

The Civil War in Chile

Motive Forces Behind South American «Revolutions»

(Continued from last issue)
 The "socialist" and "anti-imperialist" mask of Davila and his former companion-in-arms, Marmaduke Grove, served the one purpose of derailing the working masses from their genuine struggle. This demagogic also found an echo in the Right wing Lovestone group, which declared at the time, that "Radical Rising in Chile Triumphs" and that "Davila Establishes Anti-Imperialist Regime". It is not strange at all that the Lovestoneite opportunists should fall for all the demagoguery of Chile's bourgeoisie. They can't be expected to see further than their nose. They have in their time seen such "radical" and "anti-imperialist" movements in the antics of Chiang Kai-Shek, Calles, Obregon, Sandino, etc.

But the "revolutionary" flirtations of Davila and Co. cannot divert the conscious proletariat. Davila and his "socialist" phraseology are not even a novelty for us. For Ibanes (whom Davila represented as ambassador to Washington), when he came to power, used a more or less analogous ruse. He also spoke about "anti-imperialism" and national reformism. But his anti-imperialism was directed against the British imperialists alone (whom his predecessor, Alessandri, had served) and in favor of American imperialism. His national reformism became concretized in throwing the whole weight of the crisis on the shoulders of the working class.

For lack of information, we cannot devote ourselves sufficiently to the role played by the official Communist party in the latest events. We shall return to that subject on another occasion. From the information we can get through the bourgeois and the local Communist press, it appears that the party did not attempt a repetition of its putschist tactics, pursued at the time of the revolt of the navy. If this is so, then the party acted quite correctly, for the situation, nationally as well as on the whole continent, is not at a ripe for an insurrection of an independent character.

In order to understand better the problems of the Chilean revolution we shall give a brief account of the social forces in Chile. The proletariat of the towns and countryside, about 400,000 in number, quite considerable in proportion to the population of the country—about 4,000,000—has not yet assimilated the ideas of Communism and still remains subject to great confusion. This is due in large part to the enormous ideological shortcomings of the official party. The working class movement of Chile is one of the oldest in Latin America. It is known for its strong spirit of militancy and for its abounding revolutionary energy. But very often, due to its ideological backwardness, its revolutionary energy is exploited for the interests of alien class forces, as demonstrated to a certain degree by the latest events.

The Communist party is also one of the oldest parties of Latin America and today the strongest, enjoying a great deal of influence over the working class. But it is still very far from being able to give the necessary leadership to the revolutionary proletariat. For it is itself at a low ideological level. The membership as a whole, as well as the leadership are lacking in a theoretical base. The leadership in its big majority is composed of confused revolutionists and petty bourgeois radicals. In this respect it is worth while mentioning that the situation in the other Latin American countries is not much better and in some even worse. A great share of the responsibility for this state of affairs rests upon the Stalinist leadership of the Communist International. This bureaucratic international leadership, with its national socialist base resulting in the practical abandonment of the international revolutionary movement—Latin America included—contributes predominantly to the retardation and the disorientation of the Communist forces in these countries. Opportunism and adventurism have their deep roots inside the Chilean Communist Party. And where was the Chilean party to learn otherwise? From the rotten maneuvers of Stalin-Bucharin with Chiang Kai-Shek in China and with Purcell, Hicks and Co. in the Anglo-Russian Committee? From the great wisdom of the "third period" which completely overlooked the revolution in Spain and instead put the insurrection on the order of the day in France? No, the teachings and the tactics of Stalin-Manuilsky-Molotov could not help the Latin American parties rid themselves of the ulcers of opportunism and adventurism. On the contrary, they only helped to perpetuate them.

Even greater than in the fields of daily struggle, is the confusionism on the question of the character of the revolution. In the thesis presented by the South American Bureau of the Communist International on the situation in Chile, there is talk, in reference to this question, of the "agrarian and anti-imperialist" revolution and the "workers and peasants" revolution. This vital and central revolutionary problem is treated with the greatest confusion and ambiguity by the S. A. B. as well as by the whole Stalinist press of Latin America. It is only a logical consequence, since they are part and parcel of the Stalinist apparatus in the C. I. which is responsible for the presentation of the problem of the revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries as a problem of the "democratic dictatorship of the workers and the peasantry". This slogan, which has been recovered from the "museum of Bolshevik relics" (to which Lenin had relegated it with just those words), at first applied to countries whose national economy bears an agrarian character, is today being employed by the Stalinists, not only for such countries, but also for highly developed industrial countries (like Germany or the United States). The Leninist slogan of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, which carried the Russian revolution to victory and which alone can achieve its victory on an international scale, is taboo for all the Latin American Stalinists.

