

DISCUSSION BULLETIN

No. 6

January, 1951

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Report on Yugoslavia and Related Questions By Murry Weiss for the National Committee	1
2. World Imperialism and the Position of the United States -- Stalinism and the Position of the Soviet Union -- Yugoslavia and the Role of World Trotskyism By C. Jarvis, Cleveland	25

Published by the
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY
116 University Place
New York 3, N.Y.

25¢

REPORT ON YUGOSLAVIA AND RELATED QUESTIONS

By Murry Weiss

For the National Committee

(14th National SWP Convention - November 24-26, 1950)

Comrade Chairman and Comrades,

The basic motivation of our resolution, its point of departure, is that a workers' state has been established in Yugoslavia by the victory of the proletarian revolution.

The resolution sums up the interaction of objective and subjective factors in the historical process which produced a workers' state in Yugoslavia. It characterizes the party that led this revolution and analyzes the prospects for the development of the revolution.

The resolution is also a defense of the general political line we have followed with regard to Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav Communist Party. This convention must answer the question: were we right in our vigorous intervention since the break between Tito and Stalin? Our resolution not only affirms the correctness of our basic line and action. It does more. By developing the analysis and formulating a precise characterization of the class character of Yugoslavia and the YCP the resolution extends and deepens the intervention of the Trotskyist movement in the struggle and lays the groundwork for our further course.

Recently we have acquired additional evidence of progress of the revolution in Yugoslavia, particularly in the struggle against bureaucratic deformations by basing the young workers' state more firmly upon the peoples' committees and extending the participation of the workers in management and control of industry.

But we also have witnessed the continuation and acceleration of a right turn in foreign policy. This turn places the very existence of the Yugoslav revolution in jeopardy and poses the question: is this an irrevocable capitulation to the brutal pressure of Western imperialism? Or does it offer another in a series of warnings, the gravest thus far, that without the firm policy of revolutionary internationalism the Yugoslav revolution will suffer shipwreck?

For this report we rule out any polemics with the Stalinists, the Social Democrats, the centrists and the Shachtmanites.

The answer to the Stalinists -- that's a job of exposing frame-ups and slanders. The Social Democrats and centrists, who belatedly recognized the importance of the Yugoslav affair, are attracted to the worst features of the Yugoslav Communist Party and its policies. They are "Titoist" whenever there is any indication of a swing to the right. Like their masters, the bourgeoisie, they bank on destroying the Yugoslav revolution by submerging it in the imperialist bloc. As for the Shachtmanites -- they are not in our class camp but are simply a special case of left Social Democracy.

Altogether different is the challenge to our position within our party. The Johnson-Forest tendency, which vigorously opposes our

analysis and tactical line, will be dealt with. Their opposition stems from basic theoretical and strategic differences with Trotskyism. Carefully distinguished from this group are those comrades who do not counterpose a separate resolution to ours, or even in certain cases subscribe to the main line of our resolution but who have a number of questions and reservations. I shall attempt to maintain the necessary distinction in the treatment of these two internal controversies.

Before the Second World War Yugoslavia was ruled by a monarchy tied up with the church and buttressed by fascistlike gangs.. It was dominated by foreign imperialists and a parasitic native bourgeoisie linked with the big landlords and without any legal workers' movement. In addition to the general oppression of this country by the imperialists there existed an internal oppression of a whole host of nationalities by the Serbian bourgeoisie -- a small "prison of the peoples," 80% agrarian; a typical culturally backward Balkan country, disease-ridden, poverty-stricken.

In a single decade these peoples experienced a social economic and political upheaval; destroyed the whole political structure of the old order; expelled the foreign imperialists; removed those twin curses of feudalism -- the monarchy and the church, erected a new state power based on the working class, laid the basis for a real solution of the national question; wiped out the capitalist class and the big landlords; took the road of industrialization and electrification under a plan; made beginnings in collectivization; broke with the Kremlin; introduced progressive changes in the field of workers' control and management; experienced a cultural awakening; opened a struggle against bureaucracy in the state apparatus and embarked on the path of ideological development away from Stalinism towards Marxism.

What brought all this into being?

There can be no doubt -- this is the work of that mainspring of social progress, what Trotsky called "the most indubitable feature of a revolution. . . the direct interference of the masses in historic events."

After the conquest of Yugoslavia by the Nazis and Fascists in April 1941, the first stage in the war of national liberation opens.

The ruling class of Yugoslavia was no different from its blood brothers throughout Europe. This corroded regime collapsed in the face of Nazi pressure. The pro-Nazism of the bourgeoisie was expressed on March 1941 by the Regent Paul Cvetkovich regime, when it became signatory to the Axis pact. The anti-fascist sentiments of the workers and peasant masses flared up in demonstrations and uprisings and the Cvetkovich cabinet fell 48 hours after it joined the Axis. Gen. Simovich became Premier, the regency was deposed and Peter II declared ruler.

But this new regime, despite its anti-Nazi pretensions, didn't change anything fundamental. Hitler's army conquered within twelve days. The Yugoslav army disintegrated. The King and his cabinet fled to London.

The national liberation war arose out of the collapse, cowardice and treachery of the monarchy, the bourgeoisie of Yugoslavia and their Generals.

Who led this great war of the Yugoslav masses? The Yugoslav Communist Party is on the scene from the first days, calling for uprisings and organizing the resistance. But the early period of the resistance has a localized, predominantly peasant character -- a relatively easy target for the powerful Nazi forces occupying the country. The movement comes to a crisis. A series of military defeats menaces the very existence of the liberation war. What does the YCP do in these circumstances?

Let us direct our attention to the first crucial sign of the class character of this "war of national liberation": the formation of the proletarian brigades on Dec. 21, 1941. I quote from Tito's political report to the 5th Congress of the YCP in 1948 where he says, with reference to the first stage of the struggle: "the experience of the struggle in Serbia showed that armed uprising must be developed not only in breadth and numbers, that is quantitatively, but qualitatively as well. It was shown that real military units must be formed, capable of leaving their own territories and fighting wherever it was necessary, and wherever they are ordered to do so. Even though the partisan detachments who fought from the very beginning, were formed as military formations, battalions, companies, platoons, and although firm military discipline was maintained, these units nevertheless had more of a territorial character, defended their own area in the main, their villages and homes. Therefore they had a local character and as such were not capable of mobile warfare, of leaving their own territory and fighting in other parts of the country. On the other hand, we continued to develop and create territorial partisan detachments. It was from such detachments that the new fighters, who had already had their christening in fire, kept pouring into the regular units. In this connection, the supreme headquarters formed the proletarian shock brigades immediately after the withdrawal from Serbia."

Tito says further: "The proletarian brigades were thus named, first because the brigades were made up mostly of proletarians, workers from the cities, factories and mines, who had shown not only a high class-consciousness, but also exemplary courage and loyalty to the party and the people in all previous battles. Second: they were thus named, because in those awful days, that name meant an uncompromising life and death struggle, because the people were convinced by deeds during those hard days that only the working class, led by the CPY, was a consistent, uncompromising fighter against the invader."

This role of the proletarian brigades is one of the essential features marking the transformation of a national liberation war into a class war; that feature which is so penetratingly analyzed by the theory of permanent revolution. A national war in our epoch against imperialism and its agents cannot achieve victory -- without the proletariat taking the helm.

This national liberation war, led by the YCP, in which the proletariat from the beginning played a leading role, develops into civil war. The remnants of the old Yugoslavian army led by Mihailovich, becomes the rallying center for the capitalists.

Here is an important peculiarity we must direct attention to. We mustn't imagine that the armed struggle between Mihailovich and the Partisans breaks out immediately and in full force. Under pressure of the Kremlin and the Allied imperialists, there ensues an uneasy period in which negotiations take place. But very quickly the reality becomes apparent to the Partisans. Mihailovich, the representative of the native bourgeoisie and Allied imperialism, collaborates with the Fascists and the Nazis. While the Partisans are fighting the Germans and the Italians, Mihailovich is slashing at their rear. This does not exactly make for collaboration. It sets up a certain contradiction between the real course of the struggle, which is developing into an all-national class war, and the line of the Kremlin.

The YCP organizes the proletarian brigades and deepens the split with Mihailovich. At this point it is interesting to quote Mosha Piyade. In 1950 he published a pamphlet, "About The Legend That The Yugoslav Uprising Owed Its Existence To Soviet Assistance," and does a devastating job destroying that legend. He quotes the following dispatch from Moscow to Tito, dated March 5, 1942, in reference to Mihailovich and the other problems that were developing: "Study of all the information you give lends one the impression that the adherents of Great Britain and the Yugoslav government" -- that is, the Yugoslav government in London, with the King -- "have some justification in suspecting the Partisan movement of acquiring a communist character and aiming at the Sovietization of Yugoslavia. Why, for example, did you need to form a proletarian brigade? Surely at the moment the basic, immediate task is to unite all anti-Nazi currents, smash the invaders, achieve national liberation. How is one to explain the fact that supporters of Great Britain are succeeding in forming armed units against the Partisan detachments? Are there really no other Yugoslav patriots -- apart from the Communists and Communist sympathizers -- with whom you could join in common struggle against the invaders?"

"It is difficult to agree that London and the Yugoslav government are siding with the invaders. There must be some great misunderstanding here. We earnestly request you to give your tactics altogether serious thought, and your actions, and make sure that on your side you have really done all you can to achieve a true united national front of all enemies of Hitler and Mussolini in Yugoslavia, in order to attain the common aim. . ."

After receiving this letter, Tito writes to Piyade, the Central Committee representative who is up in the mountains with a small group of Partisans. They are waiting for Soviet assistance to come by airplane. For 38 days of blizzards and bitter cold they wait. Nothing comes. And then Piyade receives the following letter from Tito.

