

Doonping on China

Charlatanism as a Cover for the Concealment of Adventurism

There is no other way to characterize the article "The Rising Revolutionary Wave and Trotsky Liquidation in China" by R. Doonping in the March issue of the "Communist" than as charlatanry and falsehood. It is not a polemical contribution written by someone convinced of his point of view—right or wrong—or of a confused revolutionist, but a piece of cheap slander, bought and paid for. That it can disgrace the pages of even so rotten a review as the "Communist" is a pitiable commentary on the theoretical abyss into which Stalinism is dragging our movement.

What Should Not Be Forgotten

When a supporter of the Stalinist policies in China dares to proclaim and defend them publicly against the views—confirmed a thousand times over—of the Opposition, at the same time spewing his slanders upon Trotsky who was chiefly responsible for shaping a course towards Bolshevism in China, it is first of all necessary to repeat a number of plain facts, which all the squirming of the bureaucrats will never down:

1. Stalin-Bucharin-Martynov were the principal props for Chiang Kai-Shek until the very last moment. The Opposition demanded that the Communists break with Chiang Kai-Shek and warned in advance—not after the fact, Doonping, but in advance—against his certain betrayal.

2. Stalin and Co. subordinated the Communist Party to Chiang Kai-Shek and the Kuo Min Tang. Under Stalin, the Chinese Communist Party, in a written document pledged itself not to criticize Sun Yat Senism. Under Stalin, the Chinese C. P. declared that it had differences "only in matters of detail" with the bourgeois Kuo Min Tang. Under Stalin the Chinese Communist Party was made to obey the discipline and decisions of the bourgeois K.M.T. The Opposition demanded—in time, not after the C. P. had been drowned in its own blood—the freedom of action, the political and organizational independence of the Chinese C. P.

3. On the very eve of the moment that Chiang Kai-Shek was entering Shanghai with his army to let loose a horrible reign of terror against the Chinese workers, Stalin was crushing the Opposition in Moscow because it declared that Chiang would soon show himself to be the Chinese Gallifet. Stalin then declared that "we will still go a long way with Chiang Kai-Shek" (March 1927). At the moment that Chiang Kai-Shek was beginning the slaughter of the Shanghai proletariat the French Communist Party sent the K. M. T. a telegram greeting the entry into Shanghai as the "Chinese Commune".

4. When the Hankow government of Wang Chin-Wei and Co. was formed, Stalin praised it as the "only revolutionary center" as the organizer of the agrarian revolution (no less)—only to have it appear in its full stature of strangler of the proletariat and peasantry a brief few weeks later. The Opposition again demanded—in time!—a break with the Wang Chin Weis and the formation of Soviets.

5. Stalin concealed the crying facts of the suppression of the labor and trade union movement in China, the curbing of the peasant sections, so as not to antagonize, first Chiang, then Feng Yu-Hsiang, finally Wang Chin Wei. The Opposition had to make these facts public in secret and illegal documents.

6. Stalin and Bucharin sent telegrams to the Chinese Communists demanding that the brakes be put upon the peasants movement. The Opposition demanded that it be driven forward in collaboration with the revolutionary movement in the cities.

Chinese Soviets: Now and Then

7. The official brakemen of the Chinese revolution opposed the formation of Soviets when the revolutionary wave was rising and raised, instead, the slogan of a constituent assembly. The Opposition was for the formation of Soviets, at the proper time, when it meant setting tens of millions of workers and peasants into motion for the capture of power.

8. Stalin raised the slogan of Soviets for China only after the crushing of the Chinese proletariat and peasantry, after the physical annihilation of the Chinese Communist Party to his ally Chiang Kai-Shek, because he could not and cannot distinguish the face of a revolution from its rump. The Opposition, pointing out only what idiots and blind men cannot see—that the counter-revolution has triumphed in China—has raised the slogan of the constituent assembly for China as a transitional slogan that will revive the mass struggle and lead to the victorious issue of the third Chinese revolution, to the dictatorship of the proletariat which supports itself upon the masses of peasants.

This criminal record of the official apparatus must never be forgotten.