Without a clear view of the character of the revolution, the Communist movement will not be able to progress in the methods and tactics of struggle. The equivocal formula of the "agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution" can only lead our parties to a repetition of the Calles-Obregon policy of our Mexican party and the "Bloques Obreros y Campesinos" in other countries. All these also flowed from confusionist policies of the anti-Leninist leadership of the C. I. and its scandalous "auxiliaries" like the Anti-Imperialist League, which considered Mexico under the Calles regime a country "where the process of the liquidation of feudalism is being realized and which endeavors to create its own economy in spite of imperialist designs" (resolution on Latin America at the Anti-Imperialist Congress of Brussels).

We have seen to what extent the Stalinist concept of the "anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution" in Mexico has disarmed our party ideologically. The same danger exists for all the young and

weak Latin American parties. Its continued propaganda spells disaster for the development of the revolution in South America. There can be no intermediary revolution. Neither in Chile, nor on the Latin American continent, nor in any other part of the world for that matter. There can be only two forms of rule—the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie of Latin America is as backward and non-socialist as in the rest of the world, and therefore cannot participate at the present stage of history as a leading force in society. It can either turn to reaction and go with the bourgeoisie or follow the proletariat along the road of revolution. It is necessary to end the illusions and the idealization of the peasantry. It is necessary to take a Marxist position on the agrarian problem, so as to be able to adopt a correct revolutionary line in the development of the class struggle in Latin America. Such a position requires the recognition of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat on a national, on a continental and on a world scale.

In conclusion. The latest events reflect the existence of wide spread intranquility among all social groups and the sharpening of the class struggle in particular. The bourgeoisie is not able to solve the crisis, which determines the changes in the government cliques and which helped carry Davila into power. The misery and the starvation of the producing masses of the cities and the countryside remain as before. The personal dictatorships, or even Fascist dictatorships, no matter what sort of demagoguery they employ, will not be able to revive the carcass of the semi-colonial capitalist system in Chile. All the fundamental problems stand unsolved and are increasing in acuteness. The contradiction will take on even a sharper character in the future.

This opens up broad perspectives for the Communist party. But in order to be able to take advantage of this extraordinary, favorable situation for a progressive development of the Communist forces, it is necessary to have a clear view of the problems of the revolution, not only of Chile, but of the Latin American continent in particular and the international situation in general. It is necessary to adopt a correct strategy and tactic by coordinating and systematizing the Communist activities on a continental scale, since the triumph of the revolution in Chile depends upon that in the most important countries of Latin America, as an integral part of the world revolution. That necessary strategy and tactic can only be elaborated on the basis of the theory of the permanent revolution.

—ALBERTO GONZALEZ.

FIRST MEETING IN ANTHRACITE

The first meeting of the Left Opposition in that part of Pennsylvania will be held on Sunday, July 24th at 3 P. M., in Luzerne, Pa., the heart of the anthracite coal fields. The meeting will be held in the Italian Reunited Hall, in which comrade Max Shauchtman, editor of the Militant, will speak on "The Crisis in the Communist Movement". This will be the first opportunity of the workers in that territory to hear the viewpoint of the Left Opposition expressed from the platform. Admission is free to enable the maximum to attend.

What Is Happening in the Soviet Union

Behind the scenes of the Stalinist apparatus a deep-going process is at work undermining the "monolithism" of the leading group which is narrowing down ever more threateningly the personality of Stalin. The official party press naturally maintains a censor-bound silence on what is going on in actuality. The present letter will give our readers an insight into some of the significant events taking place.

The chief characteristic of the present situation, particularly in the mood of the party, is the disquieting indeterminateness. The causes for it are ingrained in the international situation, and the economic manifestations as well as the subjective mood of the party. During the last years, the center of gravity in the party shifted ever higher and higher. The smaller the party became distended, the more became the number of individuals that preserved an influence on the life of the state. In the course of a few years everybody was tutored by the young Comsomol (member of the Y. C. L.) retainers in the apparatus refer to the C. C. with semi-ironical smirks; the matter, you see, rests not with C. C. but with given individuals and groups within the apparatus.

The first two years of the five year plan undoubtedly uplifted the self-esteem of the upper crust and strengthened the personal authority of Stalin. Our papers reprinted the references of the foreign press to the successes of the industrialization and to its organizers. There is no doubt that this exerted its influence on sufficiently wide circles. The highest crest of this wave can be considered, if you please, the moment of the trial against the Mensheviks. It would be incorrect to explain away their confessions and repentances by cowardice alone. The more honest among them were undoubtedly under the influence of the successes in industrialization and collectivization.

THE ALL-EMBRACING COLLECTIVIZATION

But, comparatively speaking, from this same time the situation in food stuffs and necessities begins to sharpen acutely. The all-embracing collectivization represented in itself an extremely contradictory process. Very considerable strata of the peasantry went into the collective farm approximately in the same state of mind with which the unemployed flock into the community soup-kitchens. With only this difference, that in capitalist community kitchens are expended philanthropic crusts of capitalist profits, whereas within an important number of the collective farms the basic capital was eaten up. At the present moment the bureaucracy of the People's Commissariat of Agriculture reckons—secretly, of course,—that only 10% of the collective farms have become firmly established, while the remainder cannot be taken into account. It is quite possible that this is an exaggeration to the other side; a disenchanted bureaucracy is none too bashful in its dealings with statistics. But it is indubitable that the grandiose utopia of an all-embracing col-

A Letter from Moscow

lectivization of the peasantry has suffered in the course of two or three years an equally grandiose defeat. This fact enters in an ever increasing scale into the consciousness of the entire nation, and dominates more and more the consciousness of the nation.

All our crises and difficulties following after October 1917 had one and the same profound source: the absence of the jointure or the instability of the jointure between the city and the village. The vacillations in the matter of collectivization (dizziness, and then pulling oneself out of it only to be followed by new dizziness) meant for the hundred-millioned village, commotions on a grandiose scale. Here the revolution reached out to the deepest roots of the national-economic life. The bureaucracy perpetuated everything in order to endure these processes, difficult as they were through the force of objective causes, with the most acute possible unhealthy character. The peasantry at the present moment is indubitably dissatisfied. They do not know what or how to gauge and they feel all too clearly in their everyday existence that those on top do not know what direction to take. I speak in the main of the period preceding the restoration of the private market. The new reform came unexpectedly. Its consequences may be very great. At the moment it is not easy to appraise it. The responses and presuppositions it has called forth from all sides vary considerably and sometimes are directly contradictory. The leadership offers no general appraisal, i. e., does not function as a leadership. But I shall write subsequently about the markets because up to now they are in a large measure more of a symptom than an economic factor.

The discord within the villages and the discord between the city and the village, as always the case, is taken out on the worker, making his position as regards necessities worse. You have no doubt noticed in our press what a tremendous place in our inner life has been occupied by the problem of rabbit culture. The entire party was mobilized and set on foot under the slogan of breeding rabbits. Rabbit nurseries were founded in factories. One might suppose that here one is dealing with Belgium or England, yet even in these thickly populated countries the rabbit hardly appears as a subject for such a governmental cult. Tens and hundreds of factory directors and expert economists have taken an absolute negative attitude to the "all-embracing rabbit culture" as being deleterious to the industry and economy in general. It is entirely self-evident that the revival of factory truck-gardens and the creation of factory rabbit nurseries denotes the attempt to found alongside of industry "one's private", small, but reliable rural economy. Consequently in this fact is expressed the acute break in the jointure between the city and the village. But none expresses oneself seriously on this topic out loud. You may recall how Lenin opened the period of revision in War-Communism. "We must put it plainly: the peasantry is not satisfied with the character of the relations we have established." This statement is often

The letter which we publish here may be considered as entirely authoritative, being written by a well-informed comrade in Moscow who is in a position to know what is taking place. The next issue of the Militant will contain the conclusion of the letter and make it possible for our readers to be oriented more intimately on such questions as the status of the collectivization movement, the internal party situation, etc.

recalled at present by many, but, of course, only among themselves, within a narrow circle. At this moment, in the summer of 1932, it is no less exigent to give oneself a lucid accounting of the actual situation than in the beginning of 1921. But here blocking the road at every step the party regime looms in the way. . . .

The situation in foodstuffs is grave to extremes. Not only in Crimea or Georgia but in the Urals, Ukraine and Siberia. The deterioration in the functioning of the transport system has not been restored by Andreyev. Miracles were expected from this precocious bureaucrat, a former "Trotskyist", who was put in place of the old Stalinist Rukhovich, but the miracles did not materialize. The root of the matter is in the provisions situation of the workers and the employees. All the arrears in and the failures and unfulfillments of plans, the falling in quality, etc., of the transport and both the light and heavy industry have in the main the same source: the insufficient and irregular provisioning of the workers. Wherever there is a scarcity of the most essential objects for personal subsistence there you inevitably get the development of misuse, plundering, speculation, etc. Such is the atmosphere that surrounds the cooperatives and the government trade units.

At the Congress of the Trade Unions, Molotov alone improvised on the theme that the successes of the five year plan found their expression "in the considerable betterment of the well-being of the working classes and of the laboring village." Molotov, in general, is reckoned as the leader of the Left flank of the Stalinist bureaucracy. It is rumored that he personally is against all retreats and modifications in the questions of collectivization and industrialization. But Rudzutak spoke at that same Congress in an altogether different tone, "Why are we so badly off in matters relating to supplying the workers? First of all because we allotted too little attention to this sphere of activity. We were absorbed in gigantic enterprises." In his old letter about the five year plan, C. G. Rakovsky long since sounded the alarm, warning that the industrialization could break off and endanger the entire regime, if the leaders would henceforth "pay little attention" to the problems of provisioning the workers. But Rakovsky is even now in Barnaul. While Rudzutak in Moscow is forced to admit, "The great mass of consumers, the great mass of workers, and collective farms operatives, who are served by poor cooperatives, poor trade institutions are becoming imbued with nasty feelings." There is, of course, no exaggeration whatever in Rudzutak's words. This spring in Moscow factories—even in Moscow where the position is privileged—there took place mass demonstrations of dissatisfaction. And the reasons? Increased prices, scarcity of goods, increased dues and taxes, and particularly the deficiency in victuals. It became necessary to mobilize some 3,000 agitators to get to work on the workers. Of course all these "misunderstandings" have thus far borne a family character. In so far as one may judge, the bourgeoisie and its agents, the Mensheviks did not succeed in getting their hands warm from this; but the symptomatic significance of these manifestations of dissatisfaction is very great. This is apparent if only from the fact that blocks of stone such as Rudzutak have become articulate.

The bureaucracy senses that there is dissatisfaction with it from below and it transfers its growing alarm over to Stalin. While formerly the bureaucracy itself presented matters in such wise as to make Stalin the source of all successes, it is now inclined more and more in seeing in him the author of all failures. There is an evergrowing discord between the official tone in relation to Stalin and the actual attitude toward him. Shvernik, Stalin's commissar in the trade unions announced in his report at the Congress, "One of the most important conditions for the victory of the general line of our party, is the fact that at the head of our party, there stands immoveably the truest and most genial pupil of Lenin, the leader of the working class, comrade Stalin." The majority of the delegates sat through the pronouncement of these words with wooden faces. All tried to avoid looking at one another. No one believes in the "genius" of Stalin. Two years ago, even last year, many of these same delegates considered, however, useful and necessary to sustain the fable of the genius. In this way the bureaucracy hoped to strengthen its authority before the masses. Now there remains only a thin core of the bureaucracy which continues, like Shvernik, in sustaining a patently fallen idol. The majority of the bureaucracy, even in the party, is seeking to remove itself from the Stalinist faction, in the restricted sense of the word.

(To be continued) NEW YORK BRANCH PICNIC

The New York Branch of the Communist League of America will hold a picnic at Tibbetts Brook Park, on Sunday, August 7th. It is planned to get all members, friends and sympathizers of the Left Opposition in New York to attend.

Keep the date open. Watch The Militant for further information.

Nine Years of the Struggle of the Left Opposition

The Ultra-Left Zig-zag in the Comintern and the «Third Period»

(Continued from last issue)
 The dissolution of this state of affairs, as we have seen from previous articles, was not long delayed. In almost less time than it takes to tell it, virtually all the leading spokesmen of the Sixth Congress were either crushed organizationally, expelled outright, or saved from expulsion by humiliating capitulation. Just as the leaders of the Fifth Congress lasted but a brief moment in the seats of power, so did the Sixth Congress "Bolsheviks" meet with a speedy end. Bucharin, the political leader of the Congress, the reporter on the program, the president of the Comintern, was denounced a few months later as the leader of the capitalist-restorationist tendency in the Soviet Union (no less!). Lovestone, Gitlow and Wolfe were unceremoniously expelled as agents of the American bourgeoisie. Roy, who had made a livelihood denouncing Trotsky as an agent of Chamberlain, found himself designated in exactly the same manner. Jlek and Co. in Czechoslovakia, Kilboom in Sweden, Brandler (and almost Ewert) in Germany, Sellier and Co. in France, and a host of others were expelled or withdrawn from the Comintern.

The removal of any Right wing restraint made possible the climb to the heights of absurdity at the 10th Plenum in 1929, to the very peaks of the "third period". In passing, it might be mentioned that even among the Right wing politicians there is a somewhat academic dispute about the origin of the "revision-

ism of Leninism" (from the Right wing standpoint). The American Lovestoneites, who tried to sell the Sixth Congress to the American party, declare that the "revision" began only at the 10th Plenum. The German Brandlerists, as well as M. N. Roy, declare that it began at the Sixth Congress. To the extent that this dispute is of practical importance, right is undoubtedly to be found more in the man than in the American sector of the Right wing. The 10th Plenum was the *reductio ad absurdum* of the Sixth Congress, with a number of novelties added by Stalin and Molotov on their own account.

It is sometimes hard to determine whether this Plenum should be examined from the standpoint of politics or the standpoint of farce. It is the plenum par excellence of the "third period", the same "third period" which was at first denounced as an opportunistic idea by the Thaelmann-Neumann delegation to the Sixth Congress.

The "third period", its proponents explained, was characterized by a constantly increasing radicalization of the masses, simultaneously in every country. There can be no fourth period, announced Molotov, for the third period ends with revolution. The present "heightened political sensitivity of the broad masses," added Losovsky, "is a characteristic sign of the eve of a Revolution." Moireva, a member of the E. C. C. I., declared: "It is my opinion from the

May events as well as from the recent Polish events that there were a series of elements in them that recall our July days. The fact alone that the Communist parties had to restrain the most advanced sections of the working class in their surge forward, speaks for a rapidly approaching revolutionary situation." This extravagance is illuminated only if it is remembered that our "July days" were the direct precursor of the insurrectionary October days in Russia. And it must further be remembered that all these fantasies were presented to the official Communist world as unshakable articles of faith more than three years ago!

Third Period and Social-Fascism

And from this "third period" with its incessantly rising radicalization of the masses in virtually every country in the world, in which France was solemnly announced to be at the head of the revolutionary list (in 1929!), flowed the theory of social Fascism, a disease of senile decay from which the Comintern is suffering to this day. With Stalin's ingenious formula of 1924 in mind, Manuilsky now announced that "The fusion of the social democracy with the capitalist state is not merely a fusion at the top. This fusion has taken place from top to bottom, all along the line." Improving on Lenin, Manuilsky announced that Noske back in 1918 was already a social Fascist.

The master strategist of the Hungarian revolution, Bela Kun, who destroyed that revolution by failing to understand the nature of the social democracy in 1918, now tried some ten years later to repair the damage by advancing an even worse interpretation: "Social-Fascism is the type of Fascist development in those countries in which capitalist development is more advanced than in Italy. . . . In

this stage of development, social reformism dies out; it is transformed partly into social demagogic elements and partly into the element of mass violence of Fascism."

From which Manuilsky drew the conclusion concerning the united front policy that "we have never considered it as a formula for everybody, for all times and people. . . . Today we are stronger and proceed to more aggressive methods in the struggle for the majority of the working class." What the lesser functioning had to contribute to the question may easily be imagined from these few quotations.

The official motivation for the establishment of the "third period" and all its commandments was false from beginning to end. But this does not mean that there was not a profound reason for the 180 degrees turn in the course of the Comintern. The reasons for the Leftward swing here already been sketched here. Centrist, bereft of any anchor in principles, possessing no platform distinctly its own, was driven to the Left by the pressure of events and criticism. Having no real foundation, it must base itself upon an artificially preserved prestige. In order to maintain the continuity of its prestige, that is, in order to explain away the head-over-heels turn to the Left, or more precisely, in order to justify the change without in any way leaving room for criticism of its preceding course, the "third period" was called into existence.

A Convenient Theory

By its proclamation, the Centrists were able to justify the "united front from the top" with Chiang Kai-Shek and Purcell as well as no united front at all. Both were justified by one brilliant theory: the arbitrary establishment of periods. In the "second period", ac-

BOOKS BY TROTSKY

- PROBLEMS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION 450 pages Cloth cover \$1.50 paper cover 1.00
- GERMANY — THE KEY TO THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION* —SHALL FASCISM REALLY BE VICTORIOUS 48 pages paper cover 10c
- THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION 158 pages paper cover 50c cloth cover 1.00
- HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—Vol. 1 522 pages Retail at \$4
- By Special arrangements with the publishers of this book we can offer it to certificate holders at \$3
- PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE U. S. S. R.* 48 pages paper cover 15c
- COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM* 64 pages paper cover 15c

STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION*

- Part 2 of the Draft Program 86 pages 25c
- THE SPANISH REVOLUTION* 30 pages paper cover 10c
- THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER* 64 pages paper cover 15c
- THE TURN IN THE C. I. AND THE GERMAN SITUATION* (out of print) 10c

DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

- A Criticism of Fundamentals* Part 1 and 3 140 pages, cloth bound \$1.00
- WORLD UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE FIVE YEAR PLAN* 48 pages paper cover 10c (Out of Print)
- THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA 364 pages cloth cover \$1.00

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.