

Semi-monthly Organ of the
Communist League of America
(Opposition)

The MILITANT

VOL. II. No. 11

NEW YORK, N. Y. July 1, 1929.

PRICE 5 CENTS

GASTONIA

The eyes of all enlightened workers must turn today to Gastonia, North Carolina, the scene of the first great battle for the unionization of the South and the attempt to halt this work by the time-honored method of murder frame-up against nearly a score of the strike leaders headed by Fred Beal. The attempt to railroad the strike leaders is the outcome of the raid on the strikers' tent colony on June 7 which resulted in the fatal shooting of the chief of police, the leader of the raid. This raid, with its tragic consequences, was the culmination of weeks of provocation, Czarist oppression and lynch law invoked against the strikers by the authorities under the control of the mill owners.

That fatalities did not occur sooner is proof of the restraint and discipline of the workers. That finally, after they had been starved, beaten, evicted and driven into a tent colony they fought back in self defense is testimony to their courage which all class conscious workers will applaud. Gastonia has written its name already on the bright pages of American labor history. The workers there have fought and are fighting not for themselves alone but for the cause of all the exploited who aspire to organization and freedom. Their support and defense is a duty of the American working class. It must become a burning issue of the labor movement.

The unionization of the newly industrialized South, proceeding through blood and fire, is a work of profound importance for the future of our labor movement. Every step forward in this field has a strengthening and invigorating influence all around. These workers must not be compelled to fight alone. Widespread, national support is the duty of the hour.

The Communists, the most dynamic element in the working class, have played their part in the vanguard of the battle at Gastonia. In contradistinction to reformist neglect and treachery they have fought at the head of the struggle of the workers. Experience here again shows that it is the revolutionaries who fight most aggressively and courageously for the smallest reforms in the conditions of the workers.

But the Communists cannot and should not wage this fight alone. And the newly industrialized Southern workers must not be separated from the older and better organized workers of the north, not even from those who only partly understand the issues at stake. This will only isolate the struggle and condemn it to defeat. The issue of Gastonia has become a national issue which cries out for the formation of the broadest possible supporting movement. The local struggle must become a national struggle and gain the support of the working class. The advancement of unionization among the Southern workers and the lives of the arrested strikers and strike leaders depend on this.

For the development of this struggle on a national scale and on a broad basis all sectarianism must be cast aside. All efforts must be directed toward the mobilization of all conscious and progressive forces in the working class and all sympathetic elements around the communists for the help of the Gastonia workers. Any other policy is hopelessly futile, against the interests of the workers and condemned in advance to defeat.

Our way is clearly indicated by the experience of previous struggles as well as by the relation of forces and the tested fighting methods of communism. The management of the Passaic strike, despite minor errors was a brilliant exemplification of these methods which must be revived and emulated in the present situation. The Communists at the head of that historic struggle utilized the tactics of the united front with brilliant success. Thereby a broad supporting movement was created in which great masses of non-communist workers took part, along with the sympathizing and liberal elements whose aid in the circumstances was very valuable. The Passaic strike conferences throughout the country which provided the material and moral reserves of support for the striking workers at Passaic, and the methods whereby they were created, are good examples for our guiding line now.

The great Sacco-Vanzetti agitation is another excellent example of how the Communists, despite their numerical weakness and lack of direct influence over the masses, are able by correct tactics to organize hundreds of thousands of workers and set them into motion on a class issue. The Communists, as the decisive element in the International Labor Defense, were indubitably the leading and organizing force in this vast campaign. If this had been done at the start of the fight Sacco and Vanzetti would have been saved. The key to the successful work of mobilization in the Sacco-Vanzetti case as in the Passaic strike consisted in subordinating names and forms to the movement, in appearing as the defenders of the general interests of the workers and not simply of partisan aims and in the organization of non-communists and even anti-communist workers for the struggle on that ground. These methods alone made the movement possible and indirectly brought a hundred times more credit and prestige to the Communists than could have been gained by any ballyhoo of self-praise.

All this holds good in the present struggle. Nothing has happened in the meantime except to confirm this truth. The extent to which this is realized and applied in practice will have a decisive bearing on the scope and effectiveness of the struggle for Gastonia.

Banquet for Balbo - Exile for Trotsky

The anti-Fascist movement in this country, and in the rest of the world, is experiencing a tumultuous discussion and dissension. The subject involved is the report that Teruci, chief of the Fascist militia and Italo Balbo, one of the most notorious hangmen of Fascism, and Minister of Airways in Italy, upon his arrival with an airplane squadron of Fascists in Odessa, U. S. S. R., was given an enthusiastic reception by the Soviet authorities. According to the United Press reports, Balbo and his fellow blackshirts had a banquet tendered to them in Odessa which was attended by the official head of the Soviet Air Fleet and other notables.

Thousands of the best sons of Italian labor were murdered, assaulted and imprisoned by Mussolini's butchers. It is Italo Balbo whose name is an imprecation on the lips of every Italian proletarian. It was he who ordered the murder of the anti-Fascist priest, Don Minzoni, for which he was tried and released. It was he who has the blood of scores of Italian revolutionaries on his hands. Wherever he goes he is pursued by the curses of the working class. When he came to Argentina some time ago, the demonstrations of the workers against him raised such a commotion that two of them were killed by the reactionaries. In New York City, when Balbo came here he was met with a demonstration of infuriated workers at the City Hall, at the Plaza Hotel and at the dock when he sailed. Many of the Italian workers in the city felt the clubs of the Tammany Hall police who protected Balbo. In Greece and Bulgaria through which he has just passed, no reception was accorded him.

After the death of the martyred Matteotti, a session of the League of Nations in Geneva took place, during which Mussolini came forward with outstretched palm to Emile Vanderveelde, the Belgian social patriotic prime minister. Vanderveelde said: "I don't give my hand to Matteotti's murderer." Even the yellow social democrat Vanderveelde did not dare to shake the hand of blood for fear of the fury of the workers.

