

SEPTEMBER - OCTOBER, 1942

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Bulletin of the Provisional International Contact Commission
Please Reprint

Contents

MANIFESTO ON INDIA

INDIA AND THE REVISIONISTS

NOTES ON DIALECTICS

MANIFESTO ON INDIA

To the Toiling Masses of India:

To the Workers and Oppressed of the U. S. A.

On August 8, 1942, the British Government tore off its "democratic" swathing and revealed itself in its real nature as simply an instrument for the continuation of the three hundred year old plunder and oppression of the Indian people. Forced by the pressure from below of the Indian masses, the Indian National Congress called for a program of civil disobedience. The response of the paladins of democracy and civilization was not only the jailing of Gandhi, Nehru, Azad, and hundreds of rank and file Congressites, but the unleashing of the most vicious terror against the aroused masses of Bombay, Delhi, Calcutta and Ahmedabad.

WHY THE INDIAN MASSES FIGHT

Why did the Indian masses come out into the city streets? Why did they display such marvels of heroism? How was it that in the course of a few days they not only broke from under the influence of the apostles of "non-violence" but also began to recognize the Indian bourgeoisie as their enemies? For three hundred years misery and oppression has been the lot of the Indian workers and peasants. The cap-

italist apologist, Kellerman, has been forced to admit that in India there are 40 million people at all times who have never known what it is not to be hungry. The chawls (tenements) of Bombay and Calcutta, "housing" the thousands of textile workers, beggar description. According to the government reports, the food of the average worker is on a level with that given during times of famine and less than the standard required by the jail authorities! One of the four freedoms permitted to the workers until very recently was the freedom to work thirteen and fourteen hours a day. This freedom was limited in the case of children to only eleven and a half! The artisan class once the pride of Indian song and story, has been smashed and driven into an already hard-pressed countryside. There they may enjoy, along with others of the 200 million peasants, another of the four freedoms, the democratic right to pay interest to the moneylenders at 120% per year.

WAR ECONOMY — THE LAST STRAW

This was the constant state of the Indian masses for generations. Then came the war of 1939. Indian economy was feverishly transformed from a "peace" to a war economy. Speed-up and stretch-out were intensified. To

the usual poverty was added a special "democratic" poverty, the shortage of commodities. Most glaring was the contrast between the honeyed words of Churchill, Cripps and all the "schibs" on the one hand, and the realities of Indian life on the other. The worker of Ahmedabad, the peasant of Bengal, were introduced to another of the four freedoms in the form of press gangs ranging the Indian slums and countryside to conscript Indians to fight for the democracy of the British Raj! The contradictions were too great and too palpable. They had to explode. They did explode.

For months the Indian masses and the British and American masses as well, have been deluged with cries to the effect that the English army is all that stands between the Indian people and "Japanese barbarism". The only element of truth in this mendacious statement is that India is literally a grab bag for all the imperialist powers. The English imperialist is in the house, the Japanese highwayman stands at the threshold, the American capitalist is trying to bamboozle the slaves in the house into admitting him, and the Nazi gangster is not far away waiting his chance to seize the swag all for himself. To differentiate between the "ethical concepts" of the four is an impossible task for the "naive" Indians. They see that already in the East Indies there is a conflict between the Japanese and German imperialists. They know that between the United States and England, a covert but no less fierce conflict rages for the spoils of this rich sub-continent. And more and more they have been forced to the inescapable conclusion that only by breaking completely through the web of all imperialisms can there be an end to domination and an end to making India the cockpit of the world.

