

EARL

BROWDER

COMMUNIST

OR TOOL OF

WALL ST

**By GEORGE
MARLEN**

OR

**STALIN
TROTSKY
LENIN**

STAVAN, TROTSKY OR LENIN

MARLEN

STALIN, TROTSKY or LENIN

EARL BROWDER
COMMUNIST
OR
TOOL OF WALL STREET

STALIN, TROTSKY or LENIN

By
GEORGE MARLEN

COPYRIGHT 1937 BY THE AUTHOR
P.O.B. 67, STATION D, NEW YORK

Copyright NOT
renewed:
Public Domain
(noted Aug 2014)

*The contents of this book are not for general consumption.
The work is confined to the political problems of the workers,
it deals with controversial issues, and constitutes, in a sense, a
program of action for the proletariat.*

THE AUTHOR



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AT THE VAN REES PRESS

CONTENTS

Introduction	9
The Force That Gave Rise to Browder	25
The Betrayal of the German Proletariat	88
Cannon and Shachtman Lend Comfort to Browder	143
The "Seventh Congress"—A Milestone of Renegadism	161
The Betrayal of the Spanish Toiling Masses	247
Toward Communism or Back to Capitalism	316
The Bloody Phase of Centralization (The Moscow "Trials")	354
Browder Serves Stalin and Wall Street	434
The Task of the Hour	459

INTRODUCTION

IN March 1919 Lenin founded the Third International with the specific aim of overthrowing the capitalist system in all lands, establishing a world dictatorship of the proletariat, and leading humanity towards the classless, the Communist society. For many years, from the day of its birth, the Third International, the Comintern, was the repository of my firm belief that it was piloting the world proletariat and all the oppressed towards the revolutionary goal. Certain deep-going changes which slowly germinated in the inner-Comintern affairs after Lenin's death, and a certain personal experience, induced in my mind, at first the suspicion, and after exhaustive research and investigation, the unshakable conviction that the post-Leninist Comintern gave up the original aim. In 1933, having carefully weighed facts, separating the realm of actuality from that of fancy, with great deliberation and mature and sober reflection I took the momentous step of leaving the Comintern. I made a sharp break with the negative present in order to cement my ties with the positive past.

My further experience, a thorough review of the entire political scene within the proletarian camp, and sustained patient analysis, led me to conclude that not only has Stalin, who succeeded Lenin as leader of the Comintern, definitely broken with Bolshevism, but also Trotsky, the leader of the Opposition to Stalin, abandoned Marxism-Leninism.

The present work embodies the results of the closest examination and survey of the undreamed of succession of outstanding political lessons priceless to the revolutionary workers. Its aim is not merely to offer startling disclosures, but also to speak out frankly with respect to the profound transformation of the Comintern and the motive powers of this transformation. Above all, the present work is intended to demarcate sharply the teach-

ings of Marx and Lenin from the opportunism of the Stalin and the Trotsky schools.

In the few introductory lines I acquaint the reader with my personal experience within the American Communist Party, an experience which I think is worth relating in some detail. I am speaking of the suppression of my revolutionary novel, *The Road*, by the Party leadership.

I began writing *The Road* late in 1917, living in Tennessee at the time. Owing to the character of the contents of the work, the notion that a bourgeois publisher would bring it out was outside my thoughts. The book was designed to be a Party weapon, and I took it that the Party leaders upon examining the work would publish it, making it part of the ideological arsenal of the proletariat.

To continue the work in more favorable surroundings I moved to New York. Here the Public Library offered a rich field for research; and much of the precious and elsewhere inaccessible material discovered was used in *The Road*. Some years went by in tenacious and steady labor. In 1927, when the manuscript was nearly finished, I broached the subject to several leading functionaries of the Party. Oddly enough, they listened to my story with undisguised skepticism, and one by one, politely but firmly, declined to read the work, all pleading lack of time.

For a whole year I made an arduous, persistent albeit fruitless effort to break through. Thus my progress was brought to a dead stop.

To reduce the difficulty I chose a portion of the work, the chapter dealing with the Paris Commune, and distributed a few typed copies among the élites of the Party.

After months of persistently pressing and besetting now Weinstone, now Stachel, now another leader of the Party, I scored a success. Olgin read the story of the Paris Commune and at once recommended its publication to the Workers Library Publishers, a Party institution. This portion of *The Road*, with Olgin's introduction in spirit-stirring tones, was published under the title of *Paris on the Barricades*. The *Daily Worker* printed a half-announcement half-review of the new work. The editor reported that he was receiving letters from workers lauding it. One letter, "Miss a meal and buy a copy of *Paris on the Barricades*," was characteristic of the enthusiastic reception accorded the pamphlet

by the workers. Several weeks later there appeared in the *Daily Worker* a full review by Sam Darcy highly praising the work.

Emboldened by the progress I was now making, I resolved to push once more the entire manuscript. Several typewritten copies of *The Road* were distributed among the outstanding leaders of the Party.

My pressure was concentrated upon Weinstone, Browder and Trachtenberg. Working in a shop within four short blocks of International Publishers, I became a frequent and manifestly unwelcome visitor there. Trachtenberg hardly ever found a spare moment to say hello to me. And on the rare occasions when he was not too busy he would put his head through the window in his cubicle and remark in my direction, "I have no news for you. . . ."

One day Weinstone caught a cold and, compelled to stay indoors, picked up *Paris on the Barricades* to while away the time. A week later in his office he told me he considered the work a masterpiece; also that he had read some pages of *The Road* and thought the book contained excellent Communist propaganda. Right there and then he called in his stenographer and dictated a letter to Trachtenberg, urging him to give the manuscript his attention.

Several days later I caught Trachtenberg as he was about to enter a cafeteria. We halted for a brief talk, and he was quite outspoken. The letter had failed to impress him. Weinstone, in his opinion, knew nothing about book publishing and less than nothing about literature.

"Well, then, why don't you go over the manuscript and see for yourself!" I said.

"Because I am skeptical about the work," came his answer.

"Upon what do you base your skepticism?" I pursued.

"Upon this: If experienced writers like Sinclair, Barbusse or Gold cannot produce what might be called a Communist novel, how can I believe that an ordinary worker without college training can write one? It's impossible."

I pleaded guilty to the charge: I had not been to an institution of higher learning. I held the belief, however, that a worker even without a college education behind him had a right to wield the pen. Being something of a student of English, of literature and of Marxism, I dared to "poach" on the intellectual preserves,

doing so, I assured Trachtenberg, only because I felt that my literary labors would benefit the proletariat.

But he could not see my logic and was adamant in holding to his opinion. Subsequent visits to International Publishers lost all meaning and wore a routine character.

My vain attempts to see Browder were past counting. The best gotten from him was a message transmitted to me orally by his secretary, to the effect that Comrade Browder was overwhelmed with urgent work, but as soon as circumstances permitted he would set aside a couple of days for the reading of the manuscript.

As prospects grew less cheering, my efforts, conversely, gained in vigor and persistence. And lo! the strenuous and stubborn patience began to show results.

The first response came from Browder's secretary asking for my correct address to which the manuscript could be safely returned. I went for the copy in person, and to my surprise Browder granted me an interview. He genially informed me that he had taken the manuscript with him on his recent visit to Moscow. There, in the Comintern, three American comrades had read it. One was not greatly impressed by the work. The second was non-committal. The third was of the opinion that if the Party could afford the expenditure, the book should be published, not so much because it was of any great value, but because encouragement must be given to the rank-and-filers in the movement. Unfortunately, the Party was hard pressed for money. The publication of *The Road*, therefore, for the moment was out of the question.

I left Browder's room. Stopping at Grace Maule's desk to tell her good-by, I remarked, "Gee, the manuscript is in just as good a condition as when I left it over two years ago." To which she innocently replied, "Oh, yes, nobody ever touched it. It has never left Comrade Browder's drawer."

Some months apart, one after the other all the copies were returned, admittedly unread. But Trachtenberg, being a publisher, obviously felt uncomfortable returning a manuscript which had been in his possession nearly three years with the frank admission that it had never been examined. The work, he said, had at the last minute been gone over by Comrade Landy who had found it of no particular worth to the Party.

But where I failed with the élites, I succeeded with some in-

conspicuous rank-and-filers. A group of friends, workers and Communist Party members, had read the manuscript. They were impatient no less than I was to see *The Road* published and put into the hands of the workers to be used against the capitalist enemy. As matters stood it was clear that *The Road* would lie in obscurity an indeterminate number of years, and perhaps through some ill-fated circumstance be destroyed and lost. The thing to do was to avoid indulging in fanciful speculations and find a way out of the impasse.

Dozens of plans were brought forward and rejected. Suddenly, some one posed the question: Dare we not take upon ourselves the job of putting out the book? The thought frightened everybody. It sounded fantastic, unworthy of serious consideration. We were a group of workers completely lacking the most elementary experience in the publishing line. And to release a book of some six hundred pages was rather a formidable task. Even if the required money were raised, we felt certain the job would somehow be started at the wrong end and the whole affair wind up in a mess.

With passing days it became clear that no solution to the dilemma existed—except that one. The human mind is made of pliant stuff. What had been before an impulsion was viewed as a possibility, then, as the only course to be pursued. The question of going into the publishing business was now approached with diminishing diffidence, everybody struggling in a maze of suggestions, outlines and bright ideas.

The plan, hazy at first, matured rapidly. Every day the group advanced a step. Books on publishing were consulted. Proof-reader's marks were assiduously studied. The raw, green workers rapidly grasped the "mysterious" methods of book-production. The feeling of determination and self-reliance grew. Every one in the group made a substantial monetary contribution, and the project assumed the aspect of reality.

There was one brief pause in our otherwise uninterrupted progress. When the money was clubbed, an idea occurred to me. Trachtenberg had once told me I must not forget we still lived under capitalism where the publication of books is bound up with financial outlay. I now proposed that we offer Trachtenberg the money needed for the printing of the book.

By general decision I set out to see Trachtenberg once more. I had no sooner made the offer than he, with a gesture of im-

patience and a note of finality thrust me aside remarking curtly, "I don't want to be bothered with it."

Without another moment's delay my friends and I plunged vigorously forward, intently bent upon putting out the work in the briefest period of time. A name was chosen for the new "concern"—Red Star Press. A committee visited printing establishments and brought in estimates for the job.

In the latter part of November 1931, with all the handicaps, obstacles, difficulties and delays left behind, the long awaited day arrived. We doubted little that at this turn, Browder, Trachtenberg, Markoff and others would take the whole affair seriously, and in the spirit of Bolshevik self-criticism of which they themselves had spoken and written so much, would rectify their error of having ignored the work.

Equipped with handbills making known the publication of the book, a few of the Red Star Press comrades came to the open forum of the Workers School. Landy was the speaker of the evening. When the chairman rose to open the meeting, one of the Red Star group, giving him a handbill, asked him to include in the announcements "the appearance of the first Communist novel in America." Landy sat next to the chairman. His curious glance ran over the handbill and he winced as if dashed with ice-water. As the chairman read a line from our advertisement, Landy's lips curled into a contemptuous sneer. The comrades of the Red Star Press naturally were the only ones who knew the reason for Landy's discomfort. Their enthusiasm was dampened a bit, for Landy's obvious antagonism was a bad omen, especially in view of the fact that he had recently been appointed city editor of the *Daily Worker*.

More alarming still was Weinstone's reaction to the news. An ominous change had come over him. His attitude was one of open hostility. The point that brought this out sharply was the dispute with him over advertising space in the *Daily Worker*, of which he was editor. In order to open up with a bang the Red Star Press had planned to insert a quarter page ad. But Weinstone flatly refused. After considerable haggling, during which he made it plain that if the Red Star Press clung stubbornly to the original plan it would get no space at all, he allowed a four-inch ad to be inserted in the *Daily Worker*.

The advertisement wrought up an atmosphere of excitement among the élites. I encountered Jerome on the street; usually very

jovial, he gave me a churlish nod and passed quickly on. Entering the elevator in the Workers Center one day I came face to face with Trachtenberg. There was a bilious flash in his eyes and he quickly turned his back upon me. Touching him on the shoulder I asked whether he recognized me. "Oh yes, I remember you," he replied frigidly, leaving the car at the next stop. I saw Markoff and others "involved." They showed nervousness and glared at me with ill-concealed enmity. It was obvious that Landy's reaction was not an isolated phenomenon.

The first copy of *The Road* that left the bindery was submitted to the National Agitprop, with the request for a committee. The book, although received, was demonstratively unwelcomed. A week or so later, I was informed by Gertrude Haessler, Weinstone's wife, who was temporary agitprop, that pursuant to my request a committee had been set up to examine *The Road*. This was all that I ever heard about this Committee.

As we went along we continued striking rocks placed in our path by an invisible hand. The Party bookshop accepted some copies of the book but failed to display them. They were shoved out of sight upon a shelf. Only after vociferous complaints made by the comrades of the Red Star Press in the bookshop in the presence of workers, were copies put on the display table and in the show window.

These were palpably evil-boding signs. We dimly sensed trouble but could not yet discern in the threatening aspect a prelude to what followed. Remote from our thoughts was the suspicion that a conspiracy was being hatched; that some people were weaving a rope to loop around the neck of the Red Star Press.

Two currents clashed from the start in their attitude towards *The Road*. Those having no inkling of the uncommendable facts with respect to the leaders of the Party welcomed the book with enthusiasm. Opposing them were others who manifested towards the book a cold reserve.

One of the innocent enthusiasts over *The Road* was Carl Brodsky. Several days after he had purchased the book I was in his office. He was pacing the floor all wrought up, shouting: "I'm sold on this book!"

"I'm glad you've read it," I said, speaking very cautiously. "I hope you will help me bring the work to the attention of

Comrade Browder and other leading comrades. I had some difficulties in reaching them."

"You bet I will!" he cried. "I spoke to Weinstone last night. I told him this book is a *real* contribution to the movement!"

Plucking up, I told him, mentioning no names, that a few members of the Party had for years kept the manuscript in their possession, taking no trouble to read it, and now, it seemed, they feared that the spreading of the book would reveal the dereliction of Communist duty on their part. But Brodsky, not suspecting who the defaulters were, was not to be daunted.

"I don't give a damn who those people are!" he exclaimed. "I'll fight for this book!"

From the outset I pressed for reviews in the *Daily Worker* and in the *New Masses*. Having gone through a lot of red tape I was eventually forced to come to Landy. Upon learning of the purpose of my visit he retorted quite brutally:

"I don't believe the book is worth reviewing. You've made a mistake by publishing it. The damned thing is no good."

During the following weeks I became a perennial visitor to the Ninth Floor, knocking on all doors in unsuccessful exertion to find a leader willing to overrule Landy. The language papers *Uj Elore* and the *Freiheit* reviewed the work. A review appeared in the *Moscow News*. The *Arbeidet* in Norway not only gave the book a write-up but had it translated and ran it serially. But here in America the *Daily Worker* turned a deaf ear to all my requests for a review of a work written primarily for *American* workers, of a book which was, in the main, an attack upon the *American* bourgeoisie.

Equally damaging was the stubborn "failure" on the part of the *New Masses* to notice *The Road*. This periodical is regarded by a great many people as the foremost champion and promoter of proletarian art and literature in America. A mention in its pages of the publication of a new revolutionary novel would have afforded some possibilities for the distribution of the book. But behind the scenes in direct control of the *New Masses* stood Landy, Jerome, Trachtenberg, Markoff—people brought close together by their common delinquency, all having a malignant purpose in mind with respect to the work.

Joseph Freeman, officially recognized by the Communist Party and its sympathizers as one of the outstanding critics of revolutionary literature, was delivering a lecture on Soviet writers.

Some of the Red Star comrades went to hear him. During the question period two or three workers wanted to know what the speaker thought of *The Road*.

In savage phrases he declared he had never read a more miserable piece of writing. It was crudely constructed, was superficial, faulty and unconvincing, and in points of style and content devoid of any value to the literary world and to the workers. Freeman's violent criticism, the overwhelming force of his authority behind it, produced a telling effect, apparently sealing the doom of *The Road*.

To spare me some unpleasant moments my friends agreed among themselves not to tell me of Freeman's blasting outburst.

Some time later I attended a conference of proletarian writers and worker-correspondents. As I entered the hall I was greeted by Leonard Spier who had reviewed *The Road* in the *Rebel Poet*. Spier had expressed his sentiment on the work in the following words: "A great book. We can declare for it what we cannot for the works of Gold, Dreiser, Dos Passos or Anderson, that when one has read it through one is prepared, unhesitatingly and without regret, to join up with the nearest district unit of the radical movement."

Spier asked me whether I knew Joseph Freeman, the reporter at the conference. I replied I had never had the pleasure of meeting the comrade. Thereupon Spier seized hold of my arm and led me up to Freeman who was looking over his notes. Freeman and I shook hands.

"Marlen?" he said. "Oh, yes, *The Road*."

I thought I saw a flicker of uneasiness in his eyes. Inclining my head in the affirmative, I asked his opinion of the work. "I must confess," he replied, with a friendly smile, "I haven't read it yet. You know how little time we have—we want to read everything. But I'll make it my business to read it the first chance I have."

The conference was opened. Freeman delivered his report. In the discussion that followed, Leonard Spier, a worker-correspondent Baskov and two more whose names I do not recall, in the course of their remarks criticised the *New Masses* for its attitude of disregard towards *The Road*. Freeman in his summary ignored this criticism.

I told the Red Star friends that I had met Freeman and that the book lay within the scope of his interest. There were exclaima-

tions of astonishment, and the account of the episode at Freeman's lecture burst from their lips.

While the sub-surface activity to stop *The Road* went on, action upon my application to the John Reed Club was delayed from week to week. Every time I made an inquiry in the Party fraction of the Club, Jerome assured me that at the next meeting the question of my membership would be put on the agenda. Months wore on but the application was ignored. Obviously the understanding among the leaders of the fraction was to keep me out of the Club.

In Brodsky's attitude I observed a marked change. Having gotten wind of the situation he grew perceptibly cold and forgot his promise. George Siskind, who had similarly declared his readiness to fight, discovering it was Browder and his closest associates against whom the war had to be waged, recoiled in terror. And Olgin? We had been on friendly terms ever since the publication of *Paris on the Barricades*. I saw him on the second day after his return from a prolonged sojourn in the Soviet Union. Without disclosing the identity of the plotters, I let him know that *The Road* was facing annihilation unless some influential leader engaged in a contest on its behalf, and I expressed hope that he would prove the silver lining so ominously absent.

"Why don't you speak to Comrade Browder?" Olgin inquired. "He is the man to help you. He is the most wonderful comrade in the Party."

I explained what difficulties I had encountered in my attempts to see Browder and asked Olgin to speak to him. "I certainly will," Olgin promised. A week later Olgin's aloof manner told me that he had been drawn into the conspiracy.

During one of my periodical visits to the District Agitprop, Siskind blurted out that the night before several comrades of high rank had taken up the question of a review of *The Road* in the *Daily Worker*. The comrades, with one notable exception, spoke in favor of continuing the policy of ignoring the book. The dissenter was Browder. He argued that at least one mention of it in the *Daily Worker* was necessary. Thereupon the comrades concurred with his recommendation.

So, a couple of days later, instead of the usual, made wearisome through iteration, "Comrade Browder is very busy and cannot see you," I heard the gratifying "Comrade Browder has invited you to come in."

He rose to welcome me with an outstretched hand and a benign smile under his short thick mustache. His manner was open, agreeable and disarming. Gesturing me to a chair he resumed his seat at the desk. I tried to penetrate his inscrutable pale-blue eyes, my mind fluttering between two diametrically opposed estimates of the man before me. "He is at bottom a true revolutionist, deeply devoted to the cause of the working class" was one. "He is a dissembler" was the other.

Browder said he was glad the work had been published. How was it selling? he asked with some concern. Indicating a number of reviews of *The Road* on the desk before him he remarked that one of them in a day or two would appear in the *Daily Worker*.

I expressed my acknowledgments; then consumed with the desire to cut through this intricate deadly knot I gave vent to complaint of the treatment *The Road* had received at the hands of Landy, Weinstone and the others. Suddenly I stopped short. Browder had burrowed into his voluminous mail and other reading matter, appearing imperturbable and utterly oblivious of my existence. Presently the girl who had ushered me into Browder's room entered and announced that some one was waiting to see him. Rising with a mien of importance, Browder very politely intimated that my interview had extended beyond the allotted time.

On the 10th of May, 1932, the *Daily Worker* broke its obdurate silence—*six months after the publication of the book!* When a bourgeois writer creates an ideological weapon against the proletariat, the bourgeoisie, keenly on the alert to safeguard their class interests, start popularizing it through means of their press and other mediums. Very often popularization is begun long before the literary opiate has left the printing press. But with regard to *The Road* the leaders of the Party, supposedly on the alert to further the interests of the working class, *consciously* and stubbornly for a half year refused to call the workers' attention through the chief Party organ to the fact that a new weapon against the capitalist enemy had been forged by a fellow-worker. What interpretation could unsuspecting workers put upon the *Daily's* silence about a book which was continually advertised on its pages? Every worker knows that it is not every day that a Communist novel is published in America. And if this unknown work deserves mentioning neither in the official organ

of the Communist Party nor in the *New Masses*, it must be pretty punk and not worth while reading. What surer sign was needed?

I had read the review before its publication. Conscious of the fact that the atmosphere around the book was that of distinct prejudice, and that the reviewer, one of the staff of the *Daily Worker*, was influenced in the direction of toning down, I had a half-mind to adjudge the write-up as fair. But what was my astonishment when picking up the *Daily* with the review in it I discovered that the article had been doctored a bit. Certain words had been left out and the opening sentence altered so as to constitute a very sly yet vicious attack upon the work. A clever game the Party superior was playing!

Until the memory of the attack had grown dim, the book stopped moving. Those who were persuaded by a friend to read the work, after reading it, wondered why the attack by the *Daily Worker*. To cite an instance, a Negro member of the Party, Theodore P. Bassett, holding at that time the post of educational director of the International Branch of the Friends of the Soviet Union, in 1935 a candidate for Alderman on the Communist Party ticket, wrote me a note:

"Having read the adverse criticism about it, I took it up as 'just another attempt' but it is without doubt the most marvelous proletarian novel I've read. It completely dwarfs anything hitherto published in this field. It should be read by every worker."

The plot to bury *The Road* had now entered a new phase. The Party bookshop, under the pretext that the book was no longer new, removed it from sight despite protestations. Its sale was now confined to those who definitely called for it. The venomous "criticism," issuing through silent undercurrents from the political Workers Center, the Bohemian John Reed Club and the *New Masses*, gained in tempo.

On September 12, 1932, I addressed a letter to the Political Committee of the Communist Party, that is, to Browder and the close circle of his lieutenants, charging several leaders of the Party, not naming them outright, with suppressing a book containing Communist propaganda. I was not so naïve as to fancy that Browder, Weinstone and Trachtenberg would bring down the sword of proletarian justice upon the heads of Browder, Weinstone and Trachtenberg. My object was to elicit from these

palpably insincere people an official hand-signed reply which at some auspicious turn of events would serve me as documentary evidence against them. But if Browder and his associates effectually destroyed the illusion I had harbored concerning their revolutionary integrity, I still was victim of the naïveté that they could be caught with inelaborate devices. I was not yet fully conscious that I was dealing with people who in the prime days of the factional period of the Party had headed different groups in a terrific struggle for hegemony. The hard and intricate school of factionalism with its schemes, scandals and maneuvers had sharpened their percepts against the threat of danger, taught them to exercise caution in their conduct, and to avoid acts the probable effect of which might work to their detriment.

I waited in vain for acknowledgment of the receipt of my letter. My barrage of notes conveyed to the august body by anteroom orderlies, and daily telephone messages won me a brief audience with Weiner, a member of the Central Committee.

Weiner dismissed the indictment I was making with the assertion that my charges were groundless. True, *The Road* had been somewhat overlooked; but not intentionally, he assured me. To speak of suppression was to utter criminal nonsense. He promised to see to it that another mention of the book appeared in the *Daily Worker*. As to a review in the *New Masses* and my membership in the John Reed Club, these matters were outside his province.

His promise was carried out some months later. The conspirators, experiencing the need of overt support to their work in the dark, thought a remark by an "expert" on proletarian literature would prove helpful. So they put to the fore Michael Gold to stab a dagger into the back of *The Road*. I immediately wrote a reply to Gold's "criticism." My reply was ignored.

It is difficult to recount the incidents in this unequal secret war of attrition carried on by the few powerful leaders against a group of workers. All the advantages were on their side. They were formidably equipped, having a wide range of influence, a sizable literary club, a popular periodical officially representing proletarian letters on American soil and the *Daily Worker*. We had only *The Road* and little money. A facer of reality could have no doubts as to the outcome of a struggle in which powerful springs were pushing the assault upon the book and equally powerful brakes restraining its defense.

The danger of the consequences we would have faced had we attempted a counter-attack against the leaders, was mercilessly vivid. They would have ruthlessly ground us to pieces under the wheels of their formidable engine, with no one in the Party lifting a finger in our defense. The Party members would have interpreted the blast against us in the terms of Browder not in those of the Red Star Press.

Having resolved to exercise self-control and patience and for the moment limit our resistance to the "legal" methods vouchsafed us by the obstructors, we resorted to advertising, primarily in the *Daily Worker*, using excerpts from messages we received and from reviews. To give a few samples:

Ruse, editor of the Norwegian paper *Dagbladet Arbeidet*:

"Received Comrade Marlen's book *The Road*. It is really true what has been said about it, that it is the best working-class book that has ever been written outside the Soviet Union. . . . I've read a lot of working-class literature and translated much of it into Norwegian from English, but *The Road* is the best I've read yet. . . . We are running it in *Dagbladet Arbeidet*. Our readers proclaim it as one of the best serials we have ever run in our paper."

From the *Moscow News*:

"An excellent working class novel. It presents a severe indictment against capitalism and at the same time indicates the only road for the working class to travel."

Leaving out of the *Daily Worker* review the phrases devised to produce the damaging effect, we used the fragments of truth which Browder employed to mask his attack:

"A trail-blazer. . . . It is actually the first of its kind in the English language—a contemporary proletarian novel that displays a remarkable fidelity for revolutionary, that is to say, scientific principle. . . . The book must be regarded as a definite step forward for American literature. More literature of this sort would be more help in the struggle."

To counteract our advertising, the enemies, laboring prodigiously, broadcast untrue words about the work and its author. Stories made the rounds to the effect that Trachtenberg had been very much interested in publishing the book, objecting only to its length. Other rumors had it that I had demanded from Trachtenberg an exorbitant royalty.

But the systematic campaign of obstruction made these trivial violations of the truth look like pink tea by comparison. Prompted by fear, the conspirators, each acting as a coil of the ever-lengthening constricting serpent, whispered everywhere against the work. A prejudicial bent was given to the workers' mentality. A preconceived judgment was instilled and cultivated in their minds. To assault *The Road*, wherever the conversation touched this subject, became the fashion with people who had never read the book. Due to this morbid corruption, such people, invoking the oral comment of "authorities" on proletarian literature, with naïve gusto attacked the work against the opposition of those few who had read it. Both sides were far from suspecting that the issue around which they were pivoting was: the spreading or the submerging of the work, the exposure of the delinquents or the concealment of their misdeeds. Real support could come only from the workers in and outside the Party. But to gain the attention and confidence of the rank-and-file members was virtually futile. I would approach a Communist worker and put into his bewildered ears a story that sounded fantastic and criminal. I dared to "insinuate" that William W. Weinstone, the comrade who burned with nervous energy in his devotion to the working class, whose fiery harangues blasted capitalism and oppression, *was suppressing Communist propaganda!* That Olgin, Trachtenberg, Markoff, Freeman, Gold, and above all Earl Browder, a comrade of distinction, high repute, every inch a revolutionist—all these men who spoke and wrote with fervor of conviction, every one of them made of the Reddest Bolshevik stuff, were impostors! Who ever heard of wilder counter-revolutionary calumny! An irritated wasp, the listener would fling my accusations back into my face.

The fact was that Browder and his aides successfully instilled in the minds of the honest workers unbounded confidence in every one holding a position of honor and power in the Party. The workers trusted Browder guilelessly. And not a few of them revered him with a feeling that approached religious devotion.

The obstructors failed to break our resistance the first year the book was out. The Red Star Press succeeded in spreading the first edition of the work. This was achieved through heavy advertising, sacrificing a dollar for every dollar received.

The printing of the second edition burst like a bombshell

upon the conspirators. That we would be successful in breaking the halter they had fastened upon our necks never entered their calculations. Sensing the danger they resolved to make short shrift of *The Road*. They reacted with such terrific frenzy against the hated book that their labor showed results. The hate-driven subterranean fumes kept more and more workers from asking in the Party bookshop for so "unpopular" a book. Workers were embarrassed to be seen reading the proscribed volume, although nobody understood exactly why everybody was so vehement against it.

The uneven battle could not go on forever. It was rapidly coming to a close. The ruthless, worked-up drive of rabid baiting produced disastrous consequences. The Red Star Press, overpowered, broke down and gave up the hopeless task.

New York, March 1937.

THE FORCE THAT GAVE RISE TO BROWDER

FROM the moment the organized suppression of *The Road* became obvious to me, I pondered over this astounding fact. A thousand questions crowded my mind. What other incriminating secrets are hidden within the closed upper circle of the Communist Party? Is it accidental that an odious system of irresponsible bureaucratic authority developed within the organization? To whom is Browder, the man who disposes of the Party institutions as though he privately owns them, accountable? What is the source and limit of his power? How to struggle against the bureaucratic evil weighing on the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat?

To find the answers to all these questions it was necessary to get a precise view of the background of the Communist Party, to trace its history and follow up its inner development, carefully and critically examining every fact that shaped its policies and formed its leadership. Only an exhaustive study of the Party and its parent body, the Third International, could give a true picture and offer the correct solution. In X-raying and anatomizing the Party it was necessary, besides exploring all avenues, to pause and make a thorough investigation of the sharpest and therefore deeply consequential turns in its history. These were the fierce factional disputes and the resultant important remodeling of the leadership of the Party, the most important links in the chain of this development being the rise to supreme authority of Lovestone-Pepper in 1925, the expulsion of the Trotskyites in 1928 and the elimination from leadership and from the Party itself of the Lovestoneites in 1929. This last amputation marked the termination of the factional struggles within the Party, and wiped out the last pretenses of inner-Party democracy. It was at this juncture that the Browder dictatorship triumphantly arose.

Like the archæologist who digs in a barren spot and uncovers a buried city with its tombs and temples and fortifications, its slabs, obelisks, monuments and tablets with strange inscriptions, its chronicles, secrets, intrigues and crimes, I delved into Party history which was shrouded in obscurity. I did my spade-work among Party documents, reports, theses, speeches, motions, resolutions, instructions, decisions, letters, notes, journals, newspaper files, manuscripts and books, and wrested from the records precious evidence not open ordinarily to observation. Through the excavations of the registers of the political past of the leaders, by scrupulously and conscientiously perusing the writings not only of the victors in the furious battle for the helm of the Party but also the testimony of the vanquished, I placed myself upon firm ground.

Deep-seated convictions and viewpoints are not easily uprooted. But the unassailable momentous facts that told the tale wrought an entire transformation of conceptions I had held. Unimpeachable evidence *out of the mouths* of Browder, Olgin, Gold and others, which I offer to the workers in this volume, proves that the suppression of *The Road* was an insignificant episode among Browder's misdeeds. The illusive images of yesterday vanished and before my mental eye stood revealed the people who call themselves Communists and rule the Communist Party of the United States and all its auxiliaries. Some of them at one time or another served the bourgeoisie quite openly. To cite an example:

When the American bankers and munition profiteers, already bloated with the blood-stained gold of warring Europe, sent the American workers to the shambles, the "revolutionist" of years standing, Moissaye J. Olgin, one of Browder's leading aides today, sold his pen to Morgan and poured social-chauvinist opium into the minds of the unfortunate victims of capitalism. Here is what he wrote:

"It is not a war for enslaving but a war for freedom. One must be blind or insane not to see the progressive character of this war. The world at present is not sunk in the depths of darkness but in a severe and risky struggle which must bring light to out-worn humanity.

"A different sort of bravery and a different sort of beauty calls and entices: the bravery of the battlefield, the beauty of people who sacrifice their lives for their country for that which their country had declared to be their holy duty."

Olgin wrote this loathsome bourgeois war-poison in the *Forward*, June 1, 1918, *seven months after the great October Revolution*.

How did it come to pass that a man like Olgin became a "Leninist" and elbowed himself up to the top leadership of the revolutionary movement?

Prior to the proletarian revolution in Russia, the American Socialist Party, a section of the Second International, was a vast organization with a large workingclass membership and a solid core of reformist writers, lecturers and leaders. Everything was "peace and sunshine" within the Socialist Party. Marxism lay buried deep beneath the dung-heap of opportunism piled high by the leadership of the movement. Not a single foremost theoretician either in America or in Western Europe spoke of dictatorship of the proletariat and civil war against imperialism. Diligently and indefatigably the leaders worked for the bourgeoisie, then unexpectedly came Lenin and the October Revolution. The soul of the oppressed masses was set aflame. With the termination of the imperialist war, the vanguard of the world proletariat rose in fury against the bourgeoisie and the social-traitors.

Rejecting with contempt the illusion that the senile Second International could be rejuvenated and yet made an instrument of struggle against capitalist enslavers, Lenin, holding aloft the flaming torch of world revolution, issued the call for the formation of the Third International. The Socialist working masses, deeply stirred by the grandest spectacle the oppressed have ever been given to behold, the proletarian revolution in Russia, responded to the call. Like a roaring torrent rapidly swelling in volume, they dashed through all the cunning opportunist dikes calculated to hold them back, on towards the mightiest revolutionary vortex in mankind's history. In America the sudden irresistible outflow reduced the Socialist Party of over one hundred thousand members to a skeleton of its former self. And even this remnant of the American Socialist Party under a reactionary leadership applied to the Third International for admission on certain conditions.

What was the demoralized social-patriotic backwash of the imperialist war to do under the circumstances? In their quest for political livelihood, the wiser opportunists, perceiving the enormous personal advantages of a leader backed by a mammoth

proletarian State, were quick in making their choice. These rats deserted the old rusty tub, and crawled upon the brand new Red dreadnaught launched in Moscow. Under capitalism no large political party or any organization of the workers has ever existed without its portion of crooks and parasites. The Third International took its share of them during the great exodus from the Second International.

Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders observed this tendency and at the Second Congress of the Comintern prepared to fight the sneaky opportunists, quite unsuccessfully as history shows.

"The Second International is completely broken. Seeing the complete helplessness of the Second International the intermediary faction and the groups of the 'centre' are trying to lean on the ever strengthening Communist International, hoping at the same time, however, to preserve a certain 'autonomy' which should enable them to carry on their former opportunist or 'centrist' policy. The Communist International became the fashion." (*Theses*, Second Congress of the Communist International, 1920)

Once inside the Third International the Olgins quickly adapted themselves to the Red surroundings and began to quote Lenin and write Communist stuff.

Among the motley collection of opportunists and careerists that crept into the innermost circles of the new International there began a scramble for leading posts. To fight more efficiently they were forced to combine into cliques, each clique aspiring to the leadership of the Party. The method of the cliques consisted in picking out a few opportunist points in one another's political line and attacking it vigorously before the rank-and-file. The divided membership seeing opportunism in the opponents' policies, were unable to grasp the common opportunist basis of all groups.

But to pave the way for the present régime, certain far-reaching events occurred within the leading section of the Third International, the Russian Communist Party, with unusual historical circumstances in attendance.

The Bolshevik Party had grown to nearly half a million in 1923. Of the pre-1917 period Bolsheviks there was less than three per cent in the Party at the end of 1922. "At the present moment in our Party there are only 2.7% comrades with pre-revolutionary standing" (V. Molotov, *On the Sixth Year*, p. 33, Gosisdats, 1923). After the toiling masses had taken power,

thousands and tens of thousands of Russian Olgins, Mensheviks, Social Revolutionists and a wide variety of bourgeois intellectuals, professed to embrace Bolshevism and hastened into the ruling party. A portion of the old Tzarist and Kerensky bureaucracy wormed its way into the institutions of the workers State, and into the Communist Party itself:

"We dispersed that old bureaucratic element and then began to place it into new jobs. The Tzarist bureaucrats began to go over into Soviet institutions and instill bureaucratism, transform themselves into Communists and to achieve greater careerist success obtained Communist Party membership books. They have been driven out through the door, they crawl back in through the window." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVI, p. 127, Russian Edition)

"Complaints with regard to bureaucratism have long been heard, complaints undoubtedly well grounded." (*Ibid.*)

Due to their diversified technical training and their sharp wit and capacity for adaptation, they quickly pushed themselves to the fore and occupied important positions throughout the workers republic. To protect their hides the bureaucracy quickly learned to speak the Bolshevik language. Thus, towards the end of the civil war around 1921, out of a multitude of functionaries there crystallized within the Party and the State apparatus a considerable bureaucratic crust. Concerning the nature of the Soviet State Lenin explained that it is "a workers state with a bureaucratic distortion" (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18/1, article "The Crisis in the Party"). Recognizing the danger to the workers State and the world revolution, the Tenth Congress of the All-Union Communist Party held in 1921, participated in by Lenin, adopted a resolution on *Workers Democracy* aimed at eliminating the bureaucratic distortion and drawing the *entire toiling population into the work of running the State machinery*.

Shortly after the Tenth Congress Lenin fell ill and was compelled to withdraw from Party work. The resolution on *Workers Democracy* was allowed by the majority of the Central Committee of the Party, led by Stalin, Zinoviev, Bukharin and others, to remain a dead letter. An opposite development from what had been charted in the Tenth Congress resolution took place. The first two years after the conclusion of the civil war witnessed a boisterous growth of the bureaucracy with continuous swarming incursion of bourgeois "Bolsheviks" into the Party.

The ensuing fateful course of events that flowed from the growth of the bureaucracy and the exit of Lenin was bound up with the names of two men, Trotsky and Stalin.

After the split of the Russian Social Democratic Party in 1903 into Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, Trotsky sided with the Mensheviks. For some time he carried on an unrealistic campaign to unify the factions. In 1912 he assisted in forming a Menshevik bloc against Lenin. During the factional fight Trotsky at times employed very harsh terms, going to the extent of calling Lenin reactionary. In the period of the imperialist war up to the March Revolution in Russia, Trotsky occupied a Left Centrist position. Particularly on the question of making a definite break with the Centrists of the Second International and on the formula of defeating one's own government in the imperialist war, Trotsky held an incorrect position, for which attitude he drew upon himself severe criticism from Lenin.

Upon his arrival in Petrograd in 1917 Trotsky sided with Lenin, and in the Summer of that year joined the Bolshevik Party.

Like many of the leaders of the Party, Trotsky after October had disagreements with Lenin on a number of occasions. One of them was during the peace negotiations with imperialist Germany. Another moment of difference was the Warsaw offensive. Still another was after the civil war, on the question of trade unions. In most cases Trotsky was wrong. Sometimes his point of view was correct as against Lenin's.

At the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, in 1921, on Zinoviev's initiative, Stalin was proposed as General Secretary of the Party, a new post, hitherto non-existent in the Bolshevik organization. After the Eleventh Congress Stalin was inducted into this office. Stalin showed weakness in various fields of Marxian science. To cite a few examples: Lenin, Zinoviev, Trotsky and others analyzed with minute precision the class nature of the World War, laying down policies for the proletariat. Stalin from 1914 until 1917 contributed absolutely nothing to the understanding of the bloody conflict. In the interim between the March Revolution and Lenin's arrival from Switzerland, Stalin urged the workers to support the Miliukov-Kerensky government. Admitting his error in 1924, Stalin wrote: "This mistaken position I then shared with other Party com-

rades, and I renounced it fully only in the middle of April when I adhered to the thesis of Lenin. A new orientation was necessary. Lenin gave the Party that new orientation in his celebrated April theses."

As General Secretary, Stalin became the wielder of the entire technical apparatus of the Party, and, through the Party, of the Soviet State. Before him suddenly opened a path which, were he to take it, would lead to a *personal* power most rulers seldom dreamed of, and only few wielded. The unprecedented combination of historical factors was ideal for such a career. Temporary peace. Failure of the proletarian revolution in the West, with the resultant gradual stabilization of the political and economic power of the bourgeoisie in Europe. Backwardness and poverty of Russia. The near-exhaustion of the Russian proletariat fatigued by the stormy seven years of super-strenuous struggle. But above everything else the existing bureaucracy, in full operation, served as a whetstone for precisely that kind of an ambition; a body which beckoned and enticed to be made use of, a natural cornerstone upon which could be raised a stupendous pyramid surmounted by a towering peak—the man of absolute authority.

Were Stalin to allow himself to be drawn by the powerful lure and let the monocratic design take root, he would certainly not tell the workers what he had in his mind. On the contrary. To throw them off their guard, to make it difficult, even impossible, to suspect the objective he was after, he would repeatedly fire volleys of blank shots at the bureaucracy, but in reality would treat it indulgently.

Beginning with the removal of the basic principle of a Leninist party, *democratic centralism*, he would make use of the appointive power of the General Secretary to solidify and *organize* the bureaucracy, holding it by a thousand bonds of dependence. He would use his appointive power reversely and transfer to unimportant positions or remove entirely all opposed to his line. It is clear, in the struggle against the opposition to such a course, Stalin and his faction could couch their arguments in no other language except that used by Lenin.

In October 1923, Trotsky, voicing the political disaffection of the Communist workers who resented the growth of the distortion of the Soviet régime, addressed a letter to the Central Committee in which he said:

"In the fiercest moment of war-Communism, the system of appointment within the Party did not have one-tenth of the extent it has now. Appointment of the secretaries of provincial Committees is now the rule. That makes the Secretary essentially independent of the local Party organization. The bureaucratization of the Party apparatus has developed to unheard-of proportions. . . ."

Predicting calamity for the October Revolution and the international proletariat, a group led by Trotsky opposed the line taken by Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev, the "triumvirate" heading the Party in the absence of Lenin. Trotsky demanded that the leadership get down to the substance of things: swerve from the dangerous course, apply sharp measures against the bureaucracy, and carry out the decision of the Tenth Congress.

The "bureaucratic distortion" was living in vexatious uncertainty. In daily dread of losing its material advantages, it sensed that it would have no peace and security until it had completely wiped out all danger and stabilized all Soviet institutions under the man in the commanding post who now covertly associated himself wholly with the "distortion." But the time for that was not yet ripe in 1923. With glowing facts about the Red Commander fresh in everybody's memory, Trotsky was too popular to be destroyed with one felicitous blow, without throwing the Republic into a civil war. Stalin had to employ skill and ingenuity. He knew the value of demagogic speeches and paper resolutions. By the time the discovery was made that words were at variance with action he could gain a valuable pause in the intra-Party contest and consolidate his position. Following a sharp verbal contest between the Trotsky Opposition and the Stalin group, Stalin allayed all the clamor of the Opposition and the popular tumult among the workers by a mock sally against his own course. A committee was appointed to draw up a resolution on the new course, towards *Workers Democracy*. More, Trotsky himself was included in this committee and was charged with the task of drafting the document.

An exultant shout went up from one end of the Soviet Union to the other. Yet, amidst the universal jubilation, some sober-minded workers were dubious. Regarding this in the December 8, 1923 issue, *Pravda* observed:

"It is now in style to speak about the paper character of many decisions. Some comrades recall the 'beautiful resolutions' of the X

Congress and compare them with the practice which followed. Quite often the deduction is made about the fate of the present New Course."

Stalinist editors wrote reassuringly:

"The firm word has been spoken, the direction taken. The Party will tranquilly and firmly accomplish its historic change of course." (*Pravda*, December 13, 1923)

That there was an established system of leadership by appointment, that the majority in the Party was against such a system, that the will of the majority had been disregarded and violated, was affirmed by Stalin himself:

"The practice of *ignoring the will of the majority* in the organizations when appointing comrades to responsible positions in the Party must be completely done away with in actual practice. The principle of the election must be realized in fact." (Stalin, speech to functionaries, *Daily Worker*, March 7, 1924. My emphasis—G.M.)

Stalin and his coadjutors, vociferously denouncing the bureaucracy, extolled Workers Democracy. Speakers at shop meetings, writers in the entire press of the Soviet Union, lauded the abandonment of the old course of leadership by appointment, and assured the masses that the new decision of doing away with "the practice of ignoring the will of the majority in the organizations" would be faithfully carried out in line with the Leninist thesis, "Every cook must learn to direct the State."

But words did not conform with deeds. Beneath the surface a contrary force was at work. Under the cover of vigorous eloquence and painted facts the system of patronage continued to advance and expand, interlacing into a gigantic fabric with the connecting cords fastened in the hands of the General Secretary. On the one hand the place-hunters paved their way to the bureaucratic jobs by the surest means; vituperating and hounding the Opposition. On the other hand, favors were used to purchase the loyalty of bureaucrats.

Exercising to the fullest extent his executive power of appointment, cautious in the selection of persons he assigned to key posts within the Party and the State, who in turn hand-picked lesser functionaries, Stalin slowly solidified the ground under his feet, on the way towards greater and tighter bureaucratic centralization of power.

With incredible swiftness he transformed the antagonistic

majority into a minority, by employing a clever maneuver of recruiting into the Party sure supporters of the Secretariat. He began with a drive for 100,000 members in December 1923. Walter Duranty, Moscow correspondent of *The New York Times* since 1920, who, if anything, is sympathetic toward Stalin's "experiment" (as his works clearly indicate, for instance, his article appearing in the Stalinist *Soviet Russia Today*, May 1936), writes:

"When it subsequently became known that the new members would have a right to vote for delegates to the next Party Congress [in May, 1924], the full import of the maneuver became clear; the Secretariat had boldly added twenty per cent of the total electorate to its own supporters in what bid fair to be an evenly divided contest. Several years later a veteran Communist told me that he thought this to have been the turning-point in the struggle between Stalin and Trotzky. 'Prior to that,' he said, 'the odds were in Trotzky's favor. He was popular with the Army from the lower ranks to the high command, and his prestige at home and abroad was indubitably greater than that of Stalin.' . . . The problem that Stalin had to solve was how far he could utilize the Secretariat to counteract Trotzky's greater popularity. In the admission of the 100,000 he found a solution." (Walter Duranty, *I Write As I Please*, p. 216)

This maneuver was supplemented by another. When Lenin died, Stalin utilized the moment to launch a Lenin membership drive.

"Unlike Trotzky, Stalin seized opportunity with both hands. On one side he used his power as Party Secretary to shift Trotzky's adherents from key posts and replace them by men of his own choice; on the other he took advantage of the enthusiastic influx of new blood into the Party. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 233)

The Lenin drive, concluded before May 1924, brought Stalin 241,000, and together with the previous enrollment of "100,000" which in reality amounted to 127,000, the "new blood," becoming the mainstay of Stalin's power, made a grand total of 368,000, exactly half of the Party membership:

"Thus the new members, all of whom, as I said earlier, had been hand-picked by the lower ranks of the Secretariat, that is to say by the Stalinist machine, were exactly half of the total. Trotzky in his autobiography says that three-quarters of the Party were new members, but his error has no importance in view of the fact that the Party was almost evenly divided between him and Stalin in the middle of

1923 and that almost all of the new members could be relied upon to support the Stalinist platform. Indeed, what Trotzky probably means is that three-fourths of the Party were against him in May, 1924, which was perfectly correct." (*Ibid.*, p. 234)

Lenin's leadership in the Political Buro of the Party had prevented Stalin from building up the personal pyramid, or polarizing in his direction the interests of the "bureaucratic distortion." Lenin, incapacitated by illness, was still a future threat to Stalin. Lenin's untimely death in January 1924, several weeks after the *unanimous* adoption of the resolution on the New Course, completely untied Stalin's hands. The progressive transformation of Stalin, a professional revolutionist, into Stalin, a professional bureaucrat surrounded by a huge hierarchy of appointed officials, proceeded at an increased tempo. Violating the trust reposed in him by the proletariat, Stalin veered from Bolshevism, widening the gruesome rent in the Leninist organizational structure by systematically eliminating *democratic* centralism and installing *bureaucratic* centralism.

