

The Bolsheviks, so to speak, jumped the gun, in the developing world trend of capitalism, and were forced to expand imperialistically for the same reasons as was Czarist Russia, which had been assailed by that military genius with the soul and outlook of a brigand, to wit, Napoleon Bonaparte, and hence had good reason to build up buffer States between Russia and the rest of Europe. Once more in defending herself against an expanding Germany that time under the German trade booster Kaiser Wilhelm and his satellite Austria, under the Hapsburgs, Russia struck at Austria after the Belgrade assassination of the Archduke Otto, when Austria declared war after an ultimatum from Russia forbidding her to do so. Then, of course, Germany came in as an ally of Austria, and Britain and France as allies of Russia. For a long time Germany had been seeking an opening. Germany had been bluffed on many occasions such as at the Agadir incident in North Africa, when British destroyers moved in to stiffen French resistance.

To-day, Russia feels impelled to protest in no uncertain manner against U.S.A. moving into and occupying the vacuum in Europe which has taken place with the collapse of Germany and the growing impotence of Britain and France.

Failing an alliance, equivalent to a Federation of the various sovereignties of Western Europe, U.S.A. feels impelled for many reasons to block Russia from becoming the ONE European Power able to dominate all the rest. [At date of going to press, Bevin is striving hard for such an alliance between Britain, France, Belgium, Luxembourg and Holland.]

Russia is still demanding warm water sea outlets, and Britain and U.S.A. have been using Greece and Turkey to block free Russian movement to the Mediterranean. Only last week U.S. submarines have been placed to the use of Turkey, and U.S.A. is still backing Greece.

No doubt, if they are pliable enough U.S.A. and Britain will use Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland, if it is at all possible to block full Russian control of the Baltic Sea. In the past Britain had no inhibitions about turning the Mediterranean into a British lake, nor the Indian Ocean now.

Despite all such realistic evidence we find that great idealist humanitarian, Eleanor Roosevelt, voicing what appears to be rational commonsense to the millions of U.S. readers who read her syndicated press features. Such idealists have never understood the driving dynamics of capitalist economies and practice.

In the January issue of the *Ladies' Home Journal* read in many millions of homes, Eleanor Roosevelt answers a correspondent who asks:

"Walter Winchell is of opinion that Soviet Russia is preparing for a sneak attack on the United States. Do you agree with him?"

Mrs. Roosevelt answers:

"No, I do not agree with Mr. Winchell. I am not surprised, however, that he is bitter against the Soviet Union, because they attacked him unjustifiably. Nevertheless, I think we have no proof that the Soviets would or could prepare an attack against us now. I think we have a great deal of proof that the people and the Government at present are anxious for peace. They

have much rehabilitation to do in their country. They have plans to carry out for the well-being of their people which could hardly be carried out if another war was contemplated or was actually going on. I think at the moment there is no more danger of an attack from Russia on us than there is of an attack by us on Russia. In both countries the fear of such an attack exists, but I do not think that fear is very realistic."

Mrs. Roosevelt is sadly idealistic, rather than realistic.

She allies the people of Russia as a factor of influence over the Russian government. She thinks the Russian government is actually planning for the well-being of the Russian people, apart from any such alleged planning being only a factor to increase Russian production under its war-economy policy. There probably is no danger of a "sneak attack" on U.S.A. from Russia. If war does come it will likely start in Italy, Jugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, or Persia, by U.S.A. forcibly opposing Russian infiltration. In such a case it will appear that U.S.A. is the aggressor in Europe.

To understand what a war-economy means let us look at its effects in Australia, where it has only recently been implemented since the advent of the Curtin Labor Administration and furthered by the present Chifley Labor Government.

Under a permanent war-economy the well-being of the people is secondary—housing, for example, must wait.

Capital that, otherwise attracted by the prospect of reasonably big profits, would be invested in undertakings catering for the comfort and well-being of the masses, MUST BE CONTROLLED and syphoned off into industries that in "peace" years can maintain themselves by export trade—SENDING WEALTH OUT of the country—but whose factories at the outbreak of war can be almost instantly organised to the production of war material without disorganising domestic civilian production. Even before nationalisation is effective the banks are not allowed to advance credit overdrafts to be used as capital.

Under such conditions is Australia in any different circumstances to Russia or to Nazi pre-war Germany?

Only in matter of degree.

A degree that may more closely approximate Russia as the years go by and the war services and their needs dominate more more the economy of Australia. Mr. Hughes's declaration shows Australia is being committed to the next war without endorsement or consultation of "the people."