But Stalin has found it possible to give Italo Balbo a royal reception! For Leon Trotsky, for the comrade

of Lenin, for a leader of the Bolshevik Revolution, for a founder and leader of the victorious Red Army, for a founder and leader of the Communist International — Stalin has only imprisonment and exile in Siberia and deportation to the White Guards in Turkey.

PARTY MEMBERS PROTEST BALBO'S RECEPTION

On Friday, June 21, 1929, at the district membership meeting of the Italian comrades in New York and vicinity at the Workers Center, the question of the Russian reception to the famous fascist murderer, Italo Balbo, was heatedly discussed for hours. Many of the Italian comrades protested against the action of the Stalin regime, the most energetic voice of condemnation being raised by comrade Mainelli, of Union City, New Jersey. When he declared: "It was shameful to receive Balbo!" he expressed the feelings of numerous Italian comrades who have had to hang their heads and be unable to reply to the taunts of the yellow socialists and anti-Party Italian press in New York, which has raised a hue and cry about the Balbo reception.

PICNIC

arranged by the
New York Branch of the Communist
League of America
in PALISADES PARK, N. J.
ON SUNDAY, JULY 14th

Directions: Take Fort Lee Ferry at W. 130th St. On the Jersey side take Hudson River car to Dalia Boulevard. From Dalia Blvd. ten minutes walk to end of Seventh St., Palisades Park. From the Jersey side of Fort Lee Ferry auto service from 9 A. M. to 2 P. M.
— There will be eats, drinks and fun —
TICKETS 25 CENTS

IN THIS ISSUE

THE FIGHT FOR GASTONIA
LOVESTONE IS EXPELLED
BRITISH LABOR GOVERNMENT
TROTSKY ON RADEK
THE PROGRESSIVE CONFERENCE
MAY DAY PUTSCH IN BERLIN
REVOLUTION IN INDIA
BEHIND THE SCENES IN THE RUSSIAN PARTY
LOSOVSKY VERSUS LOSOVSKY

New Split Begins Lovestone is Expelled

The falling apart of the Right-Center Bloc in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the International is already finding its inevitable expression in the Communist Party of the United States. Jay Lovestone, yesterday the leader of the Party and comrade-in-arms of Foster in the war against the Communist Opposition, has been expelled by the new Political Bureau manufactured recently in Moscow. At the same time, Bertram D. Wolfe was suspended from the Political Bureau of which he was a member. These actions, together with similar ones to follow, were already evident from the tone and content of the spurious "enlightenment campaign" carried on in the Party press since the receipt of the "open address" of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. They represent the beginning of a new split in the Party.

Lovestone-Wolfe-Gitlow and Company are undoubtedly leading a split away from the Party to the Right, the logical conclusion of their whole past course of petty-bourgeois corruption and opportunism, a course in which they were continuously supported by the Stalin Executive Committee of the Communist International. They are obviously allied with the Right Wing in the International, led by Bucharin, Rykov and their faction. They will undoubtedly bring forward a Brandler platform of tactics for the American movement which will clash with the new "left" policy of the party all along the line. The Lovestone faction is strongly entrenched in the party apparatus and in the leading circles of the Needle Trades group of opportunists, and is already waging an effective internal struggle of factionalism and sabotage against the decision of the C. I. and the new "leadership" made to order by it. At the opportune moment Lovestone and Wolfe will be able to deal a heavy blow in the open.

The "enlightenment campaign" throws no light whatever on the actual processes at work and only prepares the ground for deeper convulsions. Its explanation of the new events is false and superficial from start to finish. What is taking place in the American Communist Party, as in the Communist International as a whole, is the splitting of the movement, the disintegration of its forces, the smashing of its prestige and recruiting powers among the workers. We are witnessing the culmination in the American Party of the disruptive influence of Stalinist centrism on the International movement. Only those who understand this can help the movement back to the path of Lenin.

Organization measures, suppression and falsification — the sole weapons of the newly appointed leaders — cannot cope with the disintegration. They only strengthen and deepen it. They sow pessimism and discouragement in the ranks. The Party members vote without understanding or conviction in the vain hope for peace and unity while the whole situation matures new and fiercer factional struggles. Stalinism has led the Party to a blind alley, disrupted it from within and weakened it enormously before its enemies.

Formal discipline as a cover for political impotence and bureaucratic rule has played itself out. Organization measures have lost their effectiveness. The only salvation of the movement lies in ideological clarification and a reunification of the communist ranks on that basis. The communist workers need to know what is really behind the crisis, to think and to act with conscious purpose. The cablegram leadership, without political strength, without independence, without ability and without courage cannot create the conditions for this. The communist workers will win their way to a Leninist understanding of the situation only in revolt against them.

The party needs a real discussion of the three conflicting political lines which are now clearly revealing themselves: The Right, the Centrist and the line of the Communist Opposition. The Party needs to smash through the artificial limits of the fake "enlightenment campaign" and compel a real political discussion of the issues and the viewpoints. This is the way out of the crisis. This is the way to the consolidation of the proletarian communist forces and a new life for the Party.

THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMINTERN - A Criticism of Fundamentals - By L. D. TROTSKY

(CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS ISSUE).

6. THE QUESTION OF THE CHARACTER OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION.

The slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat which leads behind it the rural poor is inseparably bound up with the question of the Socialist character of the coming, third revolution in China. And inasmuch as not only history, but also mistakes which people make in meeting its requirements, repeat themselves, we can already hear the objection raised that China has not yet matured for a Socialist revolution. But this is an abstract and lifeless formulation of the question. Has Russia, if isolated from the rest of the world, matured for Socialism? According to Lenin it has not. It has matured for the dictatorship of the proletariat as the only method of solution of national problems which cannot be delayed.

But the general destiny of the dictatorship as a whole is in the final analysis determined by the trend of world development, which, of course, does not exclude but presupposes a correct policy on the part of the proletarian dictatorship, the consolidation and development of the workers' and peasants' alliance, flexible adaptation to national conditions on the one hand, and the trend of world development on the other. This fully holds good also for China. In the same article "As to Our Revolution" (January 16, 1923) in which Lenin establishes that the peculiarity of Russia lies in the fact that it proceeds along the lines of the peculiar development of the Eastern countries, he dubs as "endlessly hackneyed" the argument of European Social Democracy to the effect "that we have not developed enough for Socialism, that we have not, as some 'learned' gentlemen say, the necessary objective economic prerequisites for Socialism". But Lenin ridicules the "learned" gentlemen not because he himself believes in the existence of the necessary economic prerequisites for Socialism in Russia but because he holds that from the absence of these prerequisites necessary for an INDEPENDENT construction of Socialism it does not at all follow, as the pedants and philistines think, that the idea of the conquest of power has to be rejected. In that article Lenin for the hundred and first or perhaps for the thousand and first time replies to the sophisms of the heroes of the Second International:

"This INCONTROVERTIBLE consideration (about the immaturity of Russia for Socialism)... is not decisive in an evaluation of our revolution." (Volume 18, part 2, page 118 and 119).

That is what the authors of the draft program will not and cannot understand. Notice that the argument about the economic and cultural immaturity of China as well as Russia—China of course more so than Russia—is incontrovertible. But from here it does not in the least follow that the proletariat has to give up the idea of capturing power, which capture is dictated by the whole historical position and revolutionary situation in the country.

The concrete historical, political and actual question is not whether China has economically ripened for Socialism, but whether she has ripened politically for the proletarian dictatorship. These two questions are not by any means identical. They might have been identical were it not for the fact that we have a law of uneven development. That is where the law holds good and fully applies to the inter-relationships between economics and politics. Thus, has China matured for a proletarian dictatorship? Only the progress of the struggle can give a categorical answer to this question. Likewise only the struggle can settle the question as to when and under what conditions will the real unification, emancipation and regeneration of China take place. Anyone who says that China has not ripened for the dictatorship of the proletariat declares thereby that the third Chinese revolution is postponed for many years.

Of course matters would be quite hopeless if feudal survivals would really DOMINATE in Chinese economics, as the resolution of the E.C.C.I. asserts. But unfortunately, SURVIVALS in general cannot dominate. The draft program also on this point does not rectify the committed errors, but repeats them in a roundabout and loose manner. The draft speaks of the "predominance of feudal medieval relations both in the economics of the country as well as in the political superstructure..." This is fundamentally wrong. What does PRE-DOMINATE mean? Is it by the number of people involved? Or is it by the dominant and leading role in the economics of the country? The extraordinarily rapid growth of home industry on the basis of the all-embracing role of merchant and bank capital—complete dependence of the chief agrarian districts on the market, enormous and ever-growing foreign trade, all around subordination of the Chinese villages to the towns—goes to show the unconditional predominance, the direct sway of capitalist relations in China. Serf and semi-serf relations are undeniably very strong. They

have originated partly in the days of feudalism, they partly constitute a new formation which regenerates the old on the basis of the retarded development of the productive forces, the surplus agrarian population, the activities of merchants' and usurers' capital, etc. However, not "feudal" (more correctly, serf and, generally, pre-capitalist) relations DOMINATE but capitalist relations. Only thanks to this unconditional role of capitalist relations can we speak seriously of the prospects of proletarian hegemony in the national revolution. Otherwise we find that the different ends do not meet.

The role of the Chinese proletariat in production is already very great. In the next few years it will increase still further. Its political role, as events have shown, could have been gigantic. But the policy of the leadership was, as has been shown, entirely directed against the capture of a leading role by the proletariat.

The draft program says that successful Socialist construction is possible in China "only on condition of direct support from countries under the proletarian dictatorship." Thus, here, in relation to China, the same principle is recognized which the Party always, recognized in regard to Russia. But if China has no sufficient inner forces for an INDEPENDENT construction of Socialist society then, according to the theory of Stalin and Bucharin, the Chinese proletariat should not take power in any of the stages of the Revolution. Or perhaps the existence of the U.S.S.R. settles the question otherwise? Then it follows that our technique is sufficient to build up a Socialist society not only here in the U.S.S.R., but also in China, viz., in the two economically most backward big countries. Or perhaps the inevitable dictatorship of the proletariat in China is "admissible" because that dictatorship will be included in the chain of the worldwide Socialist revolution thus becoming not only its link, but its driving force? But this is precisely Lenin's main idea in relation to the October Revolution, the "peculiarly" of which lies precisely along the lines of development of the Eastern countries. We see thus how the revisionist theory of Socialism in one country evolved in 1923 in the struggle against "Trotskyism" confuses and muddles up matters in approaching any new big revolutionary problem.

The draft program goes still further along these lines. It distinguishes China and India from "Russia of 1917, Poland (etc.?) as countries with a certain MINIMUM of industry sufficient for successful Socialist construction" or (which is more definitely and therefore more erroneously stated elsewhere) as countries possessing the "necessary and sufficient material prerequisites... for the complete construction of Socialism." Here as we already know there is a mere word play on Lenin's expression "necessary and sufficient" prerequisites, a false and inadmissible play because Lenin definitely enumerates the political and organizational prerequisites, including the TECHNICAL, CULTURAL AND INTERNATIONAL prerequisites. But the other chief point is HOW can one decide a priori whether a "MINIMUM OF INDUSTRY" is sufficient for the complete building up of Socialism once it is a question of an uninterrupted world struggle between two economic systems, two social orders, of which our ECONOMIC basis is in this struggle immeasurably weaker?

If we take the economic lever only, it is clear that we in the U.S.S.R., and particularly so in China and India, are sitting on the incomparably "shorter" end than world capitalism. But the whole question is determined by the REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE between the two systems on a world scale. The political long end of the lever is ON OUR SIDE, or, to speak more correctly, must be in our hands, provided we pursue a correct political line.

In the same article "As to Our Revolution", after the words that "a certain cultural level is necessary for the establishment of Socialism", Lenin remarks: "Although no one can tell exactly what this certain cultural level might be." Why can no one tell? Because the question is settled by the struggle, by the competition between the two social systems and the two cultures, ON AN INTERNATIONAL SCALE. Fully departing from this idea of Lenin's, which follows from the very substance of the question, the draft program declares that Russia had in 1917 precisely the "minimum technique" and hence also the culture necessary for the building up of Socialism in one country. The authors of the draft are trying to say in the program that which "no one can say" a priori.

It is impossible, one cannot, and it is stupid to seek a criterion for the "sufficient minimum" within national statics ("Russia prior to 1917") when the whole question is decided by international dynamics. In this wrong, arbitrary and isolated national criterion appears the theoretical basis of na-

tional narrow-mindedness in politics, the prerequisite for inevitable national reformist and social patriotic blunders in the future.

7. ON THE REACTIONARY IDEA OF WORKERS' AND PEASANTS' PARTIES FOR THE EAST.

The lesson of the second Chinese Revolution is a lesson for the entire Comintern, first and foremost for all Eastern countries.

All arguments brought forward in defense of the Menshevik policy in the Chinese Revolution must, if we take them for what they are worth, be held trebly good for India. The imperialist yoke has in India, in that classic colony, immeasurably higher palpable forms than in China. The survivals of feudal and serf relations in India are immeasurably deeper and greater. Nevertheless, or, more correctly, precisely because of that, the methods applied in China which undermined the revolution must result in India in even more destructive consequences. To abolish Indian serfdom and overthrow the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy and British militarism is a thing which can be accomplished only by a gigantic and irresistible mass movement of the people, and precisely because of its powerful sweep and irresistibility, its international purposes and relationships, it will not tolerate any half-way and compromising opportunist measures on the part of the leadership.

The Comintern leadership has already made not a few mistakes in India. Conditions have not yet allowed these errors to reveal themselves on such a scale as in China. It is, therefore, to be hoped that the lessons of the Chinese events will straighten out in good time the line of the leading policy in India and in other Eastern countries.

The central question for us here, as everywhere and always, is the question of the Communist Party, its complete independence, its irreconcilable class character. The greatest danger on this path is constituted by the organization of so-called "Workers' and Peasants' Parties" in the Eastern countries.

In 1924, a year which will be regarded as a year of open revision of a series of fundamental ideas of Marx and Lenin, Stalin advanced the idea of "dual composition of Workers' and Peasants' Parties" for the Eastern countries. It was based on the same ground of national oppression. Cables from India, as well as from Japan, where there is no national oppression, have of late frequently reported about activities of provincial "Workers' and Peasants' Parties" as of organizations which are related, and friendly to the Comintern, as if they were almost our "own" organizations, without, however, giving a more or less concrete statement as to their political physiognomy; in a word, it is exactly what has not so very long ago been written about the Kuomintang. The least dubiousness in this sphere is destructive. It is a question here of an absolutely new, entirely false and thoroughly un-Marxian orientation on the main question of the Party and of its relations to the class and the classes.

The necessity for the Communist Party of China to be affiliated with the Kuomintang was defended on the ground that the social composition of the Kuomintang was a Party of workers and peasants, that nine-tenths of the Kuomintang—this figure was repeated hundreds of times—belong to the revolutionary elements and are ready to march hand in hand with the Communist Party. However, during and since the coups d'Etat in Shanghai and Wuchang, these revolutionary nine-tenths of the Kuomintang have disappeared. No one has as yet found their traces. And the theoreticians of class collaboration in China, Stalin, Bucharin and others, have not even taken the trouble to explain what has become of the workers and peasants, the revolutionary, friendly and entirely our "own" nine-tenths of the Kuomintang membership. However, an answer to this question is of decisive importance if we are to understand in the future the fate of all these "dual composition" parties and have a clear idea of their very conception which throws us back far behind not only the program of the C.P.S.U. of 1919, but even the manifesto of the Communist Party of 1847.

The question as to what has become of the celebrated nine-tenths becomes clear to us only if we understand, first, the impossibility of a dual composition, that is, a dual class Party, expressing simultaneously two mutually exclusive historical lines—the proletarian and petty-bourgeois lines—secondly, the impossibility to have in capitalist society an independent peasant party, that is, a party independent of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Marxism has always taught, and that was accepted by Bolshevism, that the peasantry and the proletariat are two different classes, that every identification of their interests in capitalist society is false, and that the peasant can join the Communist Party if, from the property viewpoint, he adopts the views of the proletariat. An alliance of the workers and peasants under the proletarian

dictatorship does not do away with this fact, but confirms it, only in a different way, and under different circumstances. Were it not for the fact that they are DIFFERENT classes and have DIFFERENT interests, there would be no need for AN ALLIANCE. Such an alliance is compatible with the Socialist revolution only inasmuch as it exists within the iron frame of the proletarian dictatorship. In our country a dictatorship is incompatible with the existence of a so-called Peasant League precisely because every "independent" peasant organization with its own national political objects would inevitably be found to be an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Those organizations which in capitalist countries are known as Peasant Parties are in reality a peculiar type of bourgeois party. The peasant who has not accepted the proletarian position in view of his private property will inevitably look towards the bourgeoisie when it comes to fundamental political issues. Of course, any bourgeois party that relies or wants to rely on the peasantry, and, if possible, on the workers, is compelled to masquerade, that is, to create the impression that it consists of two or three different component parts. The celebrated idea of the "Workers' and Peasants' Parties" it would seem, has been purposely created to camouflage the bourgeois parties which must seek support from the peasantry and are even ready to have in their ranks also workers. The Kuomintang has from now on forever entered the annals of history as a classic type of such a party.

Bourgeois society as its kernel, is so built that the propertyless, discontented and deceived masses are at the bottom and the contented and the fakers are at the top. On the same principle is also built every bourgeois party, if it is a real party, that is, if it has in its ranks considerable masses. The exploiters, fakers and violators are in the minority in class society, every capitalist party is therefore compelled in its internal relations, in one way or another, to reproduce or reflect the relations of bourgeois society in its entirety. In every mass bourgeois party the lower ranks are therefore more democratic and more radical than the leaders. This is true of the German Center, the German liberals, and particularly the German Social Democrats. That is why the constant complaints voiced by Stalin, Bucharin and others that the leaders did not reflect the sentiments of the "Left" Kuomintang rank and file, the "overwhelming majority", the "nine-tenths", etc., etc., were so unparadoxically naive. That which was regarded as a temporary disagreeable misunderstanding which must be eliminated by means of organizational measures, instructions and circulars, is in reality a fundamental and basic feature of any bourgeois party, particularly in a revolutionary epoch.

It is from this angle that the chief argument of the authors of the draft program in defense of all kinds of opportunist blocs in general—in England or China—must be viewed. According to them fraternization with the leaders is done exclusively in the interests of the rank and file. The Opposition, as is known, insisted on a withdrawal from the Kuomintang:

"The question arises," says Bucharin, "why? Is it because the leaders of the Kuomintang vacillated? And what about the Kuomintang masses, are they mere 'cattle'? Since when is the attitude to a mass organization determined by what is done by its leaders?" (The Present Situation in the Chinese Revolution).

The very possibility of such an argument seems impossible in a revolutionary party. Bucharin asks "And what about the Kuomintang masses, are they mere 'cattle'?" Of course they are cattle. The masses of any bourgeois party are always cattle, although in different degrees. For us, the masses are not cattle. They are not cattle, and that is precisely why we do not drive them to the bourgeoisie, CAMOUFLAGING THE BOURGEOISIE BY MEANS OF A WORKERS' AND PEASANTS' PARTY. That is precisely why we must not try to subordinate the proletarian party to the bourgeoisie, but on the contrary, must at every step, set up one against the other. The leaders of the Kuomintang of whom Bucharin speaks so ironically, as of some secondary, accidental and temporary event, are in reality the soul of the Kuomintang, its social substance. Of course the bourgeoisie constitutes only the "top" in the Party as well as in society, but this top has capital, knowledge, connection; it can always fall back on the imperialists for support, and what is more it has actual political military power which directly merges with power in the Kuomintang itself. Precisely this top wrote laws against strikes, throttled the movement of the peasants, got the Communists into a dark corner, and, at best, allowed them to be only one-third of the Party, took an oath from them that petty-bourgeois Sun Yat Senism is for them above Marxism. The rank and file were picked; they served it, like Moscow, as a "Left" support, just as the generals, compradors and imperialists served it as a Right support. To

consider the Kuomintang not as a BOURGEOIS PARTY, but as a NEUTRAL ARENA OF STRUGGLE FOR THE MASSES, to play on nine-tenths of the Left bourgeoisie in order to conceal the question as to who is the real master, meant to add strength and power to the leaders, to help them to convert ever larger numbers into "cattle", and, under favorable conditions, to prepare the Shanghai coup d'Etat. Based on the reactionary idea of the dual composition of the Party, Stalin and Bucharin imagined that the Communists together with the "Lefts" will secure a majority in the Kuomintang and thereby power in the country, as in China power was in the hands of the KUO-THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL 129 mintang. In other words, they imagined that by means of ordinary elections at a Kuomintang Congress power would pass over from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat. Can one imagine a more idealistic idolization of "party democracy" ... in relation to a bourgeois party? It must be understood that the army, the bureaucracy, the press, and capital are in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Precisely because of this it already has leadership in the governing party. The bourgeois "top" tolerates or tolerates "nine-tenths" of the Lefts, and SUCH KIND OF Lefts, inasmuch as they did not venture to tackle the army, the bureaucracy, the press and their capital. By this powerful means the bourgeois top holds in subjection not only the so-called nine-tenths of the "Left" Party members, but also the masses in general. The theory of class alliance, the theory that the Kuomintang is a workers' and peasants' party, is the best of the bourgeoisie hopes for. When the bourgeoisie later meets face to face with the hostility of the masses and shoots them down, in this clash of two real forces, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, there is not even a whisper heard of the celebrated nine-tenths. The pitiful democratic fiction disappears without a trace in face of the bloody reality of the class struggle.

Such is the real and only possible political mechanism of the "dual composition Workers' and Peasants' Parties for the East." There is no other and there will not be.

* * *

Although the idea of dual composition parties is motivated on national oppression, as if this neutralizes Marx' class doctrine, we have heard already about "Workers' and Peasants'" bagatelles in Japan where there is no national oppression at all. Moreover, this is not limited merely to the East. The "dual composition" idea is endeavoring to become universal. The most caricature-like character in this respect was assumed by the Workers' Party of America in its efforts to support the candidature of the bourgeois, "anti-Trust" Senator La Follette, so as to attach, in this manner, the American farmers to the wheel of the Social Revolution. Pepper, the theoretician of the manoeuvre, who is one of those who has ruined the Hungarian Revolution and who failed to notice the Hungarian peasantry, made here a great effort to ruin the Workers' Party in its first stages of activity. Pepper's theory was that the super-profit of American capitalism converts the American proletariat into a world labor aristocracy while the agrarian crisis ruins the farmers and drives them onto the path of social revolution. A party of several thousand members, consisting chiefly of immigrants, had, according to Pepper, to make make common cause with the farmers through a bourgeois party and form a dual composition party, insuring thus the social revolution with the passivity or neutrality of the proletariat which has been corrupted by super-profits. This confused idea had its followers and half followers among the leaders of the Comintern. In the course of a few weeks the scales vacillated from one side to the other until finally a concession was made to the letter of Marxism. Having been taken off its feet the American Party had to be cut off from the noose of the La Follette party which died even before its founder.

What modern revisionism invents for the East is carried over to the West. If Pepper tried across the Atlantic to whip up history by means of a dual composition party in the United States, the latest information tells us that the Kuomintang experience finds its supporters in Italy where they are endeavoring to force on our Party the monstrous slogan of a "Republican Assembly on the Basis (?) of Workers' and Peasants' Committees". In this slogan the spirit of Chiang Kai-shek embraces the spirit of Hilferding. Will we really come to that?

* * *

In closing, we only have to recall that the idea of a "Workers' and Peasants' Party" discards from the history of Bolshevism the entire struggle against the Narodniki, without which there would have been no Bolshevik Party. What was the essence of that historical struggle? Lenin wrote about the S. R.s in 1909, the following:

"The general idea of their program was not that 'an alliance of the forces' of the proletariat and peasantry is necessary, but that THERE IS NO CLASS DIFFERENCE between the two, that there is no need to draw a class distinction between them, that the Social Democratic idea concerning the petty-bourgeois character of the peasantry in contradiction to the proletariat is fundamentally wrong." (Vol. 11, Part 1, page 198).

In other words, the dual composition Workers' and Peasants' Party was the central idea of the Russian Narodniki. Only in the struggle against this idea could the Party of the proletarian vanguard in peasant Russia develop.

Lenin insistently and persistently repeated in the epoch of the 1905 revolution, that:

"Distrust the peasantry, ORGANIZE SEPARATELY FROM THEM, be ready for a struggle against them, inasmuch as the peasants are a reactionary or anti-proletarian force." (Vol. 6, page 113. Our emphasis).

In 1906 Lenin wrote:

"The last advice is, proletarians and semi-proletarians of town and country, organize separately. Do not trust any possessors, even those small ones, even though they 'la'or'... We support the peasant movement to the end, but we must remember that it is a movement of another class, not the class which can or will accomplish the social revolution." (Vol. 9, page 410).

This idea can be found in hundreds of the larger and smaller works of Lenin. In 1908, he said:

"The alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, we will remark in passing, must by no means be understood in the sense of a MERGING OF THE DIFFERENT CLASSES OR PARTIES of the proletariat and the peasantry. Not only merging, but even ANY PROLONGED CONCORDANCE would be detrimental for the socialist revolution of the working class and would weaken the revolutionary democratic struggle." (Vol. 11, Part 1, page 79. Our emphasis).

Is it possible to condemn the very idea of a Workers' and Peasants' Party more sharply, more ruthlessly and more effectively?

Lenin puts the question in the same irreconcilable spirit also in the epoch of the October Revolution. In generalizing the experiences of the third Russian revolution, Lenin, beginning with 1918, does not miss a single opportunity to repeat that in a society where capitalist relations predominate there are only two decisive forces—the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

"If the peasant does not follow the workers, he follows the bourgeoisie. There is and there can be no middle course." (Vol. 16, page 290).

However, the "Workers' and Peasants' Party" is an attempt at the creation of a middle course.

If the vanguard of the Russian proletariat had not stood up distinctly against the peasantry, if it had not waged a ruthless struggle against the petty-bourgeois looseness of the latter, it would inevitably have itself been dissolved among the petty-bourgeois elements through the S. R.s or some other "dual composition" Party which, in turn, would itself inevitably have been subordinated to a bourgeois leadership. In order to arrive at a revolutionary alliance with the peasantry—this is not attained so easily—it is first of all necessary to separate the proletarian vanguard and thereby the working class as a whole, from the petty-bourgeois masses. This can be attained only by means of training the proletarian party in the spirit of staunch class irreconcilability. The newer the proletariat, the fresher and more direct its "blood relationships" with the peasantry, the greater becomes the importance of the struggle against any forms of the "dual composition" political alchemy. In the West the idea of a Workers' and Peasants' Party is simply ridiculous. In the East it is ruinous. In China, India and Japan this idea is deadly hostile not only to the hegemony of the proletariat and the revolution, but to the most elementary independence of the proletarian vanguard. The Workers' and Peasants' Party can only be a basis, a cover, a spring-board for the bourgeoisie.

Fatalistically also, in this fundamental question for the East, modern revisionism only repeats the errors of pre-revolutionary Social Democratic opportunism. Most of the leaders of European Social Democracy considered the struggle of our Party against the S. R.s a mistake and insistently urged the merging of the two parties, holding that for the Russian "East" a dual composition Workers' and Peasants' Party is just the thing. Had we taken their advice we would have never realized the alliance of the workers and peasants nor the dictatorship of the proletariat. The "dual composition" Workers' and Peasants' Party of the S.R.s became, and could not help becoming in our country, an agency of the imperialist bourgeoisie, that is, it tried without success, to fulfil the same historical mission in a different and "peculiar" way that the Kuomintang successfully fulfilled in China. Without containing a relentless condemnation of the very idea of Workers' and Peasants' Parties for the East, there is not and there cannot be a Comintern program.

(CONCLUDED IN NEXT ISSUE)

LOSOVSKY Versus LOSOVSKY

Despite the indications that the Stalinists are now preparing to make Losovsky the scapegoat for the catastrophic result of the new trade union line of the Comintern and the R. I. L. U. developed in the "third period", the fact remains that Losovsky's only crime was that he followed the "new line" to its logical conclusion. Unfortunately, the essence of the ultra-"left" infantile disease of the Comintern's new trade union line remains. Losovsky was the most "consistent" spokesman and advocate of this line, the sheer senselessness of which can be best demonstrated by comparing Losovsky today with Losovsky (and the line of the International) yesterday.

"Can it be seriously maintained", writes Losovsky in *The Communist International*, Vol. VI, Nos. 9-10, "that the American Federation of Labor represents an advantage to the workers' movement of the United States? Or, possibly, the All-German Federation of Trade Unions, which has shattered one revolutionary movement after another, is an advantage to the German proletariat? Would it not have been better for German proletariat if that strike-breakers' organization had not existed in November, 1918? One would have thought so. And if that is so, it is quite obvious that the Communists who construct their tactics on such an estimate of the reformists trade unions are closer to the social democrats than the Communists."

And further: "We must not forget that the section of the workers organized by the social democrats is the most reactionary section of the proletariat."

THE LOSOVSKY OF YESTERDAY

This is the "new line" for trade union work that the world Communist movement is required to swallow without as much as a gasp. But Losovsky, not to mention others, wrote differently on the same subject some time ago. Replying to the very nonsense that he advances above, he said in his book *"The World's Trade Union Movement"* (pages 84-85):

"Basing themselves upon the unions, former members of the social democratic party, such as Noske, shot down thousands of workers. All this brought about pessimism and despair in the more revolutionary and impatient German workers. From that was created a whole theory: The old trade unions are rotten through and through; they are reactionary, and in order successfully to fight the bourgeoisie it is necessary to destroy them completely. If this colossal apparatus is being used against the revolution, if it is so entwined with the bourgeois state, it is necessary to destroy it before the power of labor can be established.

"In deciding upon our line of action in this regard we followed the Comintern which was categorically opposed to the theory of destroying the unions, but was for winning them over. Why? Did we not equally estimate the reactionary character of the trade unions? Did we not recognize the fact of the interlacing of the bourgeois state with the heads of the trade unions? Did we not see their reactionary role? Certainly, we saw all that, but we are approaching the trade unions from an entirely different point of view than our German comrades then were.

"There was another reason why we were opposed to that slogan. What does it mean to consider the trade unions as 'hopeless' in the revolutionary sense (as Losovsky does now)? If the nine million workers of Germany are 'hopeless' (or the most reactionary section of proletariat, as Losovsky says today), then the revolution itself is 'hopeless'. Thus, we come to unexpected conclusions which are of a Menshevik nature."

THE "NEW LINE" IN THE UNITED STATES

It would be purely academic to make these quotations to prove the instability of Losovsky, were it not for the fact that the application of this "new line" in the United States and elsewhere is bringing the greatest harm to the working class movement as whole and the Communist movement in particular. In the United States, where the trade union question is especially difficult, the application of the present reckless and non-Leninist line threatens to play increased havoc with the movement. The American Stalinites of all shades who accommodate themselves to every twist and quirk of the international factional apparatus, who drop old "lines" and adopt new ones with the utmost nonchalance, may give little heed to the consequences of their acts. But we will continue to criticize the present trade union line of the Party until its distortions are eliminated.

The Party is wrong in its course toward the formation of a new "revolutionary trade union center" at the Cleveland conference of the T. U. E. L. Without fully understanding it, the membership of the Party is being dragged into another Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance. We are for the formation of a broad left wing opposition movement, with the necessary centralization, to fight to win the workers in the trade unions and not to surrender them to the A. F. L. fakers.

The Party is wrong in its attitude towards the progressive movement. The Party piously and indignantly points out some of the leaders of this movement (and correctly, of course) as reactionaries, as rascals, as turncoats, and thinks that thereby the problem is solved. Unfortunately, there are many workers following the Mustes and Maurers who lead only because there is progressive pressure from below, a pressure that is sure to grow. The Party does not see workers; it sees only the leaders and remains pious and indignant.

THE "UNITED FRONT WITH ONE'S SELF"

The Party is wrong in its attitude toward the united front, which has today become a parade slogan, trotted out for show and not for daily application.

The Party follows the course in this question that was correctly criticized by Losovsky (in 1926—not today!): "The united front with one's self. A quite noteworthy formula which unfortunately corresponds to the fact in some cases. It is the result of the tactic of self-isolation. Since in many cases it is only too difficult to bridge the cleavage between the social democratic and Communist workers, the attempt is made to choose conveniently the line of least resistance, that is, instead of building the united front with the workers of other tendencies, the united front between Communists in various organizations is set up. But this is not one and the same thing, or to speak more exactly, absolutely not the same thing." (Communists and Trade Unions, Berlin, 1926, page 65.) The Party cannot pass off as a genuine attempt at united front activity a conference composed of the unions directly controlled by the Party, plus the regular standbys — from Party-controlled singing societies to swimming clubs.

The Party is wrong in arbitrarily withdrawing left wing minority groups or organizations from the A. F. of L. for the purpose of achieving temporary and illusory "victories", instead of stubbornly fighting for their retention in the old unions as a militant opposition. It was wrong to withdraw the left wing millinery workers' locals from the A. F. of L. union and add them to the Needle Trades Workers Industrial League Union, without continuing the fight bitterly against the expulsion tactics of the Zaritskys. It is wrong tactics to split off the Elizabethton local of the United Textile Workers Union instead of organizing it as an opposition nucleus within the U. T. W. to fight against the fakers and for the unification of the textile workers. The slogan for the Communists is Unity. The responsibility for all splits and division must be placed squarely and indisputably on the reactionaries. The Resolutions and Decisions of the Second Congress R. I. L. U. (Profintern) says: "Insofar as there are in the reformists unions organized

minorities in sympathy with the C. G. T. U. (the French left-wing union) the latter should not create rival organizations. The adherents of the R. I. L. U. should systematically organize their groups within the reformist unions and should carry on a struggle for unity within and without." This holds good today. Jouhaux is neither better nor worse than Sigman or Green.

THE NEEDLE TRADES SITUATION

The Party is wrong in the course it pursues at the present stage of the struggle in the needle trades. The position of the left wing union in the present "strike maneuvers" of the right wing union is practically a boycottist attitude. The left denounces the maneuver as a "fake stoppage" and says that if a strike takes place, it will call upon its supporters to walk out also and to proceed to the left wing union headquarters. What the left wing should do now, however, is to begin to agitate for a strike and for united action on the part of both left and right unions to win that strike. If the left wing is capable of rising to its tasks it will mobilize the sentiment of the workers in the ranks of both unions and those who stand outside of either union. That is the path towards uniting the workers and at the same time strengthening the left wing. That the right wing fakers will not want to unite will only make it worse for them. Here again the Second Congress of the R. I. L. U. says: "In their attempt to extend and internally strengthen the revolutionary organizations they should always bear in mind that their chief task is to organize concerted actions of all workers' organizations.... To take into consideration that in countries in which there are several trade union headquarters, every action of the workers, particularly in the event of the general strike, is threatened with great danger, if the trade unions will not fight jointly. Therefore, the revolutionary trade union officials should take upon themselves the initiative to create the united front." This line was correct then and is now.

All these proposals and criticism may sound strange and novel to the fascinated adherents of the new Stalin-Losovsky line. All that is strange about it is the facility with which the Stalinist Parties have discarded the Leninist tactics.

THE YOUNG PLAN

The Dawes Plan placed a rope around the necks of the German masses. The Young and Morgan Plan, through the International Bank of Settlements, aims to extend and tighten this rope around the necks of the workers throughout the world.

The Young Plan replaces and extends the Dawes Plan for the payment of reparations by the German Government to the Allies and the United States Government. The German capitalists of course pass on the payments to the German toilers. The total amount of reparations to be paid and the time in which they are to be paid is definitely fixed in the Young Plan. This was not the case with the Dawes Plan.

Approximately \$400,000,000 a year is to be paid by the Allies to America for a period of 58 years, from August 31st, 1929 to March 31st, 1988, to cover the debts contracted by the Allies to the United States in the World War.

How German Workers must be squeezed.

The Plan calls for special payments in the first 37 years by Germany of an amount totalling \$7,826,868,000. The grand total to be paid by the sweating German masses, including the past five months under the Dawes Plan, is 36,996,000,000 Marks (about \$8,879,040,000).

The new and important feature in connection with the payments of the reparations and the war debts and the future plans is that a special institution, the International Bank of Settlements, is thereby set up through which all payments by Germany are to be made instead of directly to the Governments involved as hitherto. It will take the place of the existing machinery for the reparations collections. 65 percent of the payments will go to cover war debt payments to the United States by the former Allies; the other 35 percent will go to repair war damages, chiefly in France. The International Bank of Settlements will transfer the German marks paid by the Reich into credits for the account of the central banks of England, France and Italy. These nations can then draw on such credits for payment of their debts to the United States Government. The resources of the German railroads are pledged for Germany's payments.

Formally the United States has no hand in the entire matter; it concerns only the "Europe Powers". Actually the United States Government, carrying out the will of Wall Street, is the main force that has brought about the new plan and the International Bank, and it will use every agency at its command to enforce action and payments.

The Bank is meant to be a permanent institution which will continue to exist after the reparations have been disposed of. That is only its initial business. After wringing Germany's neck by controlling its foreign exchange and production it is meant to spread farther. It is meant to become a real factor in world trade. Its profits are expected to run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

A Center for World Exchange.

While it is transferring the billions of German marks into Germany's payments on the reparations accounts, it will endeavor to gather for itself business in other exchanges and to become the logical handler of most of the world's exchange business. Morgan, Young and Company no doubt intend that it shall become an institution controlling most of the gold of the world. To begin with it has, according to the report, 500 million dollars worth of marks to sell annually, and it is expected that an odd \$400,000,000 annually will be transferred to Washington. This in it-

self is a tremendous lever; the control over such movements of wealth is not to be minimized.

Formally America is not directly represented on the board of directors. England on the other hand plays a very prominent and formal role in the International Bank. England helps to collect reparations: America "only" receives. That England plays such a role is evidence that English capital aspires to continue as a major financial world power. That the United States plays its game indirectly shows its confidence over the situation and its real power. It also serves to establish somewhat the present relation of forces between the two greatest capitalist powers now contesting for the control of the world's available markets.

The International Bank, seemingly is to act as an ordinary bank conducting commercial, industrial and economic undertakings. But the formation of such an international institution at this time cannot be separated from the present world situation of economic, financial and political instability for capitalism. Capitalism also undoubtedly has in mind, through the International Bank, to draw the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics into its orbit as one of the few remaining markets of consequence. What capitalism could not accomplish through military intervention and war up till now it hopes to achieve through the pressure of international economy. The imperialists also hope by the new plan to draw Germany away from the Soviet Union and to unite more closely all countries against Russia. Thus the possibilities of a war offensive against the Soviet Republics are increased. The military threat is inevitably coupled with the economic threat and pressure against Russia.

False Hopes for Stabilization.

The authors of the International Bank hope to stabilize the shaky capitalist economy, exploit more intensively the existing markets and reorganize the existing and available ones under domination of Wall Street. The Plan itself says quite plainly:

"In the natural course of development it is to be expected that the bank will become an organization, not simply or even predominantly, concerned with the handling of reparations, but also with furnishing to the world of international commerce and finance important facilities hitherto lacking."

"It is to be hoped", says the Plan, "that it will become an increasingly close and valuable link in the cooperation of central banking institutions generally — a cooperation essential to the continuing stability of the world's credit structure."

So say and hope Morgan and Company. But "stability" for the capitalists is multiplied misery for the workers. The last word is yet to be spoken and it will be spoken by the workers. The International Bank cannot solve the problem of new markets. The United States and Britain cannot absorb all the gold and payments in kind that are to be made. The International Bank in due time will only aggravate the crisis of capitalism and compel the working class of the world to fight for its overthrow. The exposure of the Young Plan by the Communists and the struggle against it are a necessary part of the preparation for this.

TROTSKY THE MILLIONAIRE

"For these lies and calumnies the English pay to Trotsky hundreds of thousands of dollars." — Rojkov, "a Russian worker", in the Daily Worker, June 3, 1929.