But there was the immediate serious menace of the Trotsky faction. For Stalin and the bureaucracy it was necessary to haul down Trotsky, to eradicate his influence from among the proletariat, to assassinate his political character, to strike him from the records of the struggle of the oppressed. Trotsky's former anti-Bolshevism played ideally into the hands of Stalin. The struggle in the Bolshevik Party had all the appearance of Trotsky defending Menshevism and Stalin championing the line of Lenin. A campaign was unfolded to blot out the true history of the October Revolution by distorting the rôle played in it by Trotsky. Years back, on the first anniversary of the Proletarian Revolution, Stalin wrote in "The Rôle of Most Eminent Leaders of the Party" in *Pravda*, for November 6, 1918, the following:

"All work of practical organization of the insurrection was conducted under immediate leadership of the President of the Petrograd Soviet, Comrade Trotsky. It is possible to declare with certainty that the swift passing of the garrison to the side of the Soviet, and the skillful direction of the work of the Military Revolutionary Committee, the Party owes principally and first of all to Comrade Trotsky."

But six years later, in November 1924, the same Stalin, or rather a different Stalin, declared: "But I must state that Comrade Trotsky did not and could not have played any special rôle

in the October uprising..." (J. Stalin, *October Revolution*, p. 71).

Moissaye J. Olgin in his pamphlet *Trotskyism, Counter-Revolution in Disguise* dutifully carries out the task of distorting Party history. He avoids mentioning what Stalin wrote in 1918 but quotes the article written in 1924, to support his own assertion about Trotsky that "it would be absurd to say that he was *the leader* of the uprising." (p. 12)

Continuing in the same vein, Olgin writes:

"He who knows the ways of the Bolshevik Party will easily understand why Trotsky was not among the leaders appointed by the Central Committee to *direct the uprising*. He was a new man." (M. J. Olgin, *Trotskyism*, p. 12. My emphasis—G.M.)

Yet neither Olgin, nor Stalin, nor any man in the whole world during Lenin's life ever disputed the truth of the following historical note, well known to Olgin, for he translated Lenin's works:

"After the Petrograd Soviet passed into the hands of the Bolsheviks, Trotsky was elected its President *and in this capacity organized and directed the uprising of October 25.*" (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIV, Part 2, p. 482, note 79, Russian Edition, 1923. My emphasis—G.M.)

In later editions, after Lenin's death, this passage was deleted by the Stalinist distorters.

Historical records show that it was Trotsky who organized the Petrograd Red Guards, the shock troops of the October Insurrection.

"Last night two thousand Red Guards—the proletarian militia organized and armed by Trotsky just before the final clash—swung down the Zagorodny in triumph." (John Reed, *The Liberator*, March 1918, p. 14)

Another phase in the anti-Leninist development was the introduction of the myth of infallibility of the highest Party leadership. When the German Revolution in the Autumn of 1923 had failed, owing in large measure to the vacillation and indecision of the Brandler-Thalheimer leadership of the Communist Party of Germany, Trotsky wrote a book *The Lessons of October*, also known as *1917*. In this work he pointed out that on the eve of insurrection there usually occurs a crisis in the leadership.

He cited the experience in the Bolshevik Party during the pre-October days when Zinoviev and Kamenev showed hesitation and opposed the immediate uprising, and only after a chastisement by Lenin fell into line. This important fact, constituting a lesson of the first magnitude to serious revolutionists, had been generally unknown among the Communists abroad and little known in the Soviet Union.

The Party press, by now almost exclusively stocked with editors of implicit loyalty and obedience to the man holding the administrative whip and the bag of oats, in reviews and articles fanned a devouring blaze against Trotsky's attempt to "defame" the "Old Guard"—a new name by which the Triumvirate and half dozen men around it preferred to be called. The workers were urged to fight "Trotskyism" which was designated as "Menshevism disguised by Left phrases."

The virtue of infallibility became centered mainly in Stalin. Addressing themselves to the task of impregnating the masses with the belief that Stalin was incapable of error, the zealous office-holders commenced the work of withdrawing from circulation every book, journal and document containing criticism of Stalin by Lenin and by any one else, and admissions of errors by Stalin himself. Alongside of this process went the skillfully concocted story, circulated first in the Soviet Union and gradually throughout the world Communist movement, that "Stalin is the greatest disciple of Lenin." After perusing voluminous material of the early period of the existence of the Soviet Republic, I arrived at the conclusion that the "greatest disciple" story was pure fiction. Early papers, pamphlets and documents took no particular notice of Stalin. In Lenin's works, with the exception of an article or two, Stalin's name does not appear. During the most crucial years of imperialist war and preparations for the proletarian revolution, years which put all political people to an acid test, Lenin, while mentioning his opponents or co-thinkers, Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, had not by a single word referred to his "best disciple." During the revolution and the subsequent civil war the names of Lenin and Trotsky were usually mentioned together in speeches and articles of the Russian and the world Communist movement, with Stalin's name conspicuously absent. In the indices of hundreds of early publications dealing with the founding of Soviet power, under the letter "L" Lenin's name is found almost invariably; Trotsky's

under "T," quite often; Radek's, Zinoviev's, Kamenev's once in a while; Stalin's under "S," never. Before Zinoviev stepped into Stalin's trap and nominated him for the post of general secretary and prior to the conspiracy of the Triumvirate, Stalin was merely one among dozens of leaders who dropped their Menshevik orientation and without a murmur followed Lenin. It would take an enormous amount of space to give numerous quotations to prove this. I will confine myself to two foremost figures supporting Stalin today: Litvinov and Kalinin. Litvinov speaking of post-July days, wrote:

"A period almost as reactionary as any which had characterized the Czarist régime now followed. The Bolshevik leaders and their followers were hunted down like wild beasts: Trotsky, Kamenev, Alexandra Kolontai, and hundreds of others were thrown into prison; Lenin and Zinoviev were obliged to seek safety in hiding." (Maxim Litvinov, *Bolshevik Revolution Its Rise and Meaning*, 1920, p. 31)

The name of Stalin among the names of the Bolshevik leaders does not appear here, as it does not appear throughout this earlier work of Litvinov.

"A new government in the form of a Council of People's Commissaries . . . With Lenin as President and Trotsky as Commissar for Foreign Affairs." (*Ibid.*, p. 35)

"It was in order to provoke that Revolutionary spirit, that is, to kindle the fire of a revolution in the Central Empires that Trotsky, the head of the Russian peace delegation tried to prolong the negotiations even after their hopelessness became apparent, and made those speeches which did more to set the German people in opposition to their bourgeois classes and Junker rulers than all the declarations of the Allied statesmen put together had done in the preceding three and a half years of war." (*Ibid.*, p. 48)

Kalinin, speaking of the form of the workers' State, remarked:

"This form has not been invented by one single man, by this or that talent—Lenin, Trotsky, Kamenev and others." (*Soviet Power and the Toiling Cossacks*, speech by Kalinin, February 29, 1920)

At that time when one spoke of Marxist talents, Stalin's name was usually omitted.

Anatole Lunacharsky, People's Commissar of Education, who sided with Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev, wrote in 1923:

"Lenin and Trotsky have become the most popular (whether loved or hated) personalities of our epoch." (A. Lunacharsky, article on the character of Zinoviev)

The world bourgeoisie hated and feared Lenin and Trotsky because these two men led the revolution:

"Here and there the same question was being tackled, that of destroying the leaders of the Russian Revolution. Diplomatic representatives of the Allies figured that the best was to capture Lenin and Trotsky 'alive' carry them off to England and stage a public execution to terrorize the English and French workers." (G. Ustinov, *Tribun Revolutsiï*, p. 13)

"Lockhart and an officer of the Soviets' troops met for the first time at a private house on August 4th. They discussed the feasibility of arranging an uprising against the Soviet authorities in Moscow about September 10th at which time the English troops would be advancing in the Murman region. The date of September 10 was considered as very important owing to the fact that Lenin and Trotsky were to attend a meeting of the People's Commissaries on that day . . . plans were elaborated for seizing all the papers in Lenin's and Trotsky's offices. . . . Reilly declared it would be safer to shoot Lenin and Trotsky as soon as they were arrested." (From the People's Commissaire for Foreign Affairs Tchitcherin to the Russian plenipotentiary in Berlin, Moscow *Pravda*, September 3, 1918; editorial in *Izvestia* on Tchitcherin's telegram to Joffe. *The Revolutionary Age*, November 20, 1918, p. 2)

The confessions of the petty-bourgeois terrorists who planned the assassination of Trotsky and Lenin as the two most outstanding figures in the Bolshevik revolution, contribute to the exploding of the myth of Stalin being the head of the Red Army.

"Of special significance I considered at that moment the assassination of Trotsky, calculating that such assassination, leaving the Bolshevik army without its directing man, would undermine the military strength of the Bolsheviks. The assassination of Trotsky I placed as the first in order, necessary to accomplish it immediately at the first practical possibility. I viewed this assassination not as a political act but rather as a military measure, dictated by strategical considerations. . . . Gots was of the opinion that the political moment was sufficiently ripe for the terroristic methods of struggle, the assassination of Lenin was to be carried out at once, that this assassination would be of no less significance in undermining the Soviet Power than the assassination of Trotsky." (G. Semenov (Vasilev), *Military Work of the Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries for 1917-18*, pp. 31-32)

This testimony was printed and circulated in the Soviet Union prior to the rise of Stalin. Outside the Soviet Union in the friendly publications the names of Lenin and Trotsky almost invariably appeared side by side, with the "best disciple" unknown to the world.

"To the man in the street [in Russia] Lenin has almost a super-human significance. He is the Maker of the Russian Revolution, the Founder of the Soviet, the cause of all that Russia is today. 'Kill Lenin and Trotsky and you kill the Revolution and the Soviet.'" (*Lenin*, by Albert Rhys Williams, 1919, p. 118)

Colonel William B. Thompson, in his booklet *The Truth About Russia and the Bolsheviks*, declared that among the Maximalists (Bolsheviks) "the most illustrious figures are Lenin and Trotsky."

A footnote in Lenin's pamphlet *The Soviets at Work*, published by the Rand School of Social Science, page 5, states:

"November 7, 1917, is the date of the successful Bolshevik *Coup d'etat*. The Kerensky coalition government was forced to abdicate on that day and the Soviet government, with the Bolshevik leaders, Nikolai Lenin and Leon Trotsky, at the helm, was instituted in its place."

Moissaye J. Olgin, speaking of Soviet democracy, wrote in 1918, in biographical notes to Trotsky's *Our Revolution*, "In short, it was the same type of democracy Trotsky and Lenin are trying to make permanent in present-day Russia." In the introduction to the widely popular work, *Ten Days That Shook the World*, by John Reed, Lenin wrote:

"Here is a book which I should like to see published in millions of copies and translated into all languages. *It gives a truthful* [My emphasis—G.M.] and most vivid exposition of the events..."

The falsifiers of Soviet history, the supporters of the bureaucratic distortion of the workers State, declare that John Reed's records are not true, that they "fit in with the Trotskyist distortions":

"... there are serious political inaccuracies and mistakes in John Reed's book and some of these were even pointed out by Comrade Stalin. There are certain statements which do not correspond with historical facts and which fit in with the Trotskyist distortions of history." (Earl Browder, *The Communist*, April 1933, p. 362)

Thus disregarding Lenin's assertion that the book gives "a truthful exposition of events." Both Lenin and John Reed being dead, neither can do anything about Browder's "correction" of the famous historical work.

Among the outstanding leaders of the Bolsheviks, John Reed names Lenin and Trotsky. As one reads the book, the present day lies and distortions become sharply pronounced.

"Alone of the intellectuals Lenin and Trotsky stood for insurrection." (John Reed, *Ten Days That Shook the World*, p. 38)

"All the livelong afternoon Lenin and Trotsky had fought against compromise." (p. 123)

"But Lenin, with Trotsky beside him, stood firm as a rock." (p. 124)

"As he [Kamenev] read the list of Commissars, bursts of applause after each name, Lenin's and Trotsky's especially." (p. 139)

"On November 27th a committee of Cossacks came to Smolny to see Trotsky and Lenin." (p. 288)

John Reed quotes the enemies of the proletariat, Kerensky's *Dielo Naroda*:

"Nothing but a handful of poor fools deceived by Lenin and Trotsky..." (p. 174)

And the leader of the S. R.'s, Chernov:

"Yesterday Kerensky; today Lenin and Trotsky..." (p. 307)

After Kerensky's fall, the Central Committee of the Railway Workers Union, dominated by the Mensheviks, made a proposal to the Bolsheviks to form a Provisional People's Council. Reed says:

"Lenin and Trotsky, rumors said, were to be excluded..." (p. 228)

"The Bolsheviks were admitted in a large minority, but Lenin and Trotsky were barred." (p. 265)

A meeting of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party dealt with the question of the proposed coalition government of Bolsheviks, Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists. The minutes of this meeting are printed in the magazine of the Commission on the History of the October Revolution, *Proletarskaia*

Revolutsia, No. 10, October 1922, pp. 466, 467. Here are some of the remarks of the Bolshevik leaders:

"Dzerzinsky—... We do not permit barring Lenin and Trotsky."

"Urritsky—... We must yield neither Lenin nor Trotsky, for that would be in a sense rejection of our program; as to the others, there is no need to be insistent, but Lenin must remain chairman, and Trotsky minister of foreign affairs."

Louis Fraina's well-known compilation of articles by Lenin and Trotsky entitled *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia*; early books on the Russian Revolution, articles and speeches by Debs and other Left Socialists and radicals showed unmistakably that the leaders were Lenin and Trotsky.

"The problem of power was very much in the order of the day at the All-Russian Congress of Soviets which convened in the middle of June, Lenin and Trotsky leading the revolutionary opposition to the policy of coalition." (Introduction by Louis C. Fraina to the chapter "The Struggle for Power," p. 163, *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia*, Lenin and Trotsky)

"Why were Krapotkin, Plechanov, Breshkovskaya, repeatedly warning the nation to 'beware of the German danger,' less heeded than Lenin and Trotzky?" (M. J. Olgin, *Asia*, March 1918, p. 192)

"Today Lenin and Trotzky and other Soviet leaders are soliciting the cooperation of professionals to conduct the affairs of the state." (M. J. Olgin, *Asia*, June 1918, p. 450)

"Lenin and Trotsky were the men of the hour and under their fearless, incorruptible and uncompromising leadership the Russian proletariat has held the fort against the combined assaults of all the ruling class powers on earth." (Eugene V. Debs, "The Day of the People," *The Class Struggle*, February 1919, p. 1)

"The Red Russian Republic, the monumental achievement of the ages and the crowning glory of our century, under the superb and inspiring leadership of Lenin, Trotsky, and their equally high-souled and lion-hearted compatriots, is battling bravely, immortally, against the autocracy of all the empires of imperialism for the emancipation of all the people of the world." (Eugene V. Debs, *The Liberator*, December 1922)

The following is a cablegram to John Reed by Lincoln Steffens who wished Russia to continue in the war against Germany:

"Trotsky making epochal blunder doubting Wilson literal sincerity. I am certain President will do whatever he asks other nations

to do. If you can and will change Trotsky's and Lenin's attitudes you can render historical international service." (Quoted in *John Reed*, by Granville Hicks, p. 297)

And as late as 1924, after Lenin's death, the world Communist movement recognized Trotsky and Zinoviev as the most outstanding leaders of the Russian Party. The *Daily Worker*, then as today controlled by the Foster-Browder-Olgin leadership, carried news items about the approaching Party congress in the Soviet Union which said:

"The leadership of the Party will be of great moment to the congress. Leon Trotsky, Commissar of War and the Red Army, and G. E. Zinoviev, President of the Leningrad Soviet and Chairman of the Communist International, are the two most outstanding figures of the Party in Russia." (*Daily Worker*, May 23, 1924. My emphasis—G.M.)

Not Stalin, Voroshilov and Kaganovich, not Manuilsky and Piatnitsky, but Trotsky and Zinoviev, when Lenin died.

At all the congresses of the Comintern during Lenin's life the leading figures were Lenin, Trotsky, and often Zinoviev. This fact is attested to by the entire literature dealing with these four congresses. It is recorded not only by the Communist writers, but also by the bourgeois chroniclers. Stalin, if he was at the congresses, was merely a name.

"The central feature of the Congress was Trotsky's great speech on the world situation, a brilliant analysis of the economic position of today." (*The Toiler*, October 8, 1921, p. 7)

"An echo of the world-shattering days of the Russian revolution was heard at the Fourth Congress of the Communist International in the almost unceasing applause that preceded and followed the speeches of Comrades Lenin and Trotsky, in which they dealt with the achievements of the revolution." (Clara Zetkin, *The Communist International*, No. 24, p. 10)

"The psychological climax of the congress was undoubtedly Lenin's speech on five years of revolution. The political climax of the gathering, however, was Trotsky's speech on the same subject." (Max Bedacht, *The Liberator*, March 1923, p. 9)

At the first congress after Lenin's death, the Fifth Congress of the Comintern, one of the main figures was Trotsky.

"The fifth congress of the Third International opened at Moscow, June 18. One of its main features was the general approval shown to Leon Trotsky whose appearance aroused great enthusiasm." (*The New International Year Book*, 1924, p. 662)

One would think that on the threshold of 1926 Stalin's name would at last take its place in the publications of the Comintern on par with the outstanding leaders. Not yet—not in all publications. Many articles were printed in which the names of Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others appeared, but the name of Stalin was not to be found.

"Books of all sorts, from the most serious works of the leaders—Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others. . . I might point to the statements of Rykov, Djerzinsky, Kalinin, Kamenev. . . Frunze, the Commissar of War and Navy, and other leaders. . . Lenin's works will become the heritage of mankind as Plato's Republic or Marx's Capital. But there are many other serious writers in Russia, as Bucharin in economics, Pokrovsky in history, Riasanov in the study of Marx, Radek in international affairs, Zinoviev on revolutionary movements and Trotsky, to whom no subject is foreign." (A. A. Heller, "U.S.S.R., 1921-1925," *The Workers Monthly*, November 1925, January 1926)

In 1926 the fiction of the "greatest disciple" did not penetrate the minds of the Stalinist writers and they, as Heller in the article mentioned above, would fail to mention Stalin altogether.

That Lenin and Trotsky were the foremost figures in the proletarian revolution in Russia was taken cognizance of by all contemporary historians and writers, including those of the bourgeoisie:

"The Winter Palace was defended for a time by women soldiers (the 'Battalion of Death') but soon the government buildings were in the hands of the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky." (*World Almanac*, 1918)

"The all-Russian Congress of Workmen's Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies finally seized power in a revolutionary movement on November 7, 1917, the Military Revolutionary Committee of the Soviet of Petrograd having wrested the government away from Kerensky. Lenin and Trotsky were leaders." (*World Almanac*, 1923)

"The central figures and guiding spirit of the 'Soviet Republic' as the Bolshevik rulers themselves style their form of government have been and still are Nicolai Lenin, Premier, and Leon Trotsky, Minister of War and former Minister of Foreign Affairs." (*The Encyclopaedia Americana*, article on Russia)

"A provisional government under the leadership of Alexander Kerensky came into power. This in turn was overthrown by the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin and Trotsky." (*The International Year Book*, 1918)

In the taking of the fortress of Peter and Paul, the bastille of Petrograd, Trotsky's rôle was decisive:

"For us Petropavlovka was very important for it had an arsenal containing up to 100,000 rifles. Besides, it commanded with its guns the Winter Palace where the Provisional Government was. Comrade Trotsky then played a decisive rôle." (Antonov-Ovseenko, "The Capture of the Winter Palace," *Proletarskaia Revolutsia*, No. 10, p. 126)

During October Lenin and Trotsky were working together in one room:

"Kamenev and Zinoviev were occupied at the sessions. We were led into a different room and we beheld the leaders of the revolution, Lenin and Trotsky." (L. Stal, *Proletarskaia Revolutsia*, No. 10, p. 301)

The official announcement to the Petrograd Soviet that the bourgeoisie had been overthrown and a proletarian State established, was made by Trotsky. That speech of his was adjudged as immortal:

"But when upon the platform appeared Zinoviev and Lenin, they were accorded such a triumph that it was clear which side was victorious. Trotsky, Lenin and Zinoviev, in turn, delivered speeches. Trotsky's immortal speech has especially engraved itself upon my memory." (Arseniev, "Reminiscences of a Participant in the October Days in Petersburg," *Proletarskaia Revolutsia*, No. 10, p. 116)

"On the 25th of October, Trotsky, brilliant and valiant tribune of the uprising, indefatigable propagandizer of the revolution, in the name of the Military-Revolutionary Committee announced in the Petrograd Soviet amidst thunderous applause of the assembled that 'the Provisional Government ceased to exist.' And, as a living proof of this fact, upon the platform, greeted with a stormy ovation, there appeared Lenin, liberated from the underground by the new revolution." (N. Bucharin, *From the Crash of Tzarism to the Downfall of the Bourgeoisie*, Russian Edition, p. 138)

After the overthrow of Kerensky in Petrograd, it was imperative to capture Moscow. That Trotsky was in charge of this task also, is told by E. Weger, Sr., sent to Lenin by the Moscow Bolsheviks:

"I am making a report to the Committee [Petrograd Military-Revolutionary Committee, in charge of the insurrection—G.M.] on the situation in Moscow, whence I came. In the same room I am making a report to Ilych [Lenin]. I prove the need of immediately capturing Moscow, and lay out my motives and plan of action.

"All right, set your plan and everything it requires on paper in no more than twenty lines and turn it over to Trotsky," says Ilych to me." (*Proletarskaia Revolutsia*, No. 9, p. 299)

The Soviet government was considered as the Lenin-Trotsky government:

"Early in December the Trotsky-Lenin government issued a demand upon the Allies to re-state definitely their war aims within seven days." (*The New International Year Book*, 1917, article "Russia," p. 607)

A cartoon by Young in *The Liberator*, July 1918, shows Trotsky holding a Red flag inscribed "Soviet Government," Lenin standing near him; across the ocean Uncle Sam looking at them through the wrong end of a spy-glass, saying, "Boys, I can't recognize you."

Five years after October, the most popular leaders in the Soviet Union were still Lenin and Trotsky:

"The tenth All-Russian Soviet Congress opened at Moscow, December 23, with more than 3000 delegates, and gave further evidence of the continued popularity of Lenin, Trotsky and the Red Army." (*The New International Year Book*, 1922, p. 681)

In the early Communist publications one can often come across such expressions as:

"And Lenin and Trotsky, the very symbols of the Russian Soviet Republic . . ." (Nancy Markoff, *The Worker*, April 14, 1923)

"Trotsky's face is the face of the Russian Revolution." (G. Ustinov, *Tribun Revolutsii*, p. 16)

An appeal of repentant White officers to all Russian citizens to support the Soviet Republic, ended with:

"Long live the Soviet Republic!

"Long live Comrades Lenin and Trotsky!

"Long live the Third International!" (*Izvestia*, April 5, 1921, also *The Communist Review*, July 1921)

Louise Bryant, who made a study of the leading figures in the Bolshevik revolution, describes Lenin, Trotsky, Rakovsky, Kollontai, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Bukharin, Stootchka, Rykov, Lunacharsky and many other prominent, and some generally unknown leaders. Stalin not only does not get a line in her book but *his name is not even mentioned*, nor the names of Voroshilov, Kaganovich, Orjonikidze and other present leaders. Trotsky's name is met virtually on every page, and a large chapter is devoted to the description of his personality and his rôle in the revolution.

"No man will overshadow his eminence in the history of the revolution except Lenin. They will remain the two most distinguished personalities." (Louise Bryant, *Mirrors of Moscow*, chapter "Leon Trotsky, Soviet War Lord," p. 131)

All this was recorded when the events were fresh in everybody's mind, and the conspiracy, with the accompanying invention of the "best disciple," had not yet taken place.

The well-known correspondent of *The New York Times* adds his testimony:

"We all knew that to nine-tenths of the Russian masses Trotzky was second only to Lenin in popular esteem." (Walter Duranty, *I Write As I Please*, p. 224)

The correspondents of bourgeois newspapers, in the first years of the existence of the proletarian dictatorship, were not aware that there was a person bearing the name of Stalin:

"But in the year 1917 The New York Times Index was already being published in quarterly volumes. In the four volumes covering this fateful year in Russia's history the entries under Trotsky are very nearly three columns of small print. Stalin's name does not occur. It is not mentioned in the Index volume for the last quarter of 1917 covering the November revolution, where Trotsky figures to the extent of two and one-fourth columns. . . . For 1918-21 the entries under Trotsky average one-quarter of a column. The entries under Stalin are zero. It is an extraordinary fact that the man who has actually ruled Russia ever since Lenin's death a dozen years ago and the last eight or nine years ruled without a rival, did not rate a single item in the Russian dispatches of this newspaper during the first five years of Soviet history." (*The New York Times*, August 28, 1936)

To the Western labor leaders, sympathizers of October, the

brains of the Soviet Republic were Lenin, Trotsky and other outstanding figures. Stalin was not mentioned.

"I am confident that in a battle of brains between Lenin, Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinovieff, and Chicherin on the one side, and the world's bourgeois diplomatists on the other, the former must ultimately triumph." (Robert Williams, General Secretary of the British Transport Workers Federation, *The Liberator*, August 1920, p. 15)

The noted English sculptress, Clare Sheridan

"... made up her mind to go to the Soviet country and do the heads of the great men there—Lenin, Trotsky and the rest.... She did Zinoviev, Trotsky, Dsirjinsky, Krassin, Lenin and a Red Guard." (*The Liberator*, June 1921, p. 30)

Stalin was not among the great men of the Soviet country, in the opinion of Clare Sheridan.

Years after, particularly at the beginning of 1929, Stalin was declared by his supporters to be the greatest disciple of Marx and Lenin.

"... the writings of that greatest disciple of Marx and Lenin, Joseph Stalin." (William Z. Foster and Earl Browder, *Technocracy and Marxism*, p. 13)

And further evolution made his name one of the two greatest in human history:

"... two of the greatest names in human history, Lenin and Stalin." (William Z. Foster, *Daily Worker*, June 25, 1926)

In accordance with the developments within the Soviet Union the bourgeoisie gradually withdrew the name of Trotsky from reference articles, the name of Stalin making its appearance. That Trotsky organized the October uprising, attested to by Stalin himself, has been completely "forgotten," not only by Stalin and his "historians," but also by the bourgeoisie:

"Indeed the ultimate victory of Lenin and the Bolsheviks was in large measure due to the masterly organizing ability of Stalin." (*The National Encyclopaedia*, 1932, article on Stalin)

For several years after the October Revolution it was known to every intelligent school boy and girl throughout the world that it was Trotsky who organized the Red Army. Numerous

references to this historical fact were made in the early literature of the Soviet Union. The following occurs in a review of a pamphlet Trotsky wrote during the World War:

"Trotsky gives a brilliant analysis of the soldiers' and officers' composition of the Russian army, predicting the inevitability of a cruelest disaster, which, in turn, will unleash 'the revolutionary energy of the people.' His profound understanding of the operating forces of the contemporary army permitted him to become the organizer of the Red Army—the organizer of victory." (*Proletarskaia Revoliutsia*, No. 3 (15), p. 349)

Before the rise of the organized and centralized bureaucratic distortion of the Soviet Union, the distortion of its history and the character of the leaders who founded and saved it from counter-revolution, Foster did not have any particular reason to hide the facts. He openly recognized that next to Lenin, Trotsky was the most outstanding leader of the October Revolution. He wrote something which he now, a supporter of the distortion, would not write, namely, that Trotsky organized the Red Army:

"Leon Trotsky (Bronstein), Peoples' Commissar for War, and, next to Lenin, the biggest figure of the revolution.... He went back to Russia after the February revolution in 1917, and immediately became active and influential, side by side with his life-long comrade, Lenin. Trotsky is the unusual combination of an organizer and an orator. His greatest achievement was the organization of the Red Army." (Wm. Z. Foster, *The Russian Revolution*, chapter "Some Revolutionary Leaders," p. 108)

During Lenin's life, before the invention of the "best disciple," no one hesitated to state that Trotsky organized the defence and the victory of the Soviet Republic:

"Comrade Lenin, the greatest personality of the Revolution, its brain, its heart, its will; Comrade Trotsky, the organizer of the Red Army, the organizer of the defence and the victory of the Revolution." (Clara Zetkin, *The Communist International*, No. 24, p. 11)

A leading cartoon by Robert Minor in *The Liberator*, March 1920, shows Trotsky in a Red Army uniform, in his hand a rifle, and the bourgeois generals and statesmen recoiling in panic; the legend beneath the cartoon reading, "The East-side Jew that conquered Europe."

Olgin, writing in 1935, declares that all this about Trotsky is nothing but lies. Trotsky, according to him—

"... made great public orations—but he never led the civil war. He may have been deluded into believing that he was the whole moving spirit of that tremendous historic combat. He may believe so to the present day. The actual facts are just the reverse. The facts are that *Stalin* and *Voroshilov* were the great fighters on the various battle fronts—leaders with clear revolutionary vision and strategists of the first order." (*Trotskyism*, p. 13, Olgin's emphasis)

Olgin declares that Trotsky knew nothing about organizing the army, and ingratiatingly remarks that it was the proletariat who organized the Red Army:

"He knew nothing about the organization of an army, he had wrong ideas about revolutionary war strategy. The work of organizing the Red Army was done by the entire country, by millions of the proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party." (*Ibid.*, p. 13)

Lenin, it seems, knew different. Maxim Gorky relates a conversation with Lenin who asserted that there were lies spread about him and Trotsky, and highly commended Trotsky for the able work of organizing the Red Army:

"There are many lies, especially, it seems, about me and Trotsky." "Striking his hand on the table, he said:

"And yet let them show another man who could in one year organize an almost model army and even win the respect of military specialists. We have such a man. We have everything! And there will be miracles." (*Russki Sovremennik*, 1924, Vol. 1, p. 243. Also, *Vladimir Lenin*, State Publishing, Leningrad, 1924, p. 23)

In 1932 this work by Gorky was published by the International Publishers. The passage quoted above is omitted in its entirety. A different passage is inserted; the whole conversation of the author with Lenin is completely distorted:

"I was very surprised at his high appreciation of L. D. Trotsky's organizing abilities. V. Ylytch noticed my surprise.

"Yes, I know there are lying rumors about my attitude to him. But what is, is, and what isn't, isn't—that I know also. He was able at any rate to organize the military experts."

"After a pause he added in a lower tone, and rather sadly: 'And yet he isn't one of us. With us, but not of us. He is ambitious. There is something of Lasalle in him, something which isn't good.'" (Maxim Gorky, *Days with Lenin*, pp. 56-57)

That Trotsky is a revolutionary general was a well-known fact even in the middle of 1926:

"Those who know Trotsky only as an economist and revolutionary general, will be surprised to read this tribute, which reveals him also as a deep lover of poetry." (*New Masses*, June 1926, p. 18)

Editors of the *New Masses* were then Joseph Freeman, Michael Gold and others. A few days before the Left Opposition was expelled by Stalin one could behold in the *New Masses* for November 1927, on page 7, right in the midst of an article by Michael Gold, the picture of the famous *organizer* and *commander* of the Red Army over the following legend:

"L. D. Trotsky

"President of the Petrograd Soviet in October, Organizer and Commander of the Red Army during Civil War, and now leader of the 'Opposition.'"

Commissar Litvinov, before he sided with the organized distortion of the workers State, wrote:

"Trotsky has, indeed, succeeded in realizing his favorite idea of creating a revolutionary army." (Maxim Litvinov, two letters to an American correspondent, published by the People's Russian Information Bureau, printed by the National Labour Press)

The distortion of the history of the Red Army proceeded gradually. By 1930 it became "established" that it was Stalin who had organized the Red Army:

"Tremendous work Stalin carried out after October together with Lenin in organizing the party in the condition of Proletarian dictatorship, in organizing the government apparatus and particularly the Red Army." (*Malaia Soviet Encyclopaedia*, 1930, Vol. 9, article "Stalin," p. 407)

In 1933 the workers were told that the victory of the Red Army was closely tied up with Stalin's name:

"With the name of Comrade Stalin, the best Leninist, leader of the party of the Bolsheviks, leader of all toilers, is closely connected the armed struggle, the victories and the building of the Red Army." (*Pravda*, February 23, 1933)

"... Only thanks to the self-abnegating work of such organizers as Stalin, who became in a brief period our real Bolshevik military spe-

cialist, we succeeded in organizing the Red Army and be victorious on numerous fronts." (Voroshilov, *Pravda*, March 5, 1933)

And by 1935 the rising generation of the Soviet Union was being taught that during the civil war Trotsky planted counter-revolutionary nests in the Red Army:

"All his steel will, all his genius as an organizer and director of masses, Stalin put into the work of revival of the 3rd Army and preparation of a counter-blow against Kolchak. The counter-revolutionary nests planted by Trotsky were smashed." (*Pravda*, January 16, 1935, "Fifteenth Anniversary of the Liquidation of Kolchakovism")

With the conclusion of the civil war the millions of the Red Army were turned towards the economic front of the republic. Here, too, Trotsky was in the leading position:

"Victorious Red Army, having liquidated the bloody front—has begun the not less heroic struggle on the bloodless front, possessing, as before, for its leader the great tribune and organizer of the proletarian revolution, Comrade Trotsky." (Publisher's note, G. Ustinov, *Tribun Revolutsii*, Moscow, 1920. Work registered by the Publishing Department of the Moscow Soviet of Workers and Peasants Deputies)

Incidentally, after the distortion of the history of October, of the civil war, and of the rôles played by Trotsky and Stalin had sufficiently advanced, much ado was made about Stalin's immense popularity *especially* with the Third Army. The records do not bear out this claim. No special notice of Stalin was taken by the Third Army, even after Kolchak was smashed:

"The Third Army, in the Urals, issued a proclamation to the workers and peasants declaring that its military task was completed, and that it turned itself toward the 'labor front,' and claimed the honor of being called the First Red Labor army—electing Trotsky as its president." (John Reed, *The Liberator*, January 1921, p. 16)

In his work of supporting the bureaucratic centralism of the workers State, Olgin lies that Trotsky never was close to the life of the workers, never built their organization in preparation for the great struggle against capitalism:

"He never was in the thick of the workers' life as builder of their organizations. He never succeeded in winning to his particular side any considerable number of workers. He always was, and always remained,

a writer and speaker only, enjoying great popularity among the petty-bourgeois intellectuals." (*Trotskyism*, p. 9)

There was a time when Olgin did not know of Stalin's existence, when he never foresaw the bureaucratic distortion of the first workers State and himself a cog in the bureaucratic machine of Stalin's. Olgin wrote differently then:

"Into this work of preparation Trotzky threw himself with all his energy. Here he came into the closest contact with the masses of labor. Here he acquainted himself with the psychology and aspirations of working and suffering Russia. This was the rich soil of practical experience that ever since has fed his revolutionary ardor. No true revolutionist was ever made downhearted by prison, least of all Trotsky. . . . Trotsky, an uncompromising Marxist, an outspoken adherent of the theory that only the revolutionary workingman would be able to establish democracy in Russia. . . ." (M. J. Olgin, Biographical Notes to *Our Revolution* by Leon Trotsky. Also in *Asia*, March 1918, p. 195, article "Who is Trotsky")

Olgin says that Trotsky was a stranger in the Bolshevik Party, being a Party man only in appearance:

"Time passed. Trotsky worked with the Bolsheviks. To all appearances he became one of them. But he was a stranger in the Bolshevik Party." (*Trotskyism*, p. 13)

The early literature of the Soviet Union shows the very opposite. Here, for instance, is the testimony of one who today occupies an important post in Stalin's machine and is considered an authority on Party history, which, today, he of course distorts:

"The non-party worker, Filatov, declared that he was charged by the non-party workers to shake the hand of the beloved leader of the Red Army, Comrade Trotsky. The two shook hands and Trotsky embraced Filatov. *The incident is significant of the bond between the workers and their party.*" (E. Yaroslavsky, *The Communist International*, No. 25, p. 46. My emphasis—G.M.)

Before the post-Leninist period of systematic distortion and the elevation of relatively obscure and unimportant Stalin, for which purpose the *real big figures* of October were torn down, it was recognized that Lenin and Trotsky guided the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party. At the non-party conference

of working women of Petrograd convoked on the 6th of November, 1917, Alexandra Kollantai made a proposal for a delegation to bring pressure upon the Central Committee to agree to a coalition with the petty-bourgeois Socialist parties:

"... the author of these lines found it necessary to make a contrary proposal: to greet the policy of the *Central Committee of our Party*, guided by Lenin and Trotsky." (L. Stal, "Working Woman in October," *Proletarskaia Revolutsia*, No. 10, p. 298)

The Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party was represented in the Comintern by Lenin and Trotsky who signed the Manifesto of the First Congress of the Comintern:

"With fraternal greetings:

"The Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Lenin, Trotsky)." (*The Communist International*, No. 1, Jubilee Number, p. 172)

"And in the fire of the Civil War, with all the unheard-of difficult work of creating a State and workers apparatus, the Soviet Government, through the person of Lev Trotsky, uninterruptedly addresses the masses of all countries, utilizing every occasion to wake them and call them to struggle." (K. Radek, *Oktiabrskiy Perevorot i Dictatura Proletariata*, p. 265)

On the eighth anniversary of the October uprising, two years after the first wave of distortion of Trotsky's rôle in the revolution swept the country, Lenin's and Trotsky's pictures and busts were seen everywhere during the celebration. This fact was recorded in papers and books.

"It was November 7, 1925, the eighth anniversary of the Russian Revolution. The whole city had turned red. Long red streamers hung from the roofs; red banners with stirring inscriptions fluttered everywhere; in the shop windows busts of Lenin and Trotsky were draped in red cloth." (*Vanya of the Streets*, by Ruth Epperson Kennell, p. 54)

No mention is there anywhere of the display of the pictures of Stalin. The future usurper of power was still in the background and obscurity compared with Lenin and Trotsky, biding his time.

With the establishment of the Triumvirate, Stalin was introduced by his supporters to the workers abroad. His name at first appeared not as "J" but as "I" Stalin. Nothing was said about him being "the greatest disciple of Lenin," "the greatest living

Marxist today." He was introduced by his boosters merely as one "well qualified to deal with Lenin." Lenin was a Marxist in both theory and practice. He developed the theoretical foundation, the strategy and tactics of Bolshevism and translated them into a living phenomenon. Stalin's strongest side was practice, the carrying out of practical work within the Bolshevik Party. Here is how *his own men* were acquainting the American workers with Stalin:

"The author, Comrade Stalin, an old Bolshevik revolutionary Marxist fighter and party man, is well qualified to deal with Leninism and its theory but *above all, its practice.*" (Preface to *The Theory and Practice of Leninism*, by I. (Not "J"—G.M.) Stalin. My emphasis—G.M.)

With the splendor of a Marxist star of the first magnitude, Lenin, sharply vivid in every revolutionary worker's memory, with the stars of the second, third and fourth magnitudes—Trotsky, Zinoviev, Riazanov, Bucharin, Kamenev, Rakovsky, Radek, and a host of others—still shining in the revolutionary firmament, it would have been the height of absurdity to declare that a faint, barely visible body of the fifteenth or sixteenth magnitude was of the *first*.

It must be borne in mind, however, that while as a Marxist, politically, Stalin lagged far behind *all* the great figures of October, as an *organizer* and an activist he showed uncommon ability. A few years after October, when the Communist literature of the entire world mentioned the name of every leading member of the Russian Party, it mentioned Stalin's name too.

"... there is reason to believe that, as an organizer and a man of action Stalin is second only to Trotsky." (*The Communist Review*, June 1921, p. 12)

Trotsky used his organizing ability for the proletarian revolution; and so did Stalin—for awhile.

To bring his grandiose scheme to a concrete culmination, Stalin could not confine his designs to the Soviet Union alone. Besides the Soviet Republic Lenin created the Communist International for the express purpose of leading the world oppressed towards the great goal—the World Revolution. Without roping the Communist International and its youth section into his system, Stalin and his bureaucratic affinities could never have hoped for an ultimate triumph. Were he to dissolve the Comintern

gradually or at one stroke, another international Communist organization, independent and against him, would have sprung up at once, siding with the Russian Opposition. An attempt to withdraw the Russian section and abandon the rest of the Communist International would have brought the same results. Stalin must capture the Comintern. The program of the general interconnected process was to capture the Central Committees of all the foreign sections, and in that manner full control of the entire world organization.

Fortunately for Stalin and unfortunately for the international proletariat, Lenin did not live to Bolshevize the Comintern. The result was that all sorts of anti-workingclass vultures decked out in bright red feathers had filled all its sections. In his unprincipled plot the power-hunting Stalin was not and could not be squeamish in choosing his method and material. The less scrupulous the Lovestones, Browders and Olgins were, the vaster was their opportunity to fit into the framework of the developing Stalinist order.

A classic type of an educated "Communist" adventurer with a malodorous record was John Pepper. Ladislaw Rudas, one of the leaders of the Hungarian Revolution, later President of the Lenin School in Moscow, in his book *Adventurers and Liquidationism*, published in 1922, exposed John Pepper, or Joseph Pogany, as a venomous reptile, putrid to the marrow. Pogany-Pepper during the World War sold himself to the Austro-Hungarian imperialists as a newspaperman diffusing poison *a la* Olgin among the workers. When the tormented Hungarian masses overthrew the depraved Hapsburg monarchy, the soldier of fortune, Pogany, entered the cabinet of the bourgeois government of Count Karolyi. Recognized as a fitting rogue for the post, he was made war minister, and, denouncing the Hungarian Communists as "counter-revolutionists from the Left," he worked out for the military butchers elaborate plans for the wholesale extermination of Communist workers. The wretch was prevented from carrying out his atrocious plan by the sudden collapse of the Karolyi government and the Communists establishing the Hungarian Soviet Republic. A master of adaptation, now camouflaging as a friend of the workers, Pogany accommodated himself to the change and with brazen hypocrisy declared himself a Communist. Shrewd, skillful, characterless, the political parasite quickly maneuvered into becoming a Com-

missar in the Soviet Government of Hungary. Soon the workers republic succumbed under the terrific blows of the imperialists. Fearing for his hide, not venturing any chances with the infuriated White Guards victoriously occupying Hungary, this "revolutionary" pirate fled to Vienna where during his stay he engaged in turning over Communist workers to the Austrian police. From Germany, after the March Action, to Moscow, posing as a revolutionist; thence to the United States, and back to Moscow.

Happy circumstances terminated his temporary uselessness. The opening of the fierce debates against the Trotsky Opposition indicated to him at once which side would employ his unusual qualities. The transparent swindler lifted his voice in the interests of the "Old Guard." Proving himself to be what he was, he was selected by Stalin for "Comintern work" and sent to America, this time to "Bolshevize" the American section of the Communist International.

In the American Party Pepper found the brawl between two groups, each representing a combination of lesser bands, for the control of the Party. In December 1923 the leadership of the Party fell into the hands of the Foster-Browder-Cannon alliance, supported by Ludwig Lore and Moissaye J. Olgin. The minority led by Ruthenberg, Lovestone and Weinstone strove to wrest the leadership for themselves.

It did not take long for the sharp-witted intriguer to take the American range of matters within his sweep. The Foster-Cannon allies who knew that the Russian Party was equally divided between Stalin and the Opposition, and feared to take the gambler's chance, were not ready to declare for either side in the Russian controversy. Lovestone-Ruthenberg, on the other hand, unflinchingly accepted Stalin. This group therefore became known as the Pepper-Ruthenberg-Lovestone group, or the "Marxian trunk" of the Party, as they styled themselves.

The Foster-Cannon gang was not long in spreading among the membership the knowledge of the vicious history of Pepper. The allies of Pepper, to show Stalin that they were perfectly unscrupulous and would accept any emissary from the Triumvirate of the Russian Party as long as he threw in his support to them, rushed to Pepper's defense:

"... Comrade Pepper, a comrade who has been of greater service to the Communist International in general and to the Communist movement in the United States in particular than all of the dema-

gogic, hypocritical defamers of him and of his associates. . . ." (Jay Lovestone, *Daily Worker*, December 18, 1924)

On March 18, 1924, in the Central Executive Committee, into which the international adventurer had been inducted as a member with full rights, he made a motion "That we endorse the Old Guard in the Russian Communist Party." In opposition to this proposal Foster, who had not yet "discovered" the "greatest disciple" of Lenin and one of the "two greatest names in human history," immediately submitted the following evasive amendment:

"In view of the fact that the controversy in the Russian Communist Party has been decided by a conference, the Central Executive Committee is of the opinion that it is not called upon at this time to take a position in the merits of the controversy. The Central Executive Committee will permit in the Party papers all the documents bearing on the debate and will encourage the members to study them. . . ."

But part of Pepper's mission was the task of seeing that Trotsky's documents were *not printed* and *not studied* by the membership. Pepper labored patiently to break down the Foster-Cannon hesitation and rule. Foster and other leaders of the majority travelled to Moscow to judge which side would be the victor. By then Stalin had recruited enough supporters to outnumber the half-suppressed Opposition. Grasping the implication of their position and with penetrating discernment recognizing that the working-masses in the Comintern, not informed of the actual issues involved in the Stalin-Trotsky conflict, would lean towards the one who retained control of the Russian Party and the Soviet Union, Foster-Cannon-Browder cast their watchful waiting overboard and sided with the "Old Guard." However, their former hesitation was used against them by the Pepper-Ruthenberg-Lovestone minority. At the Fourth Convention of the American Party, Ruthenberg, speaking of the Foster gang, declared that "Our majority wasn't quite sure for five months whether they were Trotskyites or not." And in an article printed in the *Daily Worker*, December 6, 1924, Ruthenberg wrote: "It is not until Comrade Foster's return from Moscow that the majority of the Central Executive Committee consented to the adoption of a resolution officially putting the Party on record for the Old Guard Bolsheviks."

Both American cliques now stood behind Stalin. Articles at-

tacking Trotsky and extolling the Triumvirate written by the members of the Foster-Browder-Cannon combination appeared in the Party publications.

"This Old Bolshevik Guard, now led by Zinoviev, Stalin and Kamenev, has grown to political maturity under the personal guidance of Lenin." (Alexander Bittelman, *The Workers Monthly*, January 1925)

At Pepper's instigation the most important speeches, articles and books by Trotsky were suppressed. Here is one of many examples of this suppression:

"TO ALL PARTY EDITORS

"Dear Comrade: You will find attached hereto an English translation of a review of Comrade Trotsky's book '1917' entitled 'How One Should Not Write the History of October.' By decision of the Central Executive Committee all Party papers are instructed to reprint this Pravda review within ten days time. It is the further instruction of the Central Executive Committee that no Party paper shall reprint the book '1917' or any chapter thereof in the Party press." ("Decision of the Party Central Executive Committee." *Daily Worker*, December 13, 1924)

Anti-Trotsky stories were spread throughout the Party. Sinister designs were imputed to him. I recall with what "revolutionary" fervor William Weinstone explained to me that Trotsky was an egomaniac suddenly possessed by a raging ambition to ride into power like Napoleon. According to Weinstone and other leaders, both of the majority and the minority, Trotsky's fight for Workers Democracy was a demagogic blind with which he covered up his dictatorial scheme. On the other hand, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Stalin, Bucharin, Rykov, Tomsky stood for collective leadership and real inner-Party democracy.

All the rank-and-filers accepted this as truth. It sounded plausible in view of Trotsky's military successes in the Civil War and his former anti-Bolshevism.

The Stalinist "Old Guard" was mistrustful of Foster-Browder-Cannon and was bent upon replacing them with the unquestionably loyal minority. An open document to the American Party said: "Politically the Ruthenberg-Lovestone group stands closer to the Comintern." But in the fierce contest of the Fourth Convention, the Ruthenberg-Lovestone-Weinstone clique, failing to secure the support of the membership, went down in humiliating

defeat. The Foster-Cannon caucus, in control of the Party machinery, "democratically" defeated their threatening rivals. Thereupon another Stalin agent, Gussev, designated as the "C. I. Rep."—the representative of the Communist International—performed a very difficult albeit clever operation.

As the hour for the adjournment of the Fourth Convention drew close, Gussev, clothed with ample authority, announced to the leaders of the two contending sets that a decision had been received from Moscow which provided that the Central Committee of the American Party be formed of an equal number of members from both groups, with the "C. I. Rep." as an impartial chairman, to avoid paralysis. The majority at first was seized with consternation; then gradually the turmoil subsided. The word of the Comintern was sacred. With ill-concealed disgust, the Foster-Browder-Cannon caucus submitted to the decision. But Gussev had another bombshell up his sleeve, which he exploded at the first meeting of the Parity Central Executive Committee:

"Of course we have now a parity C.E.C. but it is not exactly a parity C.E.C. With the decision of the Communist International on the question of the groups in the American party there goes parallel instructions to the C.I. representative to support that group which was the former Minority." (*Daily Worker*, September 3, 1925)

The tables were turned. New links were added to the long chain of Stalinist appointees. The Ruthenberg-Lovestone-Weinstone opportunists, having been unable to win the majority of the Party membership in an open discussion, were now imposed upon the organization by Stalin, in flagrant violation of the basic principles of Leninist democratic centralism. The decision of the "Comintern" was presented to the Party at a New York membership meeting held on September 25, 1925. The reporter for the new Central Executive was Jay Lovestone. In the eyes of the rank-and-file, Lovestone was the choice of the Communist International, so when Lovestone cried "stand by the Comintern" he was greeted by the workers with a wild ovation.

To show what magic the Comintern had always been in the hands of Stalin, how the membership took things on faith, the vote cast at this meeting was as follows: against the decision of the Comintern—9, for the decision—388; the minority was transformed into an overwhelming majority.

A campaign was launched by Gussev-Pepper-Ruthenberg-Lovestone to break up the remnants of the Foster-Cannon-Browder-Olgin caucus. On November 16, 1925, operating in the overwrought factional atmosphere pervaded with threats and fears, the new Central Executive Committee adopted the "Unity Resolution." Cannon, Olgin, William F. Dunne and others broke with Foster and now united with Pepper-Lovestone.

Summing up the situation in the Party at that time, Costrell, a staunch supporter of Foster, in a letter to the organizer of the Jewish Branch in Cleveland said: "An atmosphere of terror has been introduced in the Party. The leading comrades of the Party have been eliminated."

One of the foremost figures of the Foster-Cannon caucus, a member of the Central Committee, Ludwig Lore, was expelled from the Party. The professed reason for this drastic measure was his opportunism, especially in connection with the advertising of bonds in his paper *Volkszeitung* for the White Guardist Horthy dictatorship of Hungary. Lore's followers, Rose Wortis, Juliet Poynts and others, were intimidated into accepting the decision on peril of expulsion.

That the campaign against opportunism in the Party was a fake was made clear by the attitude toward opportunism of a much darker dye than Lore's.

The Stalinist "Old Guard" took Pepper under its wing, The decision of the Comintern said explicitly: "In particular, the Executive Committee must point out that it regards a campaign conducted against Comrade Pepper as absolutely uncalled for." Later Pepper was rewarded for his services and faithfulness to the "Cause of the Proletariat" by an appointment to no less an important post than *head of the Agitprop department of the entire Communist International!* To illustrate how "Communitic" was his propaganda. During the Tea Pot Dome oil scandal, Pepper, appealing to the bourgeois-patriotic prejudices planted in the workers' heads by the capitalists, wrote in the *Daily Worker*: "Republicans and Democrats vying with one another have broken the Constitution, have destroyed the laws. . . . *They have well-nigh destroyed the power of resistance of the navy in case of war.*" (My emphasis—G. M.). Such were the elements placed by Stalin in leading positions of the Communist International!

Throughout the International, running parallel with the proc-

ess in the Russian and the American sections, stark and fateful changes were taking place. Democratic centralism was being wiped out. Leaders whom Stalin doubted were arbitrarily removed by dictatorial "Reps," their seats filled with people loyal to the "Comintern." Each set of political courtesans thus established by Stalin in control of a section was in turn used by him to influence and mislead the workers in the rest of the International. Embellished in lavish and fulsome flattery, pledges of loyalty were dispatched from the newly installed puppets to the "Old Guard Bolsheviks" in the Kremlin. The Lovestone-Bedacht-Wolfe-Weinstone crowd promptly repaid the mighty chief and benefactor without whose active aid they would have never seized the valuable prize. Buttering those in power in the Soviet Union Party they endorsed unreservedly the removal by Stalin of the Ruth Fisher-Maslow leadership in the German Communist Party:

"The Central Executive Committee of the Workers (Communist) Party of America sees in the last decision of the Comintern on the situation of the Communist Party of Germany a tremendous step forward in the bolshevization of our International. It agrees with and accepts unreservedly these decisions of the Comintern. Our own experience has strengthened us in the conviction that only a vigorous execution of the proposals of the Communist International will ensure the bolshevization of the Communist Party of Germany..." (*Daily Worker*, November 19, 1925)

In the Soviet Union, meanwhile, the "bureaucratic distortion" was making steady headway. In dim outline the contours of the huge structure were growing more defined. The practice of appointment, of conferring favors, expanded wider and deeper, spreading its tentacles into the Party, State, trade unions, industry, army, scientific institutions, farms, press, libraries, rest homes. In the midst of widespread hardships, an army of voracious placemen offering sycophancy and implicit obedience to the would-be absolute dictator in exchange for relative economic security and position of authority, sprang to the fore in the Soviet Union. Like hungry locusts, aristocrats of labor, domestic and foreign degenerated Bolsheviks, little Plekhanovs and all sorts of John Peppers, slimy petty-bourgeois intellectuals bound by cultural, social and emotional threads to the former ruling classes, swarmed around Stalin and ate out of his hand. Once in

the apparatus, nonentities acquired an enhanced importance. They formed a body of officials classified in ranks, each subordinate to the one above, every one fawning on the more powerful, courting favor by a cringing demeanor. Employing his unusual organizational ability, becoming a virtuoso in the artistry of his new craft, Stalin with mechanical precision was advancing towards his personal absolutism.

To entrench the Soviet bureaucracy ideologically, and gradually make it independent of the tasks and interests of the world proletariat, Stalin doctored his own earlier writings and introduced a new theory: the creation of a Socialist society in one country, in the Soviet Union.

In April 1924, adhering in words to the general Marxist truth on this question, Stalin wrote:

"Can we succeed and secure the definitive victory of Socialism in one country without the combined efforts of the proletarians of several advanced countries? *Most certainly not.* [My emphasis—G.M.] The efforts of a single country are enough to overthrow the bourgeoisie; this is what the history of our revolution proves. But the definitive triumph of socialism, the organization of socialist production, the efforts of the country alone are not enough, particularly of an essentially rural country like Russia; the efforts of the proletarians of several advanced countries are needed. So the victorious revolution in one country has for its *essential* task to develop and support the revolution in others. So it ought not to be considered as of independent value, but as an auxiliary, a means of hastening the victory of the proletariat in other countries.

"Lenin has curtly expressed this thought in saying that the task of the victorious revolution consists in doing the 'utmost' in one country for the development, support, awakening of the revolution in other countries (*Vide The Proletarian Revolution*)." (I. Stalin, *Theory and Practice of Leninism*, pp. 25-26)

Correct, simple, truly Leninist.

But in *Leninism*, by Joseph Stalin, published sometime later, on page 53, the author, realizing that he could not make a sharp about-face without some sort of an excuse, gives a vague explanation that the formulation of the impossibility of building Socialism in one country alone was "directed against some of the critics of Lenin, against the Trotskyists." Then Stalin proceeds to tell the workers that the "formulation became obviously inadequate and therefore inaccurate." And repeating the question at issue he gives the answer opposite to the one given previously:

"Can socialism possibly be established in one country alone by that country's unaided strength? This question must be answered in the affirmative." (My emphasis—G.M.)

The Stalino-bureaucratic development, once begun, was not to leave the leadership in the hands of a triumvirate, or a duumvirate (Stalin-Bucharin), but in the hands of a *monocrat*. This was the aim, purpose, logic and unavoidable corollary in the process of bureaucratic centralization.

Stirred by the terrible prospect, Zinoviev and Kamenev made a desperate endeavor to stem the weltering flood. The whole Leningrad district comprising the most advanced section of the Russian proletariat, the workers that lighted the torch of the Communist revolution in 1917, turned against Stalin. Krupskaya, Lenin's widow, Lashevich, former member of the Military Revolutionary Committee which organized the October Insurrection, Muralov, leader of the Moscow uprising against the Kerensky government in November 1917, later commandant of the Moscow military district, Rakovsky, head of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, Radek, and thousands of old Bolsheviks sided with the Zinoviev-Kamenev-Trotsky Bloc.

Zinoviev and Kamenev revealed the frame-up against Trotsky they and Stalin had organized two years before. A private political buro, secret code, pledges not to polemize one against the other, only against Trotsky, and the invention of the target "Trotskyism," counterposing it to Stalin's "Leninism." Karl Radek in a letter written some time afterwards said: "I heard repeatedly from the mouths of Zinoviev and Kamenev how they invented 'Trotskyism' as an actual slogan."

The struggle of the Opposition from 1923 on was of a spasmodic character. Trotsky, and later, still more than he, Zinoviev and Kamenev, made attempts at accord and unity with the Stalinists—an illusory policy, for there could be no compromise between the "bureaucratic distortion" and Workers Democracy. In his long climb to power Stalin utilized these mistakes of the Oppositionists and the resulting lulls in the fight. He maneuvered and fortified his position, strangling the remnants of Workers Democracy piecemeal, with signal success.

At the end of 1925, prior to the Fourteenth Congress of the All-Union Communist Party, a collision occurred, prepared by the developments, between the Opposition Bloc and the Stalin-Bucharin Bloc, the latter combination comprising the centralists-

bureaucrats (Stalin faction) and "democratic" bureaucrats (Bucharin-Tomsky-Rykov). On December 1, Zinoviev, speaking at the Leningrad Party Conference, was reported by the *Pravda* as having said that in 1923—

"... the main accusation of the opposition boiled down to the following: at the X Congress of the Party in 1921 we had resolved to put into actual life inner-Party democracy. In 1923 we confirmed that resolution, but inner-Party democracy was not carried out. Thus spoke the opposition. . . . Now at the threshold of 1926, we must firmly declare no more delays. . . . At the present, our economy, the condition of the Party, the condition of the Soviet Union are such that the question of the inner-Party democracy can and must be placed in all its magnitude, in a real manner."

The basic feature of the Bolshevik Party under Lenin was unrestricted discussion of all questions and problems confronting the organization, particularly in a pre-congress period. Disagreement with Lenin was not construed as treason to the Party and the working class. Quite the contrary, it was part and parcel of Bolshevism. On more than one occasion this or that question was decided in opposition to Lenin.

Stalin and his new right hand, Bucharin, abolished this fundamental principle upon which a Marxist party lives and through which it functions. Abandoning the former slogan "Stand by the Old Guard," since a section of the "Old Guard" had become the Opposition, the Stalinists raised a new cry, "Preserve the unity of the Party." Unity, of course, by submitting to Stalin. Using this slogan to justify its actions, the Stalin machine stifled all attempts at discussion, and *Pravda*, on December 22, 1925, came out officially declaring "No discussion in the Party."

Articles by the Oppositionists were not allowed to be printed and distributed among the membership. Even Lenin's widow, Krupskaya, was not permitted to make her thoughts known in the Party. Her article criticising the bureaucratic regime and exposing Stalin's right hand, Bucharin, was suppressed.

Foxy Stalin, far from denying the suppression, pointed out that the Opposition really had no grounds for complaint since he "also suppressed" Bucharin's reply to Krupskaya:

"Now Comrade Kameneff and Zinovieff think they can frighten us by talking about 'prohibitions,' and are as indignant as any liberal could be because we refused to allow the publication of Comrade

Krupskaya's article. They won't frighten any one by this sort of talk. In the first place we did not only prohibit the appearance of Comrade Krupskaya's article but also the appearance of Comrade Bucharin's article. In the second place, I should like to ask why we should not have the right of prohibiting the publication of an article by Comrade Krupskaya *if we think* [My emphasis—G.M.] that this prohibition is in the Party interest." (J. Stalin, *Leninism*, concluding words at the Congress, p. 450, International Publishers)

To make known the views of the Opposition, Zinoviev attempted to issue a magazine, as Bukharin did during Lenin's life in the period of the controversies regarding peace or war with imperialist Germany. But Stalin's strangulating hand lay heavily on the vocal cords of the Opposition. Openly, he declared:

"Certainly we prohibited the publication of this organ of a faction, and shall, if necessary issue similar prohibitions in the future." (*Ibid.*, p. 449)

In the days of Lenin the Party printed and distributed all documents and platforms, in accordance with democratic centralism. Stalin ordered that the platform of the Opposition not be printed. Its distribution was considered illegal, as was the Opposition itself. Stalin tells of this in one of his speeches:

"Why did we not print the well-known 'platform of the Opposition.' Zinoviev and Trotsky explain it by saying that C. C. and the Party were afraid of the truth. . . . Why do we not publish the 'platform' of the Opposition in the case in question? Above all because the C. C. did not wish to legalise Trotsky's fraction. . . ." (*Inprecorr*, November 17, 1927)

That discussion was being strangled and the Opposition's request to permit the publication of its platform rejected, is told by Molotov, Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars:

"The Opposition more than once attempted to impose a discussion upon the party. With every year passing, it is less and less succeeding in this. . . . However, the Central Committee rejected the proposal of the Opposition to publish its platform in which the Opposition, upon all questions, counterposes its own line." (V. M. Molotov, *Partia i Oppositsia*, 1928, pp. 79-80)

The leaders of the Opposition were allowed by Stalin's C. C. (Central Committee) to present "their point of view" in the Party units on the basis of supporting—Stalin's line!

"Why do Trotzky and Zinoviev not try to visit the nuclei and expound their views there? The following fact is very characteristic. After the Plenary Session of C.C. and the C.C.C. in August this year, Trotzky and Zinoviev sent in a declaration stating that they wished to speak at the meeting of the Moscow functionaries if the C.C. had no objection to this. The C.C. replied (the answer was sent to the local organizations) that it did not object to Trotzky and Zinoviev appearing on the platform, under the condition however that, being members of the C.C., they would *support the resolution of the C.C.* What happened? They renounced appearing on the platform. (General laughter). (J. Stalin, *Inprecorr*, No. 64, November 17, 1924, p. 1430. My emphasis—G.M.)

Olgin knows these facts but conceals them under the following distortion:

"A legend is peddled around to the effect that Trotsky and his associates 'were not given a chance' to present their viewpoint to the rank-and-file Party membership. As a matter of fact, the debate between the opposition and the Party leadership was continued *from 1924 till 1927*. In numerous sessions of the central bodies, in numberless meetings of the lower bodies of the Party, the program of the opposition was thrashed out, scores of books, hundreds of pamphlets dealing with these questions were published and widely distributed. The Opposition received a hearing even to the point of exhausting the patience of the Party members." (M. J. Olgin, *Trotskyism*, p. 14)

Books and pamphlets were published and widely distributed, true, but they were books and pamphlets of the Stalinist faction, in control of the entire Party machinery. The voice of the Opposition was effectively stifled.

"Trotsky shouts all over the world that he never had a chance to discuss his program with the Party members. But this is a brazen lie." (William Z. Foster, *Daily Worker*, February 16, 1937)

"... Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek and other Trotskyist spokesmen had been given *unlimited opportunities* to argue their position." (C. A. Hathaway, *The Communist*, March 1937. My emphasis—G.M.)

Obviously, what Foster, Olgin and Hathaway say is a lie.

At the Fourteenth Congress of the All-Union Communist Party, Stalin, mindful that the memory of the New Course adopted in 1923, and of the resolution on *Workers Democracy* in 1921, was fresh in the workers' minds, could not avoid the

question of bureaucracy. To divert the attention from the process of *growth* of the bureaucracy, he spoke of its "survivals":

"In like manner we must distinguish between the bureaucratic survivals in our state enterprises . . ." (J. Stalin, *Leninism*, p. 389)

Stalin, of course, pointed out that Lenin "also" attacked the "vestiges" of bureaucracy:

"Lenin himself, the man who described our Soviet order as a typically proletarian state, expressed himself in very vigorous terms when he condemned the survival of vestiges of bureaucracy." (*Ibid.*, p. 388)

On the floor of the Fourteenth Congress, the Bukharinite Tomsy hurred back the "lie" of the Opposition that Stalin aimed at becoming dictator. And Rykov, another "democratic" bureaucrat, assured the Congress, and through the *Pravda* in which his speech was published, the entire world proletariat, that "The Party never has and never will bow to either Stalin or Kamenev."

The centralists-bureaucrats, the purely Stalin faction, Voroshilov, Ordjonikidze, Kaganovich, Molotov, Zdanov, Mikoyan, Manuilsky and others let these remarks pass unanswered. They bided their time.

The cunning bureaucrats intensified their hypocritical howl against bureaucracy in the *abstract* and for Workers Democracy. Stalin wrote in *Pravda*, "We are developing a party democracy."

Immediately following the Congress a thunderbolt crashed down upon the heads of the Opposition, especially of the Leningrad District. The rank-and-file were decimated. Leaders were removed, expelled on trumped up charges, driven from Leningrad, some imprisoned. The less fearless were cowed into submission. Zinoviev was removed from the Political Bureau of the Central Committee and from the chairmanship of the Comintern.

Delivering a report to a meeting of the newly appointed Stalinist functionaries of the Leningrad organization of the Party, having approved the reprisals, Bucharin, with a perfectly straight face insisted, "We must strive, more energetically, for inner-Party democracy" (*Inprecorr* No. 58, 1926, p. 987).

Throughout the Third International the puppet leaders enthusiastically endorsed the lashing of the Opposition. Under the Lovestone Central Executive Committee, the *Daily Worker* on

July 31, 1926, declared that the reprisals against the Opposition "were necessary to secure and cement the unity and revolutionary efficiency of our brother Party."

Discussions on the Russian Question were organized in the American Party. To show the "fairness" with which the Lovestone leaders conducted the discussions it is enough to mention Point Four of the resolution presented to the New York functionaries' meeting Sunday, January 9, 1927. This point said:

"For a better understanding of the issues involved in the Russian question, the functionaries' meeting endorses the proposal for a *thoroughgoing discussion* within the units of the Party in behalf of the position of the C.E.C. and the Communist International *against the stand of the Opposition*. (My emphasis—G.M.)

The year 1927 marked the last phase of resistance on the part of the Opposition against Stalin's bureaucratic steamroller. Facing the unbearable atmosphere of baiting, intimidation, terrorization and suppression, the Opposition attempted a counter-attack. It assailed the Stalin-Bukharin unity with the top layers of the British trade union bureaucracy. It stigmatized the unity of Stalin with Chiang Kai-shek. It demanded an end to the personal dictatorship of Stalin. It raised the cry for curbing the bureaucratic hogs and the village bourgeoisie and for the improvement of the conditions of the workers. It proposed an industrialization plan, carried out *through Workers Democracy*, with the toilers participating in the management. It demanded the restoration of Leninist principles within the Party. To the new-fangled theory of "peacefully" creating Socialism in one country it counterposed the orthodox Marxian-Leninist idea of the universal destruction of the bourgeois power, which destruction alone would allow the elevation of human society to the next stage of its evolution.

Some months before the "Expulsion Congress," Stalin, in a very clever way, prepared the ground for Trotsky's expulsion. While his foreign lackeys, upon his secret instruction, demanded the expulsion of Trotsky, foxy Stalin, to show the workers he was fair and was against disciplinary measures against such figures as the former organizer of the Red Army, was "opposing" this move. It was necessary to make it appear that Stalin was exhausting all patience in the struggle with the Opposition.

Years later something very illuminating on this score was told by Lovestone:

"It might interest you to know that at the full meeting of the executive committee of the Communist International, held in Moscow in July, 1927, Thaelmann and I were elected to meet a sub-committee of the Political Bureau of the C.P.S.U., consisting of Stalin and Bucharin, to demand that the Russian party expel Trotsky forthwith. It might likewise interest your readers to know that Stalin was then most adamant in his opposition to the expulsion of Trotsky from the C.P.S.U." ("Letters to the Editor of The Times," *The New York Times*, February 14, 1937)

Came the agonizing phase of the tense struggle at the Fifteenth Congress of the All-Union Russian Communist Party in the Autumn of 1927. The opposition was deprived of the right to vote. Kamenev, Rakovsky and other Oppositionists were granted a "consultative" voice. "... the leaders of the Opposition Party, admitted to the Congress with consultative voice" (Rykov, *Report of the Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 134).

How much voice, can be seen from the records. When Rakovsky was delivering his speech he was heckled, interrupted and finally not allowed to continue:

"I ask you if the Left wing of the Party is to be expelled. . . . Voices: 'Get out of the Party and be done with it. Away with the Mensheviks from the platform! This platform is not for Mensheviks. It is not a Left but a Menshevik wing!' 'The Congress insists on his removal.' 'Down, down!' (Commotion. Chairman rings the bell.)

"Chairman: Who is in favor of allowing Comrade Rakovsky to continue his speech?

"Nobody." (*Report of the Fifteenth Congress*, p. 108)

The decision to exclude from the Party all who held the Opposition's point of view was passed "unanimously."

At this "Expulsion Congress," Stalin was so uncouth as to repeat his obviously hypocritical demand for a struggle against that which he was upbuilding:

"There can be no doubt that we possess certain elements of bureaucracy in the State, cooperative and Party machine. . . . The task of the Party is to fight against bureaucracy." (J. Stalin, *Report of the Fifteenth Congress*)

In his speech, by way of "self-criticism," Stalin admitted that the administrative whip was being applied against the Opposition. This anti-Leninist method of brutally maltreating inner-Party opponents Stalin called a *shortcoming*:

"Another shortcoming. This consists in the application of administrative methods in the Party: instead of the method of conviction which is of decisive importance for the Party, we *apply administrative methods in the Party*. This shortcoming. . . creates the danger of converting our Party organizations, which are organizations of self-activity, into hollow, bureaucratic institutions." (J. Stalin, *Report of the Fifteenth Congress*, p. 67. My emphasis—G.M.)

But since Stalin succumbed to the irresistible lure of power, nothing could slake his fierce appetite. His words of self-criticism did not square with his deeds that followed. The G.P.U.'s administrative measures supplemented the stormy "Leninist" rhetoric. Stalin now passed from debate to action and slashing out ruthlessly liquidated the vestiges of Leninism in the Party. The completion of transforming the Communist Party organizations of the Soviet Union "into hollow, bureaucratic institutions" proceeded at a terrific pace. Swift and telling blows fell upon the Opposition. A breath-taking sweep of expulsions riddled the organization throughout the wide expanse of the Soviet Union. Thousands of intransigent Oppositionists of spotless revolutionary records were banished to Siberia. Prisons, rigorous persecution and black-listing with the resultant deprivation of means of livelihood, and other Draconian means, were employed by the bureaucrats to destroy the anti-Stalin section of the Party.

Leon Trotsky, who for years headed the Red Army and Navy, was slandered, vilified, expelled from the Party and exiled to the wilds of Alma Ata.

The marionettes in all sections of the Comintern, the Browders, John Peppers and Sam Dons applauded vociferously the actions of Stalin and rejoiced in the tremendous progress they were making in supplanting Leninism with their own system.

But the new system, Stalinism, was not yet filled out to fullness of form. It was not yet made fairly stable and, as regimes go, perpetual. Certain impediments were still in its way. Stalin was rising by stages, but the apex had not yet been reached. Workers Democracy in the Soviet Union had been overpowered, but vestiges of workers' control of management lingered on, and

within the Party, the Soviet bureaucracy and the Comintern, a measure of "democracy" prevailed, necessitating further manipulations inside and outside the Soviet Union.

The reshaping of the Comintern was speeded up. True, the puppet leaderships existed in the entire Comintern, but so did the right of opposition to them. This was a negative and dissolving feature that endangered Stalin's grip upon the sections. Ambitious attempts on the part of foreign bureaucrats to seize this or that Party were frequent (the Cannon-Foster-Weinstone plot in 1927).

In the Summer of 1928 at the Sixth Congress of the Third International, and later in the months hard upon the heels of this conclave, came the maturity of the Stalinization of the Comintern and the Soviet Union. The Sixth Congress was a Stalino-Bucharinite farce. Upon the official scene open to the view of the Communist rank-and-file of the world, the false spokesmen of the oppressed hoodwinked the workers, regaling them with pompous "Leninist" verbiage. Their copious speeches, clear and persuasive, delivered with "feeling" and deep "sincerity" dealt with the woes of the toilers of the world. Their fluent revolutionary diction acquired by them through years of iteration shaped itself into lofty impassioned utterances hailing the approaching final battle against the cruel oppressors of the colonies, of Negroes, of workers and peasants. The crucified Opposition was denounced as counter-revolutionary: and numerous blank shots were fired against the bureaucracy. In closing, the dignified representatives of the Communist International proclaimed their undying love for the proletariat and, rising, sang lustily the *Internationale*. The fusion of noble thought and noble feeling seemed complete.

But behind the scene something altogether different was taking place. Away from the brilliant footlights and the beating of the stage drums, lurking in the shadows, the stage manager and his closest and most loyal henchmen organized what later became disclosed by the illuminating confession of Lovestone as the "Corridor Congress" against Bukharin, the last eminent member of the "Old Guard." Bukharin retained a very thin, a very insignificant shred of independence of thought and a limited right of criticism within the bureaucratic stratum of the All-Union Party. That shred the Lovestoneites and the gangs of similar stripe meant to retain in the International. But inde-

pendence of thought and opinion, no matter how miserably minute, allowed, especially in foreign sections, a certain degree of organizational autonomy. This formed an obstacle to the completion of the process of bureaucratic centralization of the Comintern.

Surrounded by strict secrecy, while the orators on the lighted stage displayed vast erudition in Marxism, burst into fits of eloquence and vied with one another in the grace of delivery and subtleness of demagoguery, a scheme was evolved to wipe out the very mild, the extremely timid "opposition" of the Bukharinites.

The Browder-Foster-Bittelman gang was bidding against the Bukharinite-Lovestone, pledging unconditional submission to Stalin. The Lovestone ring of careerists tried to compromise and yield points. Now one and now the other of the chieftains closeted himself with Stalin and haggled over the price he would be content with for the seat of power in the American section. Coded cables were shot across the ocean to America by the key-men of both gangs. Some secrets trickled out and caused much buzzing among the rank-and-file, until the Party and the Moscow office boys in the Comintern were all agog.

Stalin naturally did not like this talk about his secret horse-trading. In his speech delivered before his political clerks in the American Commission on May 6, 1929, Stalin denied any secrecy in his deals with the American leaders. He said:

"In order to show how pure Communist morals are depraved and defiled in the course of a factional struggle, I could cite yet another fact as, for instance, my conversation with Comrades Foster and Lovestone. I refer to the conversation that took place at the time of the Sixth Congress. It is characteristic that in correspondence with his friends Comrade Foster makes this conversation out to be something secret, something which must not be talked about aloud. It is characteristic that Comrade Lovestone, in bringing his charges against Comrade Foster, in connection with this conversation, refers to his talk with me and boasts here that he, Comrade Lovestone, unlike Foster, is able to keep a secret and that under no conditions would he consent to divulge the substance of his conversation with me. Why this mysticism, dear comrades; what purpose does it serve? What could there be mysterious in my talk with comrades Foster and Lovestone? Listening to these comrades, one might think I spoke to them of things which one would be ashamed to relate here." (*Stalin's Speeches on the American Communist Party*, p. 15, published by the Central Committee, Communist Party, U.S.A.)

The game was played to its conclusion. Stalin, having virtually finished Bukharin, was determined to crush Lovestone. This was by no means an easy task, and Stalin knew that "Comrade Lovestone is indisputably an adroit and talented factional wire puller" (Stalin). Lovestone, shrewd and skillful, was in full control of the Party apparatus, of the *Daily Worker*, the *Freiheit*, the Party building on Union Square, the cooperatives, Camp Nitgedaiget,—of all the properties of the Party. If faced with the alternative of secession, Lovestone could have carried off the precious prize. Had Stalin proceeded with the simple method he had employed in 1924, he would have fared badly in America. The fully detailed amazing story of how Stalin outbluffed and outmaneuvered Lovestone will some day be written to show one of the most remarkable pieces of machination in political history.

First Stalin utilized Lovestone to eliminate the Trotskyites. Lovestone performed this service to Stalin with alacrity and administrative thoroughness. On November 16, 1928, shortly after the Sixth Congress, the Trotskyites were expelled by the Lovestone Central Executive Committee, with the great cry: "No tolerance of Trotskyism in the ranks of the Party. We call upon all District Executive Committees and all subdivisions of the Party to expel the followers of Trotsky. . . ." And in the same breath adding the usual piece of hypocrisy against bureaucracy and for unity: "Merciless struggle against any manifestation of bureaucratism in the Party. Unity against counter-revolutionary Trotskyism."

To assure Stalin of their loyalty, the Lovestoneites organized hooligan raids upon the Trotskyist meetings in New York. The most outstanding attacks were the breaking up of the Labor Temple meeting on February 26, 1929, and of the Hungarian Hall meeting on April 9, by gangs armed with black-jacks, knives, lead-pipes and clubs. In his *Outlines for Speakers on Trotskyism*, March 1929, the Lovestone chieftain, Will Herberg, explained:

"Why we break up Trotskyist meetings—they are demonstrations against the Soviet Union of the same type as Monarchist, Socialist demonstrations."

In the Sixth Convention of the American Party, the Lovestone faction, through the "democratic" pressure of its apparatus, se-

cured the support of over eighty-five per cent of the membership. Stalin's agents, carrying out their plans, made a breach in the Lovestone forces by winning over Weinstone who expressed willingness to go the whole hog. Weinstone always keenly watched for a chance to climb into a higher post. In half jest, I believe Weinstone's actual ambition is to displace or at least to succeed Stalin. After his desertion of Lovestone, his post as District Organizer of New York was filled by the Lovestoneite Lifshitz.

The Sixth Convention of the American Party was a revolting spectacle of these adventurers brazenly scrapping for their bureaucratic jobs. It is enough to mention the session of March 8, 1929, with obscene cries and a fist fight among the delegates.

Lovestone strengthened his control of the Party, having meanwhile done everything within reason to mollify Stalin, even to the extent of treacherously yielding his foremost leaders, Bukharin and Pepper. Such perfidious conduct was not a novelty with Lovestone. Sometime before he had assisted Stalin to crush the leaders of the German Communist Party, Brandler and Thalheimer, who were the political counterpart of Lovestone. Prior to the Sixth Convention of the American Party, Lovestone, in a pamphlet, reminded Stalin of the valuable services the Lovestone-Wolfe gang had rendered the chief bureaucrat in Moscow:

"Our Party has pursued an energetic policy in the struggle against Brandler and Thalheimer and the other right wingers and conciliators in the German Party. In the Fifth Plenum of the Comintern, the comrades representing the viewpoint now held by the majority of the Party were amongst the *most aggressive* in the struggle against Brandler, Thalheimer, Bubnik and the Trotskyist deviators from the Leninist line. Our Central Committee gave *prompt and energetic endorsement* to the struggle of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. against the right danger." (Jay Lovestone, *Pages from Party History*, p. 16. My emphasis—G.M.)

At last came the completion of Stalin's scheme. He tricked the whole Lovestone leadership to Moscow. Once in the hands of the omnipotent bureaucrat, the Lovestoneites were lost. The bargaining days were over. It was: accept Stalin's dictatorship or be doomed as an enemy of the proletariat and the Soviet Union. Stalin, with contempt for both gangs of American "revolutionary" crooks, revealed now openly how the leaders of the two

bands, behind the back of the American Party, vying with one another in servility, were selling out the cause of the toiling masses for clique privileges, power and emolument:

"You know that both groups of the American Communist Party, competing with each other and chasing after each other like horses in a race, are feverishly speculating on existing and non-existing differences within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Why do they do that? Do the interests of the Communist Party of America demand it? No, of course not. They do it in order to gain some advantage for their own particular faction and to cause injury to the other faction. . . . The Foster group demonstrate their closeness to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by declaring themselves 'Stalinites.' Lovestone perceives that his own faction thereby may lose something by this. Therefore, in order not to be outdone, the Lovestone group suddenly performs a 'hair raising' feat and, at the American Party Congress, carries through a decision calling for the removal of Comrade Bucharin from the Comintern. And so you get a game of rivalry on the principle of who will outdo whom. Instead of a fight on principles you get the most unprincipled speculation on the differences within the C.P.S.U. . . . The Lovestone group performs another 'hair raising' feat and expels Comrade Pepper from the Party! the same Pepper whom only the day before they had defended against the C.I. Another game of rivalry—who can spit furthest. . . . The Foster group want to demonstrate their devotion to the C.P.S.U. by declaring themselves 'Stalinites.' Very good. We, the Lovestoneites, will go still further than the Foster group and demand the removal of Comrade Bucharin from the Comintern. Let the Fosterites try to beat that! Let them know over there in Moscow that we Americans know how to play the stock market. The Foster group want to demonstrate their solidarity with the Comintern by demanding the carrying out of the decision of the Comintern regarding Pepper's recall. Very good. We, the Lovestoneites, will go still further and will expel Comrade Pepper from the Party. Let the Fosterites try to beat that! Let them know over there in Moscow that we Americans know how to play the stock market." (*Stalin's Speeches on the American Communist Party*, pp. 12, 13, 14)

On "Comrade" Pepper, Stalin declared:

"The action of the leaders of the majority at the Convention of the Communist Party of America, particularly on the question of Pepper, must be condemned." (*Ibid.*, p. 19)

Stalin brazenly intimated, as is seen from his words, that it was he who made and unmade leaderships in the Comintern. Parenthetically, Pepper later was given a job in the salt works

in the Soviet Union: hence the jest, Stalin put Pepper in the salt.

Stalin now proceeded rapidly with his plan. He cabled an "Address" to the American Party in which the decision of the "Comintern" was told to the membership. The leaders of both groups, Lovestone and Bittelman, were to be removed from America "to eliminate the evil of factionalism." Lovestone's lieutenants, Stachel, Bedacht, Amter, Olgin, Trachtenberg and others, immediately abandoned their discomfited chief.

Stalin changed his original plan about giving the Party to Foster when he learned that Foster had flirted with the Trotskyites. Stalin reprimanded Foster as follows:

"Did not comrade Foster know that he should have held aloof from the concealed Trotskyites that were in his group? Why, in spite of repeated warnings, did he not repudiate them at the time? Because he behaved first and foremost as a factionalist. Because in the factional fight against the Lovestone group even concealed Trotskyites might be useful to him." (*Ibid.*, p. 28)

Foster was temporarily shelved until he demonstrated full loyalty to the "Comintern." Instead, Browder, who had proved his reliability during his stay in China, was summoned from the Far East. For a while the membership was in the dark as to who was the secretary of the Party. In order to snare the rank-and-file, and disprove the Lovestoneites' assertions that the Party was being turned over to the former minority, a sort of a secretariat of three consisting, insofar as can be ascertained, of two former Lovestoneites, Bedacht and Weinstone, and a Fosterite, Browder, was set up to take charge of the Party.

Lovestone, Gitlow and Wolfe, failing to see eye to eye with Stalin and accept the "Address" were expelled from the Party by their former friends. The Party seethed with excitement. Twenty-four hours after the publication of the "Address" Lovestone had lost the entire rank-and-file support. So politically unclear were the Party members that it was sufficient for them to know that Lovestone had refused to accept the decisions of the "Comintern" to turn away from him and against him. Perfidious Lovestone was now paying for his sin of keeping the Party members in ignorance with regard to the game played by Stalin, which Lovestone could not have exposed, of course, without exposing himself.

At once the newly appointed leadership opened an "enlightenment" campaign against the former favorites of Stalin. Much truth, with an admixture of lies to cover up the rottenness of Weinstone, Stachel and the rest of Lovestone's former aides, was spilled about Lovestone.

In a paroxysm of helpless rage, Lovestone, having founded his paper *The Revolutionary Age*, spilled the secret about the "Corridor Congress":

"It was the *weakness* of the Sixth Congress that it allowed *surface* unanimity hide deep dissensions, that it did not uncover, expose and condemn the 'Corridor Congress' openly and officially." (Will Herberg, article "Sixth Congress" in the *Revolutionary Age*)

The deception and betrayal of the proletariat the Lovestoneite Herberg called "weakness." Lovestone now revealed that people who for a number of years had been his collaborators and friends, were "unprincipled" and "degenerated elements." The leakage of secrets did not stop there. It transpired that Lovestone had made ready to steal the Party. Weinstone, Stachel and Minor had prepared a list of names of Party members to whom all Party property could be safely transferred. It was the Chief's absence from America that "weakened" Stachel, for the moment in charge of the whole Party machinery, and drove him to Browder.

Of a sudden, seized with a momentary poignant remorse, Lovestone made a half-hearted confession. In an article "Crisis in the Communist International," in the *Revolutionary Age*, Vol. 1, No. 3, he wrote:

"The present unhealthy relation between the C.P.S.U. and other parties in the Comintern is not a sudden manifestation. It has been growing for some time but it now expressed itself in an acute form. All of us, at one time or another have participated in various phases of this non-Leninist activity. The campaign against Trotskyism, for example, suffered from these anti-Leninist methods, especially in its last phases."

The Lovestone leaders, the "Marxian trunk," never letting pass an occasion to swear by Lenin, thus deceiving the proletariat into the belief that they follow his teachings religiously, for reasons known to themselves and to those who understand them perfectly, "forget" to refer the workers to Lenin's Testament.

In this last word to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,

Lenin, perceiving the unmistakable symptoms of bureaucratic degeneration in Stalin, wrote:

"I propose to the comrades to find a way to remove Stalin from that position and appoint another man who in all respects differs from Stalin only in superiority—namely, more tolerant, more loyal, more civil and more considerate to comrades..."

Lovestone has always officially ignored these important words of Lenin, giving the intimation, through this disregard, that the Testament is fiction, an invention of the Trotskyites. Fortunately, the Stalin editors occasionally let huge cats out of little bags. The *Inprecorr* of November 17, 1927, published Stalin's speech delivered by him at the October plenary session of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. Among other things, Stalin remarked:

"It is said that in the 'testament' in question Lenin suggested to the Party Congress that it should deliberate on the question of replacing Stalin and appointing another comrade in his place as General Secretary of the Party. THIS IS PERFECTLY TRUE [My emphasis—G.M.]. . . . Let us read that passage . . . ' . . . I therefore suggest that the comrades should discuss the question of dismissing Comrade Stalin from this post and appointing for it another person who, in all other respects, is only distinguished from Stalin by one quality, i.e. that of being more tolerant, loyal, civil and considerate towards the comrades . . .' Yes, comrades, I am rude towards those who are rudely and disloyally destroying and disintegrating the Party." (p. 1429)

The hand-picked fawners listening to this speech cheered. And so dishonest were they that they let pass the outright lie Stalin had uttered, for clearly Lenin did not say Stalin was rude to those who were disintegrating the Party. Just the opposite—*rude to comrades*. They "failed" to notice also the remark about Stalin's *questionable loyalty*.

Lovestone's former henchman, Olgin, now a loyal Browderite, calls Lenin's Testament a Trotskyist calumny:

"This piece of Trotskyite calumny, which decries 'Stalinism' as 'rude, disloyal and bureaucratic,' reproduces what is purported to be an authentic document written by Lenin in 1923 and 'suppressed' by the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. The document is supposed to state that Trotsky is more fit to be General Secretary of the Communist Party than Stalin who is 'too rude.'" (M. J. Olgin, *Trotskyism*, p. 139)

Olgin puts the word suppressed in quotation marks to give the idea that the charge of suppression is untrue and ridiculous. Let Olgin show where and when, except in Stalin's speech at the October 1927 Plenum, was the document published in Stalinist literature, and let him explain why the document is not available to the workers in the Soviet Union.

Not a word is there in the Testament about Trotsky being more fit than Stalin for the post of General Secretary. Olgin's assertion about Lenin's Testament not being authentic is refuted by *himself* on page 140. Olgin writes:

"Stalin brought out the fact that the document was not a 'testament!' that it was a letter addressed by Lenin to the Thirteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

A *letter*, insists Olgin, not a *testament!* As if one could expect Lenin to place a heading "My Testament" over his message which happened to be the last, thus acquiring the nature of a testament, to the highest body of the Party!

It is true that Lenin's suggestion was never carried out. The conspiracy was already in operation, and Stalin's "resignation" which he "handed in" to his bureaucrats was "not accepted" by them. Trotsky, erroneously believing in the possibility of eventual peace with the Stalinists, did not insist at first on carrying out Lenin's advice. When he did, it was already too late. That Trotsky's line of fight was incorrect is readily seen from various acts of his which played directly into the hands of Stalin.

In 1925 Max Eastman published Lenin's Testament in a work *Since Lenin Died*. The Lovestone and the Foster bands raised an unspeakable howl against Eastman's "pack of lies." Many revolutionary workers were prodded by the desire for facts to read Eastman's book. Trotsky's coming out with a sharp denunciation of Eastman naturally destroyed at once the interest in Eastman's revelations. And Eastman's *Since Lenin Died* became known in the Party as "Since Eastman Lied."

Years later, Trotsky in a letter to Muralov explained that his act, unpardonable in my judgment, flowed directly from the compromising line the Opposition pursued:

"My then statement on Eastman can be understood only as an integral part of our then line toward conciliation and peace-making." (*The New Internationalist*, November 1934)

Trotsky in Alma Ata continued using his pen against the supreme bureaucrat. The popularity of and sympathy for Trotsky was vast among the workers, and the sentiment for the Opposition, from many indications, was widespread. To deprive the Opposition of its head, Stalin, through a special arrangement with the Turkish Fascist dictator, Kemal Pasha, exiled his chief opponent to Turkey.

Having wiped out the "democratic" bureaucrats with their prokulakism and timid two-year industrialization program, and removed the leader of this tendency, Bukharin, from the chairmanship of the Comintern, depriving him of all importance and prestige, Stalin turned to the heart of the matter. He had brought the whole foregoing struggle to a successful conclusion. It was now necessary to fortify the bureaucracy and speed up the process of bureaucratic penetration. By enacting decrees, essential provisions were made to legalize bureaucratic centralism and render the penetration irrevocable.

Stalin did not let his phenomenal success of establishing himself as personal dictator go to his head. He was well aware of the terrible danger from the Russian proletariat. In a vast cloud of illusion about creating Socialism in the Soviet Union within the briefest period of time, with much horn-blowing, speech-making and triumphant fanfare, he struck out with the Five-Year Plan of industrialization and collectivization. To a large extent Stalin took over Trotsky's industrialization program, with this important difference: Trotsky, guided by Lenin's formula of workers' participation in the management of industry and the State, proposed to carry it out through Workers Democracy; Stalin carried it out through his bureaucracy.

Having destroyed inner-Party democracy, Stalin, instead of the promised fight against the "vestiges" of bureaucracy, extirpated the few remnants of Workers Democracy in industry, establishing the hard and fast rule of the bureaucrat from above.

Far from foreseeing such degeneration and reaction, Lenin wrote:

"The struggle with the bureaucratic distortion of the Soviet organizations is assured by the firm bond between the Soviets and the people, in the cause of the exploited toilers, by the flexibility and elasticity of this bond. . . ."

"The more firmly we must stand now for the mercilessly firm power, for the dictatorship of individual persons for *definite processes*

of work, during specific periods of *purely executive* functions [Lenin's emphasis], the more diverse must be the forms and means of *control from below* [My emphasis—G.M.], in order to paralyze every shadow of possibility of distorting the Soviet power in order to repeatedly and tirelessly uproot the weeds of bureaucratization." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XV, pp. 223-224, Russian Edition, 1923)

Lenin criticized the delay in drawing the *entire toiling* population into the process of control and management. He voiced his dissatisfaction with the fact that Workers Democracy was not practiced to the fullest extent in the Soviet Republic:

"The Soviet apparatus in words is accessible to all toilers, in reality it is far from being so... Up to now we have not yet reached the point where the toiling masses can participate in the management." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVI, pp. 124-127, Russian Edition, 1923)

Exercising a keen vision the founder of the workers republic pointed out that:

"To struggle against the bureaucracy to the final victory will be possible only when the entire population will participate in the work of management." (*Ibid.*, p. 127)

In September 1929, Stalin's Central Committee passed a decision which marked a still sharper turn towards bureaucratization and centralization of management and of all phases of life in the Soviet Union:

"Soviet Union Communists must help to establish order and discipline in the factory. Members of the Communist Party, *union representatives and shop committees* are instructed *not to interfere in questions of management.*" (Decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, *Freiheit*, September 9, 1929. My emphasis—G.M.)

"An order that is likely to astonish many American radicals was published today by the Bolshevik Party Central Committee. It provides that Soviet factory managers must be obeyed by all workers; whatever rank these may happen to hold in the local Bolshevik Party or in their trade union section... trade unions, shop stewards' committees, etc. are curtly told to cease attempting to usurp the managerial functions... The managers are to have full powers personally to appoint and dismiss all members of the administrative and technical staff. Still more astonishing is the equal right granted to them to dismiss ordinary workers or put them on any job or transfer them to

any shop... the factory managers must receive contracts guaranteeing a long term of office, and can only be dismissed by the high industrial authority which appointed them... it also marks a further stage in the final centralization of all things here." (*The New York Times*, September 8, 1929)

The day this reactionary decree was issued by Stalin was a field-day for the Soviet bureaucracy. Management of the economic life of the Soviet Union dealt with such questions as outlay for industrialization, the share of income of the toilers, salaries of the bureaucratic strata, etc. Workers were deprived from now on of the right to remove some scoundrelly bureaucratic boss imposed and appointed from above. Instructions were "No interference with management!" To whisper now of drawing the toiling masses into management was to advocate interference with the "building of Socialism" and therefore was branded as pure counter-revolution.

Workers Democracy was cast into oblivion. The wild grass of bureaucratic distortion painstakingly cultivated by Stalin gradually grew into a dense and extensive forest of poison-wood. The tempo of industrialization and bureaucratization was speeded up to accomplish the Five-Year Plan in four years. Thus, by extending the special privileges to the bureaucratic distortion, by placing it in exclusive control and position of influence, Stalin "fought" to eradicate the bureaucratic "survivals" in the Soviet Union.

With Stalin's fiftieth birthday arriving on the heels of the great victory, the day was celebrated with a mighty outburst of feeling and jubilation. The Soviet Republic, from the Baltic to the Pacific and from the Arctic down to the Black Sea, burned with a great spiritual fire. The bureaucrats pledged unswerving allegiance to the man who was the center of respect and affection, in whose honor poets wrote songs, whom editors and orators lauded and elevated to the level of the greatest leaders of the proletariat, Marx, Engels and Lenin, to the man who carried the brunt of the fight, loyally refusing peace and compromise with the Opposition, directing the struggle to a triumphant conclusion, to the man who opened the avenue to luxuries—to the great, devoted leader and comrade, Joseph Stalin.

Pouring from all points of the compass the flood of warm congratulations converged upon the Kremlin, seat of the beloved leader. And, incidentally, in the course of the celebration, much caviar, game and champagne was consumed by the big

and bigger shots of the bureaucracy, the beneficiaries of the victory.

In the sections of the Comintern the bureaucrats, in their assorted sizes, the Browders and the Sam Dons, in the press and at meetings, sang hymns of praise to the "greatest disciple of Lenin" whose removal Lenin in his Testament—no, it was a letter—recommended to the Party.

Could the workers in the Comintern grasp what important, world-shaking changes were taking place in the Soviet Union? Absolutely not. Every key position, every post was manned by a Stalinist functionary, all avenues of information within the sections were watched over by the Browders and their Weinstones and Stachels. These people, steeped in political corruption, having learned revolutionary phrases by rote and the art of demagoguery to perfection, pulled blinkers over the mental eye of the rank-and-file. Not a single tendency in the labor movement clearly understood what was taking place in the Soviet Union. Even the Trotskyites were confused and therefore, in turn, confused others. Every step Stalin took to extend his authority over the Soviet Union and the Comintern they branded as a mistake, leaving the harmful impression that Stalin's aim was to further the interests of the proletariat.

"One of the most radically *false* [My emphasis—G.M.] steps yet taken by the Stalin-controlled Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has just been announced in a decision of its Central Committee. It deprives the Russian factory workers of one of the greatest achievements of the Bolshevik Revolution: the rights of the worker in the shops and his control of their management." (*The Militant*, October 1, 1929)

The stage that followed Stalin's inner-Party struggle for bureaucratization and centralization was designated as the "Third Period" of capitalism since the revolutionary upheavals of 1919. It was a fake Left zigzag to cover up the consolidation of the bureaucracy. A *genuine* Left turn would have been suicidal for Stalin. It would have meant a policy of curbing the bureaucracy. Without this fake Left cover, in the face of Stalin's drastically reactionary steps, the revolutionary proletariat of the workers republic would never have relinquished their October gains without a struggle. They yielded under the terrific pressure of the Stalinist concocted combination: entrapping red-hot phrases heralding the building of a Socialist society in the Soviet Union;

the frenzied outbursts against the berated and traduced Left Opposition; venomous contempt for the Bukharinites; a spurt of enthusiasm on the part of the million-headed bureaucracy who stampeded all into the new line; the economic whip over the workers, and the threat of the administrative arm of the State.

When the shops and factories were under complete control of the workers, Stalin and his plotters were unalterably opposed to planned industrialization which, under the circumstances, would have increased the proletariat numerically and strengthened Workers Democracy. Now, with an appointed Stalinist bureaucrat in every industrial unit, Stalin was for hasty industrialization, issuing the slogan "Complete the Five-Year Plan in Four Years!"

A major point in the Stalinist program was collectivization of the farms. Under normal, undistorted conditions of proletarian dictatorship the forced collectivization of peasant holdings would have been an ultra-Leftist measure. Under Stalin it was part of the general Rightward course, *the extension of the bureaucratic base in the village.*

The Stalinists told the Soviet worker, whose mind by now was in a tangle, that just as Stalin had foreseen, the world revolution was taking a rapid stride forward. Throughout the capitalist world, the bureaucrats asserted, there was widespread radicalization and "an unprecedented revolutionary upsurge" developing into the seizure of power by the proletariat. The Communist Parties were directing the mighty tide towards the world revolution, giving the "lie" to Trotskyist assertions that Stalin's policies, in practice, meant the abandonment of the struggle for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie.

Since in reality no "widespread, general radicalization" and no "unprecedented revolutionary upsurge" was taking place, the petty-bourgeois refuse in control of the sections of the Comintern, proceeded to manufacture an upsurge. To the flunkies who sold their conscience to Stalin for political jobs, it was immaterial what sort of smoke screen, ultra-Left or ultra-Right, to lay before the proletariat. Their positions as "leaders" would not be impaired. They now madly flew in the face of facts. The Communist Parties were ordered to go on a rampage. "Capture of the streets" was the aim. The Sam Nessins went berserk. Adventurous demonstrations accompanied with wild scraps with the police were staged; the pictures of "battles" and "in-

surrections" were promptly sent to the Stalinist editors in the Soviet Union to drug the Russian workers. Newsreels in Moscow were exhibiting the "revolutionary upsurge" in the capitalist world. In their zeal to make their fabrications look real and impressive, the Stalinists added to their stories and pictures of uprisings and anti-capitalist terror some photographs showing havoc and destruction. To give an example: On Broadway in New York City, in the Spring of 1930, there occurred a sewer gas explosion. To lay new pipes the street was torn up for a couple of blocks by the City Water Supply, Gas and Electricity Department. The Stalinist magazine *Stroika*, May 25, 1930, reproduced the picture of the gas-pipe explosion with the following "Third Period" information:

"BOMBING ON BROADWAY

"In the bosom of the 'great American democracy' there is seething a profound social unrest. It breaks out into the open at one time in the shape of strikes and demonstrations, at another in individual terrorist acts, the authors of which are seldom discovered. To illustrate, at the end of April on Broadway, the main street of New York, fifteen bombs exploded in one day, causing tremendous damages. The picture shows Broadway after the explosion."

Such fraudulent manipulations were needed to lull the workers' vigilance, dispel their doubts and suspicions, gain time and tighten the power in Stalin's hands. Realizing that no political party or group in the labor movement would participate in the antics of the Stalinist "Third Period," faced with the need to exclude any possible danger of criticism within and close to the Comintern, which was going through the last stage of bureaucratic centralization, Stalin had to apply different theories and new tactics. All opponents within the proletariat, the Social Democracy, reformist trade unions, the Left Opposition and the Brandler-Lovestone autonomists, were designated as "social-fascists." A new tactic of united front was introduced, "United front from below only," which kept all non-Stalinist organizations out of the "united front," forming a protective moat around the Comintern.

Under the impression of the "Left" swing, the noisy assurances of the coming of Socialism in two five-year plans and the visible approach of the world revolution, the workers were duped. Stalin succeeded in preventing the growth of opposition in capitalist

countries; and in the Soviet Union thousands of Oppositionists, propagandized and starved, capitulated to Stalin. This was accomplished so much the easier because many outstanding leaders of the Opposition, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others, submitting to Stalin much earlier, had taken the steel out of their followers. The breaking up of the Opposition ranks was enormously facilitated by a reversed attitude of some former Oppositionists, who, like Karl Radek, to gain confidence and reward from the master, snapped savagely at Trotsky.

In the cold mausoleum in the Red Square, Workers Democracy lay strangled beside the mute remains of the man who had championed its cause. The bureaucratic distortion, centralized by Stalin, aided in its sweeping conquest by the inexorable law of momentum, now firmly saddled the workers republic politically and economically. The days of utter uncertainty, days of grave anxiety were over. Under the double stimulus—position of authority and economic well-being—the bureaucracy set out to build "Socialism," to reap the harvest sown by the October Revolution. The new labels for Stalin stuck. A new language was being developed—a mixture of phrases from Marx, Engels, Lenin and *Stalin*. Articles and speeches, colored with poetic regard for the proletariat, were pitched in a high key. Disparity between words and deeds widened daily. The surface zigzags, before to the Right, now to the Left, concealed the fundamental, general, and steady departure from *Marxism*, Stalin's main drift to the Right, *always to the Right*.

The Comintern was transformed into a network of outposts in charge of commandants—the Browders—covering the capitalist world, performing a double function for the Stalinist bureaucracy. One of these functions is to put out the searchlight of Marxism. The other is to serve as a bargaining card in Stalin's deals with the world imperialists.

As to the Communist workers, they followed the lead of Stalin and his adulators—Browder and a host of other choice blooms. They knew, instead of an elucidation of the intra-Party struggle in the Soviet Union, a torrent of stinging abuse and base accusations directed against Trotsky and the Left Opposition. Not conversant with the bureaucratic dislocation of the workers republic, drugged with Red phrases, they continued to repose their faith in the faithless leaders, trusting without fear or misgiving.

THE BETRAYAL OF THE GERMAN PROLETARIAT

THE years 1930, 1931 and the first half of 1932 were marked with phenomenal growth of the Nazi forces. The apex was reached in the July 1932 elections, following which the line of Fascist development curved sharply downward. Nazi meetings began to lose their wonted animation. The masses of the destitute petty-bourgeoisie and some backward workers, hitherto captivated by the fervor of Fascist eloquence, showed signs of apathy. In the November 1932 contest Hitler lost two million votes. By December six hundred leading Nazis had left the party. Gregor Straesser, Hitler's organizer, resigned. Fascism was crumbling.

The Communist Party, on the other hand, marked a substantial increase of influence. The July 1932 elections showed an upward trend and in the November ballot, with the Socialist Party barely holding its own, the Communist Party gained a million votes. The Communist representation in the Reichstag went up from 54 to 78, and in November 1932 jumped to one hundred. Despite the persecution by the Bruening government and the ever-growing Nazi terrorism, the masses made a definite turn towards Communism, an indication that the tension between the classes was approaching the breaking point.

At this supremely critical moment, had the Leninist line and leadership continued in the Communist International, the Executive of the Comintern would have acted swiftly and decisively. An emergency congress would have been immediately convened. The best Marxian brains in the International would have worked out plans for an offensive against the German bourgeoisie. A united front with the Second International and all anti-Fascist groups for a concerted action against the Nazis would have been proposed, and a flaming manifesto issued to the world

proletariat to support their German brothers in this crucial hour. The French workers would have shaken France from one end to the other, openly warning the French imperialists against intervention when the German workers seized power. The Austrian, Polish and Czechoslovak workers would have been ready to make supreme sacrifices to prevent an attack against the German revolution. In the important centers of the first workers republic a mighty show of military force would have been made, hurling defiance into the teeth of the bourgeois ambassadors, with the deafening cry of the Red Army soldiers: Do not dare invade Soviet Germany! The Soviet masses would have been mobilized in monster demonstrations, voicing solidarity with the German proletariat, imbuing it with the Bolshevik spirit of self-reliance and sacrifice, urging it to transform the disintegration of Hitler's forces into a rout, and march forward to power, to plant the Red Flag of proletarian revolution over the miserable debris of the Weimar Republic.

The very opposite course was pursued by Stalin. During Lenin's time in three and a half years, from 1919 to 1922, the Communist International held *four* congresses. Under Stalin, at the time of the great crisis in Germany, the Comintern could boast of only *two* congresses in *eleven years!* And these two congresses were organized to facilitate the concentration of power in the hands of Stalin. Yet, although five years had passed with no congress, not a word was issued by the Stalin executive calling for such a conclave. At this crucial moment in the life of the German and world proletariat, Stalin and his Argus-eyed servitors preserved an unbroken, mysterious silence.

Walter Duranty, whom the Stalinist flunkies in America and elsewhere quote whenever he reports increase in production in the Soviet Union or growth of Stalin's popularity but pass over in silence certain uncomfortable items in his dispatches, cabled a startling piece of news from Moscow when the German Communist Party showed the rapid increase of votes and influence. He reported a "strange paradox—that the Bolshevik Kremlin today regards the growth of the revolutionary movement in Europe with real anxiety" (*The New York Times*, November 20, 1932).

Three days later the editors of the *Times* commented:

"In Moscow, writes Mr. Duranty, there is one menace which is feared above all others, and it is the outbreak of a revolution in Ger-

many or elsewhere in Europe. This is a far cry from the time when Lenin staged the Bolshevist revolution in Russia, not because he was interested in Russia but because he wished to set Western Europe on fire. Today Stalin does not want to set anything on fire. He wants to be let alone to build Socialism in Russia. *He is afraid of revolution abroad*, even if it comes without Soviet aid." (My emphasis—G.M.)

On January 30, 1933, Hindenburg appointed Hitler chancellor. Piatnitsky, Kuusinen, Bela Kun, Manuilsky, Knorin and other members of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, all able speakers and writers, uttered not a syllable. Not a statement on Germany came from the people calling themselves "The Staff of the World Revolution." Again Walter Duranty cabled strange words. On February 2, the subheadline over his dispatch read, "Soviet is silent on Hitler government but seems not to view it as an entire evil." His cablegram contained the following: "It is significant that not a single word of comment on the Hitler cabinet has appeared in the Soviet press."

Indeed it was significant. Stressing local problems, thousands of articles appeared in the Stalinist press. Numerous meetings and parades were held by Stalin periodically in the Soviet Union, before and after Hitler's accession to power. When the Moscow subway opened, columns, pages in the press in the Soviet Union were devoted to this event. The Stalin machine organized mass meetings and a parade of half a million workers in Moscow. But when Hitler, elevated to power by German capitalism, was making ready to wipe out in blood the flower of the international working class, not a word of comment appeared in the Soviet press! Up to this very day there has been no analysis of the colossal defeat in Germany or a brief article of comment by the "greatest disciple of Lenin" and the "leader of the world proletariat." The *Daily Worker* gave prominence to news of local character, shoving the reports about the gruesome tragedy in Germany into the background; and to allay the alarm of the workers, it occasionally ran an article with a reassuring note.

For the moment it was not clear to me why Stalin feared revolution in Germany, as his action plainly indicated. But there is always a reason for an apparently inexplicable occurrence. The key to the cipher was to be found in Lenin.

In Chapter I of the pamphlet *Left Communism an Infantile Disorder*, Lenin points out that:

"... after the proletarian revolution in at least one of the advanced countries things will in all probability take a sharp turn: Russia will cease to be the model, and will become again the backward—in the Soviet and Socialist sense—country."

In 1919 Lenin said:

"For Soviet Republics, in higher cultural stages, whose proletariat has far higher working possibilities, there exists every possibility for shoving Russia aside when they once establish a workingclass government."

Pointing out that Moscow was only a temporary center of proletarian revolution, Lenin hinted that with the overthrow of the bourgeoisie in Western Europe, Berlin, in all probability, would be the future seat of the Communist International.

In 1917 Lenin explained that the Russian proletariat would be for only a brief period of time in the van of the world proletariat:

"It is not its special qualities but rather the special coincidence of historical circumstances that has made the proletariat of Russia for a certain, perhaps very short time, the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world." (Lenin, *Farewell Letter to the Swiss Workers*)

To Stalin who is well familiar with Lenin's writings the import of these weighty statements was brought home sharply. It was the "warning" of a Marxist master-mind whose force of analysis he knew well. Stalin is, of course, always conscious of the stupendous difference between himself and Lenin. The great founder of Bolshevism and of the Soviet Republic won his leadership, prestige and love of the masses by dint of his enormous Marxist intellect, his self-abandon and loyalty to the cause of the oppressed; Stalin enjoyed the love of only the bureaucracy because of his *disloyalty* to the cause of the masses. Lenin was entrusted with power by the workers and he never abused it. He always honestly adhered to and strengthened democratic centralism, the basic tenet of Bolshevism. Stalin, on the other hand, pushed his way to the seat of absolute personal power through the medium of a craftily built-up apparatus which carried out within the Party and all Soviet institutions a ruthless war of suppression and annihilation. Had Stalin not utilized his strategic post of General Secretary to organize his legions

of lickspittles and bureaucratic whips to crush all opposition which included men superior to him in Marxism, where would he be now? He would hardly hold a post equal in importance to the one which would be occupied by Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, or Bucharin. Workers in the capitalist countries had made their choice of the Comintern and Lenin's leadership *voluntarily* and *intelligently*. Stalin superimposed himself as the leader of the Comintern by deceiving the vanguard through vile machinations and artful plots, playing self-seeking charlatans one against the other.

Stalin had seen the proletarian revolution in Russia. He visualized what revolution in Germany would look like. Workers in a revolution throw off all restrictions, and control is in the hands of those who have been crushed and stifled for decades. *No bureaucracy exists during the revolution.* The bureaucratic development is a process requiring time. *Stalinization* of the bureaucracy, i.e., its formation into an organized body with the main wires leading to the supreme bureaucrat in the center, is a stage that can be completed only after a long and furious fight against democratic centralism. Some myopic bureaucrats in the German Party doubtless had the illusion that they would ride into power, unaware that Stalin's interests did not allow the extension of the October revolution. Stalin knew through personal experience that a bureaucratic pyramid could be erected only after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie *in a backward country*, with the proletarian revolution *defeated outside*, following a long, strenuous, skillful struggle against *Workers Democracy*.

Stalin could not hope to extend his bureaucratic sway over the mighty burst of all fetters by the powerful German working class. He sensed the danger that his own stranglehold upon the Russian masses would have been broken. On the other hand, Fascist reaction in Germany would have automatically strengthened Stalin's personal dictatorship in the Soviet Union. Fascism, therefore, was viewed in Moscow not as an entire evil. To be more precise, Stalin viewed it as a lesser evil, not immediately and directly imperilling his rule.

Stalin grasped the terrible threat the German revolution held for the bureaucratic centralization of the first workers State. A Soviet revolution in Germany would have rolled over into Poland, Austria and other countries, transforming Central and Eastern Europe into a turbulent Red sea. Germany, the most

industrialized country in Europe, would have become the leading center of the world revolution, with the liberated German proletariat not particularly interested in submitting to a self-appointed leader in backward—in the Soviet sense—Russia. The Russian proletariat would have put the bureaucracy again under its thumb. The Stalinist pyramid would have crashed to the ground.

There was no doubt in the minds of the Stalinites that the defeat of the *declining* Fascist movement in Germany would have freed tremendous revolutionary forces in Central Europe:

“... the mighty historic mission of the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. today is to build Socialism in one, single country, the German worker today is confronted with another mighty historic task—to demolish fascist dictatorship in Germany, *which would mean the victory of the proletarian revolution throughout Central Europe.*” (*Germany—Hitler or Lenin*, p. 4, reprinted from No. 7, *The Communist International*, Workers Library Publishers. My emphasis—G.M.)

Not only Central Europe but very likely Spain, Italy and the Balkan States would have been drawn into the revolutionary vortex. The props would have been knocked out from under Stalin and his gang. Stalin saw it perhaps clearer than all his subordinates:

“The German question, next to the Russian question, is of the greatest importance. Firstly, this is because Germany is nearer to revolution than any other country in Europe, and secondly, because the victory of the revolution in Germany signifies its victory throughout Europe. . . . Only Germany will be able to take the initiative in this matter. The victory of the revolution in Germany will guarantee the victory of the International revolution.” (From Stalin's speech at the Polish Commission of the Comintern, 1924, quoted in *The Communist International*, October 1932, p. 655)

Two roads were open to Stalin. To restore the Leninist Comintern, to unwind the chain of his betrayals, to surrender and face the revolutionary tribunal of the proletariat; or to continue along the road of treachery. History knows what road Stalin preferred. The proletarian revolution in Germany might have come without Soviet aid; it, therefore, had to be prevented with Stalin's aid. To preserve the stability of his bureaucratic pyramid, the movement in Germany had to be disrupted at all costs, even of having Hitler in power. It would take Hitler a few years

to remilitarize Germany; Stalin meanwhile would push onward the arming of the Soviet Union. Hitler could be held in check through maneuvers with France, England and other bourgeois countries. Of course, the disruption of proletarian revolution in Germany, a ghastly crime of enormous dimensions, could be perpetrated with only the greatest of skill, so as not to arouse the suspicions of the German and the world proletariat.

The German crisis occurred when Stalin and his Browders were carrying through their "Third Period." To have made any change in policy would have been disastrous for the structure Stalin was completing within the Soviet Union. "Social-fascism," "the united front from below only" had to stand, had to be utilized in the scheme to stop the German proletariat.

A comprehensive and authentic record of the manner in which the fiendish piece of work was accomplished was discovered in the speeches and articles of the noted Stalinist leaders themselves. The preparation and carrying out of the most extraordinary breach of trust in the history of betrayals, is graphically depicted in their writings which comprise the incontrovertible documentary evidence, the factual record which proves the charge.

To begin with:

"From the middle of 1930, during the whole of 1931 and to the middle of 1932 the Presidium, the Political Secretariat and the Political Commission concerned themselves more with the problems of the C. P. of France than with those of any other section of the Comintern." (O. Piatnitsky, *The Work of the Communist Parties of France and Germany*, p. 3)

Monstrous, yet true! To divert the attention of the Communist workers in all countries *including* Germany, the Piatnitskys and Browders trumpeted everywhere that France was approaching a revolutionary situation. This at the time when the whole world with bated breath watched the rapid concentration of the Hitler forces and the steady growth of the political crisis which would resolve itself in either Fascist or proletarian rule.

In Germany itself Stalin could not very well ignore the rapidly developing situation. To those who were not standing in immediate proximity to the Stalinist interests, the policy Stalin executed in Germany was the height of absurdity. It was, however, a clever scheme of confusion, sabotage and disruption, very

skillfully carried out by the Piatnitskys. At times the German puppets balked at some too obviously disruptive move, but were bent by the higher-ups in the "Comintern" to carry out the orders. The temporary refusal on the part of the leaders of the German Party to support Hitler's referendum to oust the Socialist government of Prussia is one instance. Speaking of this occurrence, Piatnitsky says:

"You know, for example, that the leadership of the Party opposed taking part in the referendum on the dissolution of the Prussian Landtag. A number of the Party newspapers published leading articles opposing participation in that referendum. But when the Central Committee of the Party jointly with the Comintern arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary to take an active part in the referendum, the German comrades, in the course of a few days, roused the whole Party." (*Ibid.*, pp. 24-25)

This tactic, inconsistent with the plain dictates of common sense, the Stalinists explained as follows:

"Failure to participate in the referendum would signify that the Communists support the present reactionary Landtag." (*Pravda*, July 24, 1931)

One must keep in mind the capital fact that the leadership of the German Communist Party was not a free agent. Having gone through the process of bureaucratic centralization it now was completely subservient to Stalin. The miserable menials in the Central Committee of the German Party had to carry out the line of the "Comintern" or suffer the fate of Lovestone, Brandler, Jilek, Ruth Fisher and other "smart Alecks."

Thus the millions of Communist workers were ordered by the German Browders to march to the polls on August 9, 1931, and side by side with brown-shirted Nazis cast a vote for Hitler's proposition, which was now labelled by the Stalinists "Red Referendum." The referendum, the chief slogan of which was "Away With Marxism," was supported also by the reactionary agrarians and the Stalhelm Fascists. It failed to gather the needed number of votes due very likely to the "sabotage" of the Communist workers. The Fascist rule was postponed for a year and a half.

Speaking of the results of the Nazi-Communist vote, *Pravda* called it "the greatest blow of all that the working class has yet dealt the Social Democracy" (August 12, 1931).

To still further confuse the German workers and at the same time make a big show of votes, the Communist platform of *proletarian revolution*, already considerably diluted with Stalinism, was cast overboard, and substituted with a "brownish" program of *national* and social emancipation. Said Piatnitsky at the Twelfth Plenum: "Had not our Party, with the assistance of the E.C.C.I. proclaimed its program of national and social emancipation, it would not have received so many votes..."

Once the Party was put upon nationalist rails it began to show here and there a touch of anti-Semitism. A Communist Party member, Scheringer, a former Fascist, wrote a pamphlet published by the Stalinists in which he declared that there were no Jews in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany. Willi Muenzenberg, editor of the Communist daily, *Welt am Abend*, in the August 4, 1931 issue assured the readers that "On the editorial board of the *Welt am Abend* there is today not one single Jew."

The Stalinist defense organization refused to give assistance to members of any other organization even though they were persecuted by the bourgeoisie. To cite an example: Werner Jurr, a leading member of the Brandlerite youth group, for anti-capitalist speeches and articles was sentenced by the Federal Court at Leipzig to a prison term. The Brandlerites approached the Stalinist Rote Hilfe for aid. The district secretary of the Rote Hilfe of East Prussia, rebuked them with the remark "Jurr is a social-fascist. We have no interest in such people. Let him rot in jail" (Quoted in *Revolutionary Age*, March 1, 1930).

The "Third Period" was extended into all fields of the labor movement including the trade unions. The Stalinist disrupters separated the German Communist workers from the huge non-Communist masses, leaving the latter to the reactionaries. The reformist trade unions were declared to be hopeless, under the control of the "social-fascists."

This "strange" move on the part of the "Comintern" revising Lenin's teaching on the folly of building Red unions was welcomed by the Socialist leaders:

"We note with satisfaction that the commanders in chief of the Communist trade union troops have completely maintained the orders issued a year ago. . . . The new 'line' leads to the cleansing of the trade unions from the Communist slogan-smiths. This is all we could hope for." (*Vorwärts*, Berlin, January 5, 1930)

The wide-eyed Communist workers were told that such a separation did not mean the abandonment of the Socialist workers to the reformist leaders. Red trade union oppositions were set up. The Leftward-moving workers quite often gave majorities to these Communist oppositions. One would think that to be consistent the Communists would pull in the direction of Red unions. But no, the opposition took up exactly the same position as the reformists, holding *back* the development towards the Red unions, keeping the proletariat divided:

"The trade union oppositions in the reformist trade unions frequently succeed in gaining a majority in the local branches of the different reformist trade unions. But the Communist Parties and the trade union oppositions do not convert these into strongholds from which to extend their influence over the other branches of the same unions or over branches of other trade unions which are affiliated to the same local trades councils. This can only be explained by the fact that the opposition branches not infrequently take up the same position as reformist trade unions." (O. Piatnitsky, *Bolshevization of the Communist Parties*, p. 50)

Since the sabotage of the Stalinites in the trade unions was too obvious it required some sort of show of reproach and criticism. This was readily supplied by Piatnitsky himself. "The work in the reformist Unions is scandalously neglected" (O. Piatnitsky, *Work of the Communist Parties of France and Germany*, p. 34). "Work" in the reformist unions in actuality was an attempt to break them up. Some Party functionaries in Germany openly raised the cry "Destroy the reformist trade union!" This aroused the intense hatred of Socialist workers and jarred the ears even of the most loyal, the most unintelligent members of the Stalinist Party. The impropriety of such slogans was recognized and criticized by the leaders of the Comintern although the aim was confirmed.

"There is no need to shout from the housetops 'destroy the unions' as was done in Germany. But that we want to break up the reformist unions, that we want to wrest from them the workers, that we want to explode the trade union apparatus and to destroy it—*of that there cannot be the slightest doubt.*" (Red International Labor Union Plenum, February 15, 1932, speech by Lozovsky. My emphasis—G.M.)

Guidance and assistance was systematically withheld from the lower functionaries. Those workers who sincerely and whole-

heartedly tried to transform Communist talk into action and thus win the confidence of workers were brutally persecuted by the petty flunkeys. At times the persecution went as far as to drive the honest Communist workers out of the Party and help the capitalists to fire them out of their jobs. Many non-Party workers, as a result, were forced into the Fascist ranks. Piatnitsky relates this in the vein of criticism:

"The carrying out of the decisions about work in the factories was started with a great fuss, and very soon all this talk petered out. Meanwhile, the members of the Red factory councils were left to shift for themselves without any guidance. In the Plenum materials you will find the report of a working woman who is still employed in the Visag works. At Visag's there are five Reds on the factory council, and six or seven reformists. This working woman tells a terrible story of how these members of the factory council (both reformists and our members) persecuted her—also a member of the council—for carrying out the line of the Party. [That is, for taking talk seriously—G.M.] They transferred her from department to department, and spread the devil knows what sort of rumours about her to discredit her and destroy the influence she had in the factory. She had acquired this influence by putting forward demands for towels, soap, overalls and things of that kind (Visag is a chemical works). The result was that these 'Reds' on the factory council so discredited our Party, *that the workers went over to the Nazis.*" (O. Piatnitsky, *The Work of the Communist Parties of France and Germany*, pp. 33-34. My emphasis—G.M.)

One might imagine that persecution of that kind was limited to an isolated case or two. From what Piatnitsky says further, on page 34, it is clear that this vicious Stalinist practice was widespread throughout the big factories in Germany:

"Do you think this is an isolated case? *In very many cases* our members of factory councils vote with the reformists *in favour of discharging workers.*" (My emphasis—G.M.)

Did Piatnitsky demand that such saboteurs and scoundrels be immediately driven out of the Communist movement? Did he call them the names the Stalinists apply to the Trotskyites, Lovestoneites and workers generally who dare to criticize their line? No, he did not. This obstructor of the Communist cause in Germany, in his "criticism" used the soft, mild, almost friendly phrase "disassociate ourselves" from these Reds in words but agents of the Nazis in practice. His positive contribution was the pla-

tonic advice to "help" those who were in earnest about Party work:

"Would it not have been better to reorganize these 'Red' factory councils, *disassociate ourselves* from those who had obviously become reformists, and to *help* those that were really trying to do something instead of making all the noise and fuss? (*Ibid.* My emphasis—G.M.)

The Communist workers suffered defeats in factories, primarily due to the consistent and persistent opportunist activity of the Stalinist Red factory councils:

"Comrades explain our defeats in a large number of big works by the *passivity* and *opportunism* displayed in *practice* by the Red Factory Councils, and this is *undoubtedly true.*" (O. Piatnitsky, *World Communists in Action*, p. 30. My emphasis—G.M.)

The German workers began to observe that the Communist Party in *words* had the appearance of being Communist, but in *deeds* was opportunist, not different from the Social Democracy!

"Now the workers say: The programme and tactics of the C. P. of Germany are all right, but in its practical work it does not differ from the reformist party." (O. Piatnitsky, *The Work of the Communist Parties of France and Germany*, p. 34)

"I can quite imagine the feeling of non-party, unorganized workers, or even workers who have recently been in the S. D. party but are not yet contaminated by the social-democratic poison, and who have decided to abandon their old party and go over to the Communists, who, in their opinion, have a better policy. But on arriving in our Party, they find that there is little difference between us and the social-democrats, both in the sphere of practical policy and in the work of the lower C.P. organs. There is the same practical opportunism. . . . The most glaring examples of practical opportunism in the factories are to be observed in the work of the red factory committees." (Gussev's speech in the German Commission of the Enlarged Presidium, E.C.C.I., *The Communist International*, Vol. VII, No. 4, p. 141)

But to say that the Stalinist "Party" was steeped in opportunism would be putting it mildly. It was corroded with the baneful anti-workingclass acid:

"At many of these works the Red factory shop committees *gave their consent to dismissals of workers.* What stunning effect this had

on the workers is seen from the results of the elections of the factory shop committees this year at the *twenty* big factories referred to above.

"The result of this most pernicious *carelessness* and *passivity*, disguised as a 'Left' 'revolutionary' phraseology, of bad control and incompetent leadership on the part of many Party organizations was not only that social-fascism still succeeded—we hope not for long—to hold its position in a number of big factories but that the *Fascists* became even STRONGER in these same places. . . ." (O. Piatnitsky, *World Communists in Action*, p. 41. My emphasis—G.M.)

This direct sabotage which played into the hands of the Fascists, this open assistance rendered to the capitalists by the "revolutionary" flunkeys in dismissing workers who took the idea of class struggle seriously, the "Bolshevik" leader, Piatnitsky, calls "carelessness" and "passivity." He reveals that the Communist *Party cells*, completely paralyzed by the leadership, did not even stir to oppose such vicious practice:

"Unfortunately, there have been quite a few cases where Red factory committees and sections of Red trade unions *agreed to wage reductions* and the *discharge of workers*, that is, acted in this regard just as the reformists do, while the Party factory cells, owing to their inactivity, *did not repudiate* these acts of the Red factory committees or sections of Red trade unions." (O. Piatnitsky, *The World Economic Crisis*, p. 87. My emphasis—G.M.)

While the Stalinist Red factory committees terrorized the honest Communists and helped the bourgeoisie ferret these workers out of the factories, the workers supporting the Fascists received jobs and privileges. The whole thing worked out ideally for the bourgeoisie and its Fascist tools.

"The members of the fascist organizations get work easier, are less frequently dismissed, have certain prospects of foreman's jobs, apparent privileges, etc." (F. Heckert, *The Communist International*, Vol. VII, No. 8, p. 74.)

Piatnitsky, director of the Stalinist sabotage in Germany, fully apprised as to the progress of this work, declared with the most brazen, cynical air that the causes of loss of ground should be investigated!

"It is necessary to carry out not in words, but in deeds systematically and resolutely the following measures . . .

"1. To *investigate* the causes of loss of ground at the big factories in the reformist trade unions of Germany, the causes of the weak

growth of Red trade unions, of the decline of Party membership. . . ." (O. Piatnitsky, *World Communists in Action*, p. 60. My emphasis—G.M.)

"Criticism" by the members of the Presidium of the Executive of the "Comintern" *had to coincide with reality* which was known to the members of the "Communist Party" of Germany. In that manner the impression was created in the heads of the Communist workers that the leadership of the Comintern was not hiding the truth of the situation, but was criticizing with a view to eradicating the wrong policies and tactics.

The vicious sabotage went on up to and even beyond the point when the Fascists took power in Germany. So well did the Stalinist Red factory committees and the Red trade union opposition carry on the obstruction, running counter to the workers' drift towards Communism, that the influence of the Party in the factories progressively declined, and was finally reduced to insignificance. The disheartened, embittered, hopelessly confused German workers, meeting a persistent sabotage from the "Communists" and criminal passivity from the Social Democrats, yielded to the "Socialist" demagoguery of the Nazis. One would think that at least some sham campaign would be carried on by the "Reds" in the factories to prevent this tragedy. Nothing of the kind:

"At the time of the fascist coup the influence of the Communist Party in the factories was insignificant, and a section of the workers who feared dismissal began to join the fascist factory organizations, and *were not restrained* from doing this by the Communists and the members of the Red trade union opposition." (O. Piatnitsky, *The Communist Parties in the Fight for the Masses*, p. 73. My emphasis—G.M.)

The fluctuation in membership in the Stalinist "Party" during 1930, 1931 and 1932, assumed colossal proportions, particularly among workers in the factories. There was an absolute decrease in the number of Party members recruited among those at work:

"While the number of members grows, fluctuation is growing, too. The Communist Party of Germany loses, as a rule, one half of the number of its new members. . . .

"The largest part of the members of our Parties are at the present time unemployed, so that the number of members who are employed is steadily undergoing a relative decrease, while *in Germany* it is actually undergoing an *absolute decrease*." (Kuusinen, *Prepare for Power*, p. 107. My emphasis—G.M.)

The Stalinist policies facilitated the Nazi penetration among the unemployed:

"To be sure, the Hitler Party has also penetrated into the ranks of the proletariat—*above all amongst the unemployed* and certain backward sections." (Ernst Thaelmann, *Labour Monthly*, September 1932, p. 584. My emphasis—G.M.)

The Social Democracy and all other opportunist forces within the German working class did their share in holding the proletariat back from the march upon its class enemy. But it was the Communist vanguard, under the control and direction of the Stalinist puppets guided by the "general staff" in Moscow, that performed the *main work* of paralyzing the proletariat, of driving hundreds of thousands of hungry workers into the Nazi trap:

"The Communist vanguard must primarily be held responsible for the fact that the National Socialists have been able to induce hundreds of thousands of hungry unemployed workers to join their 'storm battalions.'" (*The Communist International*, August 15, 1932, p. 496)

Tens of thousands of disappointed, disheartened young workers left the Socialist-controlled reformist trade unions due to the passivity of these organizations. By the policies of the Young Communist League, by its bureaucracy, its fakery and open sabotage, they were driven into the Nazi camp:

"The young workers are *looking forward to struggle and activity*, and are leaving the reformist trade unions. In the course of the last one and a half years, 120,000 young workers left the ranks of the A.D.G.B. Where did they go? *They did not join the Young Communist League*. Owing to a lagging behind [! G.M.] of the Y.C.L. in this respect *there can be no doubt* that a considerable section of these young workers *joined the National Socialists*." (*Ibid.* My emphasis—G.M.)

The Socialist trade-union bureaucrats had neither a revolutionary nor the Stalinist opposition to contend with. The demagogical and physical fight of the Fascists against the striking workers was allowed by the Stalinist leadership to go on *entirely unopposed*. Stalinist sabotage was at its worst when the struggle of the workers against the bourgeoisie was at its sharpest:

"It may be confidently stated that had active groups existed within the Reformist Miners' Union during the preparation for the October

strike we would have been able to capture a number of union meetings called to disrupt the struggle. We would have been able to lead to the struggle most of the 60 mines in which the workers hesitated to join the strike and where the decisive word was uttered by the Reformist factory-committee members. During the January movement of 1932, when the Reformist workers were in a state of the greatest indignation, it became particularly apparent that the absence of work within the Reformist union facilitates the trade-union bureaucracy in all their maneuvers.

"In the Christian union work had never been conducted and the position remains unchanged to this day.

"The Party and the Red Trade-Union Opposition almost completely ignored the activity of the Fascists during these strikes. During the January strike of 1931 the Fascist leadership organized shock detachments against the strikers; during the October strike the Regional Committee of the National Socialist Party (Fascists) openly agitated against the strike. The C.P. of Germany did not react to this in any way." (S. Perevoznikov, *The Communist International*, July 1932, p. 407)

Members of the German "Party" were warned by the E.C.C.I. against criticizing the leadership which faithfully carried out Stalin's line of rendering the proletariat impotent. Expulsion, vituperation, blacklisting and ostracism were the punishments meted out to those who dared to raise a voice of protest against the obviously defeatist policies of the Party:

"But the Comintern will certainly set its foot down upon undermining criticism against the Party leadership. The E.C.C.I. supports the present leadership of the Communist Party of Germany." (Kuusinen, *Prepare for Power*, p. 148)

The "Party" was thus put into a mental and disciplinary strait-jacket in order to allow the leaders to carry on their devastating work without interference from below. The German masses showing a decisive trend towards Communism despite the vicious disruption and sabotage, one can conceive what sweep the Communist Party would have made if *correct* policies had been introduced. The German Communist Party was an immense organization, at one time numbering 300,000 members, much bigger than the Bolshevik Party ever was prior to or immediately after the October Revolution.

"In Germany we have 38 Party dailies. If all of these 38 daily newspapers had good and proper leadership they could exercise much greater

influence upon the masses of the workers than they do at present. Remember that from 1912 to 1914 the Bolshevik Party had only one legal daily, *Pravda*. And what miracles *Pravda* performed in Russia in those days!" (O. Piatnitsky, *Bolshevization of the Communist Parties*, p. 14)

No, the Stalinist puppets in charge of the German Communist Party were not Bolsheviks, and they were placed at the head of the Party not for the purpose of performing miracles for the working class. Their duty was to carry on service for the Stalinist bureaucracy.

The Stalinist bureaucrats fanned intense hatred among Communist workers toward Socialist workers who were nicknamed "Zoergiebels," after the bloody Social-Democratic Berlin Chief of Police. This was cultivated even among the Communist children. In a Stalinist publication, *Die Trommel*, at the end of 1929, the slogan was advanced: "Beat the smallest Zoergiebels out of the schools and playgrounds!"

Socialist workers were branded as *strikebreakers!*

"In the election of committees of action in the case of lockouts and of strike committees and other organs of struggle, *all persons connected with Social Democracy* and the trade union bureaucracy are to be rejected on the grounds that they are strikebreakers." (Decision of the Strassburg Conference, 1929. My emphasis—G.M.)

It was not an easy matter to implant in the heads of the Communist workers the newfangled perverted notion about Social Democracy:

"The fact that, in connection with the fascist tendency, which is at the very basis of decaying monopolistic capitalism itself, the social-democratic has been transformed into a social-fascist party, has with difficulty penetrated into the consciousness of our parties." (A. Martinov, *The Communist International*, Vol. VII, No. 2-3, p. 67)

Since the theory of "social-fascism" tended to repel the Socialist workers from their Communist brothers, it played into the hands of the reactionary leadership of the Socialist Party and the reformist trade unions. The Socialist and trade union leaders strenuously opposed a united front of all workingclass organizations. Remembering the lessons of the Russian revolution when Lenin had exposed their Russian counterparts, the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, as agents of the bour-

geoisie, the German Socialist leaders feared exposure and were always apprehensive lest the proletariat sweep away Fascism together with capitalism and the Social Democracy. The immediate danger of Fascism, however, stirred the proletarian instinct in the German working class as a whole, impelling the rank-and-file and the lower functionaries of both the Socialist and the Communist Parties toward each other in united action against Hitler.

To meet this ominous situation the shrewd guardians of Stalinism worked their post-Leninist, anti-Marxist invention: *United front from below only*.

Piatnitsky tells something of this tactic:

"The united front. How is that established? On the streets. Owing to the fact that the 'Nazis' indiscriminately beat Communists, Social-Democrats, reformists and even non-party workers, it was found possible to establish the united front. This is a very good united front." (O. Piatnitsky, *The Work of the Communist Parties of France and Germany*, p. 39)

The Stalinists' foul game had to be supported by the Browders of all sections:

"The welding together and development of the united front from below is, at the present time, an urgent task not only for the German, Polish, and Czecko-Slovakian Parties, but for all sections of the Comintern. Without carrying out this task in practice, we can make no progress." (Kuusinen, *Prepare for Power*, p. 89)

Accordingly, the whole Communist International practiced the tactic of "united front from below only":

"But the united front of struggle cannot be replaced by the Comintern 'from above.' It can only be formed from below." (D. Z. Manuilsky, *Social Democracy, Stepping Stone to Fascism*, p. 51)

"The Communists have not formed and will not form a united front with the Social-Democratic leaders." (*Daily Worker*, April 26, 1932)

"There is and can be no united front with any group of social democratic leaders. The anti-fascist united front can and will be brought about to the exclusion and against the groups of social democratic leaders." (*Rote Aufbau*, December 1, 1931, article by Willi Muenzenberg)

Despite the deepening of the economic and political crisis and

the definite preparations of the bourgeoisie for the liquidation of their democratic form of rule and its substitution by Fascism, the Communist workers were drugged to believe that that was not the case:

"Equally false is the theory that the Social Democracy is about to be kicked out by finance capital to make room for open Fascism." (*Rote Fabne*, February 13, 1930)

The apprehensions of the Communist workers at the visible growth of the Fascist forces and the negative results of the tactic of "united front from below only" were dispelled by the promises of Stalin's puppets that if Hitler seized power the united front would be established and Fascist rule overthrown:

"If they [the Fascists] once come into power, the united front of the proletariat will be established and sweep everything away. . . . They will come to grief more speedily than any other government." (H. Remmele, *Rote Fabne*, October 16, 1931)

To further allay the workers' disquietude the Stalinists assured the masses that it really did not make much difference whether Fascism or bourgeois democracy was in the saddle:

"The Fascist dictatorship offers no basic distinction from Bourgeois democracy." (*Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany on the Decisions of the Eleventh Plenum*, May 1931)

"The counter-posing of Fascism and bourgeois democracy is a *liberal* interpretation." (A. Martynov, *Kommunistische Internationale*, May 1931, p. 895)

The attempts of the lower functionaries of the Communist Party of Germany to form a united front with the Socialist organization were crushed mercilessly by the Executive of the "Communist International." To insure the failure of these attempts the cry was raised that the chief blows of the Communist Party must be directed against Social Democracy:

"As the bourgeoisie cannot be overthrown without the overthrow of its main social support, it is not incorrect to say that we ought to direct our *main offensive* against social-democracy." (Kuusinen, *Prepare for Power*, pp. 105-106. Emphasis in the original)

"The danger would be small if the social-fascists would always resort to undisguised strike-breaking tactics, if they would openly

march shoulder to shoulder with the fascists. Then the role of Social-Democracy, as the main social support of the bourgeoisie, would soon come to an end, and our task would be easier. But that is not how things stand.

"The *main blow*, as I have already stated in my report, must in the present period of preparing for the revolution be directed against social-fascism. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 141. Emphasis in the original)

"The fact that, for example, in our revolutionary trade union work, united front offers could be made from above to district trade union leaderships or other instances of the reformist bureaucracy (Ruhr district), also shows that our principled struggle against the Social Democracy was not conducted resolutely enough to make such mistakes impossible." (Ernst Thaelmann, *Die Internationale*, No. 11-12, 1931)

"But just because the workers now display a strong interest in the united front, some organizations of our Parties, and in some places the Parties themselves fail to adhere to the attitude of the united front from below, of the united front based upon the platform of the class struggle, *but slide down to the opportunist position of the united front with the Social-democracy*. In Wurtemberg, for instance, the Social-democratic and the Communist organizations signed a 'Burgfrieden' (civil peace) in a certain little town in preparation for the communal elections and kept it up for six weeks. Similarly in Stuttgart a 'Burgfrieden' was also signed before the municipal elections. Comrade Thaelmann has already cited similar examples in his article and subjected them to sharp criticism, and our party leadership in Stuttgart had to systematically interfere in order to correct these opportunist mistakes." ("The Ideological Mistakes and Shortcomings in the Fulfillment of the Decisions of the Eleventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I.," *The Communist International*, March 15, 1932, p. 153. My emphasis—G.M.)

The Stalinist leaders never stopped dinning into the ears of the Communist Party members that of the two armies, the Fascist and the Social-Democratic, the latter was the more dangerous to the German workers:

"Without the isolation of Social Democracy, without the destruction of its influence over the masses, the overthrow of capitalism is impossible. Of the two armies, the Social-democratic is the stronger, *the more dangerous* and the more capable of resistance." (*Kommunistische Internationale*, July 23, 1931. My emphasis—G.M.)

The greatest danger, something which would prove fatal for the proletariat was the "*opportunist overestimation*" of the Nazi movement:

"Nothing would be more fatal than an opportunist overestimation of Hitlerist Fascism." (Speech at the Plenum of the Communist Party of Germany by Ernst Thaelmann, February 19, 1932)

The workers' uneasiness with regard to the danger of the Hitler dictatorship was invariably quieted by the Stalinist spellbinders:

"We shall do everything to bar Hitler's way to governmental power." (*Rote Fabne*, April 26, 1932)

To create a greater mix-up and prevent the Communist and the Socialist workers from getting together for unified resistance to the bourgeoisie, the Stalinist disrupters taught the Communist worker that within Social Democracy all were *social-fascists*, leaders and workers:

"The broad opportunist interpretation of the united front policy was expressed also in the fact that an editorial article in *Cahiers du Bolchevisme*, No. 9, substituted the slogan of the struggle against the Social-fascist leaders for the slogan of the struggle against Social-fascism as the main social bulwark of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The author of this article cannot understand that if the main social bulwark of the bourgeoisie were only the 'leaders' of the Social-democracy it would be very easy to deal with the Social-democracy." (*The Communist International*, Vol. IX, No. 4-5, p. 153)

Stifling the overpowering urge of the proletariat to destroy Hitler, the Executive of the "Comintern" pitilessly, persistently, unweariedly, pushed the Communist workers and with them the *whole* working class of Germany into the abyss of Fascism. Every attempt at making a correct analysis of the situation and finding correct ways to prevent the horror of Fascist rule was nipped in the bud:

"Precisely at the present stage of development in Germany fascism and social-fascism are appearing in their true colors as 'twin-brothers,' as Comrade Stalin once acutely emphasised, though this does not imply that they have reached absolute agreement. . . .

"In accordance with the Party line, and with the help of the Comintern, and of the resolutions that have been passed, our Party has of late been combