

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 poignantly 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 Musters 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 blind 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 to-day!): "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 reformist 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 Stalinized 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 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.