

Its TASKS and its DANGERS

Manuilskys and Kuusinen will perhaps answer that they now talk about the dictatorship of three classes (workers peasants and the city petty bourgeoisie) and not four as it was in China where Stalin had so happily attracted to the bloc his ally, Chiang Kai-Shek.

If so, we reply, then make an effort to explain to us why you reject the national bourgeoisie in India, that is that ally for the rejection of whom in China you expelled Bolsheviks from the Communist Party and then imprisoned them? China is a semi-colonial country. In China, there is no powerful caste of feudal lords and feudal agents. But India is a classical colonial country with a mighty heritage of the feudal caste regime. If the revolutionary role of the Chinese bourgeoisie was deduced by Stalin and Martinov from the presence in China of foreign oppression and feudal remnants, then for India each of these reasons should hold with doubled force. This means that the Indian bourgeoisie, according to the exact basis of the program of the Comintern, has immeasurably more rights to demand its inclusion in the Stalinist bloc than the Chinese bourgeoisie with its unforgettable Chiang Kai-Shek and the "true" Wang Chin Wei. And if this is not so in spite of the oppression of British imperialism and the whole heritage of the Middle Ages, the Indian bourgeoisie is capable only of a counter-revolutionary and not a revolutionary role—then condemn mercilessly your treacherous policy in China and correct immediately your program in which this policy has left cowardly but sinister traces!

Who Will Lead the «Bloc»

But this does not exhaust the question. If in India you construct a bloc without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie, then who will lead it? The Manuilskys and Kuusinen will perhaps answer with their characteristically gentle ardor: "The proletariat, of course!" Good, we answer, it is quite complimentary. But if the Indian revolution will develop on a basis of a union of workers, peasants and the petty bourgeoisie; if this union will be directed not only against imperialism, feudalism, but also against the national bourgeoisie which is bound up with them in all basic questions; if at the head of this union will stand the proletariat, if this union comes to victory only by sweeping away the enemies through armed uprising and in this way raises the proletariat to the role of the real all-national leader—then the question arises: in whose hands will the power be after the victory if not in the hands of the proletariat? What is the significance in such a case of the democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants in distinction to the dictatorship of the proletariat leading the peasantry? In other words: in what way will the hypothetical dictatorship of the workers and peasants be distinguished in its type from the actual dictatorship which the October revolution established?

There is no reply to this question. There can be no reply to it. By this course of historical development the "democratic dictatorship" has become not only an empty fiction but a treacherous trap for the proletariat. That slogan is correct which admits the possibility of two diametrically opposed explanations: in the sense of the dictatorship of the Kuo Min Tang and in the sense of the October dictatorship! There can be nothing in between these two. In China, the Stalinists explained the democratic dictatorship twice, at first as a dictatorship of the Kuo Min Tang of the Right, and afterwards of the Left. But how do they explain it in India? They are silent. They are compelled to keep silent for fear of opening the eyes of their supporters to their crimes. This conspiracy of silence is actually a conspiracy against the Indian revolution. And all the present extremely Left or ultra-Left noise does not improve the situation one iota for the victories of the revolution are not secured by noise and clatter but by political clarity.

But what has been said does not yet unwind the tangled yarn. No. Here is precisely where new threads are twisted in. Giving the revolution an abstract character and permitting it to be the dictatorship of the proletar-

iat only after some sort of a mystical or mystifying "democratic dictatorship" is established, our strategists at the same time reject the central political slogan of every revolutionary democratic movement, which is precisely the slogan of the Constituent Assembly. Why? On what basis? It is absolutely incomprehensible. The democratic revolution signifies equality to the peasant—above all equality in the distribution of land. On this is based the equality of rights. The Constituent Assembly, where the representatives of the whole people formally draw the balance with the past and the classes actually draw the balance with each other, is the natural and inevitable combination of the democratic tasks of the revolution not only in the consciousness of the awakening masses of the peasantry but also in the consciousness of the working class itself. We have spoken of this more fully with regard to China and we do not see here the necessity of repetition. Let us only add that the provincial multifariousness of India, the variegated governmental forms, and their no less variegated bond with the feudal caste relations, saturates the slogan of the Constituent Assembly in India with a particularly deep revolutionary democratic content.

The theoretician of the Indian revolution in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at present is Safarov, who with the price of a happy capitulation transferred his injurious activities to the camp of Centrism. In a programmatic article in the *Bolshevik* about the forces and tasks of the revolution in India, Safarov carefully circles around the question of the Constituent Assembly just like an experienced

rat circles around a piece of cheese on a hook. This sociologist does not by any means want to fall into the Trotskyist trap a second time. Disposing of the problem without much ceremony he counterposes to the Constituent Assembly such a perspective:

"The development of a new revolutionary ascent on the basis (!) of struggle for the proletarian hegemony leads to the conclusion (whom? how? why?—Ed.) that the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in India can be achieved only in the Soviet form." (*Bolshevik*, 1930, No. 5, page 100).

Amazing lines! Martinov multiplied by Safarov. Martinov we know and about Safarov Lenin said, not without tenderness: "Safarchik will go Leftist, Safarchik will pull boners." The above-mentioned Safarovist perspective does not invalidate this characterization. Safarov has gone considerably Leftist and it must be admitted that he did not upset the second half of Lenin's formula. To begin with, the question of the revolutionary ascent of the masses of the people develops "on the basis" of the struggle of the Communists for proletarian hegemony. The whole process is turned on its head. We think that the proletarian vanguard enters or is preparing to enter or should enter a struggle for hegemony on the basis of a new revolutionary ascent. The perspective of struggle, according to Safarov, is the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. Here, for the sake of Leftism, the word "democratic" is shaken off. But it is not said frankly what kind of a dual composition dictatorship this: a Kuo Min Tang or an October type. But for that we are

assured on his word of honor that this dictatorship can be accomplished "only in the Soviet form". It sounds very noble. Why the slogan of the Constituent Assembly? Safarov is ready to agree only with the Soviet "form".

The essence of epigonism—its contemptible and sinister essence—lies in the fact that from the actual processes of the past and its lessons it abstracts only the bare form and converts it into a fetish. This is what has happened to the Soviets. Without saying anything about the class character of the dictatorship—a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat, like the Kuo Min Tang, or a dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, like the October?—Safarov lulls somebody and primarily himself, by the Soviet form of the dictatorship. As if the Soviets cannot be a weapon for deceiving the workers and peasants! What else were the Menshevik-Social Revolutionary Soviets of 1917? Nothing but, a weapon for the support of the power of the bourgeoisie and the preparation of its dictatorship. What were the social democratic Soviets in Germany and in Austria in 1918-1919? Organs for saving the bourgeoisie and for deceiving the workers. With the further development of the revolutionary movement in India, with the greater swing of mass struggles and with the weakness of the Communist Party—and the latter is inevitable with a Safarovist muddle prevailing in its mind—the Indian national bourgeoisie itself may create workers and peasants Soviets in order to direct them just as it now directs the trade unions, in order thus to slaughter the revolution as the German social democracy, by getting at the head of the Soviets slaughtered it. The treacherous character of the slogan of the democratic dictatorship lies in the fact that it does not close tightly to the enemies, once and for all, such a possibility.

The Apotheosis of Confusion

The Indian Communist Party, the creation of which was held back for six years—and what years!—is now deprived, in the circumstances of revolutionary democratic ascent, of one of the most important weapons for mobilizing the masses, precisely the slogan of the democratic Constituent Assembly. Instead of that, the young Party which has not yet taken its first steps is inflicted with the abstract slogan of Soviets as a form of abstract dictatorship, that is, a dictatorship of nobody knows what class. It is truly an apotheosis of confusion! And all this is accompanied as usual with disgusting coloring and sugaring of an as yet difficult and not in the least sweet situation.

The official press, particularly this same Safarov depicts the situation as if bourgeois nationalism in India is already a corpse, as if Communism has either gotten or is getting at the head of the proletariat, which, in its turn, is already almost leading the peasantry behind it. The leaders and their sociologists, in the most conscienceless manner, proclaim the desired as the existing. To put it more correctly, they proclaim that which might have been with a correct policy for the past six years, for what has actually developed as a result of the false policy. But when the inconsistency of the inventions and realities are revealed, the ones to be blamed will be the Indian Communists, as bad executors of the general inconsistency which is advanced as a general line.

The vanguard of the Indian proletariat is as yet at the threshold of its great tasks and there is a long road ahead. A series of defeats will be the reckoning not only for the general backwardness of the proletariat and the peasantry but also for the sins of the leadership. The chief task at present is a clear Marxist conception of the moving forces of the revolution, and a correct perspective, a far-sighted policy which rejects stereotyped, bureaucratic prescriptions, but which, in the accomplishment of great revolutionary tasks, carefully adjusts itself to the actual stages of the political awakening and the revolutionary growth of the working class. May 30, 1930.

Some Stalinist Activities in Czecho-Slovakia

The struggle of the Centrists against the Left Opposition Communists develops its own objective logic. Where there is default of principled policy, there precarious maneuvers arise, where revolutionary integrity is throttled, bureaucratic slander flourishes. Where the capacity to think is bankrupt, crude violence is the substitute. The Stalinists in Russian do not hold back from the abuse of revolutionary justice against the Opposition proletarians and likewise they do not hesitate in Western Europe to make a united front with the police against Opposition worker-Communists. The facts are strong enough in themselves to make every commentary superfluous. We draw the attention of the workers to the following facts.

The Soviet Diplomats and the Police

A delegation of Communist workers made a demand upon the representatives of the Soviet Union in Prague, Arosew, for an explanation of the shooting of Blumkin. He thereupon alleged that he would make a direct inquiry of Moscow. After several futile interventions this successful Communist declared in the course of a debate on being driven into a tight corner by a worker, that the shooting of a Communist did not come within his diplomatic "jurisdiction". The comrades, on leaving the building, were surrounded by secret service men, detained and subjected to a severe cross-examination: the above-mentioned worker was then arrested. The bold Arosew had displayed his finished diplomatic "art" having arrived at a secret understanding with the bourgeois police for the handing over his Party comrade to them.

A "Communist" as State Attorney

Some time ago, two worker-Communists, members of the Opposition who had a long revolutionary past behind them, were hailed before the bourgeois court on the charge of having distributed illegal leaflets of the Opposition. As they belonged to the Red Aid, a comrade demanded that they supply a lawyer for their defense. The latter, a certain Dr. Eartoschek, refused to assume the duties of defense counsel as soon as he learned that it was a "counter-revolutionary Trotskyist" who was up on charges. Apart from the formal aspect of the affair, that is, that he was an official of the Red Aid who was supposed to defend every worker against the persecutions of class justice, the following is noteworthy: These

were two Communists who had been hailed up for their revolutionary consciousness and activity, for their struggle against imperialism, and for the revolutionary defense of the Soviet Union (the leaflet they distributed left no doubt on that score). But still they were at the same time Oppositionists and therefore this would-be Communist Attorney, who is a leading member of the League of the Rights of Man, the Anti-Imperialist League, the Anti-Fascist League, etc., simply refused to take up the defense and stood by passively while these workers were being condemned to jail. A sorry picture indeed!

How the Workers Think

The bureaucrats have also not hesitated to exploit the confidence of the workers and their belief in the authority of the Comintern and the Russian workers' state. Under these colors they have often enough tried to rouse a pogrom sentiment against the Opposition. But the deeper one penetrates into the Party ranks, the more evident it becomes that the rank and file of the workers have a strong aversion to beating up their fellow workers. In Zizkov, one of the working class quarters of Prague, our comrades arranged a discussion evening on the lessons of the Canton insurrection. A Party official who learned of this meeting, thought that the best method of carrying it on would be by smashing in Opposition workers' heads. He demanded at one Party meeting that energetic measures be taken to break up our meeting. But the workers have their own opinion and were guided by their own instinct. Not a single man among them signified his assent to the proposal of the bureaucrats. Prague, June 17, 1930. —JAN



PUBLIC WARNING!

We note with alarm that Stalin's first public unleashing of Karl Radek (*Inprecorr*, No. 23, page 505), for the purpose of throwing a stink-bomb at the Opposition's standpoint in India, is immediately accompanied by a deviation! In the very second paragraph of his article, Citizen Radek speaks of "the so-called third period". What does he mean "so-called" third period? We demand that he be compelled to issue a new statement of error, and that forthwith. Why should he be any more privileged than Kameney?