GANDHI-NEHRU BETRAY STRUGGLE

What has been the attitude of the Indian National Congress during this period? For the masses of India, literally nothing was demanded by these gentlemen. Before August 8 the conflict between Gandhi and Nehru was a conflict over the best method of shedding the blood of the Indian people in the service of the British Raj. Behind Gandhi stands such people as Shanyamassi Birla, one of the richest of the Indian textile kings. Gandhi's whole history is one of stifling of the movement for Indian

independence on every occasion, the most monstrous example being the perfidious betrayal at New Delhi in 1930. Nehru's history is very similar. Constant phrasemongering with regard to Indian independence. Constant capitulation to Gandhi. It was only the boiling of the masses underneath both of these leaders of different sections of the Indian bourgeoisie, that compelled them to take action. When they did they attempted to hold the mass movement within the bounds of "non-violence". But the Indian masses burst through these bonds. Not only did they manifest great militancy, but they also turned against the wealthy Indians as well. We of the Revolutionary Workers' League call upon the workers of all countries to demand the release of Gandhi and Nehru, and all other political prisoners of the British Raj. But we warn the masses of India that the Gandhis and Nehrus can lead them to nothing but defeat.

Already Manabendra Nath Roy has found his proper place in the ranks of the British exploiters. Sapru runs from Calcutta to New Delhi and back trying to find some formula that will get the masses off the streets and save the faces of both the Viceroy and the Gandhists.

STALINISM IS NOT COMMUNISM

Most contemptible is the role of the so-called "Communist" Party of India and the so-called "Communist" International. Daily, hourly, they have called for an imperialist second front. In the Indian Revolution they have a real "**second front**" of revolution, that they dare not handle, because it would cut the ground from under their bureaucratic position. We appeal to the workers in the Soviet Union to give every aid to the revolution in India, and, in the process to push out the Stalinist or any other stooges of imperialism that stand in the way.

To the millions upon millions of Indian peasants we say: Seize the land now. Do not wait until after the war. Cancel the mortgages and debts. Support your natural leader, the Indian working class. Split into 650,000 villages you can not achieve your emancipation except by following the lead of the proletariat, that class whose conditions of life compel it to pursue the most decisive measures against the same classes that suck your blood.

FOR SOCIAL REVOLUTION

To the Workers of India, we say: Yours is one of the greatest tasks of all history. Lead the social revolution, the Indian proletarian revolution to victory. Once and for all you can free all toiling India from hunger, misery, and imperialist war. But to do this you must not only drive the British imperialists into the sea, you must seize from them, from the Indian princes, the Birlas, the banks, the factories, the mines, the railroads. And to do this you need your own government, a Workers' Council government. You need your own Workers' Army that will smash all exploiters Indian, British, Japanese, etc.

But to do this you need, above all, your own Marxian party. Without that you are without a brain and a will. With it you are invincible, when such a party is linked up with the party

of revolution throughout the world, the International Contact Commission for a New Communist (4th) International. In this task we pledge you our material and political aid.

To the Workers of the United States we say: The fight of the Indian masses is your fight, not in any vague, but in the most real sense. Your class brothers across the sea are striking a most vital blow at world imperialism with its attendant misery. Demand that all armed forces be immediately recalled from India. No shipments of munitions to help British imperialism shoot down the workers and peasants of India! Turn all material aid over to the revolutionary Indian workers! Come out into the streets and demonstrate against imperialist intervention and for a Soviet India!

13th PLENUM of the REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE, USA.

INDIA AND THE REVISIONISTS

News of the Indian Revolution is being withheld from the "people back home". By a "judicious" press censorship the Anglo-American Imperialists hope to obliterate the dynamic reality of the tidal wave in the Asiatic sub-continent. But social phenomena have little respect for the wishful thinking of bourgeois censors: the Revolution in India sweeps on unabated.

September 8th in Bombay, one month after the start of the present "disobedience" campaign, witnessed the most widespread struggle against Britain yet encountered. On Friday, August 21st, 50,000 workers at the Tata munition works, largest steel mill in the British Empire, went on strike and demanded the release of Gandhi. This news, according to the liberal Louis Fisher, "has not been reported in the press anywhere."

