

The Eleventh Plenum of the Comintern

From the point of view of political ignorance, stupidity and ideological cretinism it is indisputable that the Tenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the C. I. broke all the records. The ridiculous theories of the "third period" (social fascism) the "ingenious" evaluation of the revolutionary situation in France surpassed everything that the party could have conceived of as platitude and theoretical decadence.

The Eleventh Plenum has abandoned the theories of the "third period". It has forgotten the "revolutionary situation" in France and recalled social fascism only in a very feeble voice, all of which may be counted as an ideological victory for the Left Opposition. Yet, the resolutions of the Eleventh Plenum give ample proof of the theoretical ignorance and the confusion that exists in the minds of the present leaders of the C. I. For whoever is not familiar with the history of the Comintern during the last few years, but is sufficiently familiar with Marxian methods, it is enough to go through the resolutions of the Eleventh Plenum to find innumerable contradictions in them and to be convinced of the low ideological level of the present leaders of the Executive. We shall occupy ourselves at length with these resolutions.

The Estimation on the U. S. S. R.

What does the Soviet Union represent at the present moment? A socialist state, or a Socialist society? Has the U. S. S. R. already entered into a period of socialism? That is the main question to which we shall reply. During the last few years the bureaucracy has been crying from the house-tops that the U. S. S. R. has entered into socialism. The Eleventh Plenum retreats in this question to which it replies: "In the U. S. S. R. the construction of the foundation of socialist economy is being completed."

Here the question arises: What do the foundations of socialist economy consist of? A house in which the foundation is socialism, but which needs walls and a roof. In a general way, Marxism assumes that the foundation of a socialist society is to be found in capitalism developed to its highest stage; without this, socialism is impossible. It is the task of the proletariat to transform the social structure of capitalist economy, by proceeding through various stages by means of the proletarian dictatorship with a methodical organization of economy leading up to a socialist society. From this it follows that those who claim that in the U. S. S. R. the foundations have been completed thereby say that no great progress has been made over capitalism, which is like saying nothing at all. In reality, Leninism has never pictured the development of socialism as a vertical development, but rather as a development step by step. In "The State

and the Revolution" the development of Communism is presented as follows: (a) war Communism; (b) Socialism; (c) Communism. This is the way Lenin pictures the development by stages. After the proletariat conquers power, it cannot immediately conduct the entire economy, that is, it cannot instantly institute socialism. It nationalizes the most important factories, then it extends this action to the minor industries and after it sets itself the task of socializing agrarian economy. That is what is going on in the U. S. S. R. and this would continue with ever greater success, if the leadership were to analyze the situation as it actually is. That is why the only correct formulation is that of comrade Trotsky on the nature of the Soviet state: "The U. S. S. R. has entered the first stage in the development of socialism". The formulation of the Eleventh Plenum is theoretically impotent, it is the formulation of people who have been frightened away from their slogans of yesterday, when they were speaking of having entered into socialism, at a time when milk was lacking for the children and for whom they had to justify their bureaucratic adventurism.

The Colonial Question in China and in India

Which class leads the liberation movement of the colonial masses in the colonies and the backward countries? The proletariat, allied with the peasantry and leading it, defeats the power of the ruling classes, fights against foreign imperialism, against native capitalism, against reaction and, supporting itself upon the peasantry, it institutes the proletarian dictatorship by means of the Soviets. This is what Lenin taught us. But Stalin has revised Lenin, presenting as an example of the Soviet system, the institution of Soviets in the agrarian regions in China. He has thereby declared that the peasantry can play an independent rôle and organize itself a Soviet government that will lead to the socialist reorganization of China. The Eleventh Plenum goes still further: "Due to the manifest experiences of the masses in the Soviet provinces, the Soviets and the red army, which have issued forth from the agrarian revolution, draw into the struggle the industrial centers." Not only is the peasantry, then, an independent class, but it is the class which actively directs and organizes the proletariat! It is clear that we have here a new theory that breaks completely with Leninism. It is pure Stalinism . . . And we may rest assured that the originators of this theory have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. They do not understand its importance for the development of the colonial movements. But here we find a second point which completely destroys the peace of this dilemma, and that is the estimation on India: "The acquisition of the leadership of revolutionary liberation movement of the masses by the proletariat is at present the most important condition for the victory of the Indian revolution." Then, it is not the peasantry any more that leads in the revolutionary liberation movement; but the proletariat. But in what is India less favored than China? Why can the peasantry lead the revolution in China but not in India? Is Stalinism justified in China? Where is the difference? In the specific weight of the proletariat? Or in the character of the peasantry? Up to the present we do not know of any political and social differences aside from the fact that in China Stalin already has been able to ally himself with Chiang Kai Shek whereas in India that has not yet happened.

(To be Continued)

NCING

nt Revolution TROTSKY

e published by the
Publishers

ent on a much-disputed question

Paper cover — 50c

by check or money order made out
last 10th St., New York City.
ers. Special prices in bundles.

The Eleventh Plenum of the Comintern

(Continued from last issue)

On the question of social-fascism, the resolution says:

'Wherever the Communists apply mechanically the correct tactic of class against class' without taking into account the level of the Communist movement, wherever they identify fascism with social-fascism, the social-fascist leaders with the social democratic workers, the Communists weaken their independent leadership of the class struggle . . . thus permitting the social democracy to maneuver by simulating a struggle against fascism (Austria, Poland) and to deceive the masses who follow them.'

In this formulation, there is an open avowal that the identification of fascism with social-fascism was an error that cost the Communist movement dear. Could it be otherwise?

The social democracy is beyond dispute a petty bourgeois wing and the assistant to the bourgeoisie, serving it as a powerful weapon in the struggle against the revolutionary proletariat. Fascism is also a wing of the bourgeoisie, even though of a different type put forward by the bourgeoisie also to battle against the proletariat but under different conditions. The social democracy is the party of the petty bourgeoisie which supports itself primarily upon the labor aristocracy and upon its great influence among the poor strata of the proletariat. Fascism is a petty bourgeois and of functionaries, and possesses an influence among broad strata of the middle peasantry.

These two petty bourgeois movements, in spite of the fact that they support each other subjectively and objectively, sometimes collide because of the diversity of their composition, the differences in their ideological traditions and the methods with which they support the bourgeois regime (bourgeois democracy or dictatorship). The duty of the Marxists is to make clear these differences and not to hide them, for otherwise we might arrive at the conclusion of a monolithic bourgeois class, without internal struggles without competition in the struggle for national and international struggles.

The pitiful results, not only of the bad application, but of the theory of social-fascism in general, proceed from the fact that every worker sees, even by observing daily life, that in spite of all the Communist arguments, in spite of the name of social-fascist acute struggles still break out between the two parties—fascist and social democratic. The fascist party destroys the headquarters of the social democrats and their newspapers, arrests them sometimes, and even tortures and kills them. The worker revolts against this, but the Communist movement does not draw him towards it because, thanks to its ridiculous theory of social-fascism, the Communist party refuses to fight together with the social democracy against fascism at the moment when this becomes a vital necessity for the proletariat. (An investigation conducted by the central organ of the German Communist Party, the **Rote Fahne**, among the Social democratic workers showed the correctness of our contention. To the question: "What prevents you from joining the Communist party?", many workers replied: "I am for you but against the theory of social-fascism.")

What is responsible for the negative results of our work?—The bureaucrats of the Eleventh Plenum of the Comintern reply: "It is the workers who do not understand." They do not want to acknowledge that at the moment when they drew the parallel between fascism and social democracy, they drove towards the identification of fascism and social democracy that is, of the social democratic workers and the fascists.

The casting of the responsibility for the bad application upon the national sections is nothing but a retreat in the theory of social-fascism. But as always, it is upon the ranks that the responsibility is cast.

The bureaucracy is afraid of the truth like an ape of his image, so as not to see its own incompetence, otherwise it would have seen that the weakness of the Communist movement does not reside in the ranks. But the bureaucracy is loyal to it-

self. For every mistake made it immediately finds a formula which frees it of responsibility. In the long run, it always finds a scapegoat (like Molotov, for example) in order to crawl out of a bad situation.

Among other stupidities they never forget to take a kick at the Russian Opposition:

"The work of constructing socialism has finally destroyed all the hopes of the capitalist world, and the 'predictions' of the Trotskyists on the degeneration of Soviet economy into capitalist economy."

Here as everywhere, the bureaucracy fights against the Left Opposition by the solitary means of falsehood. Did the Left Opposition foresee a degeneration of socialist economy into a capitalist economy? Yes, but on one condition: that the policy of Stalin and Bucharin of the years 1926-1927, that is, the policy of "socialism at a snail's pace" be applied. It is Stalin and Bucharin who fought for this policy and slandered the Opposition as agents of the bourgeoisie because of their proposals for industrialization.

Does the Left Opposition today still see a danger of degeneration of the Soviet Union? Yes it sees dangers in the proportions between the different branches of industry (which is sometimes directed by concealed Mensheviks) and in the extraordinary strengthening of the apparatus.

Besides this, the disappearance of the control of the party masses is also a great danger. The degeneration and the replacement of the socialist economy of the U. S. S. R. by a capitalist economy is related above all to the militancy of the proletariat and of its vanguard in the U. S. S. R. as well as outside of it.

The greater the vigilance shown by the C. P. S. U. the closer will be the decisive victory of the proletariat.

The Left Opposition saw all the dangers and called them to the attention of the international proletariat. It will continue to do it, without looking forward to eulogies from the narrow bureaucrats of the Eleventh Plenum but in the interests of the world proletariat. —JANIN.

For your Library

Books

By Leon Trotsky

THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

A Criticism of Fundamentals

Introduction by J. P. Cannon

140 pages hard paper cover 35c

THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

Introduction by Max Shachtman

86 pages, two-colored paper cover 25c

TURN IN THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE GERMAN SITUATION

30 pages, paper cover 10c

WORLD UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE FIVE YEAR PLAN

Introduction by Arne Swabeck

22 pages, paper cover 10c

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION

30 pages, paper cover 10c

COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM The Trade Union Question

Introduction by James P. Cannon

64 pages, paper cover 15c

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

208 page book—cloth bound 1.00

paper cover .50

THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA

Introduction by Max Eastman

364 page book, formerly \$2 now 1.00

MY LIFE—600 pages 5.00

SINCE LENIN DIED

By Max Eastman

158 page book printed in London

1924

50

Special Rates in Bundles of 5 or more

Order from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

84 East 10th Street

New York City