 18 and 23 for one year of military service after the war. In the midst of the "war to end wars" American Imperialism is already preparing for new and bigger bloodbaths. At the same time the hue and cry of General Somervell and the War Manpower Commission about a shortage of war workers is just so much eyewash for another attempt to pass the Woodward regimentation bill next year. There is no real shortage of labor; in fact there is an increase in unemployment. The government, however, is anxious to impose total job-regimentation while the so-called war emergency is still intense....

The main design of the French, Greek, and Belgian governments at the moment seems to be the disarming of the guerrilla masses. The same people who were praised for their "valiant" efforts in the "liberation" (re-conquest) of these countries, are now being FORCEFULLY disarmed by the "democratic" governments because they fear those same guns will now be used to fight for bread and peace....

What has happened to the myths about "democracy", about a "war to end all wars", about a "people's war", about "peace and plenty", about "free elections", about "freedom of speech and assembly", about "respecting the will of the people"? Just lies and demogogy! Capitalism has proven again that its aims are no different from

those of 1914 (except for the additional task of smashing the Soviet Union) and its propaganda is no less hypocritical and treacherous.

There can be no more peace, no plenty, no free elections, few workers rights so long as capitalism is permitted to exist. Each day will merely continue to expose - as we of the International Contact Commission have pointed out for five years - that all this was merely lies, and more lies.

Only the Proletarian Revolution can defeat Fascism, only the Proletarian Revolution can bring permanent peace. ONLY the Proletarian Revolution!