"Your observation about the common harness of the Yugoslav government, (Drasha Mihailovich) and Nedich is correct but Grandad (that's Stalin) finds difficulty in crediting it. A day or two ago I got a letter a mile long from him, in which he says that our reports give him the impression that the Partisan movement is getting deeper and deeper into communist waters, otherwise how would it be possible for supporters of London to organize the Chetniks against us? Further he asks why it was necessary to form a special proletarian brigade. He

wants us to revise our policies and create a broad national liberation front."

In this same letter Tito tells of his answer to Stalin. "To this I have replied, briefly and clearly, that he has drawn the wrong conclusions from our reports, that we have got a broad national liberation front, though not in common with fifth-columnists, but with the great majority of true patriots; that the supporters of London, are not working with the label London, but that of the occupying forces, i.e. the Nedich label, in their struggle against us; that we have sufficient documentary proofs of this; that the setting up of proletarian brigades was an indispensable step, when the Partisan movement was in danger of being broken up by fifth-columnists, and that the proletarian brigades are not fighting for Sovietization, but by their heroism are an example to our people how to fight in this struggle for one's freedom and independence."

A number of very important conclusions can be drawn from this exchange. It is clear, first of all, that the Allied imperialists and the Kremlin are trying to force the Partisans to capitulate to Mihailovich. The YCP refuses to capitulate. But its refusal is not motivated by any correct theoretical comprehension of the nature of their struggle. On the contrary they are trying to explain to Stalin that they are following the Kremlin line. They imagine that Stalin is misinformed. They do not suspect that he is trying to come to agreement with Mihailovich behind their backs.

Here is the crucial point. They are leading a mass struggle which evolves in accordance with the logic of the permanent revolution. They don't understand this. But they have the will to carry on the struggle. This is characteristic of both the weakness and the strength of the YCP in its further evolution. Step by step they are drawn into the successive stages of the struggle -- but always the impress of their empiricism and their captivity to the ideology and politics of Stalinism is felt and distorts the development.

The class essence of the civil war is the proletariat and the peasantry against all the possessing classes and the imperialists -- this civil war immediately poses the question of power. As the Partisans clear territories, the problem of governmental authority arises. From the very beginning it becomes an irreconcilable issue separating the Partisans from Mihailovich.

In his report to the Fifth Congress Tito quotes from the draft of a proposed agreement between Mihailovich and the Partisans. The Partisans presented this point: "the organization of a temporary authority which would concern itself with the feeding of the population, the organization of the economy, the collection of means for waging the war, the establishment of organs to maintain order and security, etc., in our opinion it would be absolutely wrong in the present national liberation struggle to have this authority represented by district sheriff's office, the old district administrations, the gendarmerie, etc. In order to rally all the people for the waging of this difficult struggle against the invader, it is necessary that we create organs that will best correspond to this situation and will be closest to the people and will be able to take upon themselves all responsibilities in the name of the people. The former gendarmerie,

police and district apparatus, the district organs as well, cannot today be considered as suitable, for many hostile elements have made their way into this apparatus, because the apparatus has up to the present been in the service of the invaders and the enemy and still has influence over it through their agents. Besides, that apparatus which does not particularly enjoy the trust of the people is not suitable in these fateful days.

"We think that the National Liberation Committees, set up by the people themselves, are at present the most suitable organs upon which we could rely. These National Liberation Committees must be voluntarily chosen by the people regardless of political conviction."

The approach here is not that the conquest of power by the proletariat leading the peasantry requires the destruction of the old state apparatus of the bourgeoisie and its replacement by a new state apparatus based on the masses in struggle. Rather the empirical observation is made that the old state apparatus is in the service of the invader and of the ruling class collaborators and a new state apparatus based on the masses in arms is the only force that can organize the resistance and carry on the war to victory. This is not Marxist consciousness, but the practical conclusion represents a fundamentally different line from that pursued by the Stalinists in all other countries. Thus the allied and Kremlin campaign for a coalition with the counter-revolutionary Mihailovich is frustrated. The civil war develops.

After the Partisans have some military successes and succeed in grouping together liberated territories a Provisional Government is formed on Nov. 23, 1943. This government, based on the People's Committees, marks a new stage in the revolution.

The condition of dual power, present from the first day of the liberation war, here rises to a new high point. Where is the power of the bourgeoisie at this stage? It's split and scattered among Mihailovich, the Nazi invaders and the Italian Fascists. What is this new power that arises, led by the Communist Party, based on proletarians formed in brigades, and the peasantry, in mortal struggle against these representatives of their class enemy? This is the power of the proletarian revolution struggling for mastery of the nation. Are the leaders of the YCP consciously aware of this? Not fully and not yet. But that's the reality nevertheless.

The logic of the revolutionary war forces the YCP into taking revolutionary steps. At all stages this clashes with the designs of the Kremlin.

We could illustrate at length how every big forward movement of the Yugoslav revolution is marked by friction with the Kremlin. And in this process we see the transformation of the Yugoslav CP. Here we see how a revolution, with its enormous mass pressures, can under certain conditions -- favorable conditions, to be sure, even in some respects unique -- take hold of a Stalinist party, press it into service, cause it to swerve from its preordained course, and thereby cease to be a complete creature of Kremlin policy.

An inevitable question arises at this point. Can the pressure of the masses simply seize any working class party, including

Stalinist parties, express itself through that party, and result in the triumph of the revolution and the establishment of a workers' state?

No one has posed the question in this absolutely false and fatalistic manner. The subjective factor of the party and its leadership operated in the Yugoslav revolution; it didn't operate on the highest level but it operated. The leaders of the Yugoslav Communist Party had to make decisions. They weren't "sitting in Moscow," as they themselves repeat so often. They have a certain right to boast in this case. They said: "We didn't hear about the Liberation in a Dacha outside Moscow, over the radio." They were in the hills. They were leading the fighting force of the workers and peasants. They were being tested under fire. Most important of all they successfully resisted the treacherous pressure of the Kremlin. This takes a certain mold of men. We don't hear about those revolutions that didn't take place because other Stalinist leaders failed to make the kind of decisions these people made. They could have made other decisions -- there is nothing fatalistic in this.

Weighed down by Stalinism, the YCP nevertheless broke through its opportunism and transmitted into action the pressure of the proletariat. It is better to "succumb" to the pressures of the proletariat than to the pressure of the bourgeoisie or of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

But the process is not even, or uniform in direction. There are sharp oscillations by the Yugoslav CP from left to right and from right to left throughout the revolution and these centrist oscillations are still going on.

In the next stage of the Yugoslav revolution which opens with the Tito-Subasich agreement we witness another right swing. Negotiations with Subasich -- the representative of the London Government -- begins in June, 1944. Tito in his 5th Congress report, quotes from the document of the agreement, "On his part, the Marshal of Yugoslavia, Joseph Tito, as President of the National Committee of Liberation of Yugoslavia, will make public the statement on co-operation with Dr. Subasich government" -- (the same government, incidentally, with a little shift in personnel, which supported Mihailovich) "and will once more emphasize that the National Committee of Liberation of Yugoslavia will not raise the question of the final state system during the war."

Then he explains what was behind this deal. "We had to consent to this, as it was the condition of the Allies for recognition of the new state of affairs in Yugoslavia that came about in the course of the war with the ever-more obvious victory of the National Liberation Movement." He doesn't mention here the Allies and the Stalinist regime in Russia.

We've got to remember the picture of this war. The Partisans went into battles with five, ten, fifteen bullets per soldier. They waited year after year for assistance from the Red Army which they don't get. As a matter of fact they discover later on that not only do they fail to receive assistance but the Red Army was dickering with Mihailovich for an agreement, offering him all kinds of assistance.

We've got to remember that they armed themselves by disarming the enemy. And this proposed agreement with the Subasich Government has the character of squeezing the Partisans in the last days of their warfare: "either make this agreement or you don't get real assistance!" They've been bleeding for three years. There's no understanding the specific type of opportunism practised by the Yugoslav party without understanding these conditions.

The revolution nevertheless develops, even after the agreement leads to a joint government with these representatives of the bourgeoisie. It develops on the basis of the real power in Yugoslavia, the power that arose in the revolutionary war led by the YCP. For the bourgeoisie and imperialism the Coalition Government is the starting point of all their counter-revolutionary plans. But the revolution does not halt. We see the beginning of important social transformations. Nationalization of industry begins. The plans of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie do not make serious headway. This causes the last two bourgeois ministers to leave the government in October, 1945. Let us review the main stages up to 1945.

First, the split with Mihailovich, despite the pressure of the Kremlin and the Allies. Then, the formation of a provisional government based on the Committees, raising the dual power in the country to a high point. Next, the agreement with the defeated bourgeoisie again due to imperialist and Stalinist pressure, followed by the break-up of the coalition. The Tito-Subasich coalition leaves open the question of the outcome of this decisive turning point in the revolution. However weak and meager the power of the bourgeoisie, the coalition represented a real threat of the return of the old ruling class.

Tito says the YCP understood the danger. The bourgeoisie were going to try to bring the King back. The King was to be a "Trojan Horse," and the landlords and capitalists would march back to power under that cover. The YCP leaders apparently believe they outwitted the bourgeoisie. In their recent ideological development they have revealed a considerable understanding about their revolution, but this understanding has never attained theoretical depth -- they still believe that principles can be played with. In this sense they pass off the Coalition Government as nothing but an episodic maneuver.

From the departure of the last bourgeois ministers in October 1945, the revolution experiences a rapid development in the sphere of economic transformations.

