

May, 1942

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Bulletin of the Provisional International Contact Commission

Please Reprint

**SOCIAL FORCES IN THE INDIAN
REVOLUTION**

**TROTSKYISM, LEFT FLANK OF THE
REFORMISTS**

SOCIAL FORCES IN THE INDIAN REVOLUTION

Now that the Japanese imperialists are in India (Burma is for all practical purposes a part of India); now that the "left" office boy of British Imperialism, Sir Stafford Cripps, has been rushed to India, everybody becomes absorbed in the subject. It is to the credit of the International Contact Commission that almost two years ago it raised the fundamental problems of Indian social development. In the article "Problems of the Indian Revolution" (International News, May 1940) these basic questions were posed and analyzed. Abstractly there is very little to add, but reality, and particularly revolution, is never abstract. The events of the past few weeks compel us to supplement the previous article, and to modify it in one important respect. Before proceeding to do this, however, it is necessary to call attention to the vital role of the Indian Revolution in world politics.

IMPORTANCE OF THE INDIAN REVOLUTION

Already in the previous article, reference was made to the importance of India. Since December 7, 1941, this has greatly increased. The China of Chang-Kai-Shek has become a part of the imperialist front of England and the U. S. In addition, the Chinese Revolution has

been so disintegrated by Stalinism since 1927, that it is more probable than otherwise that the revival of the Chinese Revolution will have to come from the outside.

When it is considered that China has a population of 400 million, and India of 319 million, the significance of the Indian revolution spreading to China, and embracing also the East Indies becomes quite apparent. In addition a successful revolution in India would put an end to the series of defeats suffered by the proletariat since 1923, would serve as a stimulus to the revolutionary movement everywhere, and would have an immediate effect in stirring the masses of the Soviet Union.

Thus, it can be seen that the question of the Indian Revolution is one that is of the greatest importance for the world revolution. In order to properly understand the forces in India, however, it is necessary to consider the Indian situation from the standpoint of world economy and politics. Any attempt to consider the problems of India only within national limits would be theoretically incorrect, and practically, could only lead to a disastrous outcome. We shall therefore first discuss the imperialist antagonisms.

India has become the center of a fight not

only between the Anglo-American imperialists on the one side and the Axis imperialists on the other, but also of another fight within each of the respective camps. For a long time before the war, India was the scene of a vast conflict between American and English imperialism. One instance of this readily suggests itself to the reader, in the price war between Standard Oil and Royal Dutch Shell. In this conflict, England, having the political power in its hands, had the inner track on the U. S.

The assault of German imperialism upon the British, and the menace of complete destruction of Britain as a world power, has led to a turn of the tide in favor of the U. S. For this reason, we find American imperialism moving quickly to secure a position for itself by means of dominion status, or even "independence." For some time past, American imperialism has been supporting the Nehru group in the National Indian Congress. To this there is now added the dispatch of a special mission to India under Henry Grady. At the same time, it is endeavoring to win over the Indian bourgeois nationalists by promising them more material support against Japanese invasion than can be given by Britain.

Confronted with the menace of conquest of India by Japan, England has to resort to desperate measures. But these desperate measures cannot go so far as the surrender of India. The direct drain of Indian economy in favor of Britain amounts to almost a billion dollars a year. In addition, the indirect drain, through the usual imperialist methods, amounts to very much more. English finance capital, therefore, cannot give up India without a struggle.

CRIPPS — SOCIALIST AGENT OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM

In desperation, it resorts to the services of the "left," Sir Stafford Cripps. A personal friend of Nehru, a so-called radical in the Labor Party, Cripps can be much more effective in endeavoring to hoodwink the masses than could the too-well-known reactionary Churchill. In this connection it is significant that after the Atlantic conference which formulated the Eight Freedoms, Churchill distinctly stated that the application of these freedoms would cause no change in the status of India. So a "left winger," had to be tried to do the dirty work of the British bankers.

