

Workers' Pamphlet No. 3

BEHIND
THE
SHOOTING
OF
ZINOVIEV

Price 3d.

*Published 1936, by the
Workers' Party of Australia*

P
947.084
B39W

PRESENTED TO
THE
STATE LIBRARY
OF VICTORIA

BY

Mr. A. T. Brodney

1978

THE STATE LIBRARY OF VICTORIA
MELBOURNE

FOREWORD

The publication of this pamphlet by the Workers' Party comes at a time when increasing numbers of the world's workers are asking: "What is wrong with the Soviet Union?" Herein we attempt to briefly outline the social and political reasons leading up to the recent working class executions and imprisonments in the Soviet Union and show how they are the inevitable results of the theory of "socialism in one country alone."

This pamphlet should be read in conjunction with the previous literature of the Workers' Party which has been published internationally over the past decade. A close study of this literature will convince the studious worker and supporter of the revolutionary movement that the present changes in Soviet policy—internal and international—have been anticipated by the advocates of the Fourth International. The Fourth Internationalists (Trotskyists) were able to anticipate these events because they have maintained a clear Marxist-Leninist method of analysing the situation.

Indeed, so pertinent has been our criticisms of the anti-Marxist, national socialist policies of the Stalinist bureaucracy, that its supporters no longer attempt any political defence but couline then selves to stupid and lying statements about us in a frantic endeavour to save their own skins, and, incidentally, fool the working class.

Lack of material resources (finance) has at the last moment necessitated the omission of an important chapter dealing with the political biography of Stalin. We believe, however, that the matter we have been able to publish will help to enlighten militant workers on the cause and the meaning of the executions. Wherever possible we have quoted from the writings of Leon Trotsky, believing that the chief accused should himself be heard. Our main regret is that we have been prevented by lack of space from quoting him more often.

Secretariat,
Workers' Party of Australia



STATE LIBRARY
OF VICTORIA
21 JUN 1982
SOURCE
CALL No.

Behind the Shooting of Zinoviev

THE TRIAL

No political trial of importance in modern times has been held in such furious haste as that of Zinoviev, Kamenev and their associates. Between the date of the discovery of the alleged "plot" and the execution of the sixteen accused there lay barely one week. Such unparalleled haste alone is proof that Stalin-Yagoda have much to fear and hide.

With what howling would the claquers of Stalinism have greeted an attempt by Hitler to deal with the Reichstag fire case in four—or even ten, times the time allowed by the G.P.U.?

Moreover, on the occasion of the frame-up, Hitler had to remain content with killing his stool-pigeon—Van der Lubbe. His political opponents Torgler, Dimitrov, Popov, and Tanev, were acquitted and remained alive to expose him. Stalin kills his Van der Lubbe—David—and with him his own lifelong political co-workers. None shall remain to expose Stalin.

More apt is a comparison with Hitler's blood purge against Strasser, Roehm, Ernst and Co. But in that instance the Nazi fratricide did not hide behind a juridical farce.

Before Stalin

Let us contrast the methods used before the rise of Stalin. In 1922, the trial of the leaders of the Social-Revolutionary party, charged with terrorism and sabotage, took place in Moscow. It was held in open court and the accused were allowed to have foreign counsel. (Ironically enough one of the attorneys for the accused was Vandervelde, the Socialist Minister for the Belgian King during the war and today a leader of the Second International and of the "People's Front.") Their guilt was established in public trial beyond any doubt. They were convicted of the direct organisation of the assassination of Voladarsky, the attempts on the lives of

5

Lenin and other Soviet leaders, the dynamiting of bridges and other acts of terrorism against the workers' state. In 1922, when the country was still suffering from the devastation of civil war and famine, when industrial production was at its lowest point, the Soviet government, with the approval of the Comintern, commuted the death sentences. Contrast the open action of the Soviet government in the days of Lenin and Trotsky, with the secrecy, the hysteria, the suppression of all real information and the hurried executions, of Stalin. And remember that the Social Revolutionaries were active opponents of the October Revolution.

Regarding the Zinoviev trial; the fragmentary cable messages do not permit of analysis. Apart from impressions of reporters that "the accused babble unnaturally as though too eager to expose their crimes, almost hypnotically affirming that they had no right to defend themselves," little of definite nature emerges. It is, however, difficult to see how men in prison could organise Stalin's assassination.

The means by which the "confessions" were wrung, whether by torture, by the use of hypnotic drugs, or the usual police tricks, can only be guessed at. Until further reports are to hand, the trial, for us, as for the London "Daily Telegraph" representative at Moscow, must "end in the same mist as it began."

In the meantime we can examine something of the history of the U.S.S.R., the political struggles that have taken place between the various factions, the degeneration of the regime, the previous frame-ups that have been attempted by Stalin. From such an examination we shall learn more than by even the fullest analysis of the court proceedings.

Who Are The Executed Men?

That charges of attempted assassination are made against men who, all their lives, have opposed such methods is incredible enough. It becomes utterly fantastic when charges of being Nazi agents are hurled at such names as Zinoviev, Kamenev, Yevdokimov, Mrachkovski, Bakaiev, Smirnov and Taotsky. All of these, the others are unknown to us, have years, even decades of revolutionary activity behind them. Zinoviev joined the party in 1901, was chairman of the Communist International all during Lenin's lifetime and head of the Leningrad Soviet for years. Kamenev joined the party in 1901, he was Lenin's literary executor, head of the Moscow Soviet, chief of the Council of Labor and Defence, Lenin's substitute as chairman of the Council of People's Commissioners, and chairman, in his absence, of the Political Bureau of the party. Yevdokimov, a party member since 1903, was secretary of the party in Leningrad, a member of the party secretariat, and the organisational bureau. Bakaiev, an old Bolshevik, was until

1927 a member of the Central Control Commission. Mrachovski has been a party member for at least ten years. All these men together with Trotsky were charged in the Wrangel officer affair of September 1927, Stalin's first big attempt at framing his opponents. (This attempt is examined in another chapter.)

Regarding Smirnov; lack of initials in the cables makes it difficult to say whether this is V.M. Smirnov, whose death in exile has been reported, but not confirmed, or A.P. Smirnov, former Commissar for Agriculture, or yet I.N. Smirnov, former Commissar for Postal and Telegraphic Communications. V.M. Smirnov, one of the oldest Bolsheviks, greatly esteemed by Lenin, was the leader of the Democratic Centralists. He has been in Stalin's prisons for many years. A.P. Smirnov was a staunch supporter of Stalin against Trotsky. Of the Right wing, he was recently expelled. I.N. Smirnov, a Left oppositionist, has been in prison for years. It is most likely that the latter Smirnov is the one executed.

Among those later implicated in the "plot," are Rykov, Bukharin, Sokolnikov, Radek, Uglanov, and Piatakov. The suicide of Tomsy indicates that these, too, will face a frame-up. Who are they? Rykov is an old Bolshevik, serving long prison sentences under the Czar; after Lenin's death he was elected head of the government. Bukharin an old Bolshevik, regarded as the best theoretician among the younger men, replaced Zinoviev as the chairman of the Communist International. Sokolnikov, an old Bolshevik, who carried out the stabilisation of Soviet currency and a former ambassador to England. Radek, a Russo-Polish revolutionist who collaborated with Lenin at Zimmerwald; he was a foundation member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. Uglanov was a former secretary of the Moscow party committee and distinguished himself in the fight against "Trotskyism." Later he was removed by Stalin as a "capitalist restorationist." Piatakov, a Bolshevik since 1910, was chairman of the first Ukrainian Soviet government. Lenin, in his "testament" referred to him (and Bukharin) as "the most able forces" among the younger Bolsheviks. Tomsy, an old Bolshevik, who served long sentences under the Czar, was formerly chairman of the Central Committee of the Russian Trade Unions.

After Lenin's death Stalin, Zinoviev, and Kamenev formed the famous "troika" which as the "old guard of Bolshevism" created the legend of "Trotskyism". Under pressure from the Leningrad proletariat, and because they later realised Stalin's purpose in fighting Trotsky, the latter two joined the opposition. They were immediately removed from all positions, later they capitulated. Stalin replaced them with the Right wing members Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsy to carry on the fight against Trotsky. In 1930 these were removed as "capitalist restorationists".

This marked the beginning of the famous "third period" when Stalin made his ultra-left zig-zag, which ended only in his return to Menshevism—to the "People's Front." Just imagine the president of the Communist International, the head of the Soviet government, the leader of the Russian Trade Unions, depicted by Stalin as the banner-bearers of the capitalist restoration!

Of Lenin's political bureau, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Stalin, Tomsy and Rykov—only Stalin remains! All others are—"agents of fascism and counter-revolution." Lenin, as Krupskaya herself expressed it, was spared only by death from the repressions of Stalin's bureaucracy. Failing the opportunity to put him in prison the epigones shut him up in a mausoleum.

Lenin on "German Agents"

When Stalin charges such men with being German agents it is necessary to recall what Lenin wrote when Trotsky was similarly accused in 1917: "Can one for a moment believe in the veracity of the dispatch which the British government has received, and which purports that Trotsky, the former chairman of the Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies, in 1905, a revolutionist who has unselfishly devoted himself for decades to the service of the revolution—that this man is involved in a plan subsidised by the German government? This is indeed a deliberate and unheard of, and unconscionable vilification of a revolutionist." (Pravda, No. 34, April 1917).

These words were written before Trotsky had joined with Lenin, prior to his election as chairman of the Bolshevik Soviet in 1917; prior to the October revolution, the civil war, the creation of the Third International, and the founding of the Soviet state. Nineteen years after, Stalin, using the very same "deliberate, unheard of, an unconscionable vilification" of revolutionists accepts the advice tendered long ago by the self-same British counter-revolutionists to "use the firing squad" against oppositionists (In 1927 Austin Chamberlain gave Stalin this advice. He was then not sufficiently entrenched to accept it.)

Why does Stalin do such things?

The answer must be sought, firstly, in the internal tension created, in the economic field, by bureaucratic distortions of the industrial plan, in the political field, by Stalin's savage war against the workers' vanguard—the Left Opposition. Secondly, in the worsened international position of the U.S.S.R. brought about by the European victories of Fascism. These are the result of the narrow nationalistic policy of "socialism in one country."

Confronted with the ruinous effects of his anti-Marxian theories, Stalin seeks still to maintain and justify himself by furi-

ously lashing at the Left and the Right. Being committed to a policy of replacing even the form [nothing else remains], of the Soviet system "the highest form of democracy" [Lenin] with a system embodying "the best aspects of bourgeois parliaments" [Molotov] Stalin physically annihilates those who, even against their own will, may become that "best aspect of bourgeois parliaments"—an opposition.

Stalin fears that, even under his Hitlerised parliamentary constitution, proletarian unrest may take definite form. The murder of his erstwhile comrades is his first precaution.

Even the ghosts of Scheidemann and Ebert shudder, and grow paler at such ferocious renegacy!

THERMIDORIAN AMALGAMS

The Great French Revolution of the eighteenth century is rich with instructive lessons for the working class today. In it there were two periods of defeat: Thermidorian reaction and the Bonapartist dictatorship. On the ninth of Thermidor [July 27, 1794] the revolutionary Jacobins—Robespierre, Saint-Just, Couthon, Lebas—"the Bolsheviks of the French revolution," were overthrown by a combination of the Right wing Jacobins, the vacillators, and the Royalist reaction. The guillotine which sent twenty-one Jacobin intransigents to death the next day bit no longer into the reaction. In its turn, the Thermidorian epoch was climaxed a few years later with the ascension to power of Napoleon Bonaparte.

The Thermidorian reaction was made possible by a degeneration and corruption of the revolutionary party—the Jacobin clubs. It was facilitated by a yearning for "peace and tranquility" by certain sections of the people and above all by the politicians' wearying of the revolutionary struggle, and moving to the Right. It gained momentum from the pressure of royalists and reactionaries who adapted themselves to the revolutionary customs and speech of the times in order to save their own hides. The weak-kneed and weak-minded among the revolutionists yielded to the social pressure of the reactionary class.

The Thermidorian overthrow was not the open counter-revolution. On the contrary, it took place under the old banner and with the old watchword scarcely altered. The Left wing Jacobins were denounced as "agents of Pitt" (just as oppositionists in Russia are denounced as "agents of Hitler.") They were charged with being merely a "few isolated individuals," "splitters" who were undermining the united fatherland. The Right wing Jacobins, who were unwittingly blazing the trail for the starkly

counter-revolutionary Bonapartist dictatorship, calumniated the men they executed, imprisoned and banished as "counter-revolutionists". When the revolutionary Hebertists were sent before the tribunal, the reactionaries threw the communistic Momoro, the idealistic "orator of mankind", Anarcharsis Cloots, and Leclerc into the same group with counter-revolutionary bankers and German agents. When Danton, Desmoulins and Pheippeaux were arrested, they were combined with forgers like Fabre and Delaunay, thieves like Lacroix; and men like Chabot who had taken 100,000 francs from the royalists. This reactionary abomination came to be known as a Thermidorian amalgam. It was devised to confuse and bewilder, to make it possible for a growing reaction to dispose of revolutionists under the guise of combatting counter-revolution.

At just such amalgams Stalin is an old hand! For years the Opposition has been calumniated as the agents of White Guard generals, of Chiang-Kai-shek, of Chamberlain, of Japanese imperialism, of fascist counter-revolution, as suited the momentary convenience of the amalgam. With the ever-existing "last dregs of counter-revolutionary Zinovievists and Trotskyists" there have always been arrested "White Guards, kulaks, the old princes, counts, gendarmes, etc." The purpose is to confuse and bewilder, to make it possible to dispose of revolutionists under the guise of combatting counter-revolution. Let us pass on to an examination of a few attempts.

In September 1927, on the eve of the Fifteenth Party Congress, when the struggle of the Left Opposition with the Stalin bureaucracy was at its height, it was suddenly announced in the Russian press that the opposition had been caught "planning a military overturn in the U.S.S.R. after the manner of Pilsudski's overturn", with an officer of the notorious White Guard general Baron Wrangel. At that time the Opposition still had Trotsky, Zinoviev, Yevdokimov, Bakaiev, Smilga and others on the highest party organs, the Central Committee and the Control Commission, who forced an investigation of the charges. This enquiry resulted in establishing the fact that the "Wrangel officer" was an agent of the G.P.U. who had been detailed off to compromise the Opposition. This G.P.U. agent had made contact with an eighteen year old youth, unknown to anybody, but sympathetic to the Opposition, and offered to procure for him a typewriter and duplicating machine with which to print the Platform of the Opposition, which had been forbidden circulation by Stalin. The disclosures made by the Opposition were so great that Stalin and Menzhinsky (then head of the G.P.U.) were forced to acknowledge that the "Wrangel officer" was their agent sent to compromise Trotsky and his associates. The disclosures (made in the party organs) were not allowed to appear in the press, the Opposition was expelled and many were arrested and imprisoned.

[Note the names of those protesting. Zinoviev, Bakaiev and Yevdokimov are executed. Mrachkovski, executed, was named by Stalin and Co. as "involved" in the plot. Smilga was imprisoned over the Kirov affair.]

A day or two before Trotsky's exile to Central Asia (January 1928) a foreign journalist made an offer, through Radek, to transmit secretly, if need be, a letter to Trotsky's friends abroad. Trotsky expressed to Radek his conviction that the journalist was a G.P.U. agent but having nothing to say to his friends abroad which he had not said openly, wrote a letter. Next morning "Pravda" used the letter as proof of Trotsky's secret connections "with foreign countries."

On July 20, 1931, the pro-fascist paper "Kurjer Codzienny" of Cracow, published a gross forgery under the signature of Trotsky. Despite the fact that Trotsky's writings are banned in the U.S.S.R. (men have been shot for attempting to bring them in) the article from the "Kurjer" was reprinted in Moscow "Pravda"—in facsimile. Trotsky established that the document was manufactured by the G.P.U., with the assistance of Yaroslavsky, and printed in the "Kurjer" (at advertising rates) for the purpose of reproducing it in the U.S.S.R.

The Kirov Affair

On December 1, 1934, Kirov, Stalin's lieutenant at Leningrad was fatally wounded by one Nikolaiev. In the first reports issued Nikolaiev was said to have confessed that the act was one of personal revenge actuated by Kirov's responsibility for his dismissal from his position. Three weeks after, it was suddenly announced that Nikolaiev had confessed to a plot to assassinate Stalin, Molotov, Kaganovitch and other Soviet leaders. According to the new confession Nikolaiev had been co-operating with a Latvian consul [acting on behalf of Hitler], who had financed the plot and who sought a letter from Nikolaiev's terrorist group to Trotsky, the consul guaranteeing delivery. During the wave of denunciation of "Trotsky, the fascist agent", loosed in the Soviet press following this "disclosure", Kamanev, Zinoviev, and other former members of the Opposition were arrested as [involved in the plot. It was, however, immediately announced that sufficient evidence to bring these to trial had not been obtained, but their "administrative exile" was being considered. The Thermidorian amalgam: Assassin-Consul-Hitler-Zinovievists-Trotsky had fallen apart, as no evidence of any letter from the Nikolaiev group to Trotsky could be established.

In the indictments against Nikolaiev and his thirteen associates [who were executed on December 28, after summary trial] no reference to the "letter to Trotsky" is to be found. The matter

was "dropped."

Official announcements showed that up to that time there had been executed [besides Nicolaiev and group] 121 people after secret trial before the military tribunal.

At the end of December it was suddenly announced that "fresh evidence" had been found to send Zinoviev, Kamenev, and seventeen other party members for trial as being involved in the assassination of Kirov. At the trial no such evidence was forthcoming the sole charges being made were that the accused had by their criticism of the official line created the "atmosphere" in which the assassin acted. On the contrary the accused strenuously denied complicity in any plot. On the strength of their confessions" (capitulations to Stalin, made many times previously) these were sentenced to terms of from two to ten years imprisonment. Seventy eight other oppositionists were simultaneously exiled for terms of from two to five years.

Now let us return to the "amalgam". On December 7 "Isvestia" replying to an article in the Finnish "Huvudstad Bladet" expressly repudiated the idea that the assassination was the act of opponents inside the party. Its repudiation was a little premature, as the Finnish article suggested to the fertile mind of the "genial leader" that the opportunity of a frame-up was too good to miss. The charges against Trotsky, etc., followed, but the task was too great for the G.P.U., Stalin had, on that occasion, to be content with the imprisoning and exiling of critical party members.

One other aspect of the matter is worthy of note. Among the 121 executed after secret trial were several members of the Leningrad G.P.U. Why? Were the G.P.U. actually involved in promoting the Nikolaiev-Consul-Trotsky amalgam, carefully following the Wrangel officer formula? Did they hatch the assassination plot and then—growing careless—allow it to mature to reality? The answer may never be known. Stalin's firing squads have destroyed the evidence. But knowing the methods of the "best disciple", it is, however, a justifiable inference.

"Death Plot" Against Stalin

On November 6 1935, Fred Zeller, secretary of the Socialist Youth Alliance of the Seine District, a well-known sympathiser of Trotsky's, sent a postcard to an old army comrade Robert Fol, secretary of the 18th Section of the Young Communist League of France in which he ended his remarks with "Down with (a mort) Stalin".

On December 12, 1935, "Arbeideren" organ of the Norwegian Communist Party came out under sensational headings "Death

Plot Against Stalin", and cited this "freshly arrived postcard from France". They charged that Trotsky's agitation "culminates in the propaganda for terrorists attacks against the Soviet Union and is aimed above all against the greatest leader of the world proletariat in our time, Stalin.....It is no accident that the conspirators in the plot against Kirov were former members of the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev opposition, who came forward as the agents of Fascism and counter-revolution". This article further called for Trotsky's deportation from Norway.

So far as the Norwegian workers were concerned, Stalin's tools did not have to wait long. On December 16, the Norwegian Labor Party organ, "Soerlandet" said: "Even though a knowledge of French is not so widespread among workers as would enable them to understand that the expression 'a mort' really means 'Away with!' 'Down with!' they were nevertheless in a position to see clearly whether Trotsky, had he planned the murder of Stalin, would have dealt with such a conspiracy in an ordinary postcard.... We brand the man who wrote this article in 'Arbeidere' as an unconscionable rascal. He knows well that Trotsky is a ruthless opponent of assassination and individual terror..... The aim is to compel the Norwegian government to place Trotsky under arrest. This will not happen... We have said before and we repeat again: It is impossible to have any dealings whatsoever with people who set out deliberately to mislead the workers. Against such people we declare War, and only War!"

Stalin with the G.P.U. and the state resources at his disposal, with a gagged press and a helpless working-class, murdered sixteen men to do what his French and Norwegian hirelings failed to do—to "implicate" Trotsky in an assassination plot.

These are but a few of the many attempts which "the genial Leader" has made to frame his opponents. The literature of the Left Opposition abounds with other examples.

BUREAUCRACY *v* INTERNATIONALISM

It is beyond the scope of this work to trace in detail the struggle between the bureaucracy [led by Stalin] and the workers' vanguard [led by Trotsky]. All the differences between these two forces are contained in the clash between the Marxist-Internationalist stand of Trotsky and the Russian-Nationalist position of Stalin. Trotsky holds that socialism can be achieved only through the international proletarian revolution; Stalin maintains that the U.S.S.R. can achieve "classless society" independently of the world revolution.

In the internal matters of the U.S.S.R. a struggle arose headed

by Trotsky against bureaucracy. This difference manifested itself in, and in opposite views on the development of Soviet economy; Trotsky urging speedy industrialisation, Stalin standing for building "at a snail's pace." [Years later the Stalinist bureaucracy carried out the opposition's industrial plan in a distorted form].

In the Comintern, the struggle waged around the German situation of 1923; Trotsky was for revolution, Stalin for "curbing the Germans". On the Chinese revolution, Stalin stood for the hegemony of Chiang Kai-shek (the Kuomintang); Trotsky for independent workers' and peasants' organisations. In the British General strike of 1926 Stalin insisted on maintaining relations with the English trade union bureaucracy (the Anglo-Russian Committee); Trotsky for breaking with the betrayers.

The bureaucracy triumphed. By 1928 Stalin was sufficiently strong to exile Trotsky and the other opposition leaders. It is this triumph of the bureaucracy which interests us here.

Already by 1927 the reaction had so strongly entrenched itself that the Opposition wrote: "The principal causes of the constantly growing crisis in the party is the alarming way in which bureaucracy has been growing since Lenin's death, and is still growing. The Central Committee possesses not only ideological means of influencing the party but also governmental and economic means. Comrades who are dissatisfied or in dissent are afraid to raise their voices in the party meetings. The masses only hear the speeches of the party officials, all of them from one and the same mould. Mutual solidarity and confidence are being weakened. All resolutions are being adopted with untailing 'unanimity'.....The bureaucratism comes from the fact that the advance guard of the working-class is not prepared to recognise the policy of the government as its own. It is clear that in its composition and its style of living, the personnel of the administration is largely bourgeois and is turning away from the interests of the proletariat and the poor of the villages in order to serve the trader, the kulak, the new bourgeoisie, the intellectual in a good position.....The party bureaucrat is living on a dangerous illusion. He says: 'Our State is a workers' State: why then are people demanding increased influence over this State for the workers?' These people forget what Lenin wrote—that 'our administration has only been painted over a little; except for that it has remained a typical administration of the old sort.'"

In 1928 Rakovsky, already in exile, wrote: "The Opposition will always retain as one of its merits towards the party the fact that at the proper time it sounded the alarm about the frightful decline in the spirit of activity of the working masses and about its ever-growing indifference towards the destiny of the dictator-

ship of the proletariat and the Soviet state. What characterises the flood of scandals that have just been exposed, what is most dangerous in it, is precisely the passivity of the masses (a passivity which is still greater in the communist mass than among those not in the party), towards the unprecedented manifestations of despotism which have taken place. Workers witnessed them, but passed them off without protesting, or contented themselves with grumbling a little out of fear of those who were in power or simply out of political indifference.....Thievery, prevarication, violence, graft, unheard-of abuse of power, boundless despotism, drunkenness, debauchery: all this is spoken of as of facts already known not for months but for years, but also something which everybody tolerated without knowing why. I do not need to explain that when the world bourgeoisie clamors about the vices of the Soviet state, we can ignore them with tranquil contempt. Too well do we know the moral purity of the bourgeois governments and parliaments of the whole world. But it is not after them that we should model ourselves: with us it is a question of a WORKERS' state."

Trotsky on the Party Apparatus

During the last five years, the party apparatus has become utterly permeated with the bureaucratic deformations of the state apparatus, superimposing upon the latter the specific distortions—fraud, camouflage, duplicity,—elaborated by the bourgeois parliamentary 'democracy'. As a consequence; a leadership has been formed which, instead of the conscious party democracy, provides: a falsification and an adaptation of Leninism designed to strengthen the party bureaucracy; a monstrous and an intolerable abuse of power in relation to communists and workers; a fraudulent operation of the entire electoral machinery of the party; an application of methods curing discussion which might be the boast of a bourgeois-Fascist power, but never of a proletarian party (picked gangs of thugs, whistling and jeering to order, throwing speakers from the platform, and similar abominations); and last but not least, an absence of comradely cohesiveness and conscientiousness all along the line in the relations between the apparatus and the party.... A situation such as makes party members and class-conscious workers in their overwhelming mass afraid to talk of the crimes of the retainers of the party apparatus has not arisen accidentally, nor overnight, nor can it be eliminated by a single stroke of the pen. We are confronted not only with the powerful routine of bureaucratism in the apparatus but with great incrustations of interests and connections around the apparatus. And we have a leadership that is powerless before its own apparatus. Here we have also something in the nature of a historical law: the less the leadership depends on the party, the more it is a captive of the apparatus."

How came the Reaction?

"The defeats of the world revolution, particularly during the last few years, when the leadership was already in the hands of the Comintern..... could not fail to introduce a new note into the attitude of the working class toward the world revolution: great reservations in hopes; scepticism among the tired elements; downright suspicion and even surly exasperation among the immature. These new thoughts and new evaluations sought for their expression. Had they found it in the party, the most advanced layers might perhaps have adopted a different attitude towards the international revolution, and above all towards that in their own country; it might have been less naive and exalted and more critical but, in return, more balanced and stable. However, the new thoughts, judgements, aspirations, and anxieties were driven inwards. For five years the proletariat lived under the old and well known slogan: 'No thinking! Those at the top have more brains than you.' At first this engendered indignation, then passivity, and finally a circumscribed existence, compelling men to withdraw into a political shell. From all sides the worker was told, until he ended by saying himself, 'You, there! This is not the year 1918.' The classes and groups hostile or semi-hostile to the proletariat take into account the diminution in the latter's specific weight which is felt not only through the state apparatus or the trade unions but also through the day-to-day economic life, and the daily existence. Hence flows an influx of self-confidence that has manifested itself among the politically active layers of the petty-bourgeoisie and the growing middle bourgeoisie. The latter has re-established its friendship, and reconstituted its intimate and family bonds with the entire 'apparatus', and it holds the firm opinion that its day is coming."

L. TROTSKY ["What Now"] 1928.

IN THE WORKERS' "FATHERLAND"!

There are more Left wing Marxists in prison and in Siberia today, under the regime of Stalin Yagoda, than there were Bolsheviks under the Czarist regime. Astounding as that may sound, the records of the Bolshevik-Leninists (the so-called "Trotskyists") show it to be a fact. Not only are Russian Oppositionists jailed but many hundreds of foreign born workers. During 1935 one of these latter, Dr. Anton Ciliga, succeeded in escaping and has revealed the shocking conditions prevailing among the imprisoned oppositionists. The following extracts from the documents will tell sufficient of the story to illustrate our point — that Stalin has been carrying on a campaign of terrorism against the Left wing for many years,

"Three Yugoslav communists, comrades Ciliga, Dedich, and Dragulich, came to the U.S.S.R. which they considered, like so many thousands of other proletarian revolutionists abroad, to be their socialist fatherland. These three comrades were active functionaries of the Yugoslav C.P. Dedich had been secretary of the District Committee of the party in a large workers' community. Dragulich was a member of the C.C. of the party, and Ciliga a member of the Political Bureau. All were hated with good cause by the Yugoslav government, all three could expect the most vicious terror from the Yugoslav bourgeoisie.

"These comrades found cruel exploitation of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. and became convinced of the betrayal of the leading group, of its betrayal of the proletarian revolution, and joined the opposition, soon to share the fate of the Russian communists who carry on an unceasing struggle for the proletarian revolution, and who, in the U.S.S.R. as in other countries, are punished by prison, by concentration camps, by moral and physical abuse, by exile to the remotest corners of Eastern Siberia, to the province of Narym, to the favorite places where Czarist Russia loved to send its prisoners. The three were sentenced in 1930 to solitary confinement at Verkhni-Uralsk, and cut off not only from the proletarian movement of their own country, but also from their families and friends. What the Yugoslav authorities failed to do, was accomplished by the government of Stalin and Molotov." [Letter of protest to Akulov, Attorney General, from Bolshevik exiles at Yenniseisk, Jan. 1934.]

Ciliga himself says: "When in 1935 we ended the second term of our exile, the G.P.U., this time extended our exile for three years without trial or new indictment. Thus a foreign-born worker or militant worker who comes to Russia no longer has the right to leave it, he is changed into a species of eternal prisoner if he is dissatisfied with the condition of the proletariat and the general situation in Russia. I personally was finally able to escape from Russia after two and a half years of desperate struggle in which I found myself continuously between life and death. I succeeded because I had a foreign passport, because I had a family abroad which was able to do something, and because I squarely posed the question: relief or death. But my comrades [Dragulich and Dedich] have remained in exile and in dungeons — only active assistance by the European proletariat and by the democratic movement can set them free. In the penitentiary of Yaroslavl are three members of the political bureau of the C.P. of Hungary.....Hundreds of foreign comrades are in exile in the Russian provinces and factually in the status of prisoners, without the possibility of returning to their countries because of their opposition to their party or to the C.I."

Speaking of their treatment Dr. Ciliga continues: "In the summer of 1931, my comrades and I participated in the hunger strike which lasted eighteen days and in which over 150 prisoners participated in the penitentiary of Verkhni-Uralsk. The hunger strike was provoked by rifle fire from the guards directed at the prisoners, one of whom, Gabo Essayan, standing at the window, was wounded. The strike also had as an objective the improvement of our famine rations. The atmosphere of terror and the famine rations drove two prisoners (Vera Bergner and Victor Krayny) insane."

Do not the stories about "model prisons" sound ironical?

But let Ciliga continue: "During the 1930 conflict, in one of the harshest winters, in February the prison administration — the self-same G.P.U. — sprayed the protesting prisoners with ice water, broke the windows, and shut off the heat. In 1929, the G.P.U. went even further, — after they were doused with water, the prisoners were bound hand and foot, and soaking wet, hog-tied, without food, were left lying on cement floors for three days and three nights — in solitary confinement. Such is the juridical label for these abominations."

"As I found out later, the treatment accorded us was quite "respectable". After all, I was a European, a man, as Hitler would say, belonging to the white race. But so far as Chinese and all other "Asiatics" are concerned, the present Soviet rulers deal with them much more unceremoniously; they are generally not recognised as political prisoners. Thus, for instance, the students, the communist Oppositionists of the former Sun Yat Sen University in Moscow were either shipped to the worst exile areas and into concentration camps where only criminals were sent, or they were simply handed over for extermination to Chiang Kai-shek (they were placed on board a ship which goes from Vladivostock to Shanghai)."

On the position of German and Polish refugee communists Ciliga says: "In the eyes of the present Stalinist leadership, which is conducting a nationalist policy, every Pole and German must be held suspect, if not directly considered a spy. I am personally inclined to consider this psychology as the underlying reason for the monstrous crime of the recent shooting of fifty important Polish communists without trial, upon the unverified and all-embracing charge of Pilsudskyism, espionage and provocation."

The disclosures made by the Bolshevik-Leninist, A. Tarov, who succeeded in escaping last year, bear out to the full Ciliga's statements. Let us quote briefly from Tarov: "Prior to this first general hunger strike, as far back as 1930, the prison administration used to issue orders to spray the Bolshevik-Leninists with ice water (this, in winter, in Siberia!) While our comrades tried to

plug up the vents in order to keep the water from their cells, the G.P.U. agents aimed the hose directly into their eyes; as a result, comrade Pogasyan lost his eyesight."

We purposely refrain from quoting at greater length from the exposures made by escapees. Sufficient has been reproduced to open the eyes of class-conscious workers to the true state of affairs in the U.S.S.R. To enlarge on the matter at this stage would only tend to cause a revulsion of feeling among those friendly to the Soviet Union. At a later stage the attitude of the Workers' Party is made clear.

WHO ARE THE BUREAUCRATS?

"After the Kirov affair, the Soviet ambassador to London, Maisky, explained to a delegation of British trade unionists how necessary and justifiable was the trial of the 'counter-revolutionary' Zinovievists. This striking episode—one from among a thousand—immediately brings us to the heart of the question. We know who the Zinovievists are. Whatever their mistakes and vacillations, one thing is certain: they are representatives of the 'professional revolutionist' type. The questions of the world workers' movement—these have entered into their blood. Who is Maisky? A Right wing Menshevik who broke with his own party in 1918, going to the right in order to avail himself of the opportunity to enter as a Minister into the Trans-Ural White Government, under the protection of Kolchak. Only after Kolchak was annihilated did Maisky consider the time ripe for turning his face towards the Soviets. Today, Maisky, in the rank of ambassador, accuses 'Zinovievists' and 'Trotskyists' of striving to provoke military intervention in order to restore capitalism—the very same capitalism which Maisky had defended against us by means of civil war.

"The present ambassador to the United States, A. Troyanovsky, joined the Bolsheviks in his youth; shortly afterward he left the party; during the war he was a patriot; in 1917, a Menshevik. The October Revolution found him a member of the Menshevik Central Committee, in addition to which, during the next few years, Troyanovsky carried on an illegal struggle against the dictatorship of the proletariat; he entered the Stalinist party, more correctly, the diplomatic service, after the Left Opposition was crushed.

"The ambassador to Paris, Potemkin, was a bourgeois professor of history during the period of the October revolution; he joined the Bolsheviks after the victory. The former ambassador to Berlin, Khinchuk, participated, as a Menshevik, during the days of the October overturn, in the counter-revolutionary Moscow Committee for the Salvation of the Fatherland, together with

Grinko, a Right wing Social Revolutionist, the present People's Commissar of Finance. Suritz, who replaced Khinchuk in Berlin, was the political secretary of the Menshevik Chaidze, the first chairman of the Soviets; he joined the Bolsheviks after the victory. Almost all other diplomats are of the same type." L. TROTSKY.

One sample will show the type of "spetz's" who hold power in Soviet industry under Stalin. The chief of the gold mining industry, the engineer Serebrovsky is always referred to by his fellow bureaucrats as "an Old Guard Bolshevik" with membership extending back to 1905. That is what his party card actually shows. The facts? He participated in the 1905 revolution as a young student and Menshevik in order then to go over to the camp of the bourgeoisie for many years. The February revolution found him government director of two munition plants, a member of the Board of Trade, and an active opponent of the metal workers' union. In May 1917 Serebrovsky declared that Lenin was a "German spy"! Today, Serebrovsky is a member of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U!

Another average specimen, this time from the party apparatus, Zaslavsky, who today howls "fascist Trotskyist dogs" in Moscow "Pravda." Originally a Right wing Bundist (Jewish Menshevik), later a bourgeois journalist who carried on a campaign in 1917 against Lenin and Trotsky as agents of Germany. In Lenin's articles of 1917 there is to be found, as a refrain, the phrase, "Zaslavsky and other scoundrels like him." During the civil war period he was hiding in Kiev, a journalist for White Guard publications.

In the service of Stalin are to be found such valiant revolutionaries as Rafes, or as a Bundist (semi-nationalist Jewish socialist) was a strong opponent of the October revolution, becoming a cabinet minister of Petliura (the White Guard Ukrainian butcher, of Jews particularly). Later he joined Stalin in the "anti-Trotsky" campaign. Such tools as Cachin, the leader of the French social-patriots during the war; who negotiated with Mussolini on behalf of the French bankers. Such tools are to be found in Stalin's service by the score. Today, Cachin is the leader of the Stalinists in the French senate. In U.S.A. we find the "Trotsky slayers" headed by Olgin, who during the war deserted to the social-patriots. The war has lost for the socialist world its threatening appearance. It is not a war for enslaving but a war for freedom," he then wrote. Just recently Olgin produced an "exposure" of the "counter-revolutionary Trotsky."

To these can be added Martinov, the Menshevik theoretician against whom both Lenin and Trotsky delivered their most frequent blows in the pre-October period. Martinov became Stalin's leading theoretician; it was he who invented the "bloc of four classes" which led to the betrayal of the Chinese revolution. When he died recently, the "Workers' Weekly" in big headings

mourned the "Death of a Veteran Revolutionist." Space forbids the treatment of such as Sernal, Pepper, Voltinsky, Borodin, Kuusinen, etc., etc., etc.

But one precious pearl from the necklace of Stalin must be further examined. In this gem of gems, Australian labor is particularly interested. This is HERBERT MOORE [pseudonym of H.M. Wicks while in Australia as Stalin's Comintern agent to "bolshhevisé" the Communist Party of Australia during period 1929-31.] Who is Wicks-Moore? Originally a prominent leader of the left wing of the Socialist Party of America and later of the Communist Party, he, during the Palmer Red Hunts in 1920, became chief "red baiter" for the American Legion. From the Garry "Indiana Post" of Thursday, March 25, 1920 we quote:

"H.M. Wicks of Chicago, a reformed Socialist, spoke on the revolutionary tendencies of the times to some forty Gary business men last evening. Mr. Wicks established a socialist local in Gary several years ago; he said he helped select Oscar Anderson as the leader of the Gary strike; therefore he did not appear to be an entire stranger. He charged that the steel strike was wholly the work of the Syndicalist movement. Violent minorities in the steel unions forced the strike against the wishes of the majority, he said. The majorities did not want strike but were howled down by the leather lunged minorities whose only argument was that the opponents of the strike were agents of Judge Gary.

"Mr. Wicks has been a socialist in good standing until last fall when he openly broke with the Socialist Party. Previous to that time he had served as a member of the National Executive Committee of the Party. Hewas familiar with the work and attitude of the socialists, I.W.W. Communists and all revolutionaries. With very few exceptions, he said, the radicals were not Americans. Most of the socialists are people of foreign birth and citizenship and many do not even speak English.

"Bill Haywood and his satellites should not be tolerated in this country, Mr. Wicks said. He had been advising American Legion members not to permit these vermin to talk to them, but to knock them down. That, he said, is the only language they understand. He charged that the Socialist Party was thoroughly pro-German during the war and is today controlled by pro-German Victor Berger. Berger, he said, richly deserved the twenty years sentence meted out some time ago and he hoped the Milwaukee man would be forced to serve his time. He said if there was a traitor to his country, Berger was it.

"Mr. Wicks has no respect for socialists or radicals of any sort. Having associated intimately for years he claims to know them exactly as they are and he says that they are all selfish

opportunists who are simply after something for themselves. He commended the deportation proceedings that have rid the country of many agitators and urged that other foreign troublemakers be given the same treatment. He urged an Americanisation program for the foreign-speaking workers and said the American Legion is the one organisation in the country doing good Americanisation work.

"Mr. Wicks is preparing to tour the country on the Chautauqua platform this summer in order to let the American people understand the true situation. He has given several years to sociology and is preparing to write two books on the problems of the hour."

In 1921, Wicks-Moore applied for membership in the Communist Party of America. The "Official Bulletin of C.P. of America" No. 2 (1921) says: "The recommendation of an investigation committee that Harry Wicks shall not be admitted to the party was approved. The information proves him to be absolutely undesirable within the party ranks." Some years later he was admitted to the Communist Party, and before his departure from America in 1929 was chief "Trotsky slayer" in U.S.A. From the latter end 1929 to about August 1931 was "Comintern agent" in Australia. Early in 1932 reappeared in U.S.A. and began an "anti-Trotsky" campaign for C.P. there.

Such is the Tutor, the Inspirer, the Elector of the present leaders of the Communist Party of Australia. Such is the man who appointed them. And they CANNOT BE REMOVED, except by like methods. The membership had no say in their election; it can have no say in their removal. These are the members who cloak their plots with the slogan "rank and file control"; who hurl "bureaucrat" or "counter-revolutionist" at their opponents. These are the ones who scream loudest about "fascist methods." These are the ones who tremble with ardour to defend the "last remnants of bourgeois democracy." Australian labor will do well to guard against these new found friends of freedom. Let the fate of the Seamen's Union be a warning!

HEIL! STALIN

Since the decline of the Byzantine Empire the world has not witnessed such sickening syconchancy as is obligatory on every person taking part in any public activity in the U.S.S.R. Were there no other facts, this alone would condemn the existing regime in the eyes of any worker who is at all familiar with the traditional attitude of Marxism towards "great men." Here are a few choice examples of this organised crawling.

"Centuries shall elapse and the communist generations of the future will deem us the happiest of all mortals that have inhabited this planet throughout the ages, because it is we who have seen Stalin the leader genius, Stalin the sage, the smiling, the kindly, the supremely simple.....When I met Stalin, even at a distance, I throbbed with his forcefulness, his magnetism and his greatness. I wanted to sing, to shriek, to howl from happiness and exaltation.....Our love, our devotion, our strength, our heart our heroism, our life—all these are thine, great Stalin! Here take them, all this is thine, chief of the great fatherland. Dispose of thy sons, capable of heroic feats in the air, under the earth, on the waters, and in the stratosphere.....Men of all time and of all nations shall call by thy name all that is beautiful, strong, wise and pretty. Thy name is and shall remain on every factory every machine, every bit of land, and in the hearts of every man.....When my beloved will bear me a child, the first word I will teach him will be—STALIN." (Speech of the writer, A. Avdeyenko, "Pravda" February 1 1932)

Of this speech, Molotov, chairman of the People's Council of Commissars, said: "I refer to the speech of writer Avdeyenko who...brilliantly underscored the great significance of our struggle for Socialism, as well as the devotion to Soviet power, and the love for our party and for comrade Stalin which permeates the toilers in their millioned masses." (Pravda, February 1, 1935).

In the field of belles lettres, Stalin has assumed a position of the very highest renown. A contributor to "The Literary Gazette" tells that "It is the role of linguistics to study the style of Stalin." The versifier Demian Biedny declares: "Learn to write like Stalin writes." A writer in "At the Literary Post" casually informs the reader that Stalin "has always been distinguished by his profound comprehension of literature." A manifesto of the association of "proletarian" writers says without a smile: "Each section, each paragraph of the speech of Stalin is the most fertile theme for artistic works."

No less a genius does the Leader display in the field of philosophy. An unblushing professor tells the Communist Academy in Moscow: "The position of the thesis on Kantism cannot be completely understood in contemporary science except in the light of comrade Stalin's last letter." (The reference is to Stalin's putrid attack on the memory of Rosa Luxemburg; the connection it has with the Kantian thesis is, of course, perfectly obvious). A writer in "Revolution and Culture" sets down the fact, that Stalin is to be counted among the "profound connoisseurs and critics of Hegel" (as Stalin's collected works on philosophy amply reveal). Still another lover of bureaucratic posteriors adds that Stalin belongs among "the most competent authorities on contemporary philosophical problems." A fourth stipendiary notes in passing

in "The Cultural Front" that "Essentially, certain prognostications of Aristotle have been incarnated and deciphered in all their amplitude only by Stalin."

The late Kirov described Stalin at the 17th Congress as not more and not less than "the greatest leader of all times and of all peoples." The editor of "Izvestia," at another congress, relieved himself of this: "On the threshold of the new era stand two peerless titans of thought, Lenin and Stalin... (anything be written nowadays on anything at all without knowing Stalin? Absolutely not! Nothing can be understood without Stalin, nor anything interesting written."

Among the titles which this shy Georgian flower graciously permits himself to be called are: The colossus of steel, the great pilot [or the greatest engineer, architect, master, theoretician, collective farmer, etc.], the great disciple of the masters, the field marshal of the revolutionary army, the chief of the world proletariat, the heroic organiser of the Red Army, the inspirer of the October Revolution, the best Leninist, the best among the best, the gifted leader, the beloved leader, the most dearly beloved leader; and more of the same if space and nausea would permit.

It is sufficient to add that renamed or newly-named cities of the U.S.S.R. include Stalinsk, Stalingrad, Stalino, Stalinabad, Stalinissi, Stalin-Aoul, Stalinir and Stalinogorsk.

Why this fawning? To preserve itself, the bureaucracy puts all its hopes in the Supreme Arbiter, Stalin. To preserve him, the bureaucracy carries on a systematic, well-organised, and thoroughly hair-raising campaign of panegyrics to The Leader. Steadily dinning into the minds of the masses is the notion that they must believe what they are told, not what they see. If the masses can be made to believe that the Leader is as wise, as infallible and as good, as Omniscient and Omnipresent as God himself, then the decrees which he issues, primarily in the interest of the bureaucracy, will find more favor and less opposition.

But people with such a capacity for fawning, obviously cannot be revolutionists.

RECENT TRENDS

Even Liberal sympathisers have found grounds for doubt in recent trends in the U.S.S.R. Worker-sympathisers in the main have been confused, but have been bluffed into acquiescence by the heavily sustained barrage of ballyhoo of Stalin's agencies abroad—the Communist Parties, F.S.U.s, etc. Even the brief

review we can on this occasion afford, will show how justified is the posing of the matter "The Soviet at a Climax" [Manchester Guardian July 24, 1936] by that new found "friend of the Soviet Union" Sir Bernard Pares.

In the academic field Stalin is liquidating one by one the conquests of the October revolution and approaches the model of the Czarist schools right to the introduction of uniforms for scholars, an institution unknown even in the schools of the capitalist nations. [Decrees of April 23, 1934; April 7, and September 4, 1935] Moreover, by the decree of December 29, 1935, children of former noblemen, capitalists and kulaks will be accepted into the highest institutions of learning on the same plane with the children of workers and peasants. By comparing the decrees of Stalin with those of 1918 we see that all that the victorious revolution had annulled of the cursed heritage of the past, is now re-established.

Autonomy and independence in 1918—strict discipline and "politeness" towards adults in 1936.

Abolition of the uniform in 1918—re-establishment of the uniform in 1936.

Abolition of marks and examinations in 1918—re-establishment of marks and examinations in 1936.

Abolition of surveillance in 1918—re-establishment of surveillance in 1936.

Of the "Charter of the United School of Labor" nothing remains.

Stabilised Currency

The decrees of February 29, 1936, establishing the currency, supplements that of November 29, 1934, abolishing the ration cards, by strengthening the luxuriant growth of bourgeois relations in the sphere of the distribution of articles of consumption. The position of the highly paid "spetzes," bureaucrats, the new "labor aristocracy"—the Stakhanovists—is greatly strengthened; the position of the Soviet "basic wage" workers is immeasurably weakened.

Property Rights

Decree of February 17, 1935 revising the statutes of collective farms with a wide extension of rights of property. For the first time since the decree of 1916 which nationalised the land, deeds assuring the perpetual ownership of land are to be issued to collective farms. The intention is "to give collective farmers a feeling

that they are property owners and to stimulate a sense of loyalty towards the farms and farm property" ("Manchester Guardian" July 26, 1935)

Position of Women

On June 27, 1936 a decree was promulgated which prohibited abortion except in cases where pregnancy would have had physical effects on the woman; it also encouraged larger families, fixed higher alimony, etc. For four weeks prior to its final promulgation a mock discussion was permitted in the press. Even the bureaucrat's "mouthpiece" Louis Fischer bemoaned it as "a blot on Moscow's inspiring record for advanced social legislation....The public criticism....was a unique affair....The debate, one had to believe, must result in radical modification of the draft....Suddenly, however, Moscow dashed these hopes. Without warning, after four weeks of free discussion in which wise, invaluable amendments were offered on all sides, the Soviet Government simply republished the draft with minor changes....'Pravda' must have had its tongue in its cheek when it affirmed that 'the Soviet Government listened attentively to the views and proposals of the toilers.' That is just what the government did not do. It behaved as though no discussion had ever taken place." ("Nation," July 18 1936).

The petty bourgeois Fischer sees the main objection to the law in the shortage of housing, feeding bottles, rubber sheets etc. He understands nothing of the Marxist attitude on the status of woman, he would not be chosen by the Stalinists as their publicity agent if he did.

Stakhanovism

Stakhanovism, Stalin's ninety-ninth nostrum "for the transition from socialism (?) to communism [!!!]" has as its impetus the Stakhanovists' "mere desire to increase their wages" [Molotov, Pravda, November, 19, 1935], the decree introducing piecework [March 17, 1934] and abolishing food cards [November, 29, 1934], laid the foundations for its development. In brief, Stakhanovism, is an attempt to raise the low productivity per machine existing in the U.S.S.R. [despite the introduction of the most modern technology]. Stripped of the bureaucrat's ballyhoo, Stakhanovism is to a certain extent progressive in that it raises the productivity of labor. It is not progressive in that it "prepares the conditions for the transition from socialism to communism" [Stalin], but in the sense that without the framework of the existing transitional and contradictory Soviet economy, with its elements of socialism and capitalism, it prepares by means of **capitalist** methods the

elementary pre-conditions for a socialist society. In the pre-Stalinist epoch, money and piecework wages were never considered as categories of communism, or even of socialism. Piecework wages were defined by Marx "as the form of wages most suited to the capitalist mode of production." And only a bureaucrat who has lost the last shred of Marxist honesty can present this forced retreat from the allegedly already realised "socialism" back to money and piecework wages (and consequently, to accentuating inequality, to the over-exertion of labor power and to the lengthening of the working day) as "preparing the transition to communism."

Deep differentiation in the Soviet working class is the result. Stakhanovists earn from four to twenty times the amount received by the poorly paid layers. The bonapartist bureaucracy, by its encouragement of Stakhanovism, seeks to widen its base by creating a labor aristocracy. And the workers? Stakhanovism has been received with hostility by the working mass. This hostility expresses itself in various forms—from joking to assassination. The attitude of the bureaucrats to this hostility? Stalin's lieutenant at Leningrad, Zhadanov, answers: "In certain enterprises the movement has met with certain resistance.... The party (the bureaucrats - Ed.) **will stop at nothing** [our emphasis] to sweep out of the road of the victory of the Stakhanovist movement all those who resist it." [Pravda, Nov. 18, 1935] Do these threats have an effect on the workers? The Soviet press abounds with reports that the workers are not inclined to yield without further fight wherever their vital interests are involved.

The re-introduction of Czarist principles in the schools; the reactionary attitude towards women as "breeding cattle"; the forced speed-up of workers in industry—add to these the entry into the League of Nations, and the reliance on diplomatic pacts instead of the international workers; the introduction of ranks into the Red Army [Marshals, Generals, etc.] the "de-politicalisation" of the Young Communist League [youth's desire for progress must be suppressed]; the "liquidation" of the society of Old Bolsheviks [heroes of 1917]—and the shift to the Right becomes unmistakable.

The internal tension created by these retreats is the background against which Stalin's blood-purge must be studied. The epigones of Marxism and the alien-class bureaucracy they lead, see in the proletarian vanguard "the counter-revolution." Is it to be wondered at that the White Guards believe: "The convalescence of Russia, the first symptoms of which we pointed out many years ago, is proceeding apace with every new day. In this convalescence is the pledge of our victory."—Bodrost, No. 37, Organ of the Young Russians [Fascist-Monarchist.]

WHAT NOW?

"There is no doubt that the U.S.S.R. today bears very little resemblance to that type of the Soviet republic which Lenin depicted in 1917 (no permanent bureaucracy or permanent army; the right of recalling all elected officials at any time and the active control over them by the masses "regardless who the individual may be" etc.). The domination of the bureaucracy over the country, as well as Stalin's domination over the bureaucracy have well nigh attained their absolute consummation. But what conclusions would follow from this? There are some who say that since the actual state which has emerged from the proletarian revolution does not correspond to ideal a priori norms, therefore they turn their backs on it. That is political snobbery, common to pacifist-democratic, libertarian, anarcho-sindicalists, and generally ultra left circles of petty bourgeois intelligentsia. There are others who say that since this state has emerged from the proletarian revolution therefore every criticism of it is sacrilege and counter revolution. That is the voice of hypocrisy behind which lurks most often the immediate material interests of certain groups among this very same petty bourgeois intelligentsia, or among the workers' bureaucracy. These two types—the political snob and the political hypocrite are really interchangeable, depending upon personal circumstances.

"Despite monstrous bureaucratic degeneration, the Soviet State still remains the historical instrument of the workingclass, in so far as it assures the development of economy and culture on the basis of nationalised means of production, and by virtue of this prepares the conditions for a genuine emancipation of the toilers through the liquidation of the bureaucracy and of social inequality. Whoever has not seriously pondered and accepted these two fundamental propositions; whoever, in general, has not studied the literature of the Bolshevik-Leninists on the question of the U.S.S.R. from 1923 on, runs the risk of losing the leading thread with every new event, and of forsaking Marxist analysis for abject lamentations.

"The present-day domination of Stalin in no way resembles the Soviet rule during the initial years of the revolution. The substitution of one regime for the other did not occur at a single stroke, but through a series of measures, by means of a number of minor civil wars waged by the bureaucracy against the proletarian vanguard. In the last historical analysis, the Soviet democracy was blown up by the pressure of social contradictions. Exploiting the latter, the bureaucracy wrested the power from the hands of mass organisations. In this sense we may speak about the dictatorship of the bureaucracy and even of the personal dictatorship of Stalin. But this usurpation was made possible and can maintain itself only because the social content of the

dictatorship of the bureaucracy is determined by those productive relations which were created by the proletarian revolution. In this sense we may say with complete justification that the dictatorship of the proletariat found its distorted but indubitable expression in the dictatorship of the bureaucracy.

"Stalin guards the conquests of the October revolution not only against the feudal-bourgeois counter-revolution, but also against the claims of the toilers, their impatience and their dissatisfaction; he crushes the Left wing which expresses the ordered historical and progressive tendencies of the unprivileged working masses; he creates a new aristocracy, by means of an extreme differentiation in wages, privileges, ranks, etc. Leaning for support upon the topmost layer of the new social hierarchy against the lowest—sometimes vice versa—Stalin has attained the complete concentration of power in his own hands. What else should this regime be called, if not Soviet Bonapartism?

"Bonapartism, by its very essence, cannot long maintain itself: a sphere balanced on the point of a pyramid must inevitably roll down on one side or the other. But it is at this point that the historical analogy runs up against its limits. Napoleon's downfall did not, of course, leave untouched the relations between classes; but in its essence, the social pyramid of France retained its bourgeois character. The inevitable collapse of Stalinist Bonapartism would immediately call into question the character of the U.S.S.R. as a workers' state. Socialist economy cannot be constructed without a socialist power. The fate of the U.S.S.R. as a socialist state depends upon that political regime which will arise to replace Stalinist Bonapartism. Only the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat can regenerate the Soviet system, if it is again able to mobilise around itself the toilers of the city and the village." (L. TROTSKY, Feb. 1, 1935)

Summarising his analysis of conditions in the U.S.S.R., after the Kirov affair, Trotsky, in the article above quoted from, says:-

"(a) The terrorist tendencies within the ranks of the communist youth are one of the most virulent symptoms of the fact that Bonapartism has exhausted its political possibilities and has entered the period of the most ruthless struggle for its existence.

"(b) The inevitable collapse of the Stalinist political regime will lead to the establishment of Soviet democracy only in the event that the removal of Bonapartism comes as the conscious act of the proletarian vanguard. In all other cases, in place of Stalinism there could only come the fascist-capitalist counter-revolution.

"(c) The tactic of individual terrorism, no matter under what banner it proceeds, can, under given conditions, play only into the hands of the worst enemies of the proletariat.

"(d) The political and moral responsibility for the very inception of terrorism within the ranks of the communist youth falls upon the gravedigger of the party—Stalin."

Shall We Defend The U.S.S.R.

In case of an attack by imperialism on the U.S.S.R. the world proletariat must not leave the Soviet Union to its fate and rely upon the workers there to settle with the bureaucracy. It must defend the Soviet Union even in its present condition, naturally without giving up its criticism of the Stalin bureaucracy for one second. In this respect Trotsky has used a comparison which is striking in its simplicity:-

"It is our undeniable duty to defend the Soviet state AS IT IS (with the theories of Doriot, Treint, etc. we have nothing in common), just as we defend ANY labor organisation, though led by the worst reformist, against Fascism and military reaction. The whole question is however—HOW AND WITH WHAT METHODS? Marxists say: Only with those means which we have at our disposal, which we can consciously utilise, that is, with the methods of the revolutionary class struggle in all belligerent countries. Whatever the fortunes of war, the revolutionary class struggle will, in the last analysis, yield the best results to the workers. This applies to the defence of labor organisations and of democratic institutions of capitalist lands, no less than to the defence of the Soviet Union. Our methods remain basically the same. Under no circumstances or pretext can we transfer our revolutionary task into the hands of our national bourgeoisie." (L. Trotsky, "Who Defends Russia? Who Helps Hitler?" July 29, 1935).

The freeing of the U.S.S.R. from the Stalinist tumor is the task of the international revolution. The precondition for victory is the creation of the Fourth International. If the October Revolution and the creation of the Third International signified a basic revival of Marxism coming from Russia, from the East, so today the workers of western Europe and America are in a position to regain the Russian workers for revolutionary Marxism.

The removal of the cancer of bureaucracy from the Soviet state is the task of the conscious struggle for the Fourth International.



READ THESE PAMPHLETS!

SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY
REVOLUTION IN ONE COUNTRY } **By**
SPEECH AT COPENHAGEN } **TROTSKY**

FALLACY of the THEORY of **S. HOOK**
SOCIAL FASCISM
THE PEOPLE'S FRONT **M. SOHACHTMAN**

READ "THE MILITANT"

Monthly Organ of the Workers' Party

FOR PARTICULARS OF THESE PUBLICATIONS

AND OTHER PARTY BUSINESS,

WRITE TO,

Secretary

24, Waterview Street,

BALMAIN.