Now for Mr. Doonping's dishonest article. His two main contentions are that "Trotsky sees no revolutionary perspective in China", i. e., that he is a "liquidator"; and that China still stands before a bourgeois democratic revolution, i. e., not before the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now how does Doonping draw the conclusion that Trotsky sees no revolutionary perspective in China? Because "the theoretical root of Trotsky's mistakes is his erroneous theory of 'permanent revolution'." So Trotsky is an advocate of the "permanent revolution", that is, of the democratic revolution developing into the socialist revolution, of the flow of the class struggle rising steadily towards a higher and broader stage. If that is true (and it is) where does his "liquidationism", his "lack of revolutionary perspective" fit in? Doonping intimates that it is demonstrated in Trotsky's opposition to the slogan of Soviets at the present period, his opposition to the guerrilla warfare endorsed by the Stalinists, in his advocacy of transitional democratic slogans. Where does the one flow from the other? If the Communists do not raise the slogan of "Establish the power of the Soviets" in, let us say, Turkey, does this indicate the absence of a revolutionary perspective? Or, conversely when the Stalinists, breaking with all the teachings of Marxism and Leninism and the experiences of the revolutionary movement, carry thru in China a policy of "Communist" Makhnolism, of adventurist, self-exhausting guerilla warfare, does that prove these perverters of Marxism to be the best revolutionists?

So that Doonping's conscious falsification of Trotsky's position may be adequately understood we quote from the latter's article, "China and the Constituent Assembly":

Trotsky on the Constituent

"China is not passing through a revolution now but rather a counter-revolution. During such a period, the slogan of Soviets can have meaning only for restricted cadres by preparing them for the third Chinese revolution in the future. This preparation obviously has an enormous importance. To accomplish it, the slogan of Soviets must accompany that of the proletariat's struggle for the dictatorship at the head of all the poor masses of the population, and above all, of the poor peasants. But, besides the preparation by theory and propaganda of the revolutionary cadres for the revolutionary future, there still remains the question of mobilizing as broad as possible workers' circles for active participation in the political life of the period we are traversing."

This is not understood at all by the Stalinists. For their criminal opportunism of yesterday they substitute an equally criminal adventurism today. With the working class crushed, the revolutionary movement decapitated, the order of the day is headed, for them, by the... immediate struggle for power.

But not even for that! The Chinese proletariat has been forbidden to fight for power by the leaders of the Comintern. In China, says Doonping, the task of the moment is the struggle for the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasant-

ry, because says our feeble-minded Marxist, the remnants of feudalism dominate the economic life of China, like the "remnants" of Doonping's Kuo Min Tangism dominate his thin "Marxist" veneer. This can mean nothing but a repetition of the debacle of Hankow. For what else will this democratic revolution look like? What will be its state form? What class will direct it? What will be its social program? Not a word about this. To speak of the democratic revolution after Nanking, after Hankow, and particularly after the experiences—negative though they were—of the Canton Soviet which proclaimed the socialist dictatorship, is to place a "legal" prohibition upon the Chinese proletariat to fight for power and lay the basis for a recurrence of the crimes of Stalinism in the Chinese revolution of 1925-27.

Doonping's Defense of Browder

Two more words on Doonping. He ardently defends Earl Browder from our comrade Charlie Bryne, who in an issue of the Militant, once called Browder "Stalin's Yankee Priest in China". Comrade Bryne spoke more truly than he spoke. And here is the fact. When the nationalist government left Canton for Wuhan, the general Li Ti Sin carried out a coup d'Etat in Canton (December 1926-January 1927). The workers were disarmed. The Canton Committee of the Kuo Min Tang, led by Left wing elements, was dissolved at bayonet point. The workers' groups that protested were hunted down mercilessly and driven into illegality. Yet, after this reactionary action, the delegation of the Comintern, composed of Browder, Tom Mann and Doriot, visited Canton, were received by the butcher Li Ti Sin, and were banqueted and toasted by him without a word of the meekest protest from them against the slaughter of workers. That is the beginning and the end of Browder's revolutionary record in China.