But even Cripps will go no further than promise changes after the war, together with the inclusion of certain members of the Congress into the government. More than this he cannot do, because as a millionaire lawyer representing his client the trade union bureaucracy, he realizes that the basis of the past bribery of the English labor aristocracy and bureaucracy has been the plundering of India. He will have to go further in words and also in job concessions than in the time of the last war, because all classes in India still vividly remember the post-war betrayal.

Nevertheless a definite limit is set for Cripps. He cannot even arrange for immediate dominion status. The formula that will be used for the refusal, will be that important elements of Indian social life are not agreed on independence or dominion status. These "important elements" will be a handful of Indian princes, and a few Moslem and Hindu stooges, connected with the Moslem League and the Hindu Mahasabha. Thereupon this unctuous representative of British finance capital and its "labor" pensioners, will declare that India is not yet ready for independence or immediate dominion status.

GERMAN-JAPANESE ANTAGONISM

But the conflict within the alliances is not confined solely to the Anglo-American antagonism. Asia, and particularly India, is the great prize of the present war, as we have long pointed out. The startling successes of Japan after December 7, have put her in a position of dominance temporarily. Germany has no desire to see this condition maintained. What Germany fears is an attempt by Japanese imperialism to consolidate its gains and strike some sort of bargain with America. Japanese imperialism has too weak a financial and industrial basis to consolidate its hold on Asia, but could act (because of its objective position, not its desires) as a viceroy for a stronger finance imperialism.

Probability, therefore, is that we shall see in the immediate period an endeavor by Germany to break through Russia, Turkey, or Egypt, or all three simultaneously, in a drive towards western India. The Nazi strategy calculates that if this could be done and a junction effected with the Japanese in India, then the superior resources of German imperialism would be decisive in the economic sphere.

Upon the basis of the above conflicts of

world imperialism, the internal forces of India must be studied. The class forces in India in the order of their rank are as follows. (1) The princes and other feudal elements; (2) the Indian possessors of potential capital; (3) the Indian bourgeoisie; (4) the upper petty bourgeoisie; (5) the lower petty bourgeoisie, particularly the peasantry; (6) the proletariat. We shall examine the role of each.

1. The princes play no independent role at all in India. They are completely subservient in all but name to British imperialism, and form the surest bulwark for it. Their sole policy is to maintain a completely parasitic existence under the protection of British guns. In their hands, however, are immense tracts of land and a great store of riches.

SOCIAL BASIS OF INDIAN "LIBERALISM"

2. We have made use of the term, "possessors of potential capital." This awkward phrase is used for lack of a simpler and shorter description. English industrial capital, from the time of the East Indian Company, seized upon control of all Indian economic life and completely dominated it. This is perhaps more true of India than any other colonial possession. As a result one finds that the Indian stockholders of industrial companies are nearly always minority stockholders, completely subject to the British majority. This condition pre-determines their political role.

The so-called Liberal Party, led by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, is representative of this group. All they seek is an opportunity for expansion within the limits of British imperialism and a lessening of restriction to the extent that they could proceed to establish independent enterprises. Forced by the objective situation and the pressure beneath them, this group was compelled a few weeks ago to address the famous letter to Churchill. The very fact that this became necessary for such people, is proof of the extent to which India is boiling. The conditions of life of these people prevent them from making even pseudo-demands, and for all practical purposes they can be counted in the same category as the princes.

CLASS SIGNIFICANCE OF GHANDIISM

3. The Indian bourgeoisie is a peculiar class. As pointed out above, there is practically no large industrial bourgeoisie. Ghandi is a representative of this group. Like the first two categories, the main interest of this group is in preserving the status-quo, keeping the mass-

es in check, and advancing their own interests within the framework of British imperialism. A fuller analysis has been given in the International News, May 1940, and there is now very little to add.

The only significant addition that can be made, is the recent Gandhi plea to the British government not to carry out the scorched earth policy in case of invasion by Japan. The cloven hoof of the Indian bourgeoisie sticks out here very plainly. Gandhi is an integral part of the British imperialist machinery, and the crisis of British imperialism has so manifested itself in Gandhism that Gandhi has been obliged to retire in favor of the "left" Nehru.

The social motivation is two-fold. First, Gandhi (and when we speak of personalities we speak of them as symbolizing classes) is unable to pursue any other than a straight British imperialist policy; and second, he gives best assistance to British imperialism by holding his advocacy of "non-violence" in reserve until it can be used in an attempt to stem the revolutionary activity of the masses. Such has been his role throughout his entire history.

The form and substance of his wisdom at the present time is expressed in the contemptible slogan, "Do not stab Britain in the back," and by his declaration to the Gujarat council of the Indian National Congress, that although he believes in non-violence, it is not obligatory upon the members of the Indian National Congress!

GHANDI, NEHRU — AND BOSE

4. Economically there is no great difference between the Ghandis and the Nehrus. The followers of Nehru in general are the upper peasantry. Nehru and Gandhi have taken upon themselves a tacit division of labor, in that Nehru blusters about complete independence while Gandhi retires to the background. That Nehru will repeat his usual capitulation to Gandhi, as he did at the time of the Delhi Pact and before, goes without saying.

This is not so much due to personal characteristics of Nehru, as it is to his class basis. The congenital vacillation of Nehru is the embodiment of the social vacillations of the upper peasantry, which desires more room for the exploitation of the Indian masses, but is afraid to play with fire. From this group can be expected wordy denunciation and bluster, and then a rotten compromise with Cripps on

the basis of the inclusion of some members of this group in a new governmental set-up. The opposition to British rule, however, in this group will not disappear, as it is backed by American finance capital, which will attempt to bolster it up to a point of at least continuing the struggle for dominion status.

Breaking away from Gandhi and Nehru, but not on a personal basis, Bose has succumbed to a new version of the theory of the "lesser evil." Springing from the Bengal terrorist school, lacking the power of social analysis, and animated by a hatred of British imperialism emotional rather than reasoned, Bose has become the tool of German-Japanese imperialism. He represents in India roughly the same social forces as Wang-Chin-Wei in China. The Bose ideology is most dangerous and must be combatted by the Marxists, exposing its roots and fighting it in practice. It is the classic example of "imperialist defeatism," as opposed to revolutionary defeatism.

PEASANTRY NEED LEADERSHIP

5. The vast masses of peasantry, and that means the overwhelming majority of the Indian population (287 out of 319 million), is a classic example of the truth of the Marxist thesis that the peasantry cannot play an independent role. It must follow either the bourgeoisie or the proletariat. To follow the bourgeoisie in India today, means to yoke itself to one of four imperialisms.

The peasantry, if it is to exist in the most literal physical sense, must have the land of the princes and feudal landowners. In addition it must have a government capable of satisfying its irrigation needs. Still further must it have a government which will supply it with the products of industry in return for the products of agriculture. Under present conditions of imperialist war, and aggravated capitalist decay, such a government could be none other than a proletarian dictatorship.

"All talk about a "workers' and peasants' state" or "democratic dictatorship of proletariat and peasantry" is vain, for the basic reason that the peasantry is incapable of pursuing an independent role. This leads to the modification to which we referred earlier. Under the conditions of a revolutionary situation, the former slogan of the constituent assembly (as an **auxiliary** to the struggle for workers and peasants councils) now becomes a reactionary slogan capable only of meeting the political needs

of the Indian bourgeoisie and American finance capital.

WORKERS MUST LEAD

6. The proletariat. The leading role of the Indian revolution must and can only be taken by the Indian proletariat. Small though it is in numbers, it is nevertheless the only class that is capable of waging a struggle to the end against all forms of imperialism.

It has a telescoped task at the present time. It must organize and build its **own class party**, the Marxist party, which will enable the proletariat to act as an independent class, giving leadership to the vast Indian masses while opposing petty-bourgeois vacillations. And at the same time it must carry through a **SOCIAL REVOLUTION**, of which the tasks of colonial liberation and agrarian revolution are the first phase. Only in this way can it drive the British oppressors into the sea, seize the lands of the princes and feudalists, nationalize the land and take over the banks and industrial institutions.

To do this the Marxist Party must counterpose to the imperialist-dominated political set-ups to the call for a Constituent Assembly (which also has the support of the centrist Trotskyites)—the call for the building of Workers Soviets and Peasants Committees. This will be the dual power, which when the proletariat has won hegemony over the broad masses and has smashed the bourgeois political structure, will become the sole power in India, the proletarian dictatorship in alliance with the peasantry. Towards this goal of bringing control of the wealth of India into the hands of Indian toilers, they must build a Red Army, that will safeguard the achievements of the Indian Revolution against the imperialists of England, Wall Street, Germany and Japan at the same time it crushes the internal counter-revolution.

NEED MARXIST PARTY

It should be emphasized that this is not a broad, general perspective, but a matter of the immediate future. The pre-conditions for revolution set forth in the International News, May 1940, have matured. If these objective conditions are combined with the subjective condition of a Marxist Party, then there can be not only an Indian Revolution, but also a breakdown of the war front of the exploiters, and the beginning of what will later be the final conflict.

TROTSKYISM, LEFT FLANK OF THE REFORMISTS

History has known on dozens of occasions, cases of parties who adhere to old labels and old phrases, only to be filled with entirely different contents. Thus Stalinism still pays lip homage to Lenin, only the better to preach social-patriotism. Thus Kautsky in the last war spoke incessantly of "international socialism," only to shield his support of capitalism and the counter-revolution against the Soviets. Thus German social-democracy, in its famous August manifesto in the first war, attempted to cover up its voting for war credits with the militant ending, "Long live the Proletarian Revolution."

Although centrist forms vary, and the groups expressing its ideology originate at different points of the political compass, it is everywhere the same **in content**. Phrases of opposition to reformism, imperialist war, the bourgeois state, combine with actions of support; and just as reformism is the left flank, the left cover of the bourgeoisie, so centrism of all shades is the left wing, the left cover of the reformists.

TROTSKYISM AND KAUTSKYISM

The most "left" form of this tendency today, and the most dangerous as a force of disorientation, is the international Trotskyist movement. Originating within the Left Opposition, which despite errors was the Marxist wing of the Communist International after Lenin, it has degenerated into a centrist movement combining the most flagrant opportunism with Marxist phrases.

The comparison of the Trotsky movement with Kautskyism, at one time was merely a typical Stalinist slander; today, unfortunately, it is correct. As Lenin said of Kautskyism, so it can be said of Trotskyism, "The danger of (this tendency) is that utilizing the ideology of the past, it energetically attempts to reconcile the proletariat with the 'bourgeois labor parties,' to maintain unity, and in this way retain their authority." "One of the most widely spread sophisms of Kautskianism consists in their reference to 'the masses.' We do not want, they say, to break away from the masses and mass organizations..."

The basic theme of Trotskyism's errors is manyfold, but for our purposes we present these errors from the central theme that (according to Trotskyism), the proletariat and the Marxian Party must **FIRST** support some intermediate regime of CAPITALISM before it can **THEN** struggle for socialism. There must first be a **TRANSITION** before we can even begin the fight for socialism.

In a word: **FIRST** we fight for bourgeois democracy, and the national revolution, and **THEN** we go over to the struggle for the struggle for the proletarian revolution.

THE LABOR PARTY

"To sum up," wrote the Trotskyists, in the Socialist Appeal, September 1936 issue, "A labor party, then, like any other reformist party, is not merely non-revolutionary, but **ANTI-REVOLUTIONARY**. It is a device for preserving capitalism, not means for its overthrow. It is a mighty obstacle in the path of the revolutionary movement, not a boost forward."

Every word is correct. But in 1942 the central plank of the Trotsky "opposition" to war is precisely support of this "anti-revolutionary" Party, this "device for preserving capitalism," this "mighty obstacle in the path of the revolutionary movement". The argument for this support is ever the same: the masses will be in the Labor Party, therefore we must support it.

But the masses today support Roosevelt. Must we then, too, bow to the illusions of the proletariat? Or on the contrary, shall we pose the **INTERESTS** of the class as our first consideration? If the Labor Party is a bulwark to revolution, we must fight it at every step, we must try to stop it from being organized, must refuse to support its candidates, and so on.

But Trotskyism? It supports the **intermediate** stage whole-heartedly and with minor criticism. It advocates militantly the organization of an "independent Labor Party". Once this "anti-revolutionary" Party is formed, the Trotskyites will then be able the better to expose it from within. Cannon and his crew thus become not

builders of proletarian revolution, but architects of new and better Frankensteins.

First we build an obstacle to proletarian revolution; **first** we help organize an anti-working class movement; and **then** — always later — we shall expose it. Truly a fascinating game — but infinitely more profitable for the capitalists than for the proletariat.

TAIL-END NATIONALISM

In 1939 Leon Trotsky proposed that the Ukraine secede from the Soviet Union, and set up an independent nation. He argued that there are strong nationalist currents and sentiments in the Ukraine, and that "only a direct and bold posing of the Ukrainian question in the given concrete circumstances will facilitate the rallying of the petty-bourgeois and peasant masses around the proletariat just as in Russia in 1917".

To win over the Ukraine for proletarian revolution — for the extension of the revolution to the parts of the Ukraine not now in the Soviet Union — it is necessary, according to Trotsky, **FIRST** to accept the reactionary slogan of the Ukrainian nationalists and petty bourgeoisie, and **then** we can extend the proletarian revolution to the Ukrainian parts now under capitalist rule. "The unification of the Ukraine **PRESUPPOSES** freeing the so-called Soviet Ukraine from the Stalinist boot". Instead of extending proletarian opposition that may exist in the Ukraine throughout the Soviet Union, and thus re-democratize the Soviet State and oust Stalinism, Trotsky proposes that **FIRST** we must yield to Ukrainian nationalism.

This capitulation to the backward nationalist movements and backward nationalist reactions of the masses, has been carried still further — to France!

"The fight for national liberty," says a resolution of the French Trotskyites, quoted in the March, 1942 issue of the U. S. Trotskyites' theoretical organ, "in no way conflicts with the profound internationalism of proletarian socialism... the only progressive solution of the European problem is intimately bound up with the fight for national liberation... The aspiration of the masses to national liberty is a profoundly healthy reaction... We have nothing to gain by joining in the demonstrations by students of the monarchist 'Action Francaise' against

the Boches, if we are not strong enough to oppose these by expressions of fraternization with German workers in uniform. Admittedly our tactics on the national plane is not simple and demands much flexibility. But those who through fear of mistakes refuse to take actual part in any movement not purely proletarian, have understood nothing of Leninist policy."

CONFUSE ADVANCED AND BACKWARD NATIONS

Again the same argument: First we must participate in the struggle for "national liberation" (although we must guard that this nationalism does not become DeGaulist), and **THEN** the proletarian revolution. In fact the struggle for nationalist liberation is part of the struggle for socialism! What hopeless confusion! Before 1917 that was correct. But nationalism and all nationalist movement **TODAY** can only be reactionary movements to preserve capitalism, can only be obstacles on the road to socialism, can only be agents of one imperialist group or another. Trotskyism speaks about imperialist France, not India or China. They confuse nationalism in a country that long ago had its bourgeois democratic revolution, with a backward colonial country.

In an article on the war, J. P. Cannon states that "first of all... they (the German masses)" must "be guaranteed against a second Versailles." To arouse the German masses it is first necessary to win over the nationalist elements who fear Versailles. **Then** we will have enough allies to begin the fight for proletarian revolution.

On the Negro problem the Trotskyites favor "the right of self-determination" if the Negro masses want it. The C. L. A. (Left Opposition) opposed this slogan of Stalinism.

They give open support to China in the imperialist war, even though the Chinese bourgeoisie are only puppets of American and British Imperialism in the much larger struggle for world domination.

In India today, Trotskyism advocates a nationalist Constituent Assembly. Its concept of the role of the workers' and peasants' councils in the Indian revolution, is merely as an auxiliary, to "put pressure" on the constituent assembly (see resolution quoted in their "Fourth International." Many bourgeois liberals could

support this nationalist program — so long as the workers' and peasants' councils are considered only as "pressure" groups.

But this support of nationalism is linked with something even more pernicious: it is indissolubly tied to support of a "left people's front," of a left capitalist government — which will be a "step toward" the proletarian revolution.

LEFT PEOPLE'S FRONTISM

History has shown how "left" governments, by disarming the masses, demoralizing, deluding and miseducating them, pave the way for the right arm of capitalism. France and its Blum government is an excellent example. At the Riom Trial, Blum proudly boasted that "I saved France from civil war," from proletarian revolution. These "left governments" are last resorts of the bourgeoisie THROUGH THEIR LABOR LIEUTENANTS AND WITH THE AID OF THE REFORMISTS AND CENTRISTS, to check the working class before it goes over to revolutionary struggles. They are the most pernicious obstacles to proletarian revolution the bourgeoisie has yet developed; in fact are part of the strategy for the imposition of the open dictatorial rule. Thus a Kerensky was needed to pacify the masses, until a Kornilov could organize his counter-revolution (which fortunately failed). A Blum was necessary to pave the way for Daladier and Petain, and a Bruening to pave the way for Hitler.

But Trotskyism learns nothing from all this.

"We must support even rotten bourgeois democracy" against fascism, said Leon Trotsky, regarding the struggles in Spain. On that premise, they supported the Loyalist government "with criticism," they offered it material aid, and frantically shouted for a "left" form of that government, a "Caballero-CNT" government. In France, a few years before, they called for a "Blum-Cachin," a socialist-stalinist government.

LABOR GOVERNMENT

The crowning point of this political fiasco, however, is the present cry of the Trotskyites for a "Labor Government" in Britain, a government of the social-patriotic, reactionary and anti-revolutionary British Labor Party WITHIN the framework of capitalism. Presumably if the Labor Party takes power, Cannon and Goldman will have some excellent opportunities to write "brilliant" polemics on how to conduct

the war so as to make it a "genuine struggle against fascism."

Theoretically, all this is part of the Trotsky concept of a "Workers and Farmers government," which is a transition to the Proletarian Dictatorship — in plain political English, a People's Front without the terminology of People's Frontism.

The Road to Power, for the Trotskyites, requires first of all the propping up of capitalism, either by support of its nationalist elements or its labor lieutenants. First we must "save" bourgeois democracy; then — that ever mythical "then" — we will fight for the proletarian revolution.

Stalinist reformism also promises Socialism — but only after we first save capitalism in the present war. The difference between two opportunist groups, Stalinism and Trotskyism (this is no attempt at turning a pretty phrase) is merely a matter of political degree and of time element. Trotskyism will openly support capitalism when the open agents are eliminated, the Democrats and Republicans, the Conservatives, etc. Stalinism supports the whole structure in advance of this step — which to our thinking is more consistent opportunism.

THE WAR

Finally, let us inquire into the Trotsky war program.

"In the midst of the war against Hitler," writes Cannon, "it is necessary to extend the hand of fraternity to the German people." Excellent, but how. "This can be done honestly and convincingly only by a Workers and Farmers government... Such a government and only such a government can conduct a war against Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado in co-operation with the oppressed peoples of Germany, Italy and Japan."

Beautiful words, but absolutely devoid of Marxian content. Can a "Workers and Farmers Government" of the Labor Party type, such as advocated by Cannon for Britain and such as is actually in power in Australia, can such a government conduct the war "honestly and convincingly?" Yes, honestly and convincingly — for the bourgeoisie.

Are the Trotskyists for the struggle of the masses for international workers solidarity? No, on the contrary, says Cannon, capitulating to the propaganda of the capitalists who do

business with the "enemy" even in war, "we do not sabotage the war or obstruct the military forces in any way." While the cliques of finance capital dragoon and bewilder the masses into support of the war of plunder, "we have no choice but to submit to the decision that has been made." Since the masses have been bulldozed, "We must submit to that majority in action."

"Turn the imperialist war into a war against fascism" is the new Trotsky slogan. Train the working class at capitalist expense under trade union control. For military conscription "under trade union control." The Trotskyites are for a revolution — but not in America, only in Germany. The German Trotskyists — what is left of them — just to be consistent, are for a nationalist revolution in Germany, for support first of a movement of national liberation, and not for proletarian revolution. Instead of opposing the war on the position that the imperialist war must be turned into a civil war, against "our own bourgeoisie," Trotskyism is for the war with two conditions:

OBJECTIVE SUPPORT OF WAR

1—That it be organized and led by the left reformists and centrists, instead of the open reactionaries.

2—That it be prosecuted against the capitalist nations that have the fascist form of government.

"We must defend even rotten bourgeois democracy," says Trotskyism.

First the "war" against fascism (by Wall Street and Downing Street), then proletarian revolution. First everything in capitalism that is reactionary in democratic form and aimed at placing obstacles in the path of revolution, only providing it is demagogic and has a left sugar covering so that it can be exposed. Then — well, then we will talk of other things.

Trotskyism in its flights into abstract politics still talks of proletarian revolution, socialism,

Leninism, etc., etc. But in its moments of practical politics, it proposes the most dangerous program of action TO PRESERVE CAPITALISM. This program is all the more dangerous precisely because it shields itself in the mantle of Lenin and Trotsky (in Trotsky's better days) and precisely because it uses these left abstractions.

Trotskyism like Kautskyism in the last war has become a festering centrist wound on the political body of the proletariat. Far beyond its present meager numbers, it is an ideological threat that must be reckoned with, because as sure as the sun rises every morning, that ideology will be used to fight the proletarian revolution.

We know, of course, that the coffee clutches will wave all this aside, with the great fact that Cannon and Goldman and Morrow have been convicted by bourgeois democracy of "conspiring to overthrow the government." But this fact in itself has no more significance than if the RWL were to try to "prove" the correctness of its theory merely by the fact that Oehler and Negrete were jailed in Spain, or that the POUM is a revolutionary Marxian organization because Andres Nin was murdered by the Stalinists, or that the French Socialists are revolutionists simply because Leon Blum is now being tried in Riom. The arrest of the Trotskyites in Minneapolis has its own logic and every revolutionist will defend these class war prisoners; but the very line of Trotskyism was still further watered down by the behaviour of these individuals in the trial, by their further shift to the right.

In the hands of Cannon and Company the convictions themselves become a further smokescreen for revising Marxism. The concept of "first" bourgeois democracy and "then" revolution, is merely reformist action cloaked in the usual ambiguous centrist terminology. It is a concept of bourgeois democracy first, last, and all the time.

Volume 4, No. 3

Price 5 cents — 50 cents a year

Issued by the R. W. L. for the International Contact Commission.

Affiliates

Central Committee of the Red Front of Germany

Revolutionary Workers League of U. S.
Leninist League of Scotland

Mail address of publishers

Demos Press, Office
708 N. CLARK ST.
Chicago, Illinois

Printed in the United States

Voluntary Labor