Nationalizations are broadened. They begin collectivizations in agriculture. Monopoly of foreign trade is established. The Five-Year plan is adopted. Industrialization and electrification of the country gets under way.

These years are also marked by a growth of bureaucracy. This bureaucracy is not fully differentiated from the proletariat, it is a bureaucracy that hasn't developed or hardened into a privileged caste, in the full sense of the word. Where Marxist consciousness is absent or incomplete and its place is taken by Stalinist ideas, the pressure of bureaucracy that arises so forcefully in a backward country, makes its way.

The next big stage opens with the YCP-Kremlin split in June 1948. This split was prepared by the whole previous course of development. The National Liberation war, which developed into a civil war and then grew into a socialist revolution, could not be contained within the framework of Stalinism, not only ideologically and politically but in the deepest social and economic sense.

The Yugoslav overturn did not consist in the mere replacement of the old state apparatus by appointees from the Stalinist Kremlin, as in Eastern Europe. This revolution raised the working class and the toiling masses to its feet. It conquered power through years of terrible warfare. The underlying impulse of that revolution was to reorganize the economy of the country, to take steps toward socialist construction. Such aspirations were irreconcilable with the Kremlin's Eastern European plans. The leadership of the YCP begins to understand this. Shortly after the break, in a pamphlet, "The Real Reasons Behind the Slanders Against Yugoslavia," Tito says:

"It is sufficient to read various papers and listen to various broadcasts, not only from Western Europe but from Budapest, Bucharest, Prague, Warsaw, Sofia, etc., to grasp immediately, without much perspicacity, what the whole thing is all about. It becomes clear then how we have sinned, and that the thing is we want to build socialism as soon as possible, and that we are actually building it.

"The whole thing is that we are industrializing the country, giving it electricity. We are not remaining a backward agricultural country which only delivers its raw materials to other countries, which then ship us the finished goods. The thing is that our country should not continue to remain a mere source of raw materials for those countries which have already possessed an advanced industry. We cannot keep on buying industrial products from them at high prices, which is being done today and which was done in the past, while our peoples continue to remain poor and backward, with a low standard of living, culture, having to put up with hardships and misery as best they can, and then being called the backward and uncivilized Balkans."

This is putting the finger on the main source of the struggle. But this intolerable conflict didn't come out of nowhere. It was the outcome of a prolonged process, in which the development of the YCP is intertwined with the development of the revolution, in conflict not only with the class enemy but with the Stalinist bureaucracy, and finally and suddenly comes to the surface, to the attention of the whole world, in the break with the Kremlin.

The Tito-Stalin break clearly disclosed the living form of a proletarian revolution. And this break also brought to the surface the real nature of the YCP and the Yugoslav state.

I'm not going to deal at length with some of the superficial explanations of the split with the Kremlin. It is an extremely distasteful job, particularly because their proponents don't concern themselves with the facts and don't bother to look into the real nature of the developments.

There is the theory of the two gangs: One gang wanted to take the loot for itself and broke with the other gang. But all the laws

of gang warfare as we know them are defied in the case of Yugoslavia. The first law of gang warfare is that when a more powerful gang threatens to take over no matter how devoted you are to your own gang leader, you desert. You might feel sad about it, but you desert. Maybe here and there, particularly in Hollywood movies, somebody goes down with the leader in a blazing gun battle, but by and large, gang lieutenants shift over at once. If it's merely a question of two unscrupulous gangs, the whole lieutenancy, the whole second-line cadre in Yugoslavia should have voted to a man with the Kremlin. That's where the great power is. That's where you go, if it's no more than a gang warfare problem. But in Yugoslavia we witnessed the almost unanimous rejection of the demands of the Kremlin by broad sections of the party and working class. And this on the part of a tiny country living in the shadow of a giant. No, such a superficial explanation simply cannot explain anything of political and class importance.

The split had unexpected results for the Stalinists. They launched a ferocious attack on all fronts. There has never been anything like it from them except the attack on the Trotskyists. For the first time since the murderous assaults on the Left Opposition in Russia and internationally, all the stops were pulled out. The world press of Stalinism, its entire military and secret police apparatus were mobilized, up to the point of calling publicly for the assassination of Tito.

It looked to many as though the Kremlin would crush this upstart in a short time or drive them into the imperialist camp. Instead the whole affair boomerangs on the GPU. Titoism appears in all the Eastern European countries and in Western Europe. It becomes a major phenomenon and threatens to speed the breakup of the mass Stalinist parties. Our intervention, from the first moment of the split, was predicated on a deep-sighted appreciation of the heterogeneity of these massive Stalinist parties. We saw the first serious postwar break in the world Stalinist front. Our campaign sought to widen and deepen this break, to reach the consciousness of the masses of workers, not only in Yugoslavia, but in all countries. We saw a basis for action by taking sides in this fight and by intervening with our own ideas, forces and influence. Our tendency alone saw this and did this.

Important changes occurred after the break with the Kremlin. The revolution again moves forward. A genuine struggle against bureaucratism is opened by the YCP -- not simply against bureaucracy in Russia, but against their own bureaucratic deformations. Again, to deal with the superficial "theorists." They reduce this struggle against bureaucracy to pure demagoguery; they compare it with the Stalinist sham struggle in Russia against bureaucratism. The Johnson-Forest tendency say, "In Russia every purge is preceded by a great struggle against bureaucratism." That's not the way it went in Yugoslavia. You can't organize a whole country in a vast propaganda campaign against bureaucracy, take real measures to introduce the control of the working class into industry, strengthen the Peoples' Committees and extend their power, simply in order to disguise your real intention -- the increase of bureaucracy. That type of theory reminds me of what Trotsky said when he was accused of conducting a lifetime of revolutionary activity in order to conceal fascist plots -- "People don't build a skyscraper to hide a mouse."

These important changes were noted by us. We deepened our intervention. When signs of progressive ideological development appeared, we greeted them and took advantage of them. We discussed Trotskyism with Communist workers and leaders in Yugoslavia, found new avenues to dissident Stalinist workers in Europe and America. Did we close our eyes to the shortcomings? Did we become Titoists? Absolutely not!

On the basis of conjunctural shifts, some comrades may feel that they -- or we -- were over-enthusiastic the day before yesterday. Well, it's very good not to be either over-enthusiastic or over-pessimistic. But our line took into account both opposing aspects of the situation. It was based firmly on an understanding of the limitations, empiricism, the Stalinist heritage of the YCP; and it was just as firmly based on the proposition that here was a break to the left. We had to reach out, deal with it, help it, not sit back and predict its doom. We recognized the revolutionary development and tried to help the revolutionary tendency. We worked on the optimum variant. If anyone is then going to examine exaggerations or over-enthusiasm in the course of such an action, they will probably find it, but they will not find that we misunderstood the essence of Titoism. We worked, and we will continue to work, for every possible regroupment of revolutionary forces under the banner of Trotskyism, exploiting to the limit all the breaks and splits in the Stalinist parties.

The Johnson-Forest tendency is absolutely incapable of grasping the Yugoslav reality. They say "Titoism is pure, conscious and consistent Stalinism." To them a party and leadership that heads a revolution is identical with a party that beheaded revolutions.

They say that, if a Communist Party of the West were to defy the Kremlin, that would be significant. On this we agree. In "No support for Tito" Johnson-Forest say: "Mobilization of a mass Communist party even by Thorez or Togliatti in defiance of the Cominform or the Russian regime would be an event of world-wide significance to the revolutionary movement, however empirical or halting might be the ideological basis on which such a defiance might begin." That's not a small concession and if it were properly understood, would be significant.

Johnson-Forest can also see, in this same article, "When the Yugoslav Communist Party rejected the German state power during the war, it was able to lead a struggle with genuinely revolutionary characteristics." That also is true. But they cannot comprehend the intertwining and real results of these two factors (a struggle with genuinely revolutionary characteristics, and a defiance of the Kremlin) in the actual process of the Yugoslav revolution.

The coming to power of the Yugoslav workers under the real conditions of this revolution leaves them bewildered and dissatisfied. And this, Comrades, is because they are in the terrible position of being prisoners of an arbitrary construction and a false theory.

The revolution in property relations in Yugoslavia brought about by the revolutionary action of the masses is a matter of indifference

to them. It is merely a new stage of capitalism.

The Johnson-Forest tendency do not deny that Marxism has, since the days of the Communist Manifesto, placed the abolition of private property in the means of production as a prime task of the proletarian revolution. Their contention is, one, that private property is not an indispensable characteristic of capitalism and, two, the abolition of private property, the complete statification of industry and transport, planning, elimination of the class of private capitalists, the destruction of the state apparatus serving monopoly capitalism, is not necessarily the task of the proletariat. As a matter of fact, they say that in this new and higher stage of capitalism the dominant tendency is for the bureaucracy of labor, which everywhere assumes the features of Stalinism, to expropriate their mortal enemies, the private capitalists, take over the exploitation of the workers themselves and replace the old bourgeois state apparatus with their own.

From this fundamental sociological proposition, the whole revisionist system of the Johnson-Forest tendency follows.

How do we arrive from private property capitalism to state capitalism? According to Johnson-Forest who try to base their revisionism on Marx, state capitalism arises out of the process of centralization described by Marx in Vol. 1 of Capital, in the chapter on The General Law of Capitalist Accumulation.

It's worth-while to spend time on some of the fundamental economic propositions of which this edifice of Johnson-Forest rests. In this chapter Marx described how the concentration of capital is effected by two processes: through accumulated reproduction; or the transformation of surplus value into new capital, and through centralization, or the combination of already existing capitals. The absolute limit of this centralization, Marx shows, would be the merger of all capital in the hands of a single capitalist or trust.