That section of free enterprise capitalists, and in particular the finance capitalists, for whom Menzies is a principal spokesman, profess to see in every bit of such legislation and the recent Nationalisation of Banking Act, "the hand of socialism and communism." They, of course, know that such war economy is the main feature of Russian existence, and are foolishly unrealistic in their alleged innocence that it exists in Australia only to oppose Russia so far as policy is concerned. They do not want to understand that it emanates as the trend of the capitalism they support.

On the other hand, leading BIG capitalist enterprise has gone to bed with "Labor," and proceeds on the assumption that members of the Labor Party and indeed even Communists, are just as human, just as vain for the limelight

of publicity and office, and just as corruptable as any other political party has ever been. The German capitalists gave Hitler's "national socialism" full support on a similar issue.

Consequently, the official Labor Party comes out as a 100 per cent. National Australian Party—to build up Australia as a nation, as an arsenal-bastion of the Empire in the Pacific, and is prepared to regiment the working class to its particular brand of Capitalist Imperialism, as only fanatics of expansionism are prepared.

The Communists are just as fanatically supporting Russian expansion for a similar purpose.

The difference between the Labor Party and Stalinist Communism is one only of degree.

The difference between the Police State of Russia and the growing totalitarian authoritarianism of Australia under "Labor" rule is only one of degree.

The Commonwealth has its own police force and investigators and the necessary powers under the Crime Act and the Approved Defence Projects Protection Act to become an Australian Gestapo or O.G.P.U.

## A MARXIST SAW CLEARLY

It is necessary to understand the Bolsheviks—Russian Social Democrats—viewpoint prior to the Revolution to see how naturally they filled the role of Dictators.

Rosa Luxemburg, forty-two years ago—1906—when Russia was an extremely backward country, had this to say.

"Under ordinary conditions—that is, where the political domination of the bourgeoisie has preceded the socialist movement—the bourgeoisie itself instils in the working class the rudiments of political solidarity. At this stage, declares the *Communist Manifesto*, the unification of the workers is not yet the result of their own aspiration to unity, but comes as a result of the activity of the bourgeoisie, which, in order to attain its own political ends, is compelled to set the proletariat in motion. . . ."

"In Russia, however, the Social Democracy must make up by its own efforts an entire historic period. It must lead the Russian proletarians from their present 'atomized' condition, which prolongs the autocratic regime, to a class organization that would help them to become aware of their historic objectives and prepare them to struggle to achieve these objectives.

"The Russian socialists are obliged to undertake the building of such an organization without the benefit of the formal guarantees commonly found under a bourgeois-democratic set-up. They do not dispose of the political raw material that in other countries is supplied by bourgeois society itself. Like God Almighty they must have this organization arise out of the void, so to speak.\*

\*This is a remarkable sentence. Forty years ago Rosa Luxemburg recognised the creative power of Bolshevism, even though she sensed its effects and opposed them in theory.

Bolshevism created the Russia of today—if not out of a void, still out of a chaos of a broken-down political and economic system.

The ancient Hebrew sage who in *Genesis* said: "God created man in His own image" gave the ideologic inversion

of: Man created god anthropomorphologically, i.e., with all the characteristics and attributes of man himself. And so, as geniuses of realism, the Bolsheviks in the image of capitalism created an organization they were convinced was, "if not socialism, at least the next best thing to socialism, for they were completing the process which in the Western nations was still only the main trend of development." They were the first to start that which all the Western nations are now organizing—an authoritative, planned, controlled war-economy that practically dominates if it has not already abolished the market-economy, and would appear to be the form to exploit and exhaust all the capabilities of development still necessary for One World of Capitalism.

"How to effect a transition from the type of organization characteristic of the preparatory stage of the socialist movement—usually featured by disconnected local groups and clubs, with propaganda as a principal activity—to the unity of a large, national body, suitable for concerted political action over the entire vast territory ruled by the Russian State? That is the specific problem which the Russian Social Democracy has mullied over for some time. Autonomy and isolation are the most pronounced characteristics of the old organizational type. It is, therefore, understandable why the slogan of the persons who want to see an inclusive organization should be 'Centralism!'"

Bolshevism was clearly recognised for what it has ultimately become, even before the Russian Revolution; when over forty years ago Lenin, in *One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward*, very clearly outlined theoretically the later practice of the Bolshevik Communist Party of a rigid Centralism, Rosa Luxemburg critically answered him.

Rosa Luxemburg—translated by H. Integer, of *New Vista*—defines "the two principles on which Lenin's centralism rests (as precisely these: 1) The blind subordination, in the smallest detail, of all party organs, to the party centre, which alone thinks, guides and decides for all. 2) The rigorous separation of the organised nucleus of revolutionaries from its social-revolutionary surroundings."

This practice has been rigidly adhered to by Moscow. The purging of individuals for not adhering strictly to the party line, immediately and consecutively, every time the "party line" is changed to meet opposing conditions, was clearly implied by Lenin when he declared that "it is no longer the proletarians, but certain intellectuals in our party who need to be educated in the matters of organisation and discipline."—(*One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward*, p. 145.)

Lenin glorifies the capitalist regimentation to the production of commodities; educative influence of the factory, which, he says, accustoms the workers to "discipline and organisation"—page 147 (quoted by Rosa Luxemburg).

This is the capitalist opposite to the factory organisation by Workers' Councils (Soviets), which in practice opposed such discipline and organisation and threw out the bosses and their representatives. They substituted a basis for self-government in the production of goods for use. Before such practice could reach a wider sphere or workable stage over large areas these organs were forcibly subverted by Lenin and

Trotsky during the counter-revolution.

They had been the political force that accomplished the revolution as Councils of Workers and Soldiers' Delegates.

Tom Mann, in 1922, was forcibly struck with their practicability—especially as opposed or compared to parliamentary practice.

That Tom Mann later was suborned to acceptance of Stalinist Communism does in no way upset his considered opinion as to the value of Workers' Councils in 1922.

Under capitalism the workers are disciplined and organised as factory units to produce for the market. The market is the arbitrary final discipline, which Bolshevism has replaced only by the discipline of the Totalitarian State war-economy, which has necessarily created a huge bureaucratic and military machine which, together with the Secret Police, govern the workers more rigorously and with more severe penalties than was ever possible under the preceding form of capitalism.

The AIM of centralism is thus for a co-ordinated WHOLE which, of necessity, in this era of capitalist struggle for World Power, has been subverted to military needs.

According to Stalin, only that which happens is logical.

Then, for more than three thousand years, exploitation is the only logic for progress.

Yet the flame of the IDEA—freedom—ever burns up as the dialectical opposite to tyranny.

The centralism of the State grows all over the world as the necessary form for capitalism to assert its sovereignty. The working class can only challenge the centralism of the State by building up an opposite form beginning with the real unit of capitalism—the factory (managerial centralism extends itself to allied companies and trusts and cartels).

This dynamic opposition implies workers organising on shop and factory lines which cells will elect delegates to Workers' Councils.

When once the workers get the oppositional workers' councils of delegates functioning, then—and then only—will they have a nucleus of an organisation to challenge the State centralism.

This natural criticism of centralism—the revolt and the fight against it—was early recognised by the Communist Bolshevik Party of Russia after the Revolution, in that its struggle, as The Party was just as ruthless AGAINST THE WORKERS as it was against the old capitalist elements. Only those individual capitalists and those individual workers survived against the onslaughts of Lenin, Trotsky and (later) Stalin, who accepted the discipline and the practice of the State centralism of Moscow.

The correctness of viewpoint of Rosa Luxemburg consisted in that she theoretically grasped and critically opposed the centralism of Leninism over forty years ago.

Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Leibknecht, Otto Ruhle, and others also found it necessary to oppose the parliamentary centralism of the German Social Democrats of the Weimar Republic, in which opposition Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Leibknecht met their deaths.

Integer translates Rosa Luxemburg thus:

"Lenin seems to demonstrate again that his conception of socialist organization is quite mechanistic. The discipline

Lenin has in mind is being implanted in the working class not only by the factory, but also by the military and the existing State bureaucracy—by the entire mechanism of the centralized bourgeois State.

"We misuse words and we practice self-deception when we apply the same term—discipline—to such dissimilar notions as: 1) the absence of thought and will in a body with a thousand automatically moving hands and legs, and 2) the spontaneous co-ordination of the conscious, political acts of a body of men. What is there in common between the regulated docility of an oppressed class and the self-discipline and organization of a class struggling for its emancipation?"

"The self-discipline of the Social Democracy is not merely the replacement of the authority of the bourgeois rulers with the authority of a socialist Central Committee. The working class will acquire the sense of the new discipline, the freely assumed self-discipline of the Social Democracy, not as a result of the discipline imposed on it by the capitalist State, but by extirpating, to the last root, its old habits of obedience and servility."

Rosa Luxemburg then uses the word "centralism" in the sense of working class unity as an organisation of the working class. It is a pity she did not use a more expressive word:

"Centralism in the socialist sense is not an absolute thing applicable to any phase whatsoever of the labor movement. It is a tendency, which becomes real in proportion to the development and political training acquired by the working masses in the course of their struggle.

"No doubt, the absence of the conditions necessary for the complete realization of this kind of centralism in the Russian movement presents a formidable obstacle.

"It is a mistake to believe that it is possible to substitute 'provisionally' the absolute power of a Central Committee (acting somehow by tacit delegation) for the yet unrealizable rule of the majority of conscious workers in the party, and this way replace the open control of the working masses over the party organs with the reverse control by the Central Committee over the revolutionary proletariat.

"The history of the Russian labor movement suggests the doubtful value of such centralism. An all-powerful centre, invested, as Lenin would have it, with the unlimited right to control and intervene, would be an absurdity if its authority applied only to technical questions, such as the administration of funds, the distribution of tasks among propagandists and agitators, the transportation and circulation of printed matter. The political purpose of an organ having such great powers is understandable only if these powers apply to the elaboration of a uniform plan of action, if the central organ assumes the initiative of a vast revolutionary act.

"But what has been the experience of the Russian socialist movement up to now? The most important and most fruitful changes in its tactical policy during the last ten years [written in 1906] have not been the inventions of several leaders, and even less so of any central organizational organs. They have always been the spontaneous product of the movement in ferment. This was true during the first stage of the proletarian movement in Russia, which began with the spontaneous general

strike of St. Petersburg in 1896, an event that marks the inception of a epoch of economic struggle by the Russian working people. It was no less true during the following period, introduced by the spontaneous street demonstrations of St. Petersburg students in March, 1901. The general strike of Rostov-on-the-Don, in 1903, marking the next great tactical turn in the Russian proletariat movement, was also a spontaneous act. "All by itself," the strike expanded into political demonstrations, street agitation, great outdoor meetings, which the most optimistic revolutionist would not have dreamt of several years before.

"Our cause made great gains in these events. However, the initiative and conscious leadership of the Social Democratic organizations played an insignificant role in this development. It is true that those organizations were not specifically prepared for such happenings. However, the unimportant part played by the revolutionists cannot be explained by this fact. Neither can it be attributed to the absence of an all-powerful central party apparatus similar to what is asked for by Lenin. The existence of such a guiding centre would have probably increased the disorder of the local committees by emphasizing the difference between the eager attack of the mass and the prudent position of the Social Democracy. The same phenomenon—the insignificant part played by the initiative of central party organs in the elaboration of actual tactical policy—can be observed to-day in Germany and other countries. In general, the tactical policy of the Social Democracy is not something that may be 'invented.' It is the product of a series of great creative acts of the often spontaneous class struggle seeking its way forward. "The unconscious comes before the conscious. The logic of the historic process comes before the subjective logic of the human beings who participate in the historic process. *The tendency is for the directing organs of the socialist party to play a conservative role. Experience shows that every time the labor movement wins new terrain these organs work to the utmost. They transform it at the same time into a kind of bastion, which holds up advance on a wider scale.*"—Italics ours.—Editor S.A.W.C.]

"The present tactical policy of the German Social Democracy has won universal esteem because it is supple, as well as firm. This is a sign of the fine adaptation of the party, in the smallest detail of its every-day activity, to the conditions of a parliamentary regime. The party has made a methodical study of all the resources of this terrain. It knows how to utilize them without modifying its principles.

"However, the very perfection of this adaptation is already closing vaster horizons to our party. There is a tendency in the party to regard parliamentary tactics as the immutable and specific tactics of socialist activity."—Italics ours.—Ed. S.A.W.C.]—People refuse, for example, to consider the possibility (posed by Parvus) of changing our tactical policy in case general suffrage is abolished in Germany, an eventuality not considered entirely improbable by leaders of the German Social Democracy.

"Such inertia is due, in a large degree, to the fact that it is very inconvenient to define, within the vacuum of abstract hypotheses, the lines and forms of still

non-existent political situations. Evidently, the important thing for the Social Democracy is not the preparation of a set of directives all ready for future policy. It is important: 1) to encourage a correct historic appreciation of the forms of struggle corresponding to the given situations, and 2) to maintain an understanding of the relativity of the current phase and the inevitable increase of revolutionary tension as the final goal of the class struggle is approached.

"Granting, as Lenin wants, such absolute powers of a negative character to the top organ of the party, we strengthen, to a dangerous extent, the conservatism inherent in such an organ. If the tactics of the socialist party are not to be the creation of a Central Committee, but of the whole party, or, still better, of the whole labor movement, then it is clear that the party sections and federations need the liberty of action which alone will permit them to develop their revolutionary initiative and to utilize all the resources of a situation. The ultra-centralism asked by Lenin is full of the sterile spirit of the overseer. It is not a positive and creative spirit. *Lenin's concern is not so much to make the activity of the party more fruitful as to control the party—to narrow the movement rather than to develop it, to bind rather than to unify it.*"—[Italics are R.L.'s.]

[We had not the time to read, or now the space to print the whole translation by Intiger (1934) of this realistic criticism by Rosa Luxemburg. We therefore urge our readers, who are interested, to send 20 cents to *New Views*, 505 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N.Y., U.S.A., for the full pamphlet, *Authoritarianism and Democracy in the Socialist Organisation*, by Rosa Luxemburg. Mention this paper. *New Views* is issued monthly under the direction of H. Integer, \$1.00 per year.]

## SOCIAL POLICY TO SPEED UP PRODUCTION

The following is of interest in that it gives readers an insight into Russian customs. For example, the naivette of the peasants who hoarded Tsarist roubles and had them go bad under the Soviet regime—and later hoarded German occupation roubles and had them go bad later—still to hoard Soviet roubles and have them go bad last December. Will they allow themselves to be bitten again with ersatz currency? It also explains the difference in prices between the official rationed goods stores and the Government run "commercial" shops, or the equivalent of what is the black market, at inflated prices in other lands. The references to the *bazaar*, with which our readers will be familiar (see p. 28, issue No. 37), since the article reprinted from *Reiort*, the U.S. Anarchist quarterly, which explained the workings of this free market, in which individual surplus production was sold or exchanged, is exceptionally enlightening. The prices mentioned also show that Minister Moloney's reports on the U.S.S.R., which so incensed local Australian communists, were correctly based.

The article bears out that the Russians are still a cash-minded" people.

Capitalism is the ONLY system of society in which the use of money has been all pervasive. In feudal times it was possible for the peasants to go right through their whole life and never need

to use money, or, in fact, even ever see money at all. It outlines the fact that feudalism was a sustenance economy and that good harvests meant plenty for the serfs—and that under capitalism production is primarily to sell—for a money market. Money or the use of money under real socialism (not State capitalism) would be unthinkable.

The fact of the "commercial" (black market) shops shows that this was a method used by Stalin to try and drain off the surplus currency. If the hoarded money had come into the market freely there is no doubt that "commercial" prices would have been higher still—it is evident that they were as high as the traffic of demand would allow.

Although any unspent wages of the Stakhanovites has now been "liquidated" by nine-tenths—yet the fact remains that they must still speed up—if they are still young enough to do so—in order to earn a wage high enough to maintain the same standard to which they have been used to; there is even thus an added incentive to work for their life.

The Russian Government shows an ability to manoeuvre between the two basic classes of Russian society: the workers and the peasant, swinging from one side to the other—the pro-mizhik policy has been rightist and the industrial policy leftist. The present social policy is leftist.

## STALIN'S SWITCH IN SOCIAL POLICY

On December 14, the Soviet Government announced a series of financial and economic measures, which, taken together (according to a special correspondent of *The Economist*, Dec. 10) (amount to a significant modification of its social policy. The long decree, signed by Stalin for the Government, and by Zhdanov for the Party, consists of three sets of measures: the currency reform, the abolition of rationing, and the new policy on prices and wages. . . . They are calculated to achieve two parallel objectives: firstly, to mop up surplus purchasing power and thus to end the inflationary trend, to which the war gave a powerful stimulus, though the trend had been apparent even earlier; and secondly, to redistribute the remaining purchasing power between the various classes of Soviet society in accordance with the new social and political demands of the post-war era.

It is difficult to gauge the scope of Russian inflation. The total amount of currency is not known. . . . [it has been treated as a defence secret . . . it is doubtful whether the central planning authorities have any exact knowledge of the volume of circulation. The Russian peasant is a habitual hoarder of money [which] has flowed from the town to the countryside, where it lay hidden in chests and "money boxes." The peasants of the former occupied areas also hoarded roubles issued by the Germans, just as they hoarded old Tsarist roubles long after the victory and consolidation of the Soviet regime. . . . [The currency! had been inflated to the extent [that it would] have undermined . . . Russia's planned economy. . . .

Under the reform all cash holdings are exchanged at the rate of ten old roubles to one new one [implying] that the rouble had lost about nine-tenths of its previous value.

[Reference is here made to] State-