And now, who is Doonping himself that he presumes to teach Marxism and Leninism to Trotsky and the Opposition? He began his revolutionary education in a Chinese bourgeois university, and improved it as a student in Rockefeller's University of Chicago. During the whole period of the Chinese revolution, he was a member and ardent supporter of the Kuo Min Tang, and an opponent of Communism. After the defeat of the revolution, he joined the Communist Party and was forthwith sent to the Far Eastern University in Moscow to absorb the latest brand of Stalinism. Fearless revolutionist that he was, he resisted violently the proposals that he go to China for Communist work, calculating that a head on the shoulders in Moscow is worth two on the ground in Canton. He even wanted to quit the Far Eastern University to return to comfortable America. He was finally granted his heart's desire. To perfect his 100 percent Bolshevik education (Stalin style) he entered Murray Butler's Columbia University where he is now completing his studies—in Marxism, we suppose. In the cozy calm of the university campus, is he not just the man selected by destiny to teach the Opposition the fundamentals of Marx and Lenin?

KLORKEIT (CLARITY)

MONTHLY ORGAN IN THE JEWISH LANGUAGE OF THE LEFT COMMUNIST OPPOSITION

This 16-page paper is of special interest to all Jewish-speaking workers! Number 1 is already out and contains:

Lenin's Testament, articles by Leon Trotsky, A. Senin, I. Obin, "Emil", and others

Ten Cents a Copy
One Dollar a Year

Order from
The Militant
25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

In the Soviet Union

And the Kulak?

MOSCOW—

In a recent number of "Soviet Siberia" one finds a decision of the Executive Committee of the Regional Soviet where, among other things, it says: "Kulak holdings destined to be liquidated are divided into two groups: 1. The active Kulaks, among the richest, who must be deported to distant localities, and 2. all the remaining Kulaks who will be left within the limits of their respective districts but who will be put out and distributed over other grounds outside of the limits of the collective farms." This "liquidation" of the Kulak by means of Article 58 and by administrative measure reminds me of the plan of the late Stambulsky ("peasant" prime minister of Bulgaria killed by the fascists) to "uproot entirely" the Communist evil by means of a complete deportation of all the Bulgarian Communists (at that time they counted about 38,000) to the desert islands of the Black Sea littoral or to any other kind of deserted locality. As you see, in this field also our Centrists steal their "ideas" from others, in this case from a petty bourgeois prime minister of Bulgaria.

Voronezh versus Tomsk!

Now for some news. The leaders and semi-leaders of the capitulators have been distributed throughout the U.S.S.R. On this subject, Radek has reflected thus: "Surely L. D. will exclaim: Let Radek tell us now which is better—Tomsk or Voronezh! Ah! it must be admitted that L. D. was right in his foresight. But what can you do... There is no way out, no way out..."

Three deported Oppositionists were arrested at Schtchedrinsk. They are accused of "having received directives and of spreading them". Quite simply, they are threatened with "solitary" for having corresponded with comrades in a spirit which is not that of the capitulators. With such an accusation, the Centrists can arrest the whole population of the deportees. Moreover that is just what they are beginning to do, for recently four comrades were arrested at Tomsk and shipped to Nizhni-Sibirsk. They would like to finish us off for the Sixteenth "council".

How is your letter of November concerning the "possible or inevitable concessions to the class enemy in the realization of the Five Year Plan" to be interpreted? What concessions are you speaking about? Up to where will these concessions go? Perhaps you will write us in detail your opinion on this matter. It would be very useful. As for me, personally, it seems that being given the situation, after all the Centrist madness in the country, the return to the positions of our Platform runs the risk of being interpreted as a concession. But since since they cannot go further, I am for such a concession, that is, for the recall of the measures which have led to the "generalized mess". I mean the "generalized collectivization" accompanied by accusatory "comments".

I am against the "switching" of small agriculture on to the "socialist" rails in one or two years, because I believe that such a switching will yield absolutely nothing and because I think the theory of socialism in one country is false. I am against the monstrosities accomplished by the light-hearted Centrists in the country, which make the Kulak a martyr for the "peasant" cause. In a word, I am for the concession that would consist in a return to the position of our Platform. Is that the kind of concession you speak of in your November letter? Write us about it!

(Note of the Editors: That's it exactly.)

NTW YORK—Thousands waited in line from 11 p. m. to 9 a. m. and broke glass doors at civil service commission offices to sign up for street cleaning jobs at \$6 a day that will not materialize for a year.

Read the announcement on page two of this issue on the campaign for subscriptions to the Militant. You can help yourself to get a free copy of Trotsky's autobiography or two other books of vital interest by helping the Militant. Read it over and ACT!