

1233

VOL. 3, NO. 11      NOV., 1936



# THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

Principal Contents:

- RUSSIAN REVOLUTION ANNIVERSARY
- LYONS, DUNSTAN, AND VIC. LABOR PARTY
- MARXISM - LENINISM AND WAR
- SPAIN: THE FASCIST ATTACK
- INDICTMENT OF THE TROTSKY - ZINOVIEV TERROBISTS



-9 JAN 1937

# The Communist Review

*A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism*

Vol. 3, No. 11      SYDNEY, N.S.W.      November, 1936

## The Nineteenth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution

By E. W. CAMPBELL

### The Seizure of Power

WHEN the Baltic sailors and the Vyborg Red Guardists from Petrograd's factories occupied the bridges and surrounded the Winter Palace on November 6 (October 24 old style calendar), there began the insurrection that was to usher in a new epoch in the history of human society. The shells that fell upon the Winter Palace on the morning of November 7 (October 25) did far more than merely seal the doom of capitalism in Russia. The surrender of Kerensky's Provisional Government to the Military Revolutionary Committee and the transference of state power by that body to the Congress of Soviets, signalled more than the passing of the old regime within the boundaries of the Russian Empire. The voice of revolution that reverberated throughout the land on that memorable occasion also proclaimed the approaching death knell of world capitalism.

The October revolution broke through the front of world imperialism and elevated the working class to the position of a ruling class in a country covering one-sixth of the earth's surface, and thus provided a contagious example to the workers of all countries.

Unlike previous revolutions known to history which, apart from the brief but glorious period of the Paris Commune, ended with power passing from the hands of one group of exploiters into the hands of another such group, and usually ended with only the form of exploitation being changed, but leaving the principle of exploitation untouched, the October revolution set as its aim the establishment of the power of the working class, the abolition of all forms of exploitation of man by man, the abolition of any and every group of exploiters in society and the creation of a new classless Socialist society. The history of the ensuing nineteen years, from November 7, 1917, has been one of consistent and successful struggle for these aims.

### Achievements of Planned Economy

Walking down one of Moscow's main streets in the summer of 1935, as the writer was privileged to do, and pausing at one

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE NINETEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION, by E. W. Campbell ..	1
LYONS, DUNSTAN, AND THE VICTORIAN LABOR PARTY, by L. Donald .. .. .	8
MARXISM-LENINISM AND WAR, by L. Sharkey ..	17
MR. CURTIN ON THE "DEFENCE OF AUSTRALIA," by D. Morey .. .. .	30
AUSTRALIA'S FIGHTS FOR DEMOCRACY, FREEDOM, AND PROGRESS, by J. N. Rawling .. ..	33
SPAIN: THE FASCIST ATTACK AT NAVALPERAL, by Hugh Slater .. .. .	44
THE INDICTMENT OF THE TROTSKY-ZINOVIEV TERRORISTS .. .. .	49



of the many modern stores to examine the amazing quantity and variety of foodstuffs displayed, it was indeed difficult to imagine that only such a short time ago as the summer of 1918 Moscow workers were subsisting on but one-eighth of a pound of black bread, received every two days—if fortunate. This, owing to the state of ruination to which the national economy had been reduced by four years of imperialist war. What miracles in restoring and expanding the productive forces have been wrought since those dark days!

Almost as devastating as the imperialist war, in its effects on the economy of capitalist countries, was the world economic crisis which broke out in 1929. Factories closed their doors. Farms were reclaimed by the wilderness. Thousands of workers were cast out hungry from home by unemployment. Altogether a terrible picture of chaos, ruination and mass poverty presented itself in those years, and still does to a large extent in the capitalist world.

Yet, at the same time, in the country of Socialism an entirely different scene was being enacted. Capitalist anarchy of production had given way to Socialist planned economy. The stupendous First Five-Year Plan had been launched in 1928 and, obstinately defying the puny criticisms of capitalist observers, it was miraculously working.

And working to such good intent that the whole face of the country was changed. Not in five years, as it turned out, but in four years and three months. Hundreds of entirely new industries were created, thousands of new factories constructed, and the backward small scale peasant agriculture of Kerensky and the Tsars was switched on to the rails of modern large scale farming through collectivisation. That which had taken decades and even centuries to accomplish in other countries was achieved in workers' Russia in this short space of time. The Russian detachment of the international working class had given the bosses of the world another bitter lesson in just what they were capable of. Neither was this transformation accompanied by a worsening of the conditions of the workers, by ruination of the small producers, as is the case with capitalist industrialisation. On the contrary, conditions of workers and toiling peasants alike improved continually, and unemployment was finally conquered in the Soviet Union in 1931, just at the time when it was reaching its highest level in the capitalist world.

The power of attraction of the Soviet Union increased enormously as a consequence of all this. No longer was it merely the vanguard of the workers in the outside world that warmly re-

garded the Soviet Union, but the broad masses in general now viewed events that were taking place there with increased interest. Each fresh victory in the building of Socialism could only serve to strengthen still more the radicalising influence of the Soviet Union on the world labor movement.

### Approaching a Classless Society

Walking down the same main street in Moscow and pausing outside the same stores, one observes other things besides the tempting array of goods, continuously shrinking before the eager assault of a never-ending stream of cash customers, and just as continuously being replaced by new stocks. One notices, for instance, that above the doors of these establishments there appears not the sign "Cheapjack and Co.," denoting private ownership, but the "Moscow Trading Trust," signifying that the store is one of a chain owned and controlled by the workers themselves through their Soviets. If one visits the industrial districts the same story is unfolded by the plants and the factories. A more eloquent testimony this, than all the documentary evidence, to the fact that private ownership in the means of production has indeed disappeared from the Soviet Union.

The streets, the parks and the theatres have the same message to tell, that classes and class exploitation have vanished. At first sight one may not be struck with any appreciable difference between a Moscow street crowd and that of any other capital city in another part of the world. But sooner or later it dawns upon one that here there is something different. That here in the streets of the Red Capital there is lacking the striking signs of a division of society into classes. That here, for instance, there is lacking that about the dress, bearing and demeanor of the people, which denotes a sharp dividing line drawn between rich and poor. One misses the familiar sight to be observed in any capitalist city of the elegant dame accompanied by a snuffling pomeranian, drawn up at the kerb in a luxurious limousine, complete with liveried chauffeur, etc.

Not that there is any evidence of a general levelling down apparent either. On the contrary, there is evidence in abundance to show an ever-increasing improvement in the living standards of the mass of the people. The wealth of variety in cut and color of the dress and apparel of both male and female alike testifies to the free rein that is given to indulgence in individual tastes and requirements. It only wants a short stroll down any main street in any Soviet city to dispel the illusion that Socialism means a drab standardisation—a barrack-room regime—or anything of the kind.



It is rather amusing to think that those who are most fond of hurling such slanders are the very people who think nothing of attending a fete at Government House, or some such function, done up for all the world like a flock of penguins, and would die of shame if they were found guilty of appearing with even so much as a single tiny pearl stud out of place, according to the rigid standardised conventions of dress.

### The Most Democratic State in the World

The year 1936 already marks the fourth year of the Second Five Year Plan and the approach of the Soviet Union to the full realisation of a classless Socialist society. On the basis of the victory of Socialist planned economy—industrialisation and collectivisation, on the basis of the liquidation of classes, a further democratisation of the state has become possible and necessary.

The Soviets, right from their very inception, were a thousand-fold more democratic than any capitalist state. However, they were democratic, as Lenin said, in a new way, i.e., as compared with capitalist democracy. The latter—the parliamentary system—whilst purporting to be democracy for the whole of the people, is actually, and in practice, democracy only for the rich, only for the owners of the means of production, only for the exploiters of labor.

Proletarian democracy—the Soviet system—on the other hand, makes no pretence at being a democracy for all. It is democracy only for the workers and the toilers, drawing them into administrative and constructive work. For the rich it is dictatorship unceasing, depriving them of their privileges, taking away from them their power to exploit labor, driving them out mercilessly from all positions where they are liable to sabotage or otherwise do harm to the workers' state.

Today, when that which was expressed as an aim only in 1918, when the first constitution was written, has become a living reality and a classless Socialist society all but realised, it is only logical that the fundamental law should be altered and brought up to date. This is what the new constitution signifies. Socialist forms of economy have conquered in both industry and agriculture. Private ownership in the basic means of production has given way to public Socialist ownership. Classes and class exploitation have disappeared never to return. The mass of the people have been once and for all released from the burden of exploitation, have been finally liberated from the yoke of capitalist oppression and have been set free to develop their every faculty and to enjoy widely and in common the full fruits of their collective labor. This, of course, has its complement in

the gigantic growth and wholesale expansion of culture in the Soviet Union.

In fascist Germany the cultural heritage of centuries has been condemned to the flames in public squares for daring to not conform to the ideas of National Socialist madmen. The best among the intellectuals are banished in exile from their native soil to suit the whim of Nazi barbarians. In other countries of capitalism, not excluding Australia, the talents of the best painters are devoted to desecrating the highways with hideous posters advertising some go-getters' quack remedy for this or that oft-times non-existent complaint. Good singers earn their bread by extolling the virtues of somebody else's in song over the radio. Even poets prostitute their talents in composing jingles and limericks to widen the market for capitalist commodities.

What a difference in the land of Socialism. Scientists, artists, musicians, authors, etc., enjoying for the first time in the history of mankind conditions under which it is possible to develop freely their creative talents unhampered by narrow economic considerations. As in industry and in agriculture, so in the sphere of science, art and culture generally, there is an ever-upward swing, an ever-widening circle of masters of every sphere of human endeavor.

### Enthusiasm for Labor

The most recent remarkable result of the victory of Socialism has been the development of tremendous production enthusiasm among the workers and collective farmers. Long ago, in the very early years of the revolution, when Communist workers voluntarily devoted their days off to helping restore crippled industry, Lenin pronounced that Socialism would be victorious over capitalism because it was a higher form of society, that it would win out by dint of establishing a higher level of labor productivity. The Stakhanov movement today is a practical corroboration of these wise remarks of Lenin. The Stakhanov workers have smashed through the low technical rates of output and have established new high levels that are beyond the bounds of possibility for capitalist industry. A great impetus has thus been given to the process of development from the lower to the higher stages of Communist society.

The Stakhanov movement does more than this, however, it reveals beyond all shadow of doubt that the government and the Communist Party possess the fullest trust and the widest confidence of the overwhelming mass of the people. Otherwise such initiative from below would not be possible. The Stakhanov



movement adds additional weight to what the miserable curs of the Trotsky-Zinoviev group of terrorists confessed at their trial, namely, that the Soviet and Party leaders were so esteemed by the people that they (the terrorists) were completely unable to find any support for their plotting within the land and could only turn for allies to the fascists outside.

### Soviet Peace Policy

One of the very first acts of the new Soviet Government as soon as it was in power was to extricate Russia from the imperialist war. Since then the Soviet Union has shown over and over again its adherence to the cause of peace between the nations. Within the Union itself many nations, comprising people of diverse races, and at various historical stages of social development, are voluntarily united and peacefully developing towards Socialism. Not only exploitation of man by man, but exploitation of a smaller by a larger, a more backward by a more developed nation, has been wiped out on Soviet soil. Proletarian internationalism has triumphed indubitably over bourgeois nationalism that leads inevitably to war.

In its relations with the capitalist states which encircle it, the Soviet Union has only asked that it be left alone to develop in peace. Its foreign policy is expressed in the formula of Stalin to the effect that the Soviet Union does not want an inch of anybody else's territory, but it is not prepared to yield an inch of its own. It is well known, however, that the big imperialists are not accustomed to showing any respect for the weak, as witness Japan in China or Italy in Abyssinia today. Therefore the Soviet Government could only ensure the fulfilment of its policy by building up a strong defensive force to preserve the gains of the revolution. The glorious Workers and Peasants' Red Army will assuredly see to it that no imperialist "pig's snout" is ever tempted to poke its way into the "Soviet rose garden."

At the same time, whilst taking adequate measures to defend itself against possible attack, the Soviet Union did everything possible to assist in the difficult task of preserving world peace. It never at any time refused to participate in any international gathering that offered even the slightest possibility of putting some restraint upon war. It was only natural that as the forces of Socialism triumphed and the country became strengthened internally, its influence in international politics also grew stronger, until today there is no greater force for peace in the whole world than the Socialist Soviet Union, supported as it is

by an ever-growing number of the peace-loving masses of every country.

### Under the Banner of Marxism-Leninism

In conclusion, it is fitting to recall, in writing on its nineteenth anniversary, that the October revolution represents not only a revolution in the sphere of economic and social-political relations. It represents at the same time a revolution in the ideology of the working class. The October revolution came to life under the banner of Marxism-Leninism. It represented a triumph for this revolutionary theory of the proletariat. The October revolution in turn gave birth to the Communist International, which today continues to bear onward the banner of Marxism-Leninism, bringing hope to the toilers of every land that their hour of liberation is drawing ever nearer.

It is little over twelve months now since the Comintern concluded its historic Seventh World Congress, where Dimitrov, gallant hero of the Leipzig trial, issued his stirring appeal to the masses in the capitalist world to end once and for all the split in their ranks and for the reformist workers to unite with the Communists in the struggle against fascism and war.

Since then the unity in action between followers of both political trends has been carried a great step forward, particularly in France and in Spain. In France a Left-Wing Government has been placed in office and tremendous gains in wages and conditions made by the workers, thanks mainly to united struggle on the part of both working-class parties. In Spain Communists, Socialists and syndicalists are fighting shoulder to shoulder with arms in hand to defend democracy against fascism. In all countries, in face of the twin threat of fascism and war, the urge to unity grows stronger.

The most fitting manner in which we here in Australia can commemorate the Nineteenth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution is to strive still harder to carry forward the banner of Marxism-Leninism, to struggle more resolutely to put into effect the decisions of the Seventh World Congress, to intensify our efforts to bring about unity of the labor movement. And, above all, to strive to build and strengthen the Communist Party, which is a brother party and is linked, through the Communist International, to the glorious party that led the masses so triumphantly to the victory of October.



## Lyons, Dunstan, and the Victorian Labor Party

By L. DONALD

THE July meeting of the Central Committee laid down the main conditions for ensuring the defeat of the reactionary governments and their replacement by labor governments. The report of Comrade Dixon emphasised that the Communists will do all in their power to achieve such an object. The decisions of the Central Committee meeting have been adopted enthusiastically throughout Australia by the Communists, large numbers of A.L.P. workers and non-Party workers who see in the decisions the means whereby heavy blows may be dealt against the enemies of the people, the labor movement strengthened and revitalised, and important victories gained in the fight for increased wages, less hours, an improved living standard for the people, for peace and the defence of democratic liberties.

But, while the Communists state clearly their intention to "work unhesitatingly and unstintingly for the election of a labor government at the next elections," we also state that a vital condition for ensuring such a victory must be the achievement of real unity within the Labor Party, a firm and determined stand by the Labor Party in defence of the interests of the toiling people and energetic steps to organise mass action of the people for their vital demands, and, finally, acceptance by the Labor Party of the insistent proposals of the Communist Party for overcoming the split in the labor movement and closing the ranks of the whole working class in united action around all the urgent problems confronting our class.

What is the position in Victoria in relation to these fundamental conditions and the possibilities for their fulfilment? In examining the Victorian position we must have in mind the task of defeating not only the Lyons Government, but also the Dunstan Government, and the return of a State Labor Government.

Since the Dunstan Government came to office it has been maintained there by the Labor Party, despite the fact that this government has done practically nothing to improve the position of the great mass of the Victorian people, a position which badly needs improvement. It has drastically worsened the position of large sections, particularly the unemployed, whilst it has done everything possible to improve the position of the wealthy, to make the already rich even richer.

The disregard of the A.L.P. leaders for the needs and desires of the workers is shown most clearly in the fight for the 40-

hour week. Practically every union in Victoria has taken up this demand; numerous mass meetings have been held, from which demands have been made per deputations upon the Dunstan Government for its enactment; the building and rail-tram workers threaten strike action and events are developing in that direction in the metal industry; the A.C.T.U. Emergency Committee has requested all State Labor Governments to give effect to the 40-hour week. But Mr. Dunstan, faithful to his class interests, calmly ignores all demands, gives no satisfaction to deputations, sabotages the attempt of the Labor Premiers to have it adopted by the Premiers' Conference, and in every way indicates, in exactly the same manner as does Mr. Lyons, that so far as he is concerned **there shall be no 40-hour week.**

Still, in spite of these actions, the labor leaders support and maintain the Dunstan Government in office. Up to date the excuse has been the Legislative Council Bill, but now it is being said that the 40-hour week will be an "excellent issue in support of the A.L.P. campaign in the next State elections." The only step taken by any of the A.L.P. members in the State House is the bill introduced by J. Holland, M.L.A., which calls for the immediate operation of the findings of the Select Committee. However, in the words of Mr. Cain, deputy labor leader, "As this is a private members' bill it will not get far."

**The attitude of the A.L.P. leaders to the Dunstan Government is doing incalculable harm to the Victorian working class and the Victorian Labor Party.** The Victorian people, after 18 months of the Dunstan regime, are heartily sick of Dunstan and his landowning-banker-capitalist friends, and desire a government that will give to them a little of the "prosperity" that the government and the daily press are extolling so joyfully. But where can they look for such a government? When they examine the hated Dunstan Government they see it propped up in office by the Labor Party, and they cannot see any difference in policy between Dunstan and the party which keeps him in office. In the opposition they see the open and avowed enemies of the people, the U.A.P. forces of Lyons and Argyle.

What effect must this position have upon the chances of an A.L.P. victory in the coming State elections, and also in the Federal elections, **for the results of one will have a big effect upon the other?** The toiling people cannot see in the House a party which stands out clearly from the others as the champion of their interests, whose policy and actions are determined by their needs and demands, which fights valiantly day in and day out for those it represents in Parliament. **And because large sections of the people cannot see IN PRACTICE today that the**



A.L.P. is such a "party of the people," no amount of talk and promises at election time is going to convince them otherwise. Hence there is the grave danger of large numbers of votes being lost to the Labor Party and going to the reactionary parties.

In answer to demands of the workers that they break with the Dunstan Government, the labor leaders reply that if they did the Dunstan Government would remain in power with the support of the U.A.P. But is this a reason against breaking with the Dunstan Government? Rather it is an added reason favoring such a break. What a paradoxical situation is presented in the Victorian House, where the U.A.P. enemies of the people are in "opposition" to a government which has consistently carried out a policy of further enriching the rich at the expense of the poor. To break with such a government and force it to fall upon the U.A.P. for support will bring about an alignment of the forces representing the people (A.L.P.) against the whole of the forces representing the people's enemies (U.A.P. and C.P.), instead of as at present a form of friendly co-operation between all parties in the House, a co-operation which is not in any way in the interests of the toiling people and has produced nothing for them but continued poverty and hard conditions.

It is essential, if an A.L.P. victory is to be secured in the coming State and Federal elections, and if the workers' movement in Victoria is not to be further weakened by the continued tailing of the A.L.P. behind the Dunstan Government, that the A.L.P. leaders break with this government once and for all and come out openly with a campaign of explanation to the people on why the action was taken. If an election is precipitated the position of the A.L.P. will certainly be stronger, and if the U.A.P. comes to the rescue of Dunstan the A.L.P. will be in a position to mobilise the greatest majority of the people against the U.A.P.-C.P. Government and thus facilitate its defeat at the coming State elections.

Considerable discontent exists throughout the ranks of the Victorian people at the present time. The campaign of the Communist Party to make the rich pay for a better life for the people is having considerable effect, and it is noticeable that more and more sections of the people are coming forward in a determined manner for the rectifying of their grievances and winning of their demands. This is particularly noticeable in the trade unions and industries, where the movement for less hours and more wages assumes widespread proportions; it is reflected among the unemployed, who recently waged an unsuccessful strike struggle for their demands; the recent conference of the mothers' clubs

was the most militant yet held and it trenchantly criticised the Dunstan Government; committees of women have been set up in various localities to organise the fight for the needs of the children; there is considerable unrest among the farming population; at the same time the burning desire of the people for the maintenance of peace has shown itself in the rapid extension of anti-war activities and the growth of a very broad peace movement connected with the World Peace Congress.

Here are all the pre-requisites for a tremendous step forward by the Labor Party. The urgent need is for the Labor Party to break with the Dunstan Government, come out before the people with a clearly defined people's programme and the means of securing it, and take a leading part in mobilising the broadest sections of the people for action to secure their demands. An energetic campaign by the A.L.P., combined with the campaign being carried out by the Communist Party, would achieve remarkable results. The whole weight of the A.L.P. thrown behind the trade unions in the fight for less hours and more wages would raise the level of this movement and would undoubtedly bring victory; the co-operation of the A.L.P. with the unemployed would bring every unemployed worker in the State into action and would force Mr. Dunstan to heed the demands of the unemployed; action in support of the demands of the mothers, housewives and for real measures to guarantee child welfare, would rally large numbers of women; with the help of the A.L.P. the discontent of the farmers could rapidly find an organised expression; the participation of the A.L.P. in the general peace movement would solidify the peace forces throughout the State and arouse tremendous enthusiasm for peace and defence of democratic liberties.

Such action, particularly if it were joint action with the Communist Party, would achieve the widespread activation of all the working-class forces. Meetings could be held in every hall, at the factories, in the streets and country areas. Victoria could be flooded with printed appeals to the people. Around the working-class forces would be drawn all other elements of the population who are interested in securing a better life for the people, in defending peace and democracy. Such steps would develop the greatest movement Victoria has ever seen, would sweep away the reactionary governments, place into power a virile Labor Government and bring untold victories to the working people of Victoria and indirectly to the whole of Australia.

This perspective is not a dream or utopian phrase-mongering. It can be made a cold, logical fact. What is there to prevent it if the desire exists? The movement is already developing, the



machinery of the A.L.P. is powerful if activated fully, the trade union movement and its members would actively participate, the Communists would throw their whole weight into the campaign, large numbers of people outside the labor movement would be drawn in. **Is there any reason why such a people's movement in Victoria could not secure the same outstanding victories that the People's Front in France has secured?** Not only are these things practicable and desirable, but they are vitally essential if the demands of the people are to be won. If the reactionary governments are to be defeated, if Labor Governments are to be returned in the forthcoming elections.

All that is needed to guarantee such a movement and such victories is the desire for them by the A.L.P. leaders, the adoption of a policy that will enable them to be brought about. And it is here that the labor movement faces the greatest obstacle to its progress. The majority of A.L.P. leaders show day in and day out that they do not desire such a movement, that they are opposed to the operation of such a bold and active policy. The majority of members of the Victorian A.L.P. Executive show by their actions that they prefer anything to taking steps such as these, which require boldness, initiative and activity to operate. To change this situation is the great problem confronting the Victorian workers today, whether Communist, A.L.P. or non-party.

The present policy of the majority of the A.L.P. leaders is having the result only of hindering the progress of the labor movement, weakening the Labor Party and stifling the desire of the members for activity, preventing the achievement of ideological and organisational unity within the Labor Party and the uniting of all working-class forces, and alienating the support of large numbers of people who would be drawn to the Labor Party but for these factors.

How does this policy express itself? We have dealt with the position of the A.L.P. leadership in relation to the Dunstan Government and the effects of its alliance with this enemy of the people. The logical outcome of this policy has been that the leadership has done practically nothing to advance the movement of the workers for their main demands. What action has been taken by the A.L.P. has been by branches and in the main has been initiated by militants. Requests by branches that the executive initiate a widespread campaign for less hours and more wages have been ignored.

Its abhorrence of activity and progress is reflected also in relation to anti-war questions. In conjunction with the T.H.C.

Executive, and by means of the threat to split the trade union movement from end to end, it succeeded in bringing about the disaffiliation of unions from the V.C.A.W. and F. But its own "anti-war movement" has been hardly heard of since that time. Union anti-war committees carry out activity, but without leadership or assistance from the L.A.W.C.; the last conference of the L.A.W.C. adopted a number of progressive decisions, but these had to be endorsed by the two executives and have not been heard of since. The committee decided some months ago to hold a mass meeting in the Melbourne Town Hall in connection with the anti-conscription anniversary, and the conference decided that the meeting should be preceded by a street demonstration. Then, a few weeks before the anniversary, we were informed that these functions will not take place and the only form of celebration will be a meeting in the Trades Hall. What a pitiful travesty of the fighting campaign of 1916!

Although the executive has now decided to support the meeting, street march and Yarra Bank rally of a committee of old anti-conscriptionists, the previous inaction has prevented the mass campaign such as the anniversary justified.

One of the most representative gatherings ever seen in Melbourne took part in the recent street march and meeting in the Town Hall in connection with the World Peace Congress. But even with this movement the A.L.P. Executive refused to cooperate. The Labor Anti-War Committee does nothing to develop the movement against war, but any progressive movement against war is opposed or "banned" by the executive, because "labor has its own anti-war movement, in which everyone can find work to do."

On the Spanish situation its policy is even more tragic. Early in October Peters, president of the Victorian A.L.P. Executive, made a public statement condemning a decision by the Ballarat Trades Hall Council to hold a meeting in support of the Spanish workers. In this statement the A.L.P. president said that "we were not fully enough informed on the position to support either side," and that in any case "the labor movement was opposed to both fascism and Communism." This statement evoked immediate protest from the Ballarat T.H.C. Don Cameron, for the T.H.C., made a public statement the following day attacking "critics of the fund established by the A.C.T.U.," and on the following night the Tanners' Union secured the suspension of the T.H.C. business to move a resolution condemning the statements of Peters and calling on the A.L.P. Executive to declare itself in support of the Spanish workers in their fight against



fascism. The debate was adjourned to allow Peters to state whether he had been reported correctly or not. On the following day Peters issued a further press statement in which he said that the "labor movement had not made any pronouncement in favor of either party in the Spanish civil war." He further inferred that the T.H.C. decision was to collect funds for the relief of victims of the civil war "without discrimination." Concluding his remarkable statement he said: "I am not in favor of anarchism, syndicalism, Communism, or any of the other ill-defined isms fighting with ferocious barbarity in Spain. Working-class opinion here, as in Britain, has not declared itself with either side in the conflict." Peters' attitude is in direct conflict with the policy of the Labor Party, as expressed in *The Labor Call*, official organ of the A.L.P. and T.H.C. Executives, in an editorial on October 1. Dealing with the role of the rebels, it states:—

"Without any argument except the horrible arguments of force and destruction, these military savages overthrew the peaceful liberalism of the Spanish people . . . It is inconceivable that civilised people should defend this negation of culture and civilisation, that resorts to wholesale barbarism. The issue is shall the people rule or shall a military dictatorship stalk through the ruined cities of a cowed people? We are for the people."

Therein is the policy of the labor movement, but the president of the A.L.P. denounces such a policy. Never in the history of the Australian Labor movement has a more treacherous, lying, anti-working class statement than that of Peters been made. This serves directly to assist the fascist forces in Australia, which are attempting to prevent support for the Spanish people and its government and win support for the fascist murderers of the people. But up to the time of writing the A.L.P. Executive has not made any repudiation of the statements of its president.

In answer to the proposals of the Communists for joint efforts to defeat the Lyons Government and return a labor government the Victorian Executive can do no better than publish in *The Labor Call* a long statement deliberately distorting the whole of the Party proposals, and utilising these proposals, which are dictated by the interests of the working people of Australia, as a means of launching a tirade of abuse against the Communists. The main content of the A.L.P. Executive's statement was to the effect that Communist second preferences had put U.A.P. candidates into office, that the C.P. was more or less in the pay of the U.A.P., that the proposal for the defeat of Lyons was

a trap for the Labor Party, etc. They chose to ignore the campaign of the Communists against the Lyons Government over a long period, that the Communists are everywhere preparing the masses for a real struggle to defeat the reactionary governments at the forthcoming elections. **They ignore the lessons of Bowen (Qld.) and Port Melbourne (Vic.) elections, where Communist second preferences placed labor candidates in office and defeated the reactionary candidates.** At the same time the executive must seriously consider its own position regarding second preferences after the Port Melbourne elections, where the A.L.P. voting ticket advocated the allotting of preferences to two reactionary candidates—one a white guard interventionist, who had been taken to court for non-payment of wages—and placed the Communist candidate last on the list.

The policy of those who dominate the A.L.P. Executive is hamstringing and ruining the Labor Party; it seeks to prevent and stifle any real mass activity by the Labor Party; it gives no leadership, and carries out no real organisation; it seeks to keep the Labor Party isolated behind a "Chinese wall" of bars; it seeks to keep the ranks of the working class divided and attempts to cover its treachery by a continued tirade against the Communists; it shrinks in horror at any mention of real and effective steps to destroy the Lyons Government, and strives to keep the workers tied to the apron strings of the Dunstan Government. Such "leaders" and such a policy will never win outstanding victories for the workers or bring about the defeat of the workers' enemies.

The Communists cannot be disinterested in this position. We are deeply concerned with the strengthening of the whole labor movement, with the adoption of a virile policy by this movement, with the welding together of all the forces of the working class into a solid, invincible, fighting front, irrespective of the political or religious views of its various sections. **There cannot be such a powerful and virile united labor movement if the Labor Party is weak and the policy of the majority of its leaders is in opposition to the building of such a movement, and the necessary steps to ensure the defeat of the reactionary governments.**

The recent municipal elections showed clearly that united action and a virile policy win real successes for the labor movement and the old policy of disunity and passivity brings only defeat. Those candidates who supported united action and who put forward a virile working-class policy made big gains (Preston, Ballarat, Footscray), whilst those who avoided these conditions for victory met with defeat (Richmond, Collingwood).

It is only such a virile working-class policy and united action



that can defeat the enemies of the people, win real victories for the working people and strengthen the Labor Party and the whole labor movement.

This fact is becoming recognised by larger and larger sections of A.L.P. members and non-party workers daily. Leading members of the Labor Party and leading figures in the trade union movement recognise this fact. But this fact must also be recognised by the whole of the leadership of the A.L.P. and must bring about a real change in their present policy and methods.

But it is clear that if the leadership is to change its policy and actions, there must be more and more pressure from below, from the A.L.P. branches and trade unions. If the mass movement of the people for their demands, for the defence of peace and democratic liberties, for the defeat of the reactionary governments, is to extend and succeed, there must be a much more intensive development of this movement in the localities in the form of united action by A.L.P. and Communist branches, and in the trade unions, unemployed and other organisations.

Everything depends on the carrying out of these tasks, and in carrying them out the Communists will do all in their power to help. We again say to our A.L.P. comrades: **We sincerely desire to organise and fight with you against our common enemy, the Lyons and Dunstan Governments, against the capitalists and war-mongers, for all the needs and interests of our people. We have again and again expressed this desire, because we are firmly convinced that the fate of our people and our country depends upon its fulfilment. We have expressed our desire to affiliate with the A.L.P., to become part of the Labor Party and help to make it the virile fighting organisation of the working class.**

## Marxism-Leninism and War

By L. SHARKEY

### Part I.

THE burning question facing the human race is: Peace or War?

The newspapers scream of it, the bloated expenditures of the capitalist states for military purposes proclaim it, the words of bourgeois statesmen prove it, the military 'planes flying overhead, the tanks "exercising" in quiet country centres, the uniforms and brass bands to be seen in the streets of city, town and village eloquently remind us of the near approach of that evil monster which only a short while since the leaders of bourgeois society assured us they had "outlawed"; hadn't they successfully fought one world war to "end all war"?

It is not the purpose of this article, however, to demonstrate the nearness of war—the evidences of that are too plainly obvious, even to those who did not wish to see. It is the purpose, however, to consider the most effective means of fighting to prevent its outbreak and, if all efforts fail, that is if the efforts of all those who want peace cannot be united in one great mass opposition to war that would have a strength greater than that of the forces making for war, to explain the tactics of the Communists in relation to war and to the various wars that may eventuate and to endeavor to clear up the confusion that exists on certain points in relation to correct revolutionary tactics before and during the progress of war, if the forces of peace are beaten in the race.

What are revolutionary tactics in relation to war? Some imagine that it is only needed to declare oneself against any and every kind of war, against armed violence on principle, the position of the extreme pacifist and conscientious objector of the type of George Lansbury; others imagine that a position of defeatism, of "turn the imperialist war into civil war," the revolutionary Leninist slogan of 1914-18, covers every situation and every conceivable kind of war. Obviously, neither of these positions, and also a number of views that lie between these two, can possibly meet any, in the case of the first, or all, in the case of the second, wars that are conceivable in the immediate future.

In relation to the first, Marxism-Leninism entirely rejects pacifism, which, whilst it may do great credit to the hearts of those who espouse it, by no means reflects an equal amount of credit to their heads. "Force," Marx said, "is the midwife of history." (Vol. 1, Capital.) "War," Lenin quotes the military authority, Clausewitz, "is the continuation of politics, by other, i.e., forcible, means."



These two short statements by the two Communist geniuses suffice to indicate sharply the fundamental difference of Marxism-Leninism to all brands of pacifism. A brief study of the history of the use of armed violence in both international and civil war at once attests the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist standpoint. In international wars, the continental wars of Napoleon, even, where they were directed against feudal autocracies such as Russia and Austria of that day, and where these wars spread the doctrines of the classic French bourgeois revolution, were, to that degree, progressive. The war of the American colonists against Britain, the war of Prussia against France in 1870, in its early stages, as we shall presently see, were progressive, and, above all, the war of the Soviets against Poland and the interventionist powers, and future wars that may be forced on the U.S.S.R. by the fascist powers, such wars are historically justified—they contribute to human progress and emancipation. Without these wars, and others of a like character, liberty would be dead and Socialism impossible of achievement.

It is unnecessary to take pains to show the role of revolution as the "midwife of history," the Russian revolution, the French revolution of 1789, the present civil war in Spain, speak a language that is plain to all. In every civil war there are two parties, the party of liberty and progress and the party of counter-revolution and reaction, and force is the arbiter which, given the inevitability of the struggle in certain historical conditions, will decide the fate of the given country for a longer or shorter period of time, i.e., whether it moves towards democracy and Socialism, or backwards towards reaction and preservation of feudalism remains as in Spain and reproduces some of the worst features of the Dark Ages, as in the case of the Hitler counter-revolution in Germany. As for reactionary wars between nations and states, history teems with them from the earliest times, the wars of the slave-owners to enslave other peoples, and wars of slave-owning states against each other, from the days of the Egyptians, down through the Roman slave empire's wars, to the war of the capitalist-imperialist slave-owners of 1914, which was the greatest and most terrible of all reactionary wars, up to the present.

Marxism-Leninism, therefore, does not reject all wars, or all use of armed violence, on principle, in the present historical conditions; i.e., whilst the greater part of the earth is still in the hands of the slave-owners, who are armed to the teeth, whilst it, Marxism-Leninism, Communism, is yet struggling to disarm the slave-owners, war-lords and fascists and to put an end to their capitalist exploiting order, which is the mother of

modern wars; whilst we are yet struggling to make war impossible by the establishment of an international Socialist order, which alone will "turn the swords into ploughshares" and furl the battle-flags.

From all this it follows that Marxism-Leninism takes up a different attitude in relation to each different war, to each different type of war, that Marxism-Leninism in this, as in all other things, is both concrete and realistic.

To grasp this essential more clearly, we will need to study the different wars that were waged during the lifetime of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and the tactics which they adopted towards different wars. Marx and Engels saw in Tsarist Russia the greatest danger, not only to Socialist revolution, but to the then struggle for bourgeois revolution and bourgeois democracy, for the unification of Germany and other feudal peoples into modern national states. Marx and Engels in the paper they edited, *The Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, and elsewhere in their writings, called for war against Russia in the general interests of democratic progress, a war of Germany, which was not yet bourgeois democratic, let alone Socialist, against Russia.

In *The Zeitung* they wrote: "Only a war against Russia would be a revolutionary war for Germany. In such a war it could wash away the sins of the past, vindicate its own manliness, defeat its own despots, advance the cause of civilisation by sacrificing its own sons in a manner worthy of a people which has flung off the chains of long-suffered and dull slavery, and win freedom at home by freeing itself externally." (From the "Life of Karl Marx," by Franz Mehring. And because England and Russia and also the Prussian rulers were behind Denmark in the war over Schleswig-Holstein, Marx regarded a German victory over the Danes as necessary:—"The war which we are carrying on in Schleswig-Holstein is a real national war. Who has taken the side of Denmark from the beginning? The three most counter-revolutionary powers of Europe: Russia, England and the Prussian Government," he wrote. (Life of Marx—Franz Mehring.) A "national war" because generally it helped the democratic libertarian cause.

This thesis of national revolutionary war against Russia, which would release the democratic forces of Europe, would unify national states and by this means prepare the arena for the final struggle, the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie for the aim of Socialism, runs like a red thread through all the politics of Marx of this period. Destroy the "Anglo-Russian slavery" was a watchword of Marx and Engels of that day.



The Italian rebellions against Austrian rule presented Marx and Engels with a difficult problem and necessitated complicated tactics. They had serious polemics with Lassalle. They necessarily supported Italian independence, and Austria later had to come to play the role previously of Russia—a reactionary force. But the situation was complicated by the entry of reactionary Bonapartist\* France, behind whom Marx also discerned the menace of the Russian Tsar. Engels in a pamphlet therefore demanded that in the event of Bonaparte taking the field, Germany honor its obligations to Austria, and that the River Po, in Italian territory, must be held because it was essential to military success in the war. This roused the opposition of Lassalle, who pointed to the reactionary brutality of Austria and that Engels himself had pointed out that Germany's claim to the Po has no justification, except the necessities of the forthcoming war.

However, as Lenin said, Marxism is an unusually profound and many-sided doctrine, and the purpose of this present article is not to deal with these concrete tactics of Marx in detail, or at all adequately, but to show that the Marxist-Leninist attitude to war is concrete, that it does not lay down a rule of thumb to be used in each and every possible war, but demands a concrete approach, an investigation of all the circumstances and conditions, with the aim of ascertaining which line of action will further the historical aims of the proletariat. In all these wars, actual and probable, as well as the Crimean war and the Austro-Prussian war, 1866, Marx and Engels decided their attitude concretely on the basis of these guiding considerations.

That false and hypocritical conclusions to sidetrack the workers in 1914 were drawn by the Second International from the tactics of Marx and Engels at this time is not the fault of the latter, but of the dishonesty of the former.

So we come to the great events of the last century, the Franco-Prussian war and the Paris Commune.

Following their basic line, Marx and Engels supported Prussia (Germany) at the outset of the war. Marx addressed the Council of the First International on this, and made the point that Germany was on the defensive, that Bonaparte and the Tsar wanted a weak, disunited and feudal Germany, and that it was in the national interests of Germany for a German victory. Marx wrote to Engels: "The French need a drubbing. If the Prussians are victorious, then the centralisation of the state power will be favorable to the centralisation of the working

\* Louis Bonaparte, nephew of Napoleon, was on the French throne at the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War. He carried through the interests of the bourgeoisie without their participation in the government. Main support the

class. German preponderance will shift the centre of the working-class movement in Western Europe from France to Germany, and one has only to compare the movement of 1866 in both countries to see that the German working class is theoretically and organisationally superior to the French. The superiority of the Germans over the French in the world arena would mean at the same time the superiority of our theory over Proudhon's," etc. Engels replied: "Germany has been forced into a war to defend its existence by Bonaparte. If Germany is defeated then Bonapartism will be consolidated for years and Germany broken for years, perhaps for generations. Under such circumstances there could be no question of any independent German working-class movement. The struggle for the establishment of national unity (Germany was not the Germany we know, but a collection of semi-independent, more or less feudal, continuously wrangling and warring states, hence the emphasis on national unity.—L. S.) would absorb all energies, and in the best case the German workers would be taken in tow by the French. If Germany is victorious, then French Bonapartism is destroyed in any case; the eternal squabbling about the establishment of German unity will be ended at last, the German workers will be able to organise themselves on a far broader basis than previously, whilst the French workers will also have much greater freedom of movement than under Bonapartism, no matter what sort of a government may follow there. The great masses of the German people, all classes, have realised that the national existence of Germany is at stake and they have therefore immediately sprung into the breach. Under these circumstances it seems impossible to me that a German political party can preach total obstruction a la Wilhelm Liebknecht: Engels was here condemning Liebknecht because he had voted against credits in the Prussian parliament.—L. S.), and place all sorts of subordinate considerations before the main issue."

The main thing for Marx and Engels was the interests of the working class, and they likewise never failed to stress the independent role the working class must play in all these struggles, that it must not for an instant give up its independent aim or subordinate itself to the bourgeoisie.

This passage must also reassure some of our comrades, who seem to imagine that the declaration of the Communist Party that it would, in certain conditions, defend Australian national independence and democratic liberty against a fascist aggressor, is in some way a deviation from Marxism. Truly, Marxism-Leninism is "many-sided and profound," it needs profound study, and it does not consist of a few ready-made dogmas, applicable to all situations.



And so we arrive at the Paris Commune (which resulted, just as the Russian revolution, from a war situation, and, because of these two examples, another misconception sometimes arises, namely, that without war there is no revolution, which is a profound error), and the period after the defeat of Bonaparte at the battle of Sedan, which events demanded a change of tactics towards the struggle on the part of Marx and Engels. It is instructive to note this, that Marx and Engels had two different "lines" in regard to one and the same war, in accordance with the changes that had taken place in the struggle, when it had changed from a defensive, necessary national war on the part of Germany, after Sedan, when the Germans began to annex Alsace-Lorraine (one of the fruitful causes of the imperialist war of 1914, which Marx and Engels, with the marvellous insight of genius, foresaw—See Marx, "Civil War in France"—L. S.) and to plunder and despoil France, when it changed, obviously, from a national into an imperialist war on the part of the Germans. So Marx denounced the Prussians at this stage as imperialist plunderers. The Paris Commune, naturally, changed the whole face of things. The defence of the Commune and the defeat of both the Prussians and the French reactionaries (Thiers), who had leagued together against the revolutionary workers of Paris, became the first task of Marx and Engels and the First International. The Paris Commune itself arose as the consequence of the betrayal of France to the Prussians by Thiers and the bourgeoisie, who hated the Paris workers and the new republic more than they did Bismarck. "The capitulation of Paris by surrendering to Prussia, not only Paris, but all France, closed the long-continued intrigues of treason with the enemy, which the usurpers of September 4 began, as Trochu himself said, on that very same day. On the other hand, it initiated the civil war they were now to wage with the assistance of Prussia, against the republic and Paris" (Civil War in France). The workers of France were not prepared to hand the country over to the Prussians. They were for "national defence," and this national defence entailed a struggle also against their own bourgeoisie, who were prepared to hand Paris to the Prussians rather than see the workers in control. Later examples of this were in the Russian Revolution, when the bourgeoisie wanted to hand Petrograd to the Germans, in order to see the revolution crushed; Chiang Kai-shek in China, who capitulates before the Japanese, who betrayed the national revolution, which confronts the Chinese Communists with the task of organising the national war of independence. In France the fascist bourgeoisie, hating the victorious Popular Front, conspire with the enemy, Hitler, against the national interests, which the Communists are coun-

tering by organising the "French front," which will oppose fascist aggressors from without and their allies, the De la Rocques from within. The working class in seen in all these, and other instances, as the most reliable defender of national independence.

"We do not want an inch of foreign territory, neither will we surrender an inch of our own," Stalin declared, and the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union is ready to defend its people against imperialist enslavement, maintain its social and national freedom.

On the other hand, these instances demonstrate the treachery of the bourgeoisie, which, despite its loud professions of "patriotism," is always prepared to place its class interests above the national interests and sell its people to the conqueror, if only allowed to continue its exploitation of the toilers and plundering of the nation.

Defining this Marx wrote: "Class rule is no longer able to disguise itself in a national uniform; the national governments are one as against the proletariat." So much for the much-vaunted bourgeois "patriotism."

A national defence by the proletariat has as its corollary struggle against the bourgeoisie. Such is the teaching of Marxism, and that is why the Communists, who, whilst, where conditions make it necessary, would defend Australian independence against fascist-imperialist aggression, at the same time proclaim, in the Marxist way, the struggle against their own bourgeoisie, refuse to grant arms to that bourgeoisie to be used against the workers, the colonial slaves and for imperialist purposes. The struggle must be carried on against military credits, compulsory training, recruitment, etc., for the replacement of bourgeois governments by people's front, for the dismissal of reactionary fascist officers, for the arming of the people in time of danger, for democratic control of the army, better conditions for workers and soldiers, etc., to ensure a mass defence. Lenin denounced the defence of the fatherland slogan in 1914-18, because here it was used falsely and hypocritically by the Second International in a war of two imperialist groups, who were not in the least concerned with national defence, but with the division and plunder of the world. Which brings us to the next phase of the Marxist-Leninist attitude to war, the solution of the problems presented by the first world imperialist war, by Lenin, which once more illustrates the point: Marxism-Leninism is concrete in approach to the problems presented by each given war, as in all else.

Let Lenin sum up all that is herein written and demonstrate the concrete approach and the fundamental difference



between the problem of the war of 1914 and those faced by Marx in the last century.

"The Socialists have always condemned wars between peoples as barbarous and bestial. Our attitude towards war, however, differs in principle from that of the bourgeois pacifists and anarchists. We differ from the first in that we understand the inseparable connection between wars on the one hand and class struggles inside of a country on the other, we understand the impossibility of eliminating wars without eliminating classes and creating Socialism, and in that we fully recognise the justice, the progressivism and the necessity of civil wars, i.e., wars of an oppressed class against the oppressor, of slaves against the slave-holders, of serfs against the landowners, of wage-workers against the bourgeoisie. We Marxists differ both from pacifists and anarchists in that we recognise the necessity of an historical study of each war individually, from the point of view of Marx's dialectical materialism. There have been many wars in history which, notwithstanding all the horrors, cruelties, miseries and tortures, inevitably connected with every war, had a progressive character, i.e., they served the development of mankind, aiding in the destruction of extremely pernicious and reactionary institutions (as, for instance, absolutism or serfdom), or helping to remove the most barbarous despotisms in Europe (that of Turkey and Russia). It is, therefore, necessary to examine the historic characteristics of the present war taken by itself.

"A new epoch in the history of mankind was opened by the great French revolution. From that time down to the Paris Commune, i.e., from 1789 to 1871, some of the wars had a bourgeois progressive character, being waged for national liberation. In other words, the main contents and the historic significance of those wars consisted in overthrowing absolutism and feudalism, at least in undermining those institutions, or in casting off the yoke of foreign nations. Therefore these wars can be considered progressive. When such wars were waged, all honest revolutionary democrats, as well as Socialists, always sympathised with that side (i.e., with that bourgeoisie) which help to overthrow or at least to undermine the most dangerous foundations of feudalism and absolutism, or to combat the oppression of foreign peoples. For instance, the fundamental historic significance of the revolutionary wars of France, notwithstanding the tendency to plunder and conquer foreign lands on the part of the French, con-

sists in the fact that they shook and destroyed feudalism and absolutism in the whole of old Europe hitherto based on serf labor. In the Franco-Prussian war, Germany certainly robbed France; this, however, does not change the fundamental historic significance of that war as having freed tens of millions of the German people from feudal decentralisation and from the oppression of two despots, the Tsar and Napoleon III.

"The period between 1789 and 1871 left deep traces and revolutionary reminiscences. Before the overthrow of feudalism, absolutism, and foreign oppression, there could be no thought of developing the proletarian struggle for Socialism. When, in speaking of the wars of such periods, the Socialists always recognised the justice of a 'defensive' war, they had in view the above aims, namely, a revolution against medievalism and serf labor. Under a 'defensive' war the Socialists always understood a 'just' war in this particular sense. (Wilhelm Liebknecht once expressed himself in this very way.) Only in this sense did the Socialists recognise, and do recognise at present, the legitimacy, progressivism and justice of 'defending the fatherland' or of a 'defensive' war. For instance, if Morocco were to declare war against France tomorrow, or India against England, or Persia or China against Russia, etc., those wars would be 'just,' 'defensive' wars, no matter which one was the first to attack. Every Socialist would then wish the victory of the oppressed, dependent, non-sovereign states against the oppressing, slave-holding, pillaging 'great' nations.

"But imagine that a slave-holder possessing 100 slaves wages war against a slave-holder possessing 200 slaves for a more 'equitable' redistribution of slaves. It is evident that to apply to such a case the term 'defensive' war or 'defence of the fatherland,' would be an historical lie; in practice it would mean that the crafty slave-holders were plainly deceiving the unenlightened masses, the lower strata of the city population. It is in this very fashion that the present-day imperialist bourgeoisie, when war is waged among the slave-holders for the strengthening and consolidation of slavery, deceive the people by means of the 'national' ideology and the idea of defence of the fatherland."—"Socialism and War" (Lenin).

"Social-chauvinism is adherence to the idea of 'defending the fatherland' in the present war. From this idea follows repudiation of the class struggle in wartime, voting for military appropriations, etc. In practice the social-



chauvinists conduct an anti-proletarian bourgeois policy, because in practice they insist not on the 'defence of the fatherland' in the sense of fighting against the oppression of a foreign nation, but upon the 'right' of one or the other of the 'great' nations to rob the colonies and oppress other peoples. The social-chauvinists follow the bourgeoisie in deceiving the people by saying that the war is conducted for the defence of the freedom and the existence of the nations; thus they put themselves on the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. To the social-chauvinists belong those who justify and idealise the governments and the bourgeoisie of one of the belligerent groups of nations, as well as those who, like Kautsky, recognise the equal right of the Socialists of all belligerent nations to 'defend the fatherland.' Social-chauvinism, being in practice a defence of the privileges, prerogatives, robberies and violence of 'one's own' (or any other) imperialist bourgeoisie, is a total betrayal of all Socialist convictions and a violation of the decisions of the International Socialist Congress in Basle.

"The war manifesto unanimously adopted in 1912 in Basle has in view the kind of war between England and Germany with their present allies which actually broke out in 1914. The manifesto declares unequivocally that no people's interests of whatever nature can justify such a war, it being conducted 'for the profits of capitalists' and 'the ambitions of dynasties,' as an outgrowth of the imperialist predatory policy of the great nations. The manifesto plainly states that the war is dangerous 'for the governments' (all governments without exception); it notes their fear 'of a proletarian revolution'; it refers with full clarity to the example of the Commune of 1871 and of October-December, 1905, i.e., to the example of revolution and civil war. The Basle Manifesto thus establishes for this present war the tactics of workers' revolutionary struggle on an international scale against their governments, the tactics of proletarian revolution. The Basle Manifesto repeats the words of the Stuttgart resolution to the effect that in case of war the Socialists must take advantage of the 'economic and political crisis' created by the war to 'hasten the downfall of capitalist class rule,' i.e., to take advantage of the difficulties of the governments and of mass indignation created by the war to advance the Socialist revolution."—"Socialism and War" (Lenin).

Here it will be seen in this analysis by Lenin that (contrary to a local superstition) Lenin did not reject national defensive wars, nor progressive wars, but denounced the use of this slogan to justify participation in an imperialist massacre by the reformist-socialist. He specially stressed it in relation "to this war," 1914. He rejected such an anarchist conception that at no time was the fate of the country of no concern to the working class just as he rejected the pacifist ideology, which influence, unfortunately, at the present time, is creating some confusion, not only among the avowed pacifists themselves. "Force is the mid-wife of history," and everything depends on what class is using the force and for what purpose. Force in civil and international war and the class relations cannot be separated. Force is the "continuation of politics by other means." (Note the Spanish civil war.)

Having thus briefly glanced at the pages of the history of the policies of Marx-Lenin in relation to the wars of their times, we are now more clearly, it is to be hoped, able to approach the problems presented by the existing international situation and the tasks of maintaining peace, of furthering the ultimate aims of the working class, both in the present and if the forces of peace are finally frustrated by the outbreak of war (which we Communists do not regard as inevitable). It depends on a correct policy now and the unifying of all the forces of peace in a solid united front against the instigators of war.

The fundamental difference in the whole international situation is the existence of the U.S.S.R., the fact that now one-sixth of the earth belongs to Socialism, that the workers have a Socialist Fatherland.

This transforms the whole situation for us; makes it fundamentally different from any previous situation faced by the theoreticians of the working class.

The defence of the U.S.S.R. against imperialist attack, this has been the foremost slogan since 1917.

The Soviet Union is the basis of the world revolution, its existence must be secured at all cost, above all, a fact that never must be overlooked for one single instant. The destruction of the Soviet Union by the fascists, such a thing is unthinkable; its consequences for the world proletariat would be incalculable, a darkness worse than the Dark Ages would spread over mankind, over the world; the beacon that beckons to and gives new hope to the downtrodden and oppressed—extinguished. Yet that is what Hitlerism, the most reactionary, ruthless kind of fascism, aims at. It aims at winning the support of all imperial-



ist and fascist powers, especially British imperialism, for this "crusade." German fascism equally threatens France and other nations, it is true, which gives the basis for common action against the Hitler war menace.

The defence of peace, the defence of the U.S.S.R., has to be secured in the new conditions presented by the rise of Hitler fascism, of a war centre, a centre of darkest, medieval reaction established in the heart of Europe, holding sway over a most powerful state. Whilst historical parallels are unsafe, at the same time we can recall what has been written of how Marx regarded Russian Tsarism as the antithesis of everything that was democratic, progressive, humanitarian and Socialist in the Europe of the day. Hitler Germany plays a similar counter-revolutionary role in our times.

Lenin declared that one of the primary factors that gave the new-born Soviet Republic a chance to live and grow was the division that existed in the ranks of the imperialists, the fact that in the first months and years of its existence, imperialism was divided into two hostile camps, conducting the most ferocious war against one another. Lenin laid it down that always the Soviet Republic must take advantage to the full of imperialist divisions and antagonisms. Similar antagonisms, which threaten to burst into armed violence, exist in the capitalist world today. The victory of German fascism spells the ruin of France. Hitler openly states that in his book, "Mein Kampf." A cursory glance at history, at the relations, economic, political, geographical, of Germany and France at once demonstrates its truth. A victorious German fascism spells the end of a whole number of small countries—Holland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and others. It also threatens Britain, as the statements of British politicians, such as Baldwin's "Britain's frontier is on the Rhine," indicates that leading British bourgeois circles realise. It is in these conditions that the organisation of collective security becomes a foremost task for all those who desire peace, and it becomes the task of the Communists to lead the fight for collective security as the means giving the best possibility of securing peace. Hitler's world war threatens the death of millions of all nations, collective security, i.e., the organisation of a mighty front of all those states who do not want war, is necessary to defend their lives. Collective security also means the defence of the Soviet Union in present conditions. That is the crux of collective security for the Marxist-Leninist. The defence of peace, the lives of millions and the defence of the Soviet Union are now one and the same thing. In the same way, the victory of German fascism means the extinction of democracy in any form; consequently

the task of defence of democracy is added to that of defence of peace, is a necessary corollary to it.

We have noted Lenin's policy of preventing a coalition of the whole imperialist world against the Soviets. Lenin, as Ercoli pointed out in a speech at the 7th World Congress of the Comintern, never excluded the possibility of military co-operation with a capitalist state or number of states. Once Lenin pointed out that when approached by a French military representative, we would have cheerfully hanged each other, but we needed each other's aid. Marx would have marched with a democratic capitalist nation against Tsarism, and so a Red soldier is not debarred by any principle of Marxism-Leninism from marching with a French soldier against an aggressor, when the fate of democracy, of small nations and of the Soviet Union itself is at stake. That is the meaning of the Franco-Soviet pact, which is the greatest bridle on fascist aggression, a great bulwark of peace and specially hated by Hitler because of that.

From all this it follows that, if necessary, military sanctions imposed by the League of Nations against an aggressor must be supported; such sanctions as proposed by Litvinov to the League of Nations, not imposed for imperialist purposes, but in defence of peace and democracy against fascist aggressors.

The class line which Marx always insisted upon is to place such armies under democratic control, to expel fascist officers from control, to arm the masses, to establish election of officers, etc., in, say, the French army (or the Australian) if it was fighting together with the Red Army of the U.S.S.R., carrying out the Franco-Soviet pact or League decision, not to disrupt or destroy it in a way that would imperil the victory of the Red Army. In the fascist armies the slogan is "Turn the imperialist war into civil war."

A central point is the removal of reactionary governments, such as the Baldwin and Lyons Governments, and the election of people's front governments in their stead, to ensure democratic control. The Baldwin Government has consistently aided Hitler, with finance, with political support, as in the Rhineland; it has practically made German rearmament possible. Lyons "tunes in with Britain" in these matters and enormously increases Australia's military expenditure. The people must demand to know where the Lyons-Baldwin policy is leading. The French, Spanish, Soviet and other peace governments must be reinforced by people's front governments pledged to peace in Britain and Australia.

For the rest, for other questions, we must bear in mind the words of Ercoli at the 7th World Congress, that many problems cannot be solved in advance, that, as Marxist-Leninists, as Com-



munists, we can only approach these issues concretely when they are raised, just as the great teachers, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, have. Less speculation about the future problems, more actual work in activating and mobilising the masses to support the Soviet peace policy; pressure on the governments to ensure collective security, and mass action against war-mongers is the crying need of the present.

## *Mr. Curtin on the "Defence of Australia"*

By D. MOREY

ON October 5 Mr. J. Curtin made an announcement on defence which is of tremendous importance to the Australian labor movement, and to the Australian people as a whole. He propounded a "defence scheme" which, according to him, was commensurate "with Australia's ability to maintain it, and adequate for Australia's needs."

The seven points which he enumerated were as follows:—

(1) Aerial defence, and the further development of commercial and civil aviation, capable of conversion for defence purposes. (2) The establishment of air ports and depots at strategic points on the coast and inland. (3) Provision of adequate stores of oil fuels and concentration upon the production of oil from coal and shale, and the production of power alcohol. (4) Intensification of the search for sources of oil. (5) Provision of gas-bomb-proof shelters and facilities for the evacuation of women and children from menaced areas. (6) Maintenance of naval, aerial and land forces at an efficient standard and, in an emergency, the mobilisation of marine, land and aerial transport. (7) National survey of all industries to discover their potential value for defence purposes.

Further, he propounded "that no other country, not even Great Britain, could come to the rescue of Australia if it were to be attacked. Australia's defence had to be assured by herself . . . the party advocated that complete control of munitions and war materials should be invested in the Commonwealth Government." (S.M.H., Oct. 6.)

While some of the proposals are of benefit in the interests of the masses, e.g., No. 5, the scheme as a whole is not, and, furthermore, does not provide for the adequate defence of the country. The basis of this scheme is found in the remarks that "no other country could come to the rescue of Australia, not even Great Britain." Thus, "isolation" and the abandonment of collective security become the mainspring of Curtin's defence

proposals. In this regard, Curtin has made a serious mistake in raising the problem of defence in this fashion, because it has committed the Labor Party to a programme of re-armament, which they have no guarantee will be used for defensive purposes.

The masses know that the Lyons Government is pushing forward a programme of rearmament, under British tutelage, which includes points 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 of Curtin's programme. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Lyons Government should start to send up trial balloons on the question of a non-party parliamentary defence committee, and also make proposals that the leader and deputy-leader of the opposition be included in the Commonwealth Defence Committee.

The Sun and other journals, report on October 6 (the day after Curtin's speech) "that co-operation between the government and the Labor Party in a national defence policy is in sight now that a substantial measure of agreement has been reached. Two main methods of bringing this about are being canvassed by ministers and members of the Labor Party." (Sun, Oct. 6.)

To enter into agreement with the Lyons Government in schemes of imperial defence would mean betrayal of the masses. Imperial defence and the foreign policy of the Lyons Government are governed by the foreign policy of England and the defensive measures of the Imperial Government are simultaneously measures of oppression of the colonial peoples. The foreign policy of England at the moment still continues to be a vacillating one, of retreat before reaction, and tending away from collective security and collective action, and towards rearmament. This policy is encouraging the aggressive countries to proceed with their war plans, and their plans for the suppression of the democratic rights of the peoples of the world, and is hamstringing the countries which are for peace, paralysing and causing confusion in the ranks of the masses, as to the ability of collective action to maintain peace. At the same time, the policy of the British Government is leaving the British ruling circles a free hand to side with those whom she thinks are strongest. Thus a policy of co-operation in any degree at all with the Lyons Government, in such schemes as defence will, and must, mean capitulation to those forces which are jeopardising world peace today. It is interesting to note that a decisive section of the Labor Party in England, according to the latest press reports on the Edinburgh Conference, are in favor of the programme of rearmament as a support for collective security, and that the armed strength of the countries loyal to the League must be conditioned by the armed strength of the potential aggressor.



Britain's loyalty to the League is a very unloyal affair (the Baltic Naval Treaty with Germany, dismembering of Abyssinia, Locarno Pact, military clauses of the Versailles Treaty, charges of the Spanish delegate to the League of Nations, etc.). It can be seen that, to capitulate in any degree whatsoever to the rearmament plans of the Baldwin Government is capitulation of the worst character, and that the reason put forward by this section of the Labor Party is not a valid one.

In England, it is collective security; here, geographical isolation, which are raised as the reasons for supporting the rearmament.

The above are indications that decisive sections of the Labor Party, both in England and here, are beginning to realise that fascist countries are the real aggressors and are a constant danger and menace to world peace and security. But, instead of turning to those forces, which stand firmly for peace, i.e., the Soviet Union and those countries who have collective security agreements with her, and the masses of the people throughout the world, and, on the basis of collaboration with these forces, developing a real programme of security, they are capitulating to the reactionary sections of the ruling class, whose policy is that of retreat before the fascist aggressors, and embarkation on a rearmament programme. This policy can only assist the fascist aggressors and lead to war. Support for this policy will split the Labor Party, and drag a section of it behind the bourgeoisie.

Curtin must be made realise that the defence of Australia will not, and cannot, be guaranteed by technical measures and isolation. Our very weaknesses from the point of view of technical equipment and resources, population, etc., are good reasons why we should enter into the system of collective security and guarantees, and precisely the reason why we cannot continue to pursue a policy of being divorced from agreements which bind the powers of peace. Collective security and effective restraint of the aggressor, backed up by the action of all lovers of liberty and freedom, in all countries, is the most effective weapon for the defence of Australia. A labor government, under the influence and control of the masses, a people's army, the crushing of reaction within the country, and the improvement in the lives of the people—these, Mr. Curtin, will guarantee the unity of the forces for peace, within and without the country, in the event of Australia being attacked, and then, Mr. Curtin, your technical measures will be successful, and their mobility will be limited by the people to defence.

## Australia's Fights for Democracy, Freedom, and Progress

By J. N. RAWLING

### XIV—The Right to Work

TO most people in this country unemployment is a phenomenon that has arisen during the past decade. There were a few people, they imagine, who had no work to do at various periods, but most of them did not want work. But only during "the depression" was there a great deal of unemployment due to no fault of the people unemployed. To such people it would come as a surprise to be told that unemployment, at many times on a mass basis, has been present throughout the whole of Australia's history—hovering with deadly portent over the mass of the workers in employment. The reserve army of capitalism has ever been present—especially in times of depression and economic crisis—and capitalism has drawn freely upon it in order to use it to worsen the conditions of the workers. And, in these periods of war upon their economic conditions, the unemployed workers of Australia have organised against the attacks and resisted the onslaught of those who would beggar them and starve their children in order to maintain the rate of profit of their masters.

#### (a) Monotonous Sameness

At these various periods of economic crisis and depression the story of unemployment and of unemployed activity is repeated and repeated. Over and over again the same story is told—differing only in details that do not alter the fundamental sameness. To anyone who knows of the plight and struggles of the unemployed in the 'eighties, the story of their plight and struggles in the 'fifties and 'sixties would seem the same story—a story that had already been told in the 'forties. For example—several hundred unemployed have signed a petition to the Colonial Secretary asking that relief works be started; bands of six or seven hundred parade the streets demanding work; meetings are held daily; unemployed demonstrations are staged. That partial description could apply to Melbourne or Sydney in 1883, or 1890, or 1892, or 1893, or 1900. But, actually, it sums up a description of conditions in Sydney in 1858 and 1859. There is thus a monotonous similarity through the years of the crises. **Starvation in the midst of plenty:**—In 1866 (a year of crisis and financial collapse) the wheat harvest was the largest in the history of N.S.W. up to that time. The same was true in 1930. **Building up of huge reserve armies of workers to break down conditions:**—In the crisis of 1840-5, it was the



convicts; in the 'sixties and 'eighties, it was the Chinese and the immigrants; it has been the immigrants many times since. The attitude of the Australian workers to immigrants and to the Chinese can be well understood when the story of how they have been used is known.

When we consider the plight of the unemployed in the early 'forties we are better able to understand the enthusiasm of the people in their campaign against the proposed reintroduction of transportation of convicts. (See *The Communist Review*, Feb., 1936.) In 1843, unemployment and destitution were rampant. "We have undoubted authority for stating," said the *Sydney Weekly Register* (Aug. 5, 1843), "that a great number of the working classes in Sydney are in a state bordering on starvation." This was due to the economic crisis which brought the colonies to the verge of ruin and to the practices of hiring convicts out to private employers and of carrying out public works with convict labor. While men starved, the ruling classes were at that time conducting a campaign against the desecration of the Sabbath day! "One thing must be taken care of," insisted *The Register*, "men must not be allowed to perish in our streets. We must find them work, or we must begin to levy rates to keep them from starving."

Just previously, the unemployed had complained to the Governor (Gipps) about the promises that had been made to them in order to get them to emigrate, and requested the withdrawal of all assigned convict labor. The Governor would recognise no responsibility for the promises that had been made and refused to withdraw convict labor. On July 31 a meeting of workers was held to arrange a big public meeting. One of the speakers said that "If the working classes would not now struggle for their rights, they deserved to be crushed." Another urged the necessity of having a press, and suggested that not a new petition to the Governor be prepared but a remonstrance against his previous answer.—At a meeting of the Benevolent Society held on the same day, the secretary reported that the total number of inmates of the asylum was 1221, while 330 were in the house and 174 families were receiving out-door relief.

The public meeting referred to above was held on the race-course (now Hyde Park), and 3000 were present! In a series of motions, the Governor was condemned, the withdrawal of convict labor demanded, and a deputation appointed to wait on the Governor. Mr. McCarthy drew a picture of the terrible conditions of the workers in Sydney, and Mr. Maxwell condemned, in words that have echoed and re-echoed through the corridors of time for 105 years, Sydney's leading paper which had misrepresented the conditions of the workers in order to

procure an overflow of labor. Need I say that Sydney's leading paper, then as now, was that wonderful organ of progress, freedom, and enlightenment—*The Sydney Morning Herald*!

The deputation duly waited on His Excellency, but His Excellency "could not" withdraw the convicts. However, he was prepared to give work—at low wages. Workers, he said, "should adjust their demand to the present state of the labor market." And—just previously, the British Parliament had voted £30,000 for the support of convicts in N.S.W. and Van Dieman's Land, and already there were rumors of the reintroduction of transportation. How that was attempted and how the attempt was defeated we have already related. The gold discoveries in 1851 meant the abolition of unemployment for a number of years, only to become a more pressing problem by 1858 and, as capitalism became firmly established, a permanent feature, becoming more and more grave in the years of crises, whose recurrence is equally a permanent feature of capitalism.

#### (b) The Salvage Corps

In 1892, the worst economic blizzard that had up till then struck Australia hit with full force the workers, many of whom two years before had suffered defeat in the country's biggest strike. Unemployment, poverty, evictions, seizure of furniture, malnutrition—in these ways were the workers of nearly half a century ago paying for one of capitalism's crises—just as in the nineteen-thirties. However, the unemployed organised to defend their interests—again just as in the nineteen-thirties.

In Melbourne, during the winter of 1892, the unemployed were organised by the **Unemployed Organising Committee**, whose secretary was Mr. Passmore Edwards. Meetings, processions, and demonstrations were organised, and there were many brushes with the police. The unemployed also organised a **Salvage Corps**, whose object was to prevent the furniture of the unemployed and the poor generally from being seized for debt. This corps had three successes to its credit within a few weeks. On the first occasion it rescued furniture that had been seized and taken away. A poor woman, living at Carlton, earned a "living" for herself and child by sewing. She fell behind with her rent and her sewing-machine and furniture were seized and she was evicted. Her child and herself wandered the streets all night and were arrested. Her story next day so touched the heart of the magistrate that he ordered a small payment to her from the poor-box.

But the Salvage Corps was determined to help her in a far more effective manner. In the first place, they assisted her



from the relief fund and found her a shelter. Then, convinced that the seizure of the machine was illegal, and determined to take the law into their own hands, about 100 of them marched from the Old Trades Hall to the warehouse where the furniture was. Crowds gathered, completely blocking the trams. A body of police tried to protect the building, but the crowd was too many for them—they were swept away. "Do you intend to give us back the woman's sewing-machine?" asked the spokesman to McGinty, the auctioneer. "No," he replied, and the rejoinder was: "Well, then, we are going to take it." And they took not only the machine, which had been illegally seized, and the woman's furniture, which had been legally seized, but also all the furniture in the warehouse!—In the months that followed, it is estimated, there were over 400 cases of forcible entry for the recovery of seized furniture and for the ejection of bailiffs. In many cases bailiffs were prevented from entering; in others they were ducked in pools or horse-troughs. Bailiffs became scarce, and evictions few and far between. As a result of these defensive measures, the law of distraint was amended.

A few weeks after the events described above occurred another exciting incident—also at Carlton. A woman who kept a woodyard was in arrears of rent—"found it inconvenient to pay the 15/- per week rent" was the way the pious *Argus* put it. The bailiffs were put in and the *Salvage Corps* mobilised. About 300 of them arrived at the house and attacked the bailiffs, who fled yelling for the police. The *Salvage Corps* put all the furniture on a hand-cart and, with an escort of 350 men, it was taken towards Cardigan Street. However, a body of police barred the way, and a fight commenced for the possession of the furniture. The police gained the upper hand, and loaded the furniture on to a police van and took it to Wilson's auctioneering establishment in Station Street, followed by the crowd. A council of war was held, and it was decided to await a more opportune moment for a counter-attack. In the evening, over 300 of the corps again assembled in front of the auctioneer's building, and a siege began—the garrison being one of four men and a boy. The windows were barricaded, and the doors were backed up by furniture. The unemployed began the assault with a volley of stones from the newly-metalled road. Windows were smashed and an entrance was almost made through a side door. Then a pistol was fired from the house and two men and a little girl were wounded—(the *Argus* report, by the way, does not mention this)—the girl afterwards dying, I think, from the effects of the wound. Police reinforcements now appeared, to raise the siege of the

beleaguered garrison. An arrest was made. The corps withdrew to a vacant piece of ground or, as *The Argus* put it, "to an evil-smelling right-of-way not far off, where equally unsavory doctrines were poured forth by a number of speakers."—At 10 o'clock police came and broke up the meeting.

Next day the arrested man was before the court, around which hundreds of unemployed congregated. The magistrate believed the defendant's witnesses rather than the police, and acquitted him. Immediately afterwards a mass meeting was held at the Trades Hall. It was decided "to swear a criminal information against the auctioneer who fired" from the shop and to organise meetings in all of Melbourne's suburbs "to bring under the notice of the authorities and the general public the terrible distress existing in Melbourne." Amongst those active in the organisation at the time was W. H. Macnamara, of Sydney, who was one of the founders of the Australian Socialist League in 1887 and who was then in Melbourne.

### (c) Splitting Tactics

But W. H. Macnamara had also played an active part in the unemployed movement in Sydney. Early in March, 1892, he had written, as secretary of the Unemployed Executive, to the heads of the various churches to arouse their interest in the unemployed question. This was done in pursuance of a resolution passed by the unemployed urging upon the clergy the duty of appealing to the rich in their churches to relieve the existing poverty and destitution. A day or so later they got their answer from the Presbyterians. The Rev. Dr. White, the new Moderator of the Presbyterian Assembly, was giving his inaugural address, and was telling his smug listeners that any poverty there was in the city was due to idleness, ignorance, and vicious habits of the poor themselves. He said:

"The pauperism of Christian countries may be traced almost entirely to wilful ignorance, voluntary idleness, and vicious habits. Never was wealth less accumulated than at present. Never were the masses possessed of so large a proportion of it as at present."

And this at the beginning of the biggest economic crisis that Australia ever saw prior to 1929! The comment of the *Sydney Truth*, then posing as a radical paper with Labor sympathies, was apt:

"Never was wealth less accumulated than at present, were the words spoken in a country where 820 persons hold one-half—and by far the most valuable half, too—of the alienated lands of the whole colony! They were the words spoken in a country where the estate just



willed away by one man, David Berry, is valued at £1,250,000. They were the words spoken in a city where the accumulation of one man, who never did a real day's work in his life—Sydney Burdekin—brings him in an income of £100,000 a year! And they were also the words spoken in a city which has 3500 labor-seekers on its bureau roll, today, and in which a despairing, poverty-stricken man, Charles Westphal by name, hanged himself with a halter after writing this terrible truth: 'No work, no money, no board, no lodging. An end with horror is better than horror without end!'—Truth (March 20, 1892).

In the meantime, Cardinal Moran, head of the Roman Catholic Church in Sydney, had received his letter from Macnamara, and had replied to it. He said:

"I can attest that there is at present, and there has been for some time past, a great deal of poverty and destitution among the working families and small shopkeepers, owing to the general depression of the times. We have done whatever little lay within our power to alleviate the prevalent distress. A good many diocesan works were carried on last year. During the past few weeks other works have been begun, such as additions to St. Vincent's Hospital, the presbytery at Camperdown, a new church at Blacktown, and a new school at Balmain. Should any sums be placed at my disposal, I will be only too happy to distribute them as faithfully as I can among the truly deserving families."—The Echo, March, 1892.

But then the Cardinal went on to add that there was another class for whom he had no sympathy. "These are," he wrote, "the professional unemployed, the aim of whose leaders is to bring discredit on the cause of honest Labor, and whose endeavor it is, by political intrigue, to sow dissension and to stir up evil passions among our citizens. It was hard enough in times past to cope with mercenary and trading politicians, but it is really too bad to have to deal at the present day with mercenary and trading unemployed."—And then he had something to say to the writer of the letter himself:

"As regards yourself personally, permit me to add one word. There is an individual bearing your name whose blatant impiety I see referred to from time to time in the public press. I trust that you are not this person. In writing these lines I have given you the benefit of the doubt. But should you happen to be that individual, I consider that it would not be wise for any honest citizen

to hold correspondence with men of such folly and delusions."

The Echo (March 17, 1892) called this a "stinging rebuke." (The Echo, it may be remembered, was the echo of The Sydney Morning Herald, being an evening paper published by The Herald.—The poet Kendall, by the way, once wrote an excellent poetic summing-up of The Herald's, and its Echo's, philosophy of life;—in it The Echo was pictured on Granny's knee receiving some advice. Two stanzas ran:

"What is life? Its full amount  
Is not worth a printer's fount  
If you have no bank account—  
Cannot sit and draw your cheque, O;  
Home this lesson I would bring.  
Sling your faith—your honor sling!  
Money—money's everything!"  
"Cuckoo, cuckoo," quoth The Echo.

"To improve my pocket's health  
I've been found by steps of stealth  
Fawning at the feet of wealth  
Like a filthy-featured gecko!  
Child, remember when you're big,  
Toady even wretched rig  
If he have a broadcloth rig!"  
"Cuckoo, cuckoo," quoth The Echo.)

So The Echo was heeding the advice when it spoke of the Cardinal's "stinging rebuke." But another paper (the Truth), which posed as a friend of the workers and the unemployed, made of the whole episode an opportunity to practise splitting tactics. Cardinal Moran's letter was published in various papers, among which was the Labor paper, *The Workman*. The editor of the latter (George Black, M.P.) added a footnote:

"The religious opinions or otherwise of Mr. McNamara are his own, and he is as much entitled to hold them as is Cardinal Moran to the possession of his various ecclesiastical views. As to the agitators who address meetings of the unemployed, and thereby stir up 'evil passions,' Cardinal Moran, like most of his profession, seems to have forgotten that the founder of his faith was in the habit of preaching the doctrine of discontent with social conditions to the unemployed of his time. It is true that he also, from time to time, fed them; that, doubtless, Mr. McNamara would also do had he the power, but in



imitating Christ, as far as he may, W. H. M. is surely more deserving of the commendation than the censure of any of the Messiah's modern followers."

The Truth's comment upon this was an unbalanced and vitriolic attack upon Black for his "blatant blasphemy" in comparing Macnamara with Christ. It said:

"Truth will not venture to give the details of this man McNamara's life. They are well known to the public, but why in the name of common decency do the workers of Sydney countenance the blatant blasphemy of this unclean atheist, Black [Of course, John Norton was a fit and proper person to brand anybody as unclean!—J. N. R.], who compares the man McNamara with Christ himself. The sheet that published this foul and indecent blasphemy is supposed to be the official organ of the Trades and Labor Council. Does the council then extend its patronage and give its countenance to blasphemous revilings of the Divine Democrat, Jesus of Nazareth, by this Black? If so, it may safely be said that all decent workers will refuse to longer have any connection with that body."

But, of course, this extravagant and wholly unwarranted outburst came from no piety or jealous reverence for religion's fair name. Norton (proprietor and editor of the Truth) would have preferred that his own paper should become the official organ of Labor, just as, a few months later, he was making inquiries about the possibility of his starting a Labor paper in Melbourne from this same Macnamara, who was then in Melbourne!—However, such splitting tactics as these were responsible for a division in the ranks of the unemployed. By the end of March there were two unemployed organisations in existence in Sydney: one controlled by Macnamara and his committee, of which a Mr. Paterson was made secretary, and the other controlled by some of the Labor politicians. (Evening News, March 29, 1892.)

\*

In Melbourne, much hostility was shown to the Labor politicians, who took no interest in the state of the unemployed. Away back in '92, the unemployed had little to expect from most Labor politicians. Trenwith, leader of the Labor Party in Victoria, had defended the actions of bailiffs and auctioneers in distraining the property of the unemployed. Hostility to him resulted in mass demonstrations at meetings he held and the taking from him of such meetings. Demonstrations were not confined to action against Labor politicians. When the fifteenth Parliament of Victoria met in the second week of May, 1892, a

large body of unemployed, in column of sevens, marched to Parliament House. No reference was made to the unemployed or their conditions in the Governor's speech, but a Village Settlements Bill about which something will be said later. This was the government's plan to abolish unemployment—and the government had been promised the support of the Labor Party in Parliament. Demonstrations by the unemployed were held during that winter of 1892 almost every day in Melbourne. The men held meetings at the Trades Hall every day at 11 a.m., and the women at 3 p.m. Then, at about dusk, they would gather again at the Trades Hall and from there march to various parts of the city with banners flying and torches flaring. Sometimes, when they heard of a Labor Party meeting in another part of the city, they would march there to demand a hearing. For example, once they were holding a meeting in Queensberry Street, Carlton, when they suddenly decided to march to Richmond. For there, near the gasometer (an appropriate place, it was said), Trenwith was holding forth. It was not long before the Labor politician had fled and the unemployed leaders were speaking to their followers from his platform!

The unemployed had their poets. One in Melbourne was a Mrs. Wilson, who dedicated her "Australia's Unemployed" to Dr. Maloney, M.L.A., who was actively sympathetic to them. She spoke of "golden Australia, the star of the world, crying for work and bread," and asked:

"Would you encircle your brows with a glory,  
Engraving your name in the annals of fame?

Erase from our pages this heartrending story  
Australia must blush for through ages of shame."

On June 17, 1892, The Argus published a long article on "The Destitution in City and Suburbs." Even that paper had been forced to give heed to the cries of the unemployed. Unemployment would last only a few months at most, it said, but in the meantime there was need for immediate action. It accepted the figures of Miss Sutherland, who was connected with charitable organisations. She said that there were 2500 "in desperate need," and all genuinely deserving cases. There were to be found, she said, "in their homes, foodless and fireless, men, women, and children alike, reduced by privation, and in nearly every home sickness present, the outcome of either disease or famine." The Argus investigator made some visits. "In one house visited the other day the wife lay ill upon a sofa with a sick baby in her arms, and four other little children around her. There was not a particle of food in that home, and not a spark of fire in the grate, bitterly cold as the day was. . . . This family were to be almost immediately without shelter as well as fire or



food, as they were threatened with ejection by the landlord." (The Argus, June 17, 1892.)

But the sting of The Argus article was in the tail. No government relief must be forthcoming, it said, for that would mean departing from a political principle. And no central relief depots must be opened, for if respectable working people got into the habit of assembling at such depots they would soon lose their respectability and become pauperised and debased. So, what were required were "money from the purses of private people and personal service from those who can undertake the work of district visiting." The Argus was mortally afraid that unemployment and a common destitution would create out of the mass of the unemployed a disciplined army that would be able to ensure the granting of its demands. A campaign of splitting went on throughout the press. A common line that they sought to draw was that between the respectable unemployed and the rest. For example, the Ballarat Star was concerned with the "vaporings" of "loud-mouthed demagogues," such as Flynn, Fleming, Rosa, and Edwards, "the champions of this mass of unwashed laziness."—"Liberty of speech is a grand thing," said The Star (Feb. 26, 1892), "but when liberty degenerates into licence it ought surely to be punished." Liberty, of course, meant the liberty to stay home and starve and freeze. Licence was to meet and march and demonstrate. Those who did the latter were punished. Men were fined and imprisoned for demonstrating, for speaking—for anything around which a charge could be framed. Ten shillings' fine or three days' imprisonment were awarded four unemployed who marched in a procession on June 25, 1892. In July, John White, well known then and since in Victorian Labor circles, was fined £5 for distributing leaflets to the unemployed at the labor bureau. The charge was that the printer's name and address were not on the leaflets, but the evidence and procedure in the court prove that it was purely a political charge. (See Melbourne Herald, July 21, 1892.) When White insisted on reading his leaflet in court, the magistrate cleared the court while it was being read!

\*

Throughout the history of capitalism unemployment has been the spectre that has haunted working-class mothers and fathers, chilling them to the very marrow with fear and apprehension. In Australia, also, that spectre has ever been present—begetter of tragedies innumerable, heartbreak and despair. Thousands of workers have toiled and built up homes and seen them taken away, have prepared for their old age and have filled paupers' graves, have seen their little ones—the child at the breast, the growing boy and blossoming girl—sicken and wither

and die, have watched their partners in life droop and grow old with despair, have seen their hopes turn to ashes because of it. It has ever been present to breathe its deadly breath upon people when buoyed up the highest with optimism. And this, generation after generation! But generation after generation, too, men have fought it, have organised to defeat it. The fight against unemployment is a long, epic fight that demands a longer chronicle than we can here give it, and in that fight there were heroes and indefatigable workers whose praises have yet to be sung and whose lives, deeds, and sacrifices should serve as an inspiration to us of this latter day when unemployment is a bigger spectre than ever—having formed a big part of Australia's fights for progress and freedom.

[To be concluded]



## SPAIN

*The Fascist Attack at Navalperal*

By HUGH SLATER (Madrid)

THE big drive against Madrid which the fascists have been preparing for some time took place yesterday at *Navalperal*, a large mountain village on our extreme left flank about 50 miles north of Madrid. The fascists put everything they had into this desperate, to them vital, attack, using their very best shock troops and certain shock tactics of a typically fascist kind.

The attack was preceded by a 24 hours' air bombardment which, because the fascist planes kept very high up, had done little damage to *Navalperal* itself, but which had set the fields on fire in a wide semi-circle south of the village. They were still blazing when we arrived at about six in the evening just after the worst of the fighting was over.

And it was over. The attack had been shattered. Sixty prisoners, 23 field guns, and some hundreds of horses were captured by the government forces. All that was left of the attack was two black-painted fascist planes circling over the road as our car wound up to the village. They looked dangerous when they came immediately overhead, so we stopped by some overhanging bushes and made for cover under a group of huge grey rocks, our driver eagerly fingering his revolver as he ran. But the planes were too high. They veered off, taking no notice of us.

Suddenly we noticed a flash of silver well above, and to the right of the two black planes. One of our scouts dived steeply after them, spluttering with its machine-gun. Neither of them was hit, but they faded away to the north and did not come back.

So ended the fascists' big push to Madrid.

We asked about the main attack and were told how a column of Moors led by a Spanish officer had walked out of their trenches with their hands up, indicating surrender. When they were near enough to our lines they threw the Mills bombs which they were carrying in their raised fists. In spite of such brilliant, patriotic generalship, the People's Militia beat them off fairly easily and carried through a successful counter-offensive.

Moors threatening Madrid! It is difficult to describe the depth of feeling this news evokes in the patriotic Spaniard. Even to us it was so amazing we could only half believe it. We must have looked incredulous because we were immediately invited to walk a little way over the hill and prove it for ourselves. There we found the bodies of two men in Foreign Legion uniform, lying stiffly among the light grey rocks and blackened grass. One was Spanish, the other was certainly a Moor. As the leaders of the

sham surrender, they had been regarded as traitors, not as prisoners of war. We had heard the shots of the firing squad a short time before, while we were talking.

Probably it was our loss of Badajoz which made it possible for Moorish troops to be transported north—a loss which also resulted in the machine-gunning by the fascists, not of two, but of 1500 government supporters in the bull ring there.

Then we went up to see the famous Colonel *Mangada*. He sat very still in a basket chair on the terrace of his headquarters, overlooking the mountains. His legs were crossed, and his pale, almost effeminate, hands rested lightly on the two arms of the chair. He looked tired and gave orders, answered questions and consulted with his officers without moving or changing his expression.

A rank-and-file prisoner was being questioned when we walked (without any formality) on to the terrace. After a few questions, Colonel *Mangada* got up quietly and kissed the prisoner on both cheeks—explaining that the People's Army does not hold the misguided rank and file of the enemy responsible for the treachery of their leaders. It is hardly possible to convey in words the look of relief that came into the gaunt face of the prisoner—who had probably been told by his officers that the "reds" always mutilate and then kill everybody who falls into their hands.

Next in the group of people waiting to speak to *Mangada* were two very young Militiamen, who produced about 300 peseta's worth of notes found in the pockets of one of the fascists killed in the recent attack. *Mangada* took the notes and drew our attention to the fact that looting of any kind is absolutely condemned by the Militiamen.

Naturally it is not possible to have more than a very few words with a commander actually in the course of directing his troops in action, but we came away with the impression of a man utterly convinced of the rightness of the cause for which he is fighting and having the most complete confidence in his raw, untrained, but heroic Militiamen. Colonel *Julio Mangada*, now one of the most respected of all the leaders of the Workers' Militia, was an officer in the old Regular Army. There is a story told of how, in 1932, he was on parade with the General *Goded*, who led the fascists in Barcelona recently. On this occasion, *Goded* made a speech ending up with "Long live Spain." Colonel *Mangada* immediately suggested that he should add the more correct slogan "Long live the Republic." *Goded*—it must be remembered that he was a general in the Republican Army—refused point-blank. *Mangada* is said to have slapped the general there and then across the face before the whole com-



pany. He was arrested but later released because the military authorities considered it inexpedient to focus too much attention on Goded's anti-republican opinions.

On our way back from Navalperal the guards along the road told us that there was an ambulance going very slowly a little way ahead, carrying a badly wounded Moor to hospital in Madrid. We were to take care not to run into it in the dark. Later we passed it, standing still while the nurses moved the Moor into a more comfortable position. Such is the care with which Republican Spain treats the wounded—both friends and enemies.

### Report From Valencia

The fascists did not get very far in Valencia, the beautiful and traditionally Republican town on the Mediterranean coast. Immediately the news of the rising came through, the people of the city succeeded, almost without bloodshed, in taking over the barracks and arresting the rebel officers. But for some days the fascists carried on a hopeless and spasmodic warfare, sniping from the roofs at the people in the streets and attempting in various ways to keep the town in a state of confusion until (they hoped) reinforcements could be brought up from Teruel or some other province.

One of the methods they used was to incite certain irresponsible elements among the government supporters to burn down the churches. Valencia Cathedral was set on fire in this way on the night of July 26. The news that the Cathedral was burning was brought to the Town Hall while there was a big mass meeting going on. The speaker, a Communist member of the Town Council, immediately called upon everybody present to leave the meeting and hurry to the defence of the cathedral. Although the fire was well out of hand by the time they got there, a group of Communist students succeeded in getting away (unharmed) the famous painting by El Greco.

That the fascists have been responsible for the burning of many of the churches in Spain is certain. Their aim is to whip up a general panic among the population under cover of which to seize control. Also, and this is not the least important of their objects, to create public antagonism towards the left organisations. Here, in Valencia, they have absolute proof of this fascist tactic. The head verger of the church of **San Juan**, a known fascist, was caught by Militiamen pouring petrol over the pews and scattering lighted wax matches about the church, for the safety of which he was supposed to be responsible.

It must be remembered that fascists have used such methods before. The bombing of Sofia Cathedral is not the only fascist

arson of which the Communists have been accused. Nor is Van der Lubbe the only lumpen-proletarian who has found himself being used as the instrument of reaction.

In Valencia, the **Communist Party** has formed a Special Commission for the Defence of Works of Art. The commission is fully armed and recognised by the municipal authorities. It is probable that here at least fascist violence will cost the people no more of their cultural heritage.

The Spanish Communist Party's objection to the destruction of valuable property must not be taken to mean that, on principle, the Party is against the use of religious structures for secular purposes. On the contrary, many such buildings have been converted into hospitals, schools, and public meeting halls as the result of Communist initiative. The Escorial, for example, has been made into an almost ideally cool and spacious hospital, and the convent at Quatro Caminos, in the northern part of Madrid, with its huge new red-brick church, is now usefully occupied by the famous 5th Regiment.

We spent the night in Valencia as the only occupants of an enormous, vulgarly furnished palace, once the property of a count and now the property of the municipality. We got up early from our four-poster beds, used the uncomfortable marble bath, and went out to visit the cruiser **Sanchez Barcaiztegui**, which happened to be lying in the harbor.

On board, sitting in the crowded saloon, we were told of the ship's adventures since the rising began.

On July 17 the Barcaiztegui left Cathagena for Algeciras. On the 18th men were surprised to find that they had arrived at Melilla. Everybody felt that something was going on that they were not being told about. The officers spoke cryptically from the bridge to the other cruisers in the harbor, using obviously guarded phrases and altogether behaving very suspiciously.

Soon all the officers went into the saloon and the men stood about the deck watching two government planes dropping bombs on Melilla. They noticed that the crew of the Lepanto, one of the other cruisers, were loading the guns—presumably with the intention of bombarding the town. All the petty officers were then ordered into the saloon and the captain announced that "Our glorious General Franco has triumphed all over Spain and a new government has been set up." This information was received very coldly by the petty officers, who returned to the deck without saying anything or asking any questions. Later the whole crew was called together and the captain tried out the same remarkable statement again. This time he produced even less response than he had before.

The Barcaiztegui then followed the Valdes, the third of the



cruisers at Melilla, out towards the open sea: but before they were clear of the harbor the Valdes had rammed the quayside. It looked as if this was not just bad seamanship, and the crew of the Barcaiztegui became sure of it when their captain gave certain orders which they knew would inevitably lead their ship into a similar "accident." One of the seamen immediately shouted down the speaking tube to the engineers, "Obey no more orders from the officers—full speed astern."

Thus the men were forced to take over control in order to save the ship from being wrecked. They tied up the officers, who did not resist, and sent a wireless message to the Ministry of Marine asking what to do next. These things were disorganised and the only reply they got was two words from the radio clerk in Madrid, saying "Good work."

When he was arrested, the captain had said: "I have played my cards and lost—I have ruined my career and compromised my honor; I can never return to Spain. Put me ashore somewhere in Africa." But by then a new captain, elected by a full meeting of the crew, was giving the orders, and the prisoners were locked up to be handed over later to the civil authorities in Malaga, for which port they then set out.

A battle was raging in Malaga when the Barcaiztegui steamed into port, neither the fascist nor the government forces having been able to gain the upper hand. The Republican flag flying from the mast of the Barcaiztegui served as the decisive factor in the battle. The fascists lost heart and surrendered. The men of the Barcaiztegui were thus responsible for the capture of this vitally important seaport by the government.

The ship's committee immediately went ashore to hand over the officers and to get supplies. Every luxury—large hams, fruit, wine, and cigars being provided for them by the government forces, who were by then firmly established. The committee telephoned to Madrid asking for a new captain. One was sent in an aeroplane, but when he arrived he had to take command not of the Barcaiztegui but of another cruiser whose crew had been unable to find one of their own members competent to do the work.

We were told this story by the second in command and about 20 seamen—all interjecting and adding details. Half-way through the captain they had elected, now officially commissioned from Madrid, appeared. He leant half in and half out of the saloon door on the edge of the group. Slim, very young, in a bright white uniform and tortoiseshell glasses, the captain of the Barcaiztegui contributed his own impressions and participated in the arguments on points of detail which were continually breaking out while the story was being told.

## The Indictment of the Trotsky-Zinoviev Terrorists

[The indictment of the Trotsky-Zinoviev terrorists proceeds from the trial which took place in 1935 of members of an illegal counter-revolutionary group of Zinoviev supporters, which called itself the "Moscow Centre," and also directed the activity of the Leningrad group whose members murdered Kirov on December 1, 1934. During the trial, the court registered the ideological and political responsibility of Zinoviev, Kamenev, and other leaders of the "Moscow Centre" for the murder of Kirov.

We reproduce here in full the terms of the indictment. In *The Workers' Weekly* there has been appearing material on the evidence given during the trial. The facts given both here and in *The Workers' Weekly* completely establish the guilt of these counter-revolutionaries, and at the same time dispose of the foul calumnies that they did not receive a fair trial.]

\*

### INDICTMENT

In the Case of G. E. Zinoviev, L. B. Kamenev, G. E. Yevdokimov, I. N. Smirnov, I. P. Bakayev, V. A. Ter-Vaganyan, S. V. Mrachkovsky, E. A. Dreizer, E. S. Holzman, I. I. Reingold, R. V. Pickel, V. P. Olberg, K. B. Berman-Yurin, Fritz David (I. I. Kruglyansky), M. Lurye, and N. Lurye, Accused of Crimes Covered by Articles 58-8, 19-58-8, and 58-11 of the Criminal Code of the R.S.F.S.R.

ON January 15-16, 1935, in the city of Leningrad, the Assize Session of the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R. tried the case of the underground counter-revolutionary group of Zinovievites calling itself the "Moscow Centre," the principal leaders of which among the others convicted in this case were G. E. ZINOVIEV, L. B. KAMENEV, G. E. YEVDOKIMOV, and I. P. BAKAYEV.

The preliminary investigation and the trial of this case established that for a number of years this so-called "Moscow Centre" guided the counter-revolutionary activities of diverse underground groups of Zinovievites, including the counter-revolutionary activities of the Leningrad group of NIKOLAYEV-KOTOLYNOV, which on December 1, 1934, foully murdered Comrade S. M. Kirov.

The trial established that the so-called "Moscow Centre," being the ideological and political leader of the Leningrad group



of Zinovievites, knew that this group was disposed towards terrorism, and did all it could to fan this disposition into a flame.

This had to be admitted also by the accused ZINOVIEV and KAMENEV, who denied that they took any part in the murder of Comrade S. M. KIROV, hypocritically stating at the trial that they bore only moral and political responsibility for the murder of Comrade KIROV.

It now transpires that 18 months ago, in the investigation of the case of the murder of Comrade S. M. KIROV, the investigating and judicial authorities were not in possession of all the facts revealing the true role of the leaders of the so-called "Moscow Centre" on the one hand and the leaders of the Trotskyite underground organisation on the other, in the White Guard, terroristic underground activity of the Zinovievites.

On the basis of newly-revealed circumstances ascertained by the investigating authorities in 1936 in connection with the discovery of a number of terroristic groups of Trotskyites and Zinovievites, the investigation has established that ZINOVIEV, KAMENEV, YEVDOKIMOV, and BAKAYEV, who were convicted in the Moscow Centre case, actually not only knew that their adherents in Leningrad were disposed towards terrorism, but were the direct organisers of the murder of Comrade S. M. KIROV.

The investigation also established that ZINOVIEV, KAMENEV, YEVDOKIMOV, BAKAYEV, and a number of other accused in the present case, who will be spoken of later, were the initiators and organisers of attempts which were also being prepared on the lives of other leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet Government.

The investigation has also established that the Zinovievites pursued their criminal terroristic practices in a direct bloc with the Trotskyites and with L. TROTSKY, who is abroad.

These newly-revealed circumstances establish without a doubt that:

(1) At the end of 1932 the Trotskyite and Zinovievite groups amalgamated and formed a united centre, consisting of the persons charged in the present case, namely, ZINOVIEV, KAMENEV, YEVDOKIMOV, BAKAYEV (from the Zinovievites) and I. N. SMIRNOV, TER-VAGANYAN, and MRACHKOVSKY (from the Trotskyites).

(2) The principal condition for the amalgamation of these counter-revolutionary groups was the mutual recognition of individual terror towards the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government.

(3) Precisely from this time onwards (end of 1932) the Trotskyites and Zinovievites, acting on direct instructions from L. TROTSKY, instructions received by the united centre through special agents, concentrated all their hostile activity against the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government mainly on the organisation of terrorism towards the most prominent leaders of the Party and the Government.

(4) With this end in view the united centre organised special terroristic groups, which prepared a number of practical measures to murder Comrades STALIN, VOROSHILOV, KAGANOVICH, KIROV, ORJONIKIDZE, ZHDANOV, KOSIOR, POSTYSHEV, and others.

(5) One of these terroristic groups, consisting of Nikolayev, Rumyantsev, Mandelstam, Levin, Kotolynov, and others, who were convicted by the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R. on December 28-29, 1934, foully murdered Comrade S. M. KIROV on December 1, 1934, on the direct instructions of ZINOVIEV and L. TROTSKY, and under the direct guidance of the united centre.

1. The Trotskyite-Zinovievite United Terrorist Centre

The evidence of ZINOVIEV, KAMENEV, YEVDOKIMOV, MRACHKOVSKY, BAKAYEV and a number of other accused in the present case has established beyond doubt that the only motive for organising the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc was their striving to seize power at all costs, and that the sole and decisive means chosen for this purpose was the organisation of terroristic acts against the most prominent leaders of the Party and the Government.

Lacking all support in the working class and toiling masses of the people in the U.S.S.R., having lost all their ideological stock-in-trade, having no political programme, and imbued with bitter hatred toward the Socialist victories of our country, the leaders of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite counter-revolutionary bloc, TROTSKY, ZINOVIEV, and KAMENEV, sank utterly into the swamp of White Guardism, joined forces and merged with the most bitter enemies of the Soviet Government, and became the organising force of the last remnants of the exploiting classes which have been routed in the U.S.S.R. In their desperation and hatred they resorted to the most despicable means of fighting the Soviet Government and the leaders of the C.P.S.U., namely, political assassination.

At first, in the face of the first successes of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., they held to their hopes that difficulties would arise, with which, in their calculations, the Soviet Government would



not be able to cope. But later, seeing that these difficulties were being successfully overcome and that our country was emerging victorious from these difficulties, they frankly banked on the complication of international relations, on war and the defeat of the Soviet Government.

Seeing no favorable prospects for themselves, they have resorted to the gun; they have organised underground terrorist groups and made use of the most detestable methods of fighting, namely, terrorism.

Now the Trotskyite-Zinovievite conspirators, as a reason for their fight against the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government, no longer advance the false claim that the Party and the Soviet Government are pursuing a wrong policy, or that the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government are leading the country to its doom, as they lyingly and slanderously declared in the past. Their principal motive for the employment of terrorism they now consider to be the success of the building of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., the successes achieved in the cultural and economic growth of the country, which success, demonstrating the ideological and political bankruptcy of the Trotskyites-Zinovievites, fans their hatred of the Soviet Government still more and intensifies their desire to avenge themselves on the Soviet Government for their political bankruptcy by resorting to terrorism.

In spite of obdurate equivocation, the accused ZINOVIEV was compelled by the weight of evidence which was brought against him by the investigating authorities to admit that:

"... The main object which the Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre pursued was to kill the leaders of the C.P.S.U., and in the first place to kill STALIN and KIROV." (Vol. XII, file 16.)

Another member of this centre, the accused REINGOLD, during examination on July 3, 1936, deposed:

"... The main thing on which all the members of the bloc agreed was... the recognition of the necessity of consolidating all forces to capture the Party leadership. I must admit that the fundamental aim of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc was to remove by violence the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government, and first and foremost STALIN. At the end of 1932 the centre adopted a decision to organise a terroristic struggle against the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and the Government. I know that the Trotskyite section of the bloc received instruc-

tions from L. D. Trotsky to take the path of terrorism and to prepare attempts on the life of STALIN." (Vol. XXVII, file 52.)

On this same point exhaustive evidence was also given during the examination on July 23, 1936, by the accused KAMENEV. The accused KAMENEV stated:

"... The emergence from difficulties, the victory of the policy of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. filled us with a new flood of rage and hatred towards the leadership of the Party, and primarily towards STALIN."

"... We, i.e., the Zinoviev centre of the counter-revolutionary organisation, the members of which I have enumerated above, and the Trotskyite counter-revolutionary organisation in the persons of SMIRNOV, MRACHKOVSKY, and TER-VAGANYAN, negotiated in 1932 to unite both the Zinovievite and Trotskyite counter-revolutionary organisations for joint preparation to carry out terroristic acts against the leaders of the Central Committee and in the first place against STALIN and KIROV."

"... The main thing is that in 1932 ZINOVIEV and we, namely, I myself (KAMENEV), YEVDOKIMOV, BAKAYEV, and the Trotskyite leaders, namely, SMIRNOV, MRACHKOVSKY, and TER-VAGANYAN, decided that the only means by which we could hope to come into power was to organise the committing of terroristic acts against the leaders of the C.P.S.U., and primarily against STALIN. It was precisely on this basis of a terroristic struggle against the leaders of the C.P.S.U. that negotiations for amalgamation were conducted between ourselves and the Trotskyites." (Vol. XV, files 10, 12, 13.)

The accused KAMENEV further stated that:

"... We gambled on the country's inability to surmount the difficulties it was going through, on the state of crisis in economy, on the collapse of the economic policy of the Party leadership, and towards the second half of 1932 it was already plain that the gamble was lost. "Overcoming the difficulties, the country, under the leadership of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., marched successfully along the road of economic growth. We could not help seeing this.

"One would have thought that this would have made us stop fighting. But the logic of the counter-revolutionary struggle, the naked unprincipled attempt to seize power, led us in the other direction. The emergence from the



difficulties, the victory of the policy of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., filled us with fresh rage and hatred towards the leaders of the Party, and in the first place towards STALIN." (Vol. XV, file 27.)

This was confirmed by the accused YEVDOKIMOV who, on August 10 this year, gave detailed evidence on the organisation of the united centre and its line of terrorism. In reply to the question put to him by the investigation on what basis the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc arose, the accused YEVDOKIMOV stated:

"... MRACHKOVSKY said: 'The hopes we have placed on the collapse of the Party's policy must be considered as doomed. The methods of struggle used up to now have not produced any positive results. There remains only one path of struggle, and that is the removal of the leadership of the Party and the Government by violence. . . . ' Seeing that I agreed with him, MRACHKOVSKY, no longer having any fear that I would not support him, went on to say: 'STALIN and the other leaders of the Party and the Government must be removed. This is the principal task.'

"Right there, MRACHKOVSKY informed me that the Trotskyites had received instructions from TROTSKY on the necessity of organising terroristic attempts on the lives of the leaders of the Party and the Government, that TROTSKY, being outside the Soviet Union, correctly defined the tasks of the fight against the leadership of the C.P.S.U. At the same time, by the logic of the struggle, MRACHKOVSKY himself and other Trotskyites came to the conclusion that terror was the only method of struggle remaining. . . . SMIRNOV expressed the same views as those expressed by MRACHKOVSKY. . . . In conclusion, MRACHKOVSKY and SMIRNOV proposed that the forces of the Trotskyites and Zinovievites amalgamate and proceed to create a secret terrorist group for the purpose of committing terroristic acts against the leaders of the Party and the Government." (Vol. XXXVI, file 10.)

Similar evidence was given by a member of the Moscow terrorist centre, I. I. REINGOLD, who stated the following:

"I met KAMENEV in the second half of 1933 and also in 1934 at his apartment in Karmanitsky Pereulok, in Moscow. KAMENEV appraised the situation in approximately the same way as ZINOVIEV had done and backed his conclusions by an analysis of the economic and political situation in the country. KAMENEV arrived at the conclusion that after all things were not moving toward catastrophe but were on the upgrade; therefore, all

expectations of an automatic collapse were groundless, and the leadership that had grown up was made of too hard a granite to expect that it would split of itself. From this KAMENEV drew the conclusion that the 'leadership will have to be split.'

"KAMENEV repeatedly quoted TROTSKY as saying 'the whole thing is in the head group, therefore the head group must be removed.'

"KAMENEV urged the necessity of waging a terroristic struggle and primarily the necessity of killing STALIN, pointing out that this was the only way of coming into power. I particularly remember his cynical remark that 'Heads are distinguished by the fact that they do not grow on again.'

"KAMENEV proposed that terrorist gunmen be trained. He said that the distinguishing feature of the new bloc compared with the previous opposition bloc was the adoption of energetic terroristic action." (Vol. XXVII, file 61.)

He further said:

"... I have already stated above that the Trotskyite-Zinovievite amalgamation had no new political programme. They based themselves upon the old threadbare platform, and none of the leaders of the bloc occupied themselves with or were interested in the question of drawing up any kind of political programme that was to any degree complete and consistent. The only thing that united this ill-assorted bloc was the idea of waging a terroristic fight against the leaders of the Party and the Government. "As a matter of fact, the bloc was a counter-revolutionary terrorist gang of assassins who strove to seize power in the country by any means whatever." (Vol. XXVII, files 72-73.)

The accused I. N. SMIRNOV, during examination on August 5, 1936, also admitted that he met SEDOV, L. TROTSKY'S son, while he was in Berlin as far back as 1931.

I. N. SMIRNOV stated:

"... In the course of our conversation, L. SEDOV, analysing the situation in the Soviet Union, expressed the opinion that under the present conditions only the removal by violence of the leading persons in the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government could bring about a change in the general situation in the country. . . . " "I admit that the adoption of terroristic means as the only way of changing the situation in the Soviet Union was known to me from a conversation with SEDOV



in Berlin in 1931 as his own personal line. I admit that this line of SEDOV'S was confirmed by L. TROTSKY in 1932 in his personal instructions conveyed to me through J. GAVEN.

"I admit that TER-VAGANYAN, who with my knowledge conducted negotiations with the leftists and the Zinovievites in the name of the Trotskyite group formed a bloc with KAMENEV, ZINOVIEV, and the LOMINADZE group for joint struggle against the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government and that L. TROTSKY'S instructions regarding terror against the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet State were made the basis of this bloc." (Vol. XXIX, files 93, 104.)

The accused V. A. TER-VAGANYAN confirmed this evidence of the accused SMIRNOV, admitting his participation in the united centre, as well as the participation of the accused I. N. SMIRNOV, MRACHKOVSKY, ZINOVIEV, and KAMENEV in this centre.

The accused TER-VAGANYAN admitted that:

"The Trotskyite organisation headed by I. N. SMIRNOV, in its counter-revolutionary activity, particularly fostered hatred and rage against the leaders of the C.P.S.U. . . . It was on this hatred that the bloc was formed. . . ." (Vol. XXXVIII, file 11.)

The accused TER-VAGANYAN also admitted that as far back as 1931—

"SEDOV received from TROTSKY special instructions for I. N. SMIRNOV and the underground Trotskyites in the U.S.S.R. to adopt the most active and sharp methods of struggle against the Party and its leadership." (Vol. XXXVIII, file 27.)

Confirming the evidence of the accused MRACHKOVSKY on this point, the accused TER-VAGANYAN stated:

"MRACHKOVSKY is right when he says that the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc itself was really organised on the recognition that it was necessary to fight the leadership of the Party and the Government by terroristic methods." (Vol. XXXVIII, file 37.)

Thus, there is no doubt left that the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc had turned into a group of unprincipled, political, adventurist assassins striving at only one thing, namely, to get into power even by resorting to terrorism.

Such is the sole and exhaustive "programme" of this gang of political assassins.

Concerning terrorism as the sole basis on which the amalga-

mation of the Trotskyites and Zinovievites took place in 1932, evidence was given at the preliminary investigation by the accused R. V. PICKEL. During the examination on July 23, PICKEL stated:

" . . . According to the information conveyed to us by REINGOLD in the beginning of 1934, the united All-Union counter-revolutionary centre of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc decided by the efforts of the Trotskyites and Zinovievites to strike a crushing blow at the C.P.S.U. by committing a number of terroristic acts aimed to deprive the leadership of a head and to seize power.

"The All-Union centre of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc then bluntly raised the question of the necessity of 'surgical intervention' (meaning terror) in order to change the situation in the country radically. For this purpose the centre gave instructions to select people who nursed particularly bitter feelings against the Party leadership, who had very strong will-power, and were capable of carrying out terroristic attempts on the lives of the leaders of the C.P.S.U." (Vol. XXV, file 65.)

In conformity with the line adopted by the Trotskyite-Zinovievite underground bloc to seize power by any means, the members of this bloc widely practised double-dealing as the special and fundamental method in their attitude towards the Party and the Government.

One of the principal tasks of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc was in every possible way to conceal and mask its counter-revolutionary activity and organisation of terroristic acts.

On this point the accused REINGOLD stated:  
" . . . In 1933-34 ZINOVIEV told me when I was alone with him in his apartment that: . . . The principal practical task is to organise the terroristic work so secretly as to prevent ourselves from being compromised in any way. . . ."

" . . . When under examination the main thing is persistently to deny any connection with the organisation.

If accused of terroristic activity, you must stubbornly deny it and argue that terror is incompatible with the views of a Bolshevik Marxist." (Vol. XXVII, files 110, 112.)

Similar instructions were given by L. TROTSKY, who recommended that when terrorist acts were committed they were to dissociate themselves from them and "take up a position analogous to that taken up by the Central Committee of the Socialist Revolutionaries toward Madame Kaplan," who shot at V. I. Lenin.

Another reason why the united centre resorted to profound



secrecy and carefully masked its terroristic activity was that one of its tasks was to betray the vigilance of the working class and the masses of the toilers. While preparing the murder of Comrade STALIN and other leaders of the C.P.S.U., the united centre simultaneously strove by all means in its power to demonstrate its loyalty and even devotion to the Party and the Soviet Government, to demonstrate its repentance of past mistakes and readiness to serve the proletarian revolution honestly. The leaders of the united centre figured that having been "forgiven" they could utilise this "forgiveness" to come into power after killing Comrade STALIN. On this point the accused REINGOLD stated:

"They figured—I am speaking of the leaders of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre—that the fact that we were forgiven while STALIN was still alive, the fact that confidence was placed in us, would ensure our coming nearer to the leadership and to power; and following this, after ZINOVIEV, KAMENEV, and their supporters had come into power, they would ensure the return also of TROTSKY to the leadership and to power." (Vol. XXVII, file 168.)

This was also testified to during examination by the accused KAMENEV:

"... We discussed this question more than once. We outlined and decided on two alternatives for the leaders of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc coming to power.

"The first, and what seemed to us to be the most feasible alternative was that after a terroristic act had been committed against STALIN there would ensue confusion in the leadership of the Party and the Government, and negotiations would be opened with us, the leaders of the Zinovievite bloc, and primarily with ZINOVIEV, KAMENEV, and TROTSKY.

"We assumed that in these negotiations ZINOVIEV and I would occupy the leading positions in the Party and the country, for even under STALIN, we, by our policy of double-dealing, had, after all, been forgiven by the Party for our mistakes and had been taken back into its ranks, and our participation, that is, ZINOVIEV, TROTSKY, and myself, in the terroristic acts would remain secret from the Party and the country.

"The second alternative by which we could seize power, and which seemed to us to be less reliable, was that after a terroristic act had been committed against STALIN, the leadership of the Party and the country would be thrown into a state of uncertainty and disorganisation.

"The leaders of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc would be able to take advantage of the confusion to compel the remaining leaders of the Party to admit us to power or else resign in our favor.

"Trotsky's return and his active participation in the struggle for power were taken as a matter of course." (Vol. XV, files 33-34.)

The united Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre took the path of terror under the direct influence of L. D. TROTSKY, who personally gave the members of the united centre verbal and written instructions accordingly.

During examination on July 20, 1936, the accused S. V. MRACHKOVSKY stated:

"... We Trotskyites adopted the policy of terror long before the bloc with ZINOVIEV and KAMENEV was formed. In 1931, when I. N. SMIRNOV was in Berlin and had established contact with L. TROTSKY, instructions were received from the latter to proceed to the organisation of militant groups of Trotskyites." (Vol. XVIII, files 40, 41.)

This same MRACHKOVSKY stated:

"... According to the instructions of L. TROTSKY, received in 1931 by I. N. SMIRNOV, we were to kill STALIN, VOROSHILOV, and KAGANOVICH. STALIN was to be killed first." (Vol. XVIII, file 42.)

On TROTSKY'S attitude towards forming a united Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc and adopting terrorist methods of struggle, the accused MRACHKOVSKY stated the following:

"... In the middle of 1932, I. N. SMIRNOV put the question before our leading trio of the necessity of uniting our organisation with the ZINOVIEV-KAMENEV and SHATSKIN-LOMINADZE groups. ... It was then decided to consult L. TROTSKY on this question and to obtain his instructions. L. TROTSKY replied, agreeing to the amalgamation of a bloc on the condition that the groups amalgamating in the bloc would agree to the question of the necessity of removing by violence the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and primarily STALIN." (Vol. XVIII, files 44, 45.)

This evidence of MRACHKOVSKY was fully confirmed by the accused DREIZER who during examination stated:

"... On the direct instructions of L. TROTSKY, our All-Union centre of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc was to prepare and carry out the murder of STALIN and VOROSHILOV for the purpose of depriving the leadership of



the C.P.S.U. and the Red Army of a head." (Vol. X, file 99.)

In 1934, the accused DREIZER personally received written instructions from TROTSKY, through L. TROTSKY'S son, SEDOV, to prepare and carry out a terroristic act against Comrade STALIN. This letter was written by TROTSKY himself. According to DREIZER'S evidence, the contents of this letter were as follows:

"Dear friend,—Tell the others that today the following main tasks lie before us:

- "(1) To remove STALIN and VOROSHILOV.
- "(2) To develop work on organising nuclei in the army.
- "(3) In the event of war, to take advantage of every set back and confusion to capture the leadership."

The accused DREIZER stated that "the letter ended with instructions to inform TROTSKY of the progress of the work done in fulfilment of the above instructions. I must add that these instructions of TROTSKY fully confirm the instructions I received from MRACHKOVSKY in May, 1934." (Vol. X, files 102, 103.)

This letter was addressed by TROTSKY to DREIZER personally as to one of the people most loyal to him, and who at one time was chief of his personal bodyguard.

DREIZER handed this letter to MRACHKOVSKY, who, according to the evidence of DREIZER and of MRACHKOVSKY himself, eventually destroyed it for reasons of secrecy.

In addition to the above-mentioned letter, TROTSKY sent to the Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre a number of other verbal and written instructions concerning terrorism. In particular, he sent instructions of this nature when he met the accused HOLZMAN, who served as a contact man between L. TROTSKY and the Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre.

The investigation has established that after the break-up of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre in connection with the murder of Comrade KIROV, L. TROTSKY himself assumed the leadership of terroristic activities in the U.S.S.R., and began to strongly press forward the organisation of the murder of Comrades STALIN and VOROSHILOV. For this purpose he took steps to restore the terroristic groups in the U.S.S.R. and to stimulate their activity. He sent a number of his tried agents to the U.S.S.R. and also used for this purpose persons belonging to underground Trotskyite organisations in the U.S.S.R. who went abroad ostensibly on official business.

The investigation has established that at various times the following accused persons were sent from Berlin to Moscow as

such agents: V. OLBERG, BERMAN-YURIN, FRITZ DAVID (KRUGLYANSKY), MOSES LURYE, NATHAN LURYE, and several others who received directly from L. D. TROTSKY and his son SEDOV (L. L. TROTSKY) instructions to organise the murder of Comrades STALIN, VOROSHILOV, KAGANOVICH, and other leaders of the Party at all costs.

One of these Trotskyite agents, V. OLBERG, who arrived in the U.S.S.R. with the passport of a citizen of the Republic of Honduras, stated when arrested and examined:

"... As I have already stated, I began active Trotskyite operations at the beginning of 1931. In addition to the persons I have enumerated, I was personally connected with TROTSKY and his son LEO SEDOV; I carried out a number of assignments given to me personally by TROTSKY in connection with the Trotskyite organisation, and I was his emissary in Germany. As TROTSKY'S emissary in Germany, I carried on work in TROTSKY'S organisation in Berlin and also maintained secret connections with the Soviet Union. I maintained connections with the Soviet Union at addresses and conspirative houses which LEO SEDOV indicated to me." (Vol. XXI, file 24.)

V. OLBERG admitted that he arrived in the U.S.S.R. illegally for the purpose of carrying on Trotskyite counter-revolutionary work and of organising a terroristic act against Comrade STALIN.

During examination on February 21 this year, V. OLBERG stated that during one of his meetings with L. TROTSKY'S son, SEDOV, the latter showed him a letter from TROTSKY in which TROTSKY proposed that OLBERG be sent to the Soviet Union with a group of German Trotskyites for the purpose of organising the murder of STALIN.

"... In this letter," V. OLBERG goes on to say, "TROTSKY wrote to SEDOV stating that he fully agreed with his proposal that I be sent to the Soviet Union. TROTSKY wrote that he considered me to be an absolutely suitable person who could be fully trusted in a matter of such keenness."

To this Oldberg added:

"SEDOV said to me that it was my duty to conceal TROTSKY'S role in the organisation of terroristic acts against STALIN by every possible means, and that even if I were arrested in circumstances in which my role as a terrorist would be absolutely obvious, I was to conceal the fact that I was a Trotskyite and was committing the



terroristic act on TROTSKY'S instructions." (Vol. XXI, files 77, 78.)

As the investigation has established, V. OLBERG arrived in the U.S.S.R. with the passport of a citizen of the Republic of Honduras obtained with the aid of the German Secret Police (Gestapo).

On this point, V. OLBERG, during examination in the office of the State Prosecutor of the U.S.S.R., stated:

"... SEDOV promised to help me to obtain a passport to return to the U.S.S.R. once more. But I succeeded in obtaining a passport with the help of my younger brother, PAUL OLBERG. Thanks to my connections with the German police and their agent in Prague, V. P. TUKA-LEVSKY, I, by means of a bribe, obtained the passport of a citizen of the Republic of Honduras. The money for the passport—13,000 Czechoslovakian kron—I obtained from SEDOV, or, rather, from the Trotskyite organisation on SEDOV'S instructions." (Vol. XXI, file 262.)

Re-examined on the question of his connection with the Gestapo, V. OLBERG, on July 31 this year, stated:

"Likewise confirming the evidence of May 9 this year, I emphasise that my connection with the Gestapo was not at all an exception, of which one could speak as of the downfall of an individual Trotskyite. It was the line of the Trotskyites in conformity with the instructions of L. TROTSKY given through SEDOV.

"The connection with the Gestapo took the line of organising terrorism in the U.S.S.R. against the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government."

"... Several times I met a prominent official of the Gestapo, whose name was not mentioned to me, and I did not consider it convenient to inquire. With this official I discussed my first journey to Moscow and my plans concerning a terroristic act. This official knew my brother as an agent of the Gestapo to whom he advised me to apply for help whenever necessary." (Vol. XXI, files 263-264.)

This testimony of V. OLBERG was fully confirmed by PAUL OLBERG, also an agent of the German Secret Police, arrested in connection with another case. It was PAUL OLBERG who put his brother, V. OLBERG, as both of them testify, in touch with the Gestapo and helped V. OLBERG to obtain from the Gestapo the passport of a citizen of the Republic of Honduras, which figures as an exhibit in the present case.

PAUL OLBERG also confirms the fact that V. OLBERG'S

journey to the U.S.S.R. was organised with terroristic purposes. During examination on May 16 this year, PAUL OLBERG stated:

"... VALENTINE OLBERG informed me that an official of the German Secret Police stated that all persons taking part in preparing and committing terroristic acts would find refuge in Germany." (Vol. XXIV, file 231.)

Another Trotskyite agent, sent to the U.S.S.R. with terrorist instructions, namely, BERMAN-YURIN, stated:

"... My personal role was that I arrived in the U.S.S.R. as a person particularly in the confidence of LEV DAVIDOVICH TROTSKY with a special mission and instructions from him." (Vol. IV, file 30.)

As the investigation has established, this "special mission and instructions" were to organise the murder of Comrade STALIN. This was admitted by the accused BERMAN-YURIN, who stated that, on meeting L. TROTSKY in Copenhagen, he received from TROTSKY instructions on the necessity of killing Comrade STALIN.

"... During this conversation," said the accused BERMAN-YURIN, "TROTSKY openly said to me that in the fight against STALIN one must not hesitate to resort to extreme measures, and that STALIN must be physically destroyed." (Vol. IV, file 36.)

"... TROTSKY emphasised that the attempt must be prepared very carefully and circumspectly, and should coincide with some big political international event. It would be most preferable, if the opportunity arose, to make the attempt coincide with some plenum or congress of the Comintern. TROTSKY stated that such a terroristic act committed at a congress or plenum would immediately give it the character of an international political event; it would rouse the masses far beyond the frontiers of the U.S.S.R. and would give rise to a powerful movement.

"TROTSKY told me that this terroristic act against STALIN must not be committed secretly, on the quiet, but that the murder must be committed publicly, in front of an international forum." (Vol. IV, files 38, 39.)

Simultaneously with BERMAN-YURIN, L. TROTSKY sent the accused FRITZ DAVID (I. I. KRUGLYANSKY) to the U.S.S.R. to prepare for terroristic acts.

In the autumn of 1932, FRITZ DAVID (I. I. KRUGLYANSKY) also had a meeting with L. TROTSKY, arranged by SEDOV. In conversation with him, TROTSKY proposed that FRITZ DAVID (I. I. KRUGLYANSKY) undertake, as he expressed it, the "historic mission" of killing STALIN.



FRITZ DAVID (I. L. KRUGLYANSKY) stated:

"... In proposing that I go to the U.S.S.R. to kill STALIN, TROTSKY advised me, for the sake of secrecy, not to maintain open connections with the Trotskyites, but outwardly to adhere to the position of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany.

"This conversation with TROTSKY took place in November, 1932, and I accepted his proposal to kill STALIN." (Vol. VIII, file 73.)

On arriving in the U.S.S.R., BERMAN-YURIN found FRITZ DAVID (I. I. KRUGLYANSKY) at an address given him by SEDOV, FRITZ DAVID (I. I. KRUGLYANSKY), and BERMAN-YURIN decided to kill Comrade STALIN at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern. This, however, they failed to do owing to the fact that BERMAN-YURIN was unable to get into the congress, while FRITZ DAVID (I. I. KRUGLYANSKY), although he got into the congress, could not carry out his criminal intention because he sat far away from the platform and had no opportunity of getting near to Comrade STALIN.

As both of the accused admitted during the investigation, FRITZ DAVID (I. I. KRUGLYANSKY) was to have shot Comrade STALIN at the Seventh Congress with a Browning pistol which he received from BERMAN-YURIN. (Vol. VIII, file 77.)

[TO BE CONCLUDED]

## INCREASED SALES

INCREASED orders for the October Review were 381, or 13.5 per cent. This is good. However, to reach our objective of 5000 by May 1, 1937, the percentage increase on August issue figures must improve.

Victoria and Queensland lead in increased circulation for the September issue.

We expect other districts to challenge the leaders.

How about it, Newcastle, South Australia, and Western Australia?

Due to an underestimation of the probable increase by the Business Manager, we were unable to fulfil in full all increased orders for the September issue.

To prevent similar happenings, agents are asked to notify us of increased orders before the 20th of each preceding month.

### SALES CHART

	Increase on Aug. Figures.	
	Copies.	Per Cent.
NORTH QUEENSLAND .. ..	648	35
VICTORIA .. ..	780	30
WESTERN AUSTRALIA .. ..	120	11.11
SOUTH QUEENSLAND .. ..	405	8
SYDNEY AND DISTRICT .. ..	924	6.94
SOUTH AUSTRALIA .. ..	48	—
NEWCASTLE AND DISTRICT ..	180	—
TASMANIA .. ..	6	—
BROKEN HILL .. ..	24	—
FILES AND EXCHANGE .. ..	24	—
Total .. ..	3159	