Should this theoretical possibility occur in one nation, the formation of an average rate of profit would be directly affected by the world market. And thus, there would still be no abrogation of the fundamental laws of capitalist economy. However, this is still in the realm of abstraction. Nowhere in the capitalist world, nowhere in the real world, where the various laws of political economy modify, criss-cross and clash with one another, has centralization reached such an absolute limit. Even where an entire industry has been monopolized it still functions as a competing segment of the total social capital of the nation or of capitalist world economy.

Thus it is impossible, on the basis of the facts, to say that the economic trend toward centralization has actually produced state capitalism -- in any capitalist country of the world. The only place where such centralization of the productive forces has been effected, if you can call it centralization, is in the Soviet Union. And this came not as a result of the process of centralization in a capitalist country -- the slow elimination of one capitalist by another, but as the result of the proletarian revolution. In Russia property was statified, not by the process of capitalists or bureaucrats eliminating each other, but by workers overthrowing the bourgeoisie and placing themselves in power.

However, Johnson-Forest argue that state capitalism exists in Russia because all the categories of capitalism are to be found there: value, price, wages, commodities, capital, etc. This reasoning is false to the core. These categories, taken in their isolated form, were found, many of them, in pre-capitalist societies. There and then they were related to a different mode of production. Marx and Engels themselves anticipated that wages and other capitalist categories would linger on in the transitional society from capitalism to socialism. But Marx never considered that an economic system and its basic mode of production could be defined as the sum of its parts, separated into the various categories of production and distribution.

An economic system is first of all determined by its class structure. Feudalism is distinguished by the existence of the serf class, tied to the land and toiling for the monopoly owners of the land, the feudal nobility. Slave economy is distinguished by the producing class, the slave, who is the property of the slave owner. And capitalist society -- by the sale of labor power to the capitalist class, which owns the means of production. The specific productive relations and property forms underlying the class struggle and its origins are fundamental for the correct understanding of a given mode of production.

In Russia the capitalist class was overthrown and has never been reinstated. Many categories of capitalism continue to exist in the Soviet Union. If that weren't so, we'd have to revise our whole opposition to the theory of "Socialism in one country." But they exist within a qualitatively different context established by the October revolution.

Now Johnson-Forest can explain all the similarities between the Soviet Union and world capitalism, but with their theory they can never explain the decisive differences. For example, if there is a law of declining rate of profit, in the classic sense, in the Soviet Union, as they declare, why does it not operate to produce depression-prosperity cycles?

In the Thirties, when world capitalism was in a paralyzing depression, the Soviet Union experienced its most rapid economic growth. Now we don't ask Johnson-Forest to refute this or explain this, but at least cope with it. Don't ignore it. Isn't this an expression of qualitatively different economic systems?

Lenin's "Imperialism" is for us Marx's "Capital" brought up-to-date for the 20th century. But according to Johnson it's been out-moded. Conservative, orthodox Marxists that we are, we haven't been persuaded by this claim yet. Lenin demonstrated that one of the essential features of imperialism is the export of capital. Nothing has changed in this respect.

For a reason which I shall touch on, it becomes necessary for the Johnson-Forest tendency to do violence to facts on this question. Let me cite the following passage, which appears on page 9 of "State Capitalism and World Revolution." "The falling rate of profit is no longer theory. Like so much of Marx's abstract analysis, the proof is now before our eyes. Who in his senses today thinks that the world is suffering from an excess of capital? Where? Britain? France?

Italy? Japan? India? Brazil? China? Where? Pray, where? From everywhere the cry arises for capital. The total mass of surplus value produced, in relation to the total social capital, is hopelessly inadequate." Then they say, in passing, "It may be useful, though we doubt this, to point out the fabulous profits of this or that company in the United States. This is no more than a variety of American exceptionalism. These profits will never be able to rebuild world economy."

Everything is wrong here. Absolutely everything. Moreover, I don't think it's done deliberately, but it's a basically dishonest treatment of the world situation today. A conscientious observer wouldn't list, under the heading of "Where is there excess capital?" every country in the world except the United States, the colossus; the one country that has sucked dry the marrow, the wealth, of the world. The American imperialists have incorporated into their own system masses of capital. The whole world drive of American imperialism stems from that. They are now trying to subjugate the world militarily in order to exploit it more intensively. One doesn't deal with this pivotal question by an offhand reference to a few corporations and their fabulous profits, and then evade the question, by saying these profits will never rebuild the world. We never said and Lenin never said, that imperialist export of capital would rebuild the world. On the contrary, this tends to tear it down. Only the proletarian revolution and the economy and society it will introduce will rebuild the world.

But here is the secret of this complete distortion of reality -- Russia doesn't export capital. It imports it. As a matter of fact it loots it. But the theoretical world of Johnson-Forest does not permit such discrepancies. How to obliterate this difference between Russia and America? Ignore it!

In order to establish an identity between the Soviet Union and capitalism, a basic motivation of the whole Johnson-Forest structure, it is necessary to introduce a revision of Marxism in many fields, not only economics, but in Marxist philosophy and the materialist conception of history. This is expressed in one of the most important questions raised by the Johnson-Forest revisionists. If the overthrow of monopoly capitalism is not the revolutionary task of the proletariat, but rather the historical need of the Stalinist stage of capitalism, what, then, constitutes the content of the class struggle in a capitalist society -- without capitalists?

And, what is the source of this class struggle? It is in production, the Johnsonites tell us, again and again and again. Production! The materialist conception of history shows the roots of the class struggle in production, but the Johnson-Forest tendency have replaced the class struggle with the struggle between management and labor. They eliminate the function of the capitalist class in capitalist production by shifting the axis of the class struggle from the struggle over the rate of surplus value, expressed in the economic formula S/V , to the relation between constant capital (means of production) and variable capital (labor power), the C/V relationship. For Marx, and for us, the class struggle revolved around the existence and the rate of exploitation, expressed in the struggle over wages, hours, the intensity of labor, over the share of the national income, etc.

The organization of the CIO, for example, placed a barrier in the path of the capitalists who attempt to compensate for the tendency of the rate of profit to decline by reducing wages and lengthening hours. This accelerates the process of increasing constant capital in relation to variable and heightens the intensity of labor. Speed-up becomes an important expression of the capitalist attack on labor. This leads the comrades of the Johnson-Forest tendency to misconstrue the whole question. They view the struggle over productivity as the beginning and the end of the class struggle. They forget its source. To separate the struggle against speed-up from the pivotal struggle over the rate of exploitation as a whole is to reduce Marxism to a mockery.

Why this blatant revision of Marxism? Again the answer is simple. Productivity is a burning problem for Russia. Russia shares with the capitalist world the struggle for increased productivity. The bureaucrats in their own specific way drive for greater productivity. The managers of capitalist industry drive for productivity. Here is a similarity. Seize upon it; and turn it into an identity.

The Johnsonites have no room in their schema for the capitalist class. They must take the capitalist who owns private property from the capitalist system and replace him with the bureaucrat. This bureaucratic class doesn't produce for private profit, but is simply attached to capital as a sort of functional appendage. It is the exploiter of labor. A former servant whose master has died, or was murdered, and now has the whole works for himself. This theoretical feat is more easily accomplished by removing from consideration the rate of surplus value and pushing to the fore the C/V relationship -- productivity.

The exploitation relation as seen by Johnson-Forest is the domination of the machine over the workers, or the power of dead labor over living. Their use or rather misuse of these expressions shows they are captives of a special variety of fetishism.

In the first chapter of "Capital," Section Four, Marx describes the fetishistic conception of money. Such expressions as "the love of money is the root of all evil," "money makes money," etc., are common examples. Here a relation between persons is concealed by an outward relation between things. "Money makes money" in real life only because the capitalist's possession of it enables him to purchase the only value-creating commodity, labor power. Similarly in Johnsonian economics, we see the development of a fetish of capital. Ford isn't necessary to the Ford enterprise, they tell us. We agree that he isn't necessary from the standpoint of the proletarian revolution and socialism. But he's very necessary to a capitalist Ford enterprise.

What we have, they say, is a mass of capital that oppresses the workers. They take the Marxist understanding of the limitations imposed on the capitalist by the operation of the laws of value over which he has no control, in order to eliminate the role of the capitalist -- without the proletarian revolution. Marx had a different analysis of capitalism and capitalists. He showed in great detail how economic laws operate through the individual capitalist, determine his consciousness, and how that in turn affects the movement of the objective process.

The most safeguarded principle of capitalist law is freedom for investment. The capitalist wants to live without toiling. He wants to make an honest dollar without soiling his hands. If we hear the charge of subjectivism again, in relation to this, we can only say: In economics we're not dealing with the movement of planets. We're dealing with human beings and classes, functioning in unconscious obedience to economic laws. Marx and Engels were the first to fully understand that. The capitalists are driven by the quest for profit. They are not automatons. The right to appropriate the surplus labor of others is the cardinal principle of capitalist society. The drive to increase productivity is only a means to this end, and not the end in and of itself.

Let me now touch upon the political aspects of our differences with the Johnson-Forest tendency. We want to intervene in Yugoslavia in order to help along the process of developing a party of revolution. To us the emergence of this split in the ranks of world Stalinism, was the occasion for probing every possibility to find the revolutionary forces in that situation and help them make their way to Trotskyism.

The problem of creating the requisite revolutionary leadership, in irreconcilable struggle with Stalinism, centrism and reformism is for us the key problem. The Johnson-Forest tendency wish to throw this task out of the window along with the rest of Trotskyism. One doesn't have to deduce this -- that is what they flatly state on page 33 of their recent document. "The first sentence of the transitional program states that the crisis of revolution is the crisis of revolutionary leadership. This is the reiterated theme." Then they say, "Exactly the opposite is the case. It is the crisis of the self-mobilization of the proletariat. As we shall show, and it is perfectly obvious logically, this theme of orthodox Trotskyism implies that there is a competition for leadership, and that whereas the other Internationals have betrayed, the Fourth International will be honest. Exactly the contrary must be the analysis." Just exactly what the contrary analysis is, I don't pretend to guess. On this we are offered only inferences and innuendoes.

But here we want to ask: "Why has the proletariat been defeated time and again since 1917?" Surely, this is no unimportant question. It is the foremost question our movement has occupied itself with. Because the central problem of revolutionary politics: how can the proletariat come to victory? cannot be solved without a precise reply to this question. He who does not know the reason for these defeats cannot prepare for victory. If they result not from the crisis of leadership, but from the failure of the self-mobilization of the masses, then the situations where the mass mobilization of the proletariat reached the highest intensity: Germany, from 1918 to 1923, China, Spain, France, Europe after the Second World War, were all doomed to defeat in advance. We would have nothing of vital importance to learn from these revolutionary situations. Fascism was destined to triumph because the self-mobilization of the proletariat had not reached the point of guaranteeing automatic victory. The inference is all too clear. The objective situation wasn't ripe and so the proletariat couldn't act. Here is a new version of the old Menshevik apology for inaction and defeat.

If the Johnson-Forest tendency refuses to accept this defeatist inference (the unripeness of the objective situation), there remains only the alternative of blaming the proletariat -- for they have in advance ruled out the role and responsibility of leadership.

They reject a contest for leadership inside the working class. This means they must reject the struggle to build the revolutionary party. The task is assigned to the amorphous proletariat. "Self-mobilize! We will act as an expression of your self-mobilization." In this muddle there is not the slightest comprehension of the dialectical interrelationship between the class, the party and the leadership.

In order to justify this wild leap into the void on the most burning question of our epoch -- the role of the party, the Johnsonites make some vague references to the new stage we have reached. The State Capitalist "stage" requires a new "expanded" conception of the party. They say, "Lenin never conceived of a mass party of two and a half million people before the struggle for power." (p. 32, State-Capitalism and World Revolution) A party of two and a half million -- that must refer to the Italian Communist Party. It must mean that the unique feature of modern development is that the proletariat mobilizes in large parties. But wherein is this unique? Before the First World War, we had the mass mobilization of the proletariat in the Second International. After the First World War in the revolutionary upsurge the proletariat again mobilized in the Second and Third Internationals. In the interim between the two wars this mass mobilization continued and reached high points in every revolutionary situation. After the Second World War the revolutionary upsurge in Europe and Asia once more witnessed this phenomena. How and why is this uniquely limited to the most recent stage?

The readiness of the proletariat to take power (self-mobilization, if you please), has over and over again demonstrated itself. But he who does not understand that this readiness can lead only to disaster without the struggle for the party and the contest for leadership, as the Bolsheviks contended for leadership against the Social Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, will not help the working class realize this mobilization in victory.

The revisionist theory of Johnson-Forest is an inverted form of Neo-Stalinism. The Stalinists are assigned an historic role. Johnson-Forest write: "The Stalinists are not class-collaborationists, fools, cowards, idiots, men with supple spines, but conscious, clear-sighted aspirants for world power. They are deadly enemies of private property capitalism. They aim to seize the power and take the place of the bourgeoisie. When they support a war or do not support, support the bourgeoisie or do not support, they know exactly what they are doing. The bourgeoisie also knows. In fact everybody, including most workers, knows this, except orthodox Trotskyism." (p. 4, State-Capitalism and World Revolution.)

There's a grain of truth in this passage. It really is true that almost everybody including the Johnsonites, holds the view that Stalinism is a revolutionary force. Stalinists and some sections of the Neo-Stalinists say, "this is a revolutionary force and that's good enough. Let's not fool around with tenth-rate issues of aims,

method and ethics." The bourgeoisie, and their ideologists see in Stalinism a revolutionary force and describe the Stalinists as mortal enemies of the capitalist system. The reformists and centrists of all varieties call it a revolutionary force. And the Johnson-Forest tendency also analyzes Stalinism as a revolutionary force, if they want to think things through. They merely add, that this whole revolution, which destroys the capitalist system, is only another stage of capitalism. The methodology of all the anti-Marxist theories of Stalinism is the same notwithstanding many important differences among them.

The Johnsonites tell us that this new Stalinist stage of capitalism brings the revolution closer than ever before. This is a very radical conception. If the Johnsonites lived by it they wouldn't cling to their absolutely false theory a single day. But this very radical notion about the imminence of the revolution becomes an empty phrase for them wherever and whenever the actual revolutionary struggle of the proletariat occurs. When the living proletariat moves, that proletariat weighed down by false leadership, that proletariat they ignore. The world shaking struggle of the Korean people and the great upheaval in China has no meaning for them. These struggles they turn their backs on. Little wonder that they reject our whole conception of the Yugoslav revolution.

Other comrades who have expressed certain reservations about our resolution raise the following question:

Do we call Yugoslavia a workers' state because of the indications of a favorable leftward development in the ideological life of the YCP? We can see at once how such a method would lead to great theoretical blunders because we now have a very unfavorable rightward turn in foreign policy. Surely our appraisal isn't founded upon such ideological gyrations.

We call it a workers' state because upon investigation and analysis, by examining the dynamics of the revolution and the class relations arising out of that revolution, we observe that the workers destroyed the capitalist state apparatus, and then in a number of stages, characterized by stumbling, by lack of consciousness and ideological lags, erected their own state apparatus and took the power.

The break with the Kremlin gave us the chief clue. No one will deny this. There were some perspicacious comrades and periodicals that saw the direction of development in its earliest phase. For example, in an article by Comrade Wright in the Fourth International for 1943 he put his finger on the heart of the question. He opens the article by stating that, "a civil war is taking place in Yugoslavia and we take sides in that civil war." It is only necessary to bring that analysis up-to-date.

Now let me devote some time for a brief presentation of what is called "related questions." According to the proposal of the National Committee the discussion on the Yugoslav Resolution should be broadly construed to include all the problems raised in the pre-convention discussion. However, under this heading I am not reporting for the National Committee but will merely introduce some considerations of my own by way of opening the convention discussion.

What I most want to do, is to attempt to characterize the discussion now going on. There are three questions under discussion: Yugoslavia, the Buffer Zone, and the nature of the Stalinist parties throughout the world.

The Johnson-Forest tendency entered this discussion with the panicky cry of "Chaos!" "The house is burning down! Everybody run! Look at all the opinions, all the conflicting currents in the discussion. This is Chaos." We weren't distracted by that cry.

Our view is just the opposite. This is the richest, most profound ideological discussion in our movement since the death of Leon Trotsky. The discussion has been conducted in the best traditions of conscientious Marxist method and practice. In the first place it's a discussion that takes into account all of the facts. I remember on the Russian question, Trotsky used to dig up the facts, analyze them painstakingly, from week to week and write articles, pamphlets and books about them. The ultra-leftists and the centrists never bothered with that chore. These critics took the facts as Trotsky presented them, and then, as he said, "When I draw the figure of a woman's face, they add a mustache. If I draw a chicken, they put an egg under it." Our present opponents are content with such caricatures of a real analysis. In this respect we can be proud of our European co-thinkers. They have learned from Trotsky. They have followed the development of the events under discussion and have with the greatest care kept the analysis up-to-date. Thus the important theoretical discussion has not withered into sterile speculations. Our thinking has taken its point of departure at each stage from the actual process of social development.

Another important feature of this discussion should be noted. Despite the fact that it deals with the most profound questions of the epoch, entailing a review of the basic criteria of Marxism, it has been carried on in the freest and most comradely spirit. No one has felt forced to defend every utterance in a bitter factional spirit. This has not detracted from the standards of strict scientific responsibility. On the contrary -- it has reinforced these standards.

The logic of the discussion, it appears to me, is leading to fundamental agreement on the most important points. This too, is not a sign of chaos or the collapse of Trotskyism. The first sign of ideological chaos in the revolutionary movement is the incapacity to act, paralysis, multiplication of views on what to do in every situation, and more often than not, abstentionism, the urge to do nothing. Our movement on the contrary has shown the ability, while conducting a theoretical discussion, to act decisively, and in a unified way, at every basic turning point of the world situation.

One of the big questions under discussion has been: What is the class character of the Buffer Zone? What tactics should the Trotskyists adopt in reference to it? The difficulty does not arise in my opinion, from the first postwar period. It is clear that the Stalinist bureaucracy moved into Eastern Europe as part of a deal with Allied imperialism. The Stalinists were to crush the revolution in Eastern and Western Europe and in return they would get territory.

The capitalist class of this territory (buffer zone) remained in power. Many of them had fled and taken all their movable possessions out of the country -- but the Stalinists tried to institute capitalist stability and to deal with the rest of them.

Later the development is characterized by a sweeping elimination of capitalism, the introduction of nationalizations and the expropriation of the bourgeoisie by bureaucratic-military methods.

The question arises, shall we now call these countries degenerated workers' states? But for us "degenerated workers' state" is an inclusive definition, and included in that definition is a victorious proletarian revolution which suffered degeneration. This does not correspond to the real course of events in the Buffer Zone.

Shall we then say: neither workers' states nor capitalist states -- a new state phenomenon? This too, is unsatisfactory. The salient characteristic of the whole process has been the destruction of these states as separate states, and their incorporation, in one form or another, into the USSR. The bureaucratic-military method of destroying capitalist states leaves no room for their independent existence.

Does this bureaucratic-military elimination of capitalism in such a large section of Europe call for a re-evaluation of Stalinism? Not at all. If we view the process in its entirety, the first and foremost function of Stalinism was counter-revolutionary. It was to crush and to keep pinned down the vital force, the revolutionary proletariat, in Western Europe and in Eastern Europe. Thus the whole process of social transformation became mangled and deformed in the hands of the bureaucracy. There has been no process of eliminating capitalism in Eastern Europe separate and apart from the Kremlin-dominated process of assimilation into the Soviet Union.

The historical and geographical limits of this military-bureaucratic destruction of capitalism are for us strictly defined. Stalinism cannot overthrow world capitalism. The events since the end of the war have only confirmed this over and over again. Imperialism, after making a deal with Stalin, in which territory was ceded in return for counter-revolutionary services rendered, launched a savage "cold war" not only to recapture lost ground but to open up the Soviet Union for capitalism.

It would be a terrible mistake to overestimate either the quantitative or qualitative aspects of what is taking place in Eastern Europe.

For us the only question can be, how far has this process of "absorption" gone? On this quantitative question I am confident that with careful attention to all developments we will on the basis of our common program make timely and accurate appraisals.

The discussion has also developed around the question of the Stalinist parties. Here we can learn a lesson from Yugoslavia. Stalinist parties can be transformed. I don't see that this is a totally new thought in our program. Working class parties numbering hundreds of thousands and millions of workers get caught up in the crises of

revolutions, become transformed or split up. If we deny this perspective we can only arrive at the conception of the incapacity of the proletariat to shake off inherited handicaps and move forward to revolutionary conquests. Our task is to recognize where, how and when these transformations take place, and to intervene. That opens possibilities for the regroupment of revolutionary forces into mass Trotskyist parties. We must find in every new situation, as Trotsky has taught us, the premise for revolutionary action, the road to the masses, and help them tear loose from Stalinism and capitalism.

I want to conclude my report with the question of the right swing in the foreign policy of Yugoslavia. The basic reasons for this swing are known to us. They are treated in our resolution. It is a problem of a victorious workers' revolution in a small backward country, besieged by the Kremlin and blackmailed by world imperialism. Consequently enormous difficulties arise in the development of that revolution. All these difficulties have been sharply aggravated by the drought and the threatened famine. But this turn must also be understood as an expression of the centrism of the YCP. Internally the revolution and the policy of the party has been moving leftward, even beyond our original expectations. Externally, in foreign policy, there has been a rapid shift to the right. We should understand that these two trends will not remain separated, as the Yugoslavs hope. The effects of foreign policy will strike back home. For example, the demands of the Vatican for freedom for prisoners is not a civil liberties demand, we can be sure. They're trying to knock out one of the fundamental props of the workers' state.

The constant pressure of the rich and middle peasantry offers a continuous threat. These capitalist elements try to break through the monopoly of foreign trade or the restrictions upon the free market. The workers' state is compelled to use harsh measures against these capitalist elements. The Vatican's demands will broaden. What they really want is freedom for capitalism in Yugoslavia. And if these centrists and empiricists of YCP leadership imagine that they are going to outwit Truman (that is to say Wall Street for they could probably outwit Truman) they'll find out differently. Washington will grab them by the throat. Every concession in principle will lead to more brutal demands. We've got to watch out for that and warn the workers. No doubt, great harm has been done to the prestige of the Yugoslav revolution, and to the consciousness of the world working class by the conduct of the Yugoslav leaders on the Korean war. The possibility of an alliance of the Yugoslavs and the colonial peoples has been dealt a severe blow. But the issue is not decided. We do not put a cross over the Yugoslav revolution exclusively on the basis of this ominous trend. And our task is not only to criticize the Yugoslav Communist Party. We have to expose the murderous squeeze of the Kremlin and of Washington and Wall Street. We have to do everything in our power to mobilize mass sentiment against this double squeeze.

The extension of the October revolution, and the defense of all its conquests, from imperialist attack and Stalinist treachery -- that has been the strategic line of our movement. The Yugoslav revolution, despite its ebbs and flows, is a gigantic step forward for the European and world proletariat. For us the defense of the Yugoslav revolution from both the rapacious designs of imperialism and the

threatening attack of counter-revolutionary Stalinism, enters as an integral part of that strategic line.

SUMMARY REMARKS

Comrades: From different points of view, sometimes fundamentally different points of view, comrades have said that the main question before us is Stalinism. This correct. But for us Trotskyists, the question of all questions about Stalinism is how to bring about its destruction, its breakup and annihilation. The Johnsonite statement, "demanding" that we make some kind of declaration on Stalinism, as if it were a subject upon which we have concealed our views, is meaningless and ludicrous.

On the other hand, Comrade E. R. Frank's remarks were a significant example of the main trend in the discussion. He said that by and large we are narrowing down remaining differences among the genuine Trotskyists to terminological ones. I think this is true. He said that what is involved is the integration, assimilation, or any other word you want to use, of the Buffer Zone into the Soviet Union.

That's been the procedure, it seems to me, of our co-thinkers in dealing with the problems raised by the expansion of the Kremlin into Eastern Europe. While taking note of everything that is new, they and we have correctly guarded against constructing a new evaluation of Stalinism upon the basis of the developments in Eastern Europe.

An altogether different problem is posed in the discussion with the Johnsonites who entered the discussion on the Buffer Zone by imputing to us a basic revision of our conception of Stalinism. In effect what they say is: "If the Kremlin is capable, through bureaucratic and military methods, of seizing territory, after it has made a deal with imperialism at the expense of the working class, and incorporate areas into the Soviet Union, then you have granted a new quality to Stalinism. What then becomes of the role of Trotskyism?"

We reject this whole approach to the question. We say military-bureaucratic transformations in Eastern Europe do not open any historical vistas for Stalinism or a new road to Socialism. If the Johnsonites then argue that we are setting up an endless series of exceptions, they do not understand that history never conforms to very simple and even simple-minded formulas. This is not the first time we have witnessed the complex working out and combination of historical laws. The truism that scientific laws are not a patchwork of exceptions, should not be construed to mean that reality moves in accordance with our theoretical concepts like soldiers on a drill ground.

It is in reality the Johnsonites who have assigned an historic role to Stalinism, and not us. Their theory explicitly states these propositions: Stalinism will destroy private property capitalism. Stalinism strives for world-wide power. It is the Johnson-Forest theory, if you please, that discards the role of the revolutionary party and not our theory. The Johnsonite contention that our appraisal of Eastern Europe leads us to Stalinism, is but a poorly warmed-up

version of the old accusation that Trotskyism and Stalinism are identical.

Comrade Cannon has already dealt with the question of Pablo. It seems to be the Johnson-Forest "strategy" in this discussion to say: "You're rushing into the arms of Pablo." That's supposed to frighten us. In Los Angeles I told the Johnsonite comrades after a few ominous references to this "rushing into the arms of Pablo," that "I'm in the arms of Pablo already. Let's get started from there." We don't see any fundamental distinction between our thinking and Pablo's.

Now I come to Yugoslavia. First I want to deal with those other comrades who have hesitations and doubts. One central question seems to be uppermost in their minds. How can a centrist party lead a workers' revolution to power? One comrade says: "if you contend that the question of proletarian leadership is the main problem, how do you square this with Yugoslavia, where a non-Bolshevik and non-Trotskyist party seized the power and established a workers' state?"

Comrade Cannon formulated the essence of our approach to this question in the discussion. Marxist generalizations which derive their fundamental content from the entire process of history or economics, are absolutely incomprehensible if you attempt to apply them in a static way. When we sum up one whole epoch by saying that without a revolutionary world party the victory of the world proletarian revolution or the victory of the revolution in any given country is not possible we are entirely correct. We don't have to cede one inch on that. But we have to understand this concept and not a vulgar interpretation of it. The example of the Paris Commune is important, because it contains both aspects of the problem: how a working class in its infancy could arrive at power without the conscious factor of the leadership being present in any great degree, and how it falls thereafter because of the same reason.

In Yugoslavia today, the question of a centrist party taking the power is being answered in life and in struggle. History is demonstrating the validity of our generalization. A working class party that is not Bolshevik can under unique conditions lead the revolution right up to workers power -- but it cannot carry that revolution to its next stages -- assure the victory without rearming itself with the correct program.

This whole process which involves complicated interrelation between the party and the masses, the interplay of subjective and objective factors, is being worked out. Our task is to intervene and help in a revolutionary solution. To say "I can't see a workers' state in Yugoslavia" because of blindness on this point, is to misunderstand the method of Marxism. Our fundamental point of departure is that the workers in alliance with the peasants, destroyed the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie and erected their own state apparatus. In years of civil war the capitalist system was destroyed from top to bottom. It was replaced, owing to the absence of fully conscious leadership, by a crude, rough imperfect form of workers' power, nevertheless a workers' power. No other class is at the basis of that power. After a period of wavering and bourgeois coalitionism, in which the pressures of imperialism and Stalinism were expressed, the revolution breaks through and the last remnants of

bourgeois power in Yugoslavia is removed. There you have the qualitative turning point.

There is altogether too much unconcern about the deepgoing social transformations that have occurred in Yugoslavia. It's not simply a question of pointing to the nationalizations and saying "that's the workers' state." I don't agree with that. We have to understand the whole process, the relation between a workers' revolution, the question of power and the social transformations. That's the way we always understood Russia and that's the only way we can understand Yugoslavia.

Comrade Wright says there is a dual power in Belgrade today. I don't know what he means by that. There is not a dual power between the classes. If he wants to refer to the pressure of the peasantry in Yugoslavia, that exists, as it existed in Russia. There is the potential source of a dual power there. American imperialism is now attempting to base itself on that counter-revolutionary potential. But this is a question for the future. The all-important question in civil war is: Who is master in the land? Who rules Yugoslavia today? You have to take your choice on that. Is this question undecided? No evidence to that effect was presented. The question was settled decisively. The proletarian dictatorship was installed.

We want Yugoslavia to be a base for the world revolution. That's what we're fighting for. We don't take the grand view that Yugoslavia will be swept in. Equally erroneous is the view that because Yugoslavia is such a small country and Russia is such a big country the defense of the Soviet Union ranks higher than the defense of Yugoslavia. That's a false way of putting the question. In Russia the bureaucracy has, hand in hand with imperialism, dealt murderous blows to the world revolution. In Yugoslavia the opposite direction is to be observed. Yugoslavia represents at this point, in its predominant tendency, a revolt against Stalinism, the chief obstacle in the path of the world revolution. In that sense the defense of the Yugoslav revolution is the only real defense of the conquests of the October revolution.

Comrades, it has been announced that this discussion will be continued in literary form. The convention has enabled us to see many of the questions before us in a clearer light. Our differences and our fundamental agreement have become more precise. The adoption of the resolution will mark the close of a great chapter in the history of Trotskyism. We haven't solved all the questions before us. We didn't attempt to do that. But we stand on a higher level, and will be able to solve the outstanding questions much more successfully and speedily.

#

WORLD IMPERIALISM AND THE POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES -
STALINISM AND THE POSITION OF THE SOVIET UNION -
YUGOSLAVIA AND THE ROLE OF WORLD TROTSKYISM

by C. Jarvis, Cleveland

Programmatic generalizations dealing with our world-wide outlook are for Trotskyists determined in their essential and fundamental characteristics by our historical perspectives. This approach to the problems history poses to the vanguard of the international working class we are able to solve by our dialectical materialist method that has nothing in common with classical mechanical economic determinism, economism, or other empirical theories and methods of political action.

Analyzed and viewed from this standpoint the International Information Bulletin is a document of considerable importance that should be carefully studied to fully appreciate the ideological crisis confronting World Trotskyism. This bulletin contains full-blown in implication and meaning yet in concentrated capsule form all the revisionist and liquidationist ideas adopted by the IEC to serve as guide-posts for its new international orientation. This ideological crisis was engendered and precipitated directly and most importantly by the Yugoslav events and more generally by the discussions and polemics revolving around the class nature of the buffer countries.

Before entering immediately upon a discussion of the Yugoslav events it is first of all necessary, because of the misleading, incorrect and incomplete analyses presented in the IEC Bulletin, to begin at the source of this theoretical confusion, namely: the role of world imperialism and the position of the United States; Stalinism today and the position of the Soviet Union.

World Imperialism: Position of the U.S.

The United States together with its satellite imperialist allied nations occupies a position in world politics and an economic stature which has no commensurable historical parallel. World War II eliminated from the international scene all rival imperialisms capable of basically challenging and altering fundamentally the world hegemonic drive of United States imperialism and the world bourgeoisie. Inter-imperialistic rivalries plaguing the world today regardless of their scope are not capable of creating serious threats to the superior might of the United States whether from a military, political, or economic direction.

Contradictions of an increasingly insoluble nature appear within this new framework of world capitalism on a more amplified and formidable scale than formally but for both historically similar and contemporarily different political-economic reasons; and consequently these contradictions bear national imperialistic interests in different political relationships and in declining sliding-scale economic ratios to each other and to world political economy than formerly and in any case do not eventuate in global conflicts for world hegemony. Rival imperialisms incapable of even attempting domination of the entire world market, or even in most cases a major section of it, of necessity transform or represent their respective national interests

in the frantic struggle now going on to obtain more concessions and a greater slice of this redivision of the planet following World War II under the "aegis" of the United States. (Compared with the epoch of the rise of imperialism on a world scale this present redivision of the planet is very unfavorable to world capitalism.)

Fundamentally what determines the respective share of economic loot and the extent of political domain given to a particular capitalist nation is the degree of subservience and utilization that each national bourgeoisie has to offer their masters, that is, United States imperialism and the international bourgeoisie. There are historical and political-economic considerations which of course enter into the picture as secondary factors and necessitate special attention from these, the world masters, in order to conciliate, grant concessions and in general discipline the various sections of the rival national bourgeoisie and attempt to solve their contradictory interests.

In the final analysis all these "sub"-imperialist nations exist in such unfavorable juxtapositions vis-a-vis the United States and the Soviet Union whose "extension" of borders plus the revolutionary economic transformation in many areas in Europe and Asia has led to the creation of a total combination of obstacles that deprive these nations of lucrative fields of exploitation.

Having assured itself economic dominance, the United States through the United Nations and a whole host of other economic, political and military organizations is now consolidating its formation of a "united" bloc of nations together with a mobilization of "world opinion" against the Soviet Union and against the revolutionary struggles of the world proletariat. It is not enough to point to all the interlacing conflicting political-economic trends which debilitate the strength of this development. In the absence of a fundamentally correct world orientated program of world Trotskyism and the consequent delay of successful proletarian revolutions the continuing crisis in society will remain without a socialist solution.

To repeat: the position of the United States is unique in the history of bourgeois states in that politically, economically and militarily the international bourgeoisie have created in the United Nations an instrument effectively dominated by a single world power which has no complete historical parallel. The League of Nations controlled mainly by England was organizationally inferior in influence and power as none of the participating nations singly or collectively occupied a position in the League and in general as a world power that the United States occupies in the United Nations and in the international political scene. While it is true, and in the long run this will prove decisive, that rational reorganization and effective marshalling of world capitalist strength in this international bourgeois organization comes at a time of global revolutionary crisis, general decay of the forces of imperialism, and at a time when the Soviet Union is the second world power, it would be dangerous for us to underestimate its advantages to the world bourgeoisie in delaying the socialist revolution and prolonging the death agony of capitalism.

Stalinism and the Position of the Soviet Union

Stalinism and its Cominform must be "reevaluated" in the light of "recent" shifts in the relationship of forces in the international scene. Trotsky explained (In Defense of Marxism, p. 5): "For a long time we asserted that Thermidor in the U.S.S.R. was only being prepared but had not yet been consummated. Later investing the analogy to Thermidor with a more precise and well-deliberated character, we came to the conclusion that the Thermidor had already been consummated. . ." After the German events (1933) we no longer characterized the role of Stalinism as bureaucratic centrism but as a counter-revolutionary movement.

When the world was still in the stage of inter-imperialist struggles for world capitalist hegemony Stalinism was able to maneuver without settling final accounts with world capitalism by serving first one then another of the blocs of rival imperialisms always orientating itself in the general direction of serving the historical interests of world capitalism. This counter-revolutionary movement has served world imperialism well, for even when the struggle for world capitalist hegemony was not yet decided in favor of the United States this bureaucracy successfully placed the brunt of human sacrifices, mass destruction, and economic disorganization concomitants of all capitalists wars on the backs of the masses of the Soviet Union. United States' paramount position today is the result of Stalin's "war against fascism" pursued within the narrow limits of a nationalist struggle. If today, regardless of the disastrous effects on the Soviet Union of the last war, the Soviet Union represents the second power in world politics it is due exclusively to the tremendous struggles in defense of what remains of the October Revolution by the Soviet peoples and secondly but no less importantly the world-wide revolutionary struggles of the world proletariat. The inevitable result of this Stalinist policy during the Second World War and before has been to place the Soviet Union in the greatest peril of its existence by bringing it face to face with the united forces of world capitalism under the hegemony of the United States.

The Soviet Union is today the second world power; as a polarizing force it is eclipsed only by the United States and the combined powers of world capitalism; and as a pole of attraction giving confidence to revolutionary struggles throughout the world, despite Stalinism, it occupies a position in world politics greater than at any time since its foundation with the exception of the first few years under Lenin and Trotsky. The victory of the Soviet Union over the combined forces of German and Italian fascism and their Axis satellite nations renewed the confidence of the Soviet peoples in their revolutionary struggle and its historical justification in a way which must be viewed as second only in revolutionary import to the events of the October Revolution and the wave of world-wide struggles following that event; especially since it again served powerfully to unleash tremendous revolutionary struggles of the European and Asiatic masses which have already reached even greater heights and intensities than the revolutionary struggles following World War I, excluding of course the October Revolution itself; again despite Stalinism.

In the absence of a proletarian revolution successfully led by genuine international Marxists (i.e. Trotskyists) Stalinism and its

Cominform have been in large measure (not completely or exclusively by any means) the short term "beneficiaries" of this historical development and it has greatly augmented "their prestige," thereby preventing the destruction of the illusion that they are seriously promoting world revolution. The immediate consequence has been to greatly increase their effectiveness as a counter-revolutionary instrument in the hands of world imperialism even though it will undoubtedly prove in the end to be, historically speaking, a development of short duration and a development that contains within itself the seeds of the eventual and inevitable revolutionary destruction of Stalinism and its agencies. This then is the present role of Stalinism and it is further attested to by the presence of mass communist parties in many countries despite the demoralization existent today in all these parties and the manifold developments increasing the tendencies of splits to the left and right to occur in these movements, and the fact that one section, the Yugoslav Communist Party, split away from the main current of Stalinism.

In spite of the tremendous strength of the Soviet Union the Stalinist bureaucracy is terror-stricken. It is afraid of the very strength of the Soviet Union and the rising tide of proletarian revolutionary struggles that this strength helps inspire and not of the forces of world imperialism. Stalinism wants nothing more than to "legitimize" itself and come to terms with world imperialism. Only its irreplaceable usefulness as a counter-revolutionary instrument in the hands of the world bourgeoisie lengthens its period of existence before it is either destroyed or assimilated (more likely a combination of both) by world imperialism, providing the socialist revolution does not accomplish this task earlier. In the event of a direct attack the Stalinist bureaucracy will put up no defense of the Soviet Union. Its role in case of a direct attack will be in line with its whole counter-revolutionary history, that is, to facilitate the victory of the counter-revolution inside the Soviet Union and place itself at the disposal and service of the occupying forces. (I speak here of the hard core of the bureaucracy which is surrounded by a wall of hate of oppressed peoples both inside and outside the Soviet Union, leaving aside inevitable leftward splits and breakaways in the lower echelons of the bureaucracy inside and outside the Soviet Union once this movement begins to enter the final decisive stages of disintegration and decay.) This was Trotsky's prognosis and prediction.

The IEC bulletin sees Stalinism and consequently world imperialism in an entirely different light. Correctly pointing out the obvious parallel crises of imperialism and Stalinism they proceed to confuse and obscure the implication of this development. Quote: "Prolonged reciprocal neutralization" (?) between the American bourgeoisie and the Stalinist bureaucracy (?) rendering impossible for years the outbreak of the third world war (!) Since when was counter-revolutionary Stalinism neutral or in need of being neutralized in its relationship with the American bourgeoisie? Where in the world of living reality do forces exist in the hands of the working class and its genuine representatives to effectuate a process of "reciprocal neutralization" between two such powerful forces at the present time? Or to put the question differently: What constitutes this process of "prolonged reciprocal neutralization"? If what they mean is: to quote

once again: "a world revolutionary perspective where the mounting wave of the colonial revolution flow together with the social crisis in Western Europe that the bourgeoisie cannot definitely hold down, merging with the currents of radicalization engendered by the growing contradictions in the Anglo-Saxon countries and the current arising from the disintegration of Stalinism," they still must explain what this has to do with this process they label as "prolonged reciprocal neutralization." Stalinism as a counter-revolutionary instrument is indispensable to the world bourgeoisie in this period of mounting revolutionary crises without which they cannot even dream of establishing and reestablishing their capitalist hegemony of the entire planet. (Another, for example, presents itself: When did World War II end and World War III begin? - Korea.)

To continue, another quote: "The modifications created (?) in the relationship of forces between the United States and the Soviet Union tend to neutralize (?) each other and produces a situation of equilibrium of forces (!) which for an entire period excludes any possibility of a war of aggression against the Soviet Union" (!) How do they analyze this world political situation that has created an equilibrium of forces and explain this equilibrium in terms of a neutralization on a military plane? Answer: By the manufacture of the atom bomb in the U.S.S.R. (!?) and the downfall of Chiang-Kai-shek; also, "if (?) an equilibrium of military forces is established (?) on the world arena and will be maintained (?) for an entire period in Europe which is the sole serious springboard for a war of aggression against the Soviet Union, the military relationship of forces remains highly favorable to the Soviet Union (!) and the current pace of rearmament by the European bourgeoisie, Marshall Plan deliveries, etc., do not permit envisaging a change in this situation." (!) "Created" . . . "neutralize" . . . "equilibrium" . . . "if" . . . "established" . . . "maintained" -- these words taken out of the above quote and together with their entire analysis imperiously raises a number of questions. What is creating ? and in whose interests will this neutralizing equilibrium of military forces be established (?) if it is established? In whose interests will these forces be maintained? if they are maintained. Who will "benefit" or gain protection by the manufacture of the atom bomb in the Soviet Union? The Stalinist bureaucracy or the Soviet masses? etc., etc.

The IEC bases its whole thesis in determining the relationship of military forces between the Soviet Union and imperialism on the mistaken idea or rather fantastic notion that the Stalinist bureaucracy intends, is capable of, or desires to defend or defend in some way or other the Soviet Union in a war with world imperialism. With the exception of the mention made of the fall of Chiang-Kai-shek, which was the result of a revolutionary struggle of major importance, the class struggle and the class basis of this analysis enters into this discussion only by way of the back door if at all.

To further illustrate that this is no mistake, one more quote: "In the perspective of an aggravation of international contradiction, stagnation and economic depression, the old European continent, more and more cut off from its sources of colonial super-profits, divided against itself, the field of battle ? between the two world blocs ?! , will be more than ever plunged into atrophy and disintegration."

Another excellent prognosis ruined by an incorrect (or misleading?) phrase. If the writers of the IEC resolution were using the class struggle and class basis as the line of demarcation in the unfolding crises existing inside and between the "two world blocs" that would be one thing; unfortunately it is indicated clearly from their entire line of argumentation and the unqualified uses of the descriptive phrase "field of battle between two world blocs" (in another reference they discuss "conditions favoring periodic negotiations between the two blocs aiming at the conclusion of a compromise") without explaining what they mean by it; therefore the only conclusion that presents itself is that they have in mind some kind of struggle or irreconcilable conflict between Stalinism and imperialism which is primarily responsible for present state of affairs in this world. In this belief they reckon without their host for on the day that this "field of battle" presents itself in the form of an international conflagration and world-wide revolutionary struggles Stalinism will be ranged, as always, on the side of imperialism.

While it is true that the Stalinist bureaucracy in its present form cannot exist without the Soviet Union as its base and therefore this requires on the part of this bureaucracy a demagogic, semipseudo-struggle against world capitalism and this therefore to a degree weakens the latter, it by no means alters the fact that for every blow at the forces of imperialism Stalinism launches a thousand blows at the revolutionary struggles of the world proletariat. This is especially so today when capitalism is in world crisis and revolutionary struggles are mounting throughout so many European and Asiatic countries.

In addition, as pointed out in the bulletin, war hysteria (and one might add peace and freedom organized mobilizations) is propagated and utilized by both American imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy as a necessary cement to maintain a comparative internal discipline within their own camps. But the bulletin fails to point out that it is used on the part of American imperialism to prepare for a "holy" war against "communism," and create pacifist and "freedom" illusions while preparing war aimed at taking away all freedom while the Stalinist bureaucracy utilizes war hysteria, peace, pacifist and freedom propaganda to confuse, disorient and brutally suppress revolutionary struggles with the final aim of delivering, bound hand and foot, as large a section of the international working class that they are capable of directing and diverting in submissive fashion into the hands of American imperialism.

If the pressure of the Soviet system and world-wide revolutionary struggles force the bureaucracy to "allow" the existence of economic arrangements in the buffer states injurious to the immediate interests of imperialism it must not be interpreted that this represents on the part of the Stalinist bureaucracy an irreconcilable struggle with imperialism. On the contrary the suppression in typical counter-revolutionary style of politically independent progressive developments inside the working class movements both in the buffer states and wherever the Stalinists have power and influence far outweighs the injury done to the economic structure of these countries or impairment of the inter-dependence of their economies with imperialism generally.

If I have dealt at length with imperialism and the U.S., Stalinism and the Soviet Union it is not because many if not all these ideas

have not been proclaimed by us before at various times but to attempt to set aright the incorrect and inadequate presentation found in the IEC bulletin. Many crudifications and downright incorrect approaches to this same general problem have in recent months appeared in The Militant and Fourth International articles (for a prime example read "Korea and the Cold War," Pablo, September-October, 1950) as well as other documents on world politics.

In taking up the question of the class nature of Yugoslavia it has been imperatively necessary to take up the problems and perspectives of our world movement and its orientation before coming to a complete, precise understanding of the Yugoslav revolution. While the Yugoslav revolution is today the key to the international situation and potentially can if understood and correctly "exploited" become the opening wedge enabling us to come to the defense of the Soviet Union by leading a mass revolutionary movement and society against Stalinism and imperialism, nevertheless, until that takes place the defense of the Soviet Union is still a fundamental, primary, pivotal axis of our program which can not be minimized.

Yugoslavia and the Role of World Trotskyism

The majority and minority factions by calling Yugoslavia a workers' state have played a role in this discussion which if they are successful can only serve to liquidate, revise, and reduce to zero the subjective historical factor of the role of the party and of world Trotskyism and divorce them completely from revolutionary Marxism and the path of proletarian internationalism.

The conflict between bourgeois and proletarian ideological norms and the institutions they represent in revolutionary processes have usually assumed forms directly opposite, reversed, or inverted from the Yugoslavian revolutionary development. Where in the past economic transformations establishing a completely nationalized economy was in the case of the Soviet Union accomplished after some delay and represented the eventual consequences of a revolution of an internationalist character and scope, we now see a state society which "subjectively," ideologically speaking, did not originate and has not yet developed into a revolution of an internationalist scope and character, nevertheless, this revolutionary development completely nationalized the economic structure and did so as one of its first accomplishments.

To attempt to appraise the class character of a small state like Yugoslavia by arranging facts statistically and enumerating all the proletarian revolutionary changes that have occurred within its borders is the most hopeless form of empirical and economist thinking that can only lead to a labyrinth of contradictions. Its origins and its internationalist character, past and present, are the decisive factors.

Only when considered within the framework of the dynamic, ever-changing panorama of international, political, economic, and social forces can one even begin to understand and arrive at a precise picture of the Yugoslav revolution. While developing to a level higher in the stages of proletarian revolutionary changes and transformations than any revolution since the October Revolution many decisive

experiences lie ahead for both the party and the workers and peasants of Yugoslavia before a dictatorship of the proletariat expressed through Soviet governmental forms under internationalist leadership qualifies this development under the denomination of a workers' state.

Yugoslavia remains a capitalist state, characterized by dual power, existing, because of its nationalized economy, federated structure, and workers' councils, etc., all products of proletarian revolutionary change. The Yugoslav Communist Party through its Peoples' Front remains within a coalition type governmental framework in which the Peoples' Front acts as the transmission mechanism linking up this government with the forces of imperialism.