Writing in the September 5, 1942 issue of the "Nation", Fischer gives a realistic picture. "The strike wave in India is spreading. The most disturbed areas are the vital mining and factory region of Behar, Madras, the United Prov-

inces, the Central Province, and the Bombay Presidency. In many places the tearing up of rails has completely disrupted railroad traffic. Telegraph service is frequently discontinued and always quite unreliable. Riots and sabotage throughout India are on a much larger scale than the British government in India has anticipated, the semi-official daily Statesman of New Delhi admits. The civil disobedience movement, Indian nationalist circles in India believe, is only starting."

IMPORTANCE OF INDIAN REVOLUTION

The full import of the Indian Revolution is, as yet, evident only to a small minority. Too many regard it only as a secondary side-show, as an ineffectual sputtering somewhere in the backwoods. The bourgeoisie is attempting to implant the idea that this is but a temporary nightmare that will soon abate or pass away. Quite the contrary is true, however. The Indian Revolution is a turning point in the war. It can play as decisive a role toward ending the imperialist carnage, as the defeat of the Spanish Revolution played in making it possible. No matter how far the capitalist head-

fixers go in denying it, underlying the present conflict are two cross-currents: the military struggles **between** the imperialists for world domination, and the class struggle **against** the capitalists. The Indian Revolution, in this scheme, marks the high point, so far, of the second current. It is part of a current that must soon overtake and immerse the other, purely inner-imperialist, current.

To fail to understand today the significance of the Indian Revolution will be even more fatal than the failure of the Socialists, Stalinists and Trotskyites to understand the role of the Spanish Revolution yesterday. The present movement is a pivot point around which the political destiny of all political tendencies will be forged. It is impossible to have a false position on India and a correct position on the war; the two are indissolubly related.

India is a testing ground for the Revolutionary Marxian program. Let us turn our attention therefore to the way in which the social-patriots and centrists meet this test.

STALINIST TREACHERY

The Stalinist position on India is deliberately blurred with demagogic phrases about Britain's "guilt" and the need for "intervention" and "mediation" by the United Nations.

The August 11th, 1942 issue of the "Daily Worker" has a classic article on this subject. The opening sentence defines the problem: "The Indian people . . . are confronted with the supreme task of defending **their** country against the imminent threat of Axis invasion . . . To defend India from Japanese-fascist enslavement is to defend the present and future national existence of India, is the only (!) way to ensure India's national liberation."

It would be hard to convince the 390 million Indians that India is "their" country. Not even the Indian bourgeoisie, who are hampered by so many restrictions that they are insignificant in the whole industrial and financial scheme of India,—not even these reactionaries would dare say that India is "their" country. Only the Stalinists could be so brazen. Of all the tendencies within the Indian Congress, only the Stalinists had the gumption to vote against the civil disobedience program. The 13 members of the Communist Party of India in the Congress shouted "shame" when the question came up for a vote.

"In this stirring call to action at the Bombay Congress Meeting, they (the Stalinists) called upon all the Parties and patriots of India to unite, NOT TO LET BRITAIN'S POLICY IN INDIA STAND IN THE WAY OF DEFENSE OF THE COUNTRY, and to face the monstrous fascist invaders with a living wall of the united people of India." This position, says the Daily Worker, "besides being a clear cut repudiation of Gandhism, also goes beyond the approach of the Congress leadership to do nothing for defense until a National Government is granted." (Our emphasis).

We must not, in other words, permit the horrible conditions imposed by Britain to stop us from defending this same British imperialism and its enslavement. The Stalinist position is social-patriotism at its highest point, far to the right even of many of the Labor Party members in Britain who are clamoring for immediate independence.

The opposition to Gandhi is an opposition from the right. Not even in the Chinese revolution of 1925-27 did the Stalinists sink so low; there at least they **supported** the left bourgeois, Wang-Chin-Wei. In the interest of winning the imperialist war, Stalinism is anxious to give up all revolution, in fact is willing to act as the hangman for world imperialism. The Stalinists are so blind they can not see the contradiction in this position: it is impossible to win the war (for the Soviet Union) without extending the world revolution. Failure of the Revolution can only mean the doom of the Soviet Union itself.

TROTSKYISM TAIL-ENDS AGAIN

The official Trotskyites, unlike the Stalinists, have no illusions on the need for winning the war for the United Nations. They realize also that the proletariat must be the driving force of the present revolution. But just as in Spain, Trotskyism is for the defense of the lesser capitalist evil.

"Gandhi's doctrine, that is, the program of the Indian bourgeoisie", says John G. Wright in the August 29th issue of the Militant, "runs counter to the basic and most profound interests of the peasants and workers . . . What Gandhi and his class propose to do for the Indian working class is simply to replace the exploitation of the imperialist British bourgeoisie with that of the native capitalists."

In this statement Wright is absolutely correct. He goes on to say that "The Indian work-

ers will not rally to a proposal that they merely change masters and remain slaves." This too is absolutely correct. The activity of the Indian masses in the past six weeks shows that they are already far beyond Gandhi's program of action; that they refuse to support such a narrow program in life itself. What they need is a leadership that will take them to the next stage of the struggle.

But what do the Trotskyites propose? It defies all imagination!

"As the struggle against British rule grows in intensity, the interests of the different classes must come into an ever sharper conflict with the program of Gandhi and his class. This is one of the reasons why we Trotskyists support the current struggle of independence UNDER GANDHI LEADERSHIP."

Gandhi is betraying the workers. He can not rally the workers. He represents a reactionary class. It is precisely because he is such an enemy of the working class, precisely because he will betray us and try to throttle the revolution — precisely because of this we must support him. On the same basis American workers ought to support Roosevelt and British workers Churchill and German workers Hitler, because "as the struggle against (Britain or Germany or America) grows in intensity, the interests of the different classes must come into an ever sharper conflict with the program of (Hitler, Churchill or Roosevelt) and their class. This is one of the reasons why the Trotskyites (ought to) support the current struggle under (Roosevelt or Churchill or Hitler)."

On the basis of similar arguments the Stalinists in 1936 offered a united front to the Italian fascists on the fascist program of 1919 "in order to expose" Mussolini.

This position of the Trotskyites is not at all surprising. In recent years they have taken to support of reactionary movements so long as they had a liberal cloak, in order to "expose them". Such support includes the Townsend Pension plan, Ham and Eggs, the Labor Party, the Spanish Loyalists ("with criticism"), the Chinese butchers (again support with "criticism"), and so on.

Trotskyism, shout though it may to the contrary, can not and does not conceive of a PROLETARIAN Revolution in this era. Through all its revolutionary phrases there is the yellow thread of support to bourgeois democracy. The same can be said of India. Their August 22nd

paper, for instance, states that "1776 Showed the Way to India. The revolutionary British colonies in 1776 sounded the tocsin for the masses of Europe and the world oppressed by absolute monarchy and feudal tyrants; just so the revolutionary colonials in India in 1942 can sound the tocsin for the masses of Asia... Revolutionists in India will spurn the Atlantic Charter as another scrap of paper. They will find far better inspirations and guidance in the Declaration of Independence" . . .

These words speak for themselves. The Indian masses must have not an Indian October, but an Indian 1776; not a proletarian revolution (with its agrarian PHASE), but a pure and simple bourgeois revolution. That is the real meaning of the support to Gandhi.

REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

The Indian bourgeoisie are of a peculiar variety. Britain has held an iron hold over this small class of native exploiters. In 300 years British capitalism has milked the sub-continent of India out of approximately 200 billion dollars. Its present investment is conservatively estimated at somewhere close to 3 billion dollars. Ordinary profit for the British overlords run from 30% to 150% or more yearly. It is thus easy to understand why Britain does not permit the native capitalists, who are relatively small in number, to expand and take part of this enormous booty.

Political restrictions have stopped the native Indian bourgeois from re-investing his surplus in the more lucrative fields. Instead much of this capital has been turned inward into loans and mortgages in the countryside. Thus the alliance between the Indian prince (landlord) and the Indian bourgeois against the Indian peasant has a base in the economic realities of India. That explains for instance why Gandhi, who represents this bloc favors "civil disobedience" against the British, but is unalterably opposed to violence on the part of the natives. He is fearful that the masses will rise up and take the land, the factories and the banks. Such action would be fatal for the native Indian bourgeoisie.

What we are attempting to illustrate is that in India, more than almost anywhere else, the seizure of the land by the peasants would be fought immediately by the native bourgeoisie. Under Gandhi not a single task of the revolution can be carried out — not one. To gain anything, the masses must oppose Gandhism

(and its Nehru shades) right from the outset. To do otherwise is merely to foist illusions on the Indian workers and peasants, and worse, to dissipate their energy.

Already there are signs that the masses are becoming restless within the narrow confines of purely political strikes. The next stage calls for more positive revolutionary actions: seizure of the land, establishment of workers councils, peasant and soldiers councils, armed workers guards, and steps leading toward full assumption of power by a Workers and Peasants Council Government.

The bourgeoisie — both native and foreign — in India will use many different methods to sidetrack the Revolution. The American bourgeoisie, for instance, will attempt "mediation" — to check the Revolution and infiltrate with American capital. The British will continue to use force and to involve more bourgeois elements in their cabinets. The native bourgeois elements may go up to the point of calling for a constituent assembly or may rest content with just promises of future independence and a few minor concessions today,

which is most likely. But underlying all these moves will be the attempt to get the Indian masses to support other bourgeois forces, other bourgeois ideologies, other bourgeois regimes.

There can be only two roads for India: proletarian revolution or capitalist reaction (in a number of different forms, including the Gandhian form). The native bourgeoisie — and particularly in India — can no longer play a "1776" role. They can only play a Kerenskyite role or worse. Just as Lenin upbraided Stalin and Kamenev for wishing to support (with criticism) 1917's Kerensky, so must those be upbraided and exposed who in any shape, form, or manner are willing to support the ascetic Indian "Kerensky".

The possibility of a 1776, or a 1789, in India, is long past. The social pattern today is ever so simple — either proletarian revolution or capitalist reaction. The Revolutionary Marxists take their side with the former. Any compromise, any attempt to reconcile the two, is a service to the enemy class.

September 12, 1942.

NOTES ON DIALECTICS

(Continued from Last Issue)

Throughout the outline our friend Warde has the habit of recapitulating important points, and approaching them from different standpoints. He considers the question of logic and the question of dialectics from the: (1) historical standpoint, (2) sociological standpoint, (3) scientific, and (4) philosophical standpoint. This is a false and an eclectic approach. This is again an attempt to reconcile the false bourgeois "scientific" position with the dialectical position, as was the case with his presentation of dialectics as a philosophy, a science, neither and both; or his position on logic and dialectics. His dialectics is the BLENDING of two things in relation; rather than transformation to a new condition of two or more factors in relationship through contradictory STRUGGLE.

There is only one standpoint — the dialectical standpoint — and that is the scientific standpoint. The philosophical "standpoint" as a false carryover, and the sociological "standpoint" can cover a multitude of different positions. As for breaking the proposition down,

and viewing it from different angles (as Marx did capitalism in his three volumes) one can include the process of development, or the historical approach. But this must be done within a dialectical framework. The best example is the different approaches to the same problem in Marx "Capital." Marx gave presentation in ALL of its manifold relations, and he did not have to present the "sociological," the scientific" and the philosophical" "standpoint."

"What Darwin did for organic nature, Kant-Laplace for Astronomy, Marx for society, Hegel did for the science of the thought process," — so says Warde. We may mention in passing that Warde has time to give the three laws of Aristotle's logics, as well as detailed presentation of Hegel's contributions, BUT NOTHING DEALING WITH MARX AND ENGELS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO DIALECTICS. Is it a "slight" oversight on the writer's part to present an outline of dialectics and deal extensively with formal logic, and Hegel's contributions, and fail to present a single chapter or paragraph dealing with the contributions of

Marx and Engels, to say nothing of Lenin on the question of dialectics? The statement in which he gives Hegel the credit for the science of the thought-process sums up this failure to understand the rôle of Marx and Engels on dialectics, and to understand dialectics ITSELF — rather than merely the "thought process".

It was Marx and Engels, not Hegel, who presented the scientific position on the question of epistemology, on the question of a scientific method of reasoning, on the real process of nature. This is as great a contribution as their contribution on social development. Their contribution on social development would not be possible on the basis of Hegel's contributions of the thought process. Only by their correction their development, their synthesis of Hegel's and others' material, were they able to contribute what they did on the question of society and the class struggle.

Later in the outline Warde correctly gives Einstein credit for his synthesis of contributions in his sphere of scientific investigation. But Einstein had "nothing new", — no more than Marx did in relation to Hegel and others. To praise one and ignore the other, and attribute to Hegel what belongs to Marx is a complete lack of understanding of the problem.

MARXISM AND SCIENCE

If we had stopped with Hegel and his dialectics, we would still be looking for a SCIENTIFIC method of thought process, as well as for countless other scientific solutions that dialectical MATERIALISM has contributed.

To Warde, "dialectics" "is dialectics," and not dialectical MATERIALISM,— even though he states the case as a Catholic repeats his prayers time and again.

According to Warde, "Matter and motion are constantly being transformed into each other." This may just be a clumsy formulation. But as it reads it is false. If Warde actually means what this sentence states then it is more than a mere formulation. Motion cannot be TRANSFORMED into Matter — nor matter into motion. In reality, different FORMS of objective reality — mass and energy are in constant transformation — BOTH exist in a process of motion, although we have motion at a different tempo, a different rate of speed, etc. Warde correctly quotes Einstein who says, "Mass is a complex of energies." One can correctly state that Energy has the dialectical contradiction of "Mass" and "Wave". Matter and motion are inseparable (except in the

mind) and it is not a question of Motion TRANSFORMING INTO MATTER — rather it is matter or mass transforming into different FORMS of matter or mass, changing the relation of mass to motion, either with a higher or lower velocity level.

THE PROPERTIES (?) OF CONTRADICTIONS

We are presented, by Warde, with a list of 5 properties that contradictions possess: 1—opposition or difference; 2—unity or identity; 3—mutual dependency, reciprocal determination, essential connections, identity in difference, difference in identity; 4—the capacity for mutual conversion, of interchangeability, of transformation of one pole into the other; 5—a relative, limited, finite character.

The dispute on this point with Warde is not only over the question of the ASPECTS of contradictions that are listed. The argument against Warde is the **framework** in which he places these aspects. To speak of the PROPERTIES of contradictions is to use the word in the idealist and not materialist sense. Properties should refer to the material aspects of a thing, its qualities, its essential characteristics that can be explained by the understanding of the process of contradictions — the dialectical process. Of course this terminology suits the Hegel school, and since Warde speaks of Hegel in relation to dialectics and not to Marx in relation to Dialectical MATERIALISM, this structure fits into the whole false concept of the pamphlet.

Even among the materialists (as well as between the idealists and the materialists) there is a dispute and different approach on the question of "properties". What many mechanical materialists call properties, the static, motionless inherent qualities of a thing, has nothing in common with the properties of a thing from a dialectical point of view, from the standpoint of reality

CONTRADICTIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS

Now let us take up other aspects of the problem of contradictions, leaving aside the whole question of "properties," and consider the five points listed by Warde. The first, "opposition" and the second "unity" are two aspects of ONE factor of contradictions. No objection is made to a study which breaks these two aspects into separate parts for further analysis and understanding, but when they are listed as different aspects of contradictions, they should be listed in the dynamic, actual relationship — as one "property" of a two-fold aspect.

In part of point three, Warde uses the opposite method and lists two aspects, that is, the "identity in difference" and the "difference in identity" quite correctly.

It must always be kept in mind that these five aspects of contradiction as listed by Warde take on life or real relations, only when dealt with in connection with some MATERIAL processes. This is likewise true of the mental process, for once it is divorced from the two-fold material relationship, (which is its foundation) it becomes idle chatter.

In point five, in which Warde speaks of the relative character, etc., he is referring not to a particular process, or one material condition, but to the question of contradictions. But on this point he is fundamentally wrong. In speaking of **contradiction** one does not ONLY list the relative aspect of contradictions, one must also list the absolute aspect of contradictions.

THE UNITY OF OPPOSITES

Likewise, in point three, Warde speaks of the "mutual dependence" of contradictions and leaves out the whole question of the mutual exclusion and struggle of opposites. It is true that point one speaks of opposition. But point two and three refer to unity and mutual dependency of opposites. Nowhere in the five points is the RELATIONSHIP of these two factors listed or explained. The key to the understanding of contradiction, of this relationship is ignored for a mechanical listing of "properties" that explains nothing of decisive importance and instead opens the door for many errors.

Lenin, in Volume 13 in the Addenda. "On Dialectics" says, "The Unity (the coincidence, identity, resultant force) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, and relative. The struggle of the mutual exclusive opposites is absolute, as movement and evolution are." This one sentence is the key to the understanding of the question of contradiction with which Warde attempts to deal. Nowhere does he even come close to this concept of Lenin—and of Marx and Engels. On the contrary, he says

something entirely different. Warde goes to Hegel — not to Marx, Engels and Lenin on the subject.

Dialectics clearly reveal that "THE STRUGGLE OF THE MUTUAL EXCLUSIVE OPPOSITES IS ABSOLUTE, AS MOVEMENT AND EVOLUTION ARE," while the unity of opposites is conditional, relative, etc.

WARDE'S "LITTLE" OMISSIONS

If one writes an OUTLINE of dialectics, one should also list other important aspects of the dialectical process — of matter in motion, which Warde ignores entirely. To understand dialectics one must understand the relationship of the following aspects of a process. We list these here without going into detail because other material can be had on the subject, 1—The relation of evolution to revolution of a given process; 2—The relation of form and content; 3—The centralization and diversification factors; 4—The relation of the part to the whole; 5—The variable and constant factors; 6—The relative and absolute factors, one key aspect of this problem presented above dealing with contradictions, of opposites; 7—The relation of the contradiction of the material process at a given moment in relation to the process of development (birth-growth and decay).

ELECTICS, DIALECTICS AND POLITICS

We have listed here very briefly some of the fundamental errors of this outline dealing with Dialectics and Marxism. We have also ignored other important errors for lack of space, errors that were not directly related to laws of Dialectics. If the Trotskyites consider this outline on Dialectics as fundamentally sound, then it is no wonder that in the class struggle they fall behind events and the Petty Bourgeois movements in their policy and action. The decisive section of the Revolutionary leadership that claims to be Marxist and who determines the policy of their organization must have a clear understanding of dialectics. Otherwise, centrism is the inevitable result.

April 13—42.

Volume 4, No. 7

Price 5 cents — 50 cents a year

Issued by the R. W. L. for the International Contact Commission.

Affiliates

Central Committee of the Red Front of Germany

Revolutionary Workers League of U. S.
Leninist League of Scotland

Mail address of publishers

Demos Press, Office
708 N. CLARK ST.
Chicago, Illinois

Printed in the United States

Voluntary Labor