

Extract from an article "Staline has signed the death of the III Internationale:

Staline together with the renegade Laval has buried the III Internationale. He makes his treachery known through the intermediary of a bourgeois ministre who himself has betrayed the working class. The bureaucrats of French Stalinism draw at once the necessary conclusions, and Vaillant-Couturier in his article adds ignominy to treachery.

While the working class is moving on the revolutionary path, while the peasants are beginning to stir and enter vigorously into the fight, while the petty bourgeoisie directly affected by the crisis is radicalising itself this bureaucrate (Vaillant-Couturier) dared to write that there was no hope for the independent fight of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, that all efforts had failed and that to prevent the invasion of the U.S.S.R. there was nothing to be done except to entrust oneself to French imperialism. The III Internationale has become the agent of Stalinism. Let us review the facts:

Under the Staline-Laval pact the Soviet Government enters into a military alliance with an imperialist Government, not for its pleasure but in order not to be crushed. This treaty is on the same plane as the treaty of Brest-Litovsk which was a defeat. Should therefore the Communists and Socialists vote for the ratification of this pact? And this independently from the question whether Soviet diplomacy was really forced to sign this treaty or not?

Let us go back to the treaty of Brest-Litovsk. The social-democrats in the Reichstag voted for the ratification declaring that as the Bolchewiks accepted it there was no reason to oppose it. The Bolchewiks replied to them: "You are canailles. We are forced to negotiate in order not to be squashed. But you are politically free to vote for or against and your vote means either confidence in or mistrust of your bourgeoisie."

The proletariat of this country need not be convinced that the Soviet Government was forced to conclude a military alliance with French imperialism. The Communists and Socialists need not discuss the reasons and motives of the Soviet Government but only the reasons of the Government Flandin-Laval. If they vote for the Government they are not less "canailles" as the German Social-Democrats of 1918.

Only yesterday Thorez and Co. declared: "We love our country, but we cannot accept the national defence under a capitalist regime! If this formula has any sense it means: "We cannot entrust our bourgeoisie with the defence of our country." To-day they say: We shall join ~~our~~ forces with our bourgeoisie in order to defend the U.S.S.R." We ask: How is it that the French bourgeoisie, not good enough to defend our country declares itself good enough to defend the U.S.S.R.?" Here we have the whole question. One cannot stop in the middle of the way. To-morrow the same people will say: "We shall make common cause with our bourgeoisie to defend our country against the barbarism of Hitler because after all the French people

2  
have the same right to sacrifice their heroes as the Russian people have." This is social-patriotism.

But one may say that the immediate danger comes from German Fascism and that therefore a bloc has to be formed against it. This argument may be good enough for Soviet diplomacy but it is not Marxism. We have always held that the danger of war arises from conflicting imperialisms. What produces German Fascism and the danger of war are the enormous productive forces of German capitalism which press for outlets. The capitalisms of the most progressive countries are throttled by the confines of the Nation State. France marches hand in hand with Fascist Italy, with England against Fascist Germany. On this path one arrives rapidly at the idealisation of French democracy as opposed to Hitler Germany. This is Social-Patriotism.

But one may object: "This is all very well, but it is all the same necessary to protect oneself against the immediate danger which is that of Fascist Germany." Let us remember here that only yesterday the Komintern issued in Germany the slogan of "national liberation," which was impossible without a war. To-day one wants to defend the status quo of the Versailles Treaty in order to avoid war. If one gives up the class-struggle and the international revolution one is lost. To-day one camouflages one's treachery by the necessity of "save-guarding peace", and to-morrow when war has broken out ~~one~~ goes on with treachery to save democracy or the U.S.S.R. Neither peace, democracy nor the U.S.S.R. can be saved by the abdication of the French proletariat. To spend the only capital which we possess, the <sup>German Germany</sup> independence of the proletariat for precarious diplomatic combinations means to barr the road to revolution. The crime of reformism consists in this that it chases after shadows and thus emasculates the proletariat.

But one will object to us: "You yourselves (Bolchewik-Leninists) admit that the Soviet Government has the right to conclude alliances with Imperialist powers in the interests of its security. Should we not, we French workers, support these alliances as far as they are useful to the workers' government?" No, under no circumstances. We have already pointed out that it was the duty of the German Social -Democrats to fight the treaty of Brest-Litovsk although it was absoluteley necessary for the existence of the Soviets at a certain moment. Let us consider the same question but more concretely. Revolutionary defeatism does not mean the sabotage of a pseudo national defence by a minority. It would be absurd to attribute to the revolutionary workers the idea that in case of war they are going to destroy bridges, railways etc. The revolutionary workers, as long as they are a minority will take part in the war as the slaves of Imperialism. At the same time they prepare (par la parole) the transformation of the Imperialist war into a social war. It would even do so ~~if~~ the U.S.S.R. succeeded in obtaining the military support of the French bourgeoisie against a German aggression.

The pact indicates the weakness of the U.S.S.R. and not

its strength. This new treaty is the result of the defeats in China, Germany, Austria and Spain. As the revolutionary factor in the world has become weakened the U.S.S.R. sees itself forced to adapt itself to Imperialism. This is the meaning of the Franco-Soviet treaty. But if the Soviet Government is forced to fraternise temporarily with the oppressors of the French proletariat, there is no reason why it should further weaken the proletariat by demoralizing it and by aggravating the international situation.

When events of a world-wide scale are involved the revolutionary party has no right to allow itself to be guided by secondary, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ episodiques and problematic considerations. It must see far ahead and by gathering the revolutionary forces it will also be able to solve questions of secondary character: the revolutionary policy is always the most practical one. Stalinism is our enemy. Staline and Co. have lost all confidence and now they indulge in pure diplomacy, that is, the dirtiest one possible. They can only see combinations with this or that Imperialism. They are particularly frightened that the French workers might disturb these combinations. Thorez and Co. accept this conception. They consider the revolutionary movement as an obstacle to the salvation of the U.S.S.R.

When we Bolshevik-Leninists began to fight the theory of socialism in one country it may have looked as if it were a purely academic question. Now the historic function of that formula becomes clear: its task was to detach the U.S.S.R. from the world proletariat. It has created a national basis for the Soviet bureaucracy which enables it to concentrate all the power in its hands. The new law which makes it possible to condemn to death children of 12 years demonstrates that the U.S.S.R. is not only very far from socialism but also that the decomposition of large sections of the workers and the peasants assumes formidable proportions, inspite of all the technical advances made. And exactly when the danger of a war threatens the State created by the October Revolution the Government of the U.S.S.R. draws the last conclusion of the theory of socialism in one country by prostituting the A.B.C. of Marxism, by degrading the Komintern below the part played by Scheidemann, Noske, Renaudel, Vandervelde and Co.

When after the capitulation of the Komintern before Hitler we declared: this is the "4th of August" of the III International we received many protestations. The 4th of August, we were told, was a conscious treachery whereas the capitulation before Hitler was the inevitable consequence of a false policy. We see now the superficiality of such purely psychological appreciations. The capitulation was the expression of inner decay produced by the accumulation of mistakes and crimes.

The urgent task is to reconstruct the ranks of the avant-gard of the international proletariat. For this a flag and a program is needed. It can only be the flag and the program of the IVth International. The III International is dead. Long live the IV International.

**Collection Number: AG2722**

**WORKER'S PARTY OF SOUTH AFRICA, 1933-1935**

**PUBLISHER:**

*Publisher:- Historical Papers Research Archive*

*Location:- Johannesburg*

©2013

**LEGAL NOTICES:**

**Copyright Notice:** All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

**Disclaimer and Terms of Use:** Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of a collection held at the Historical Papers Research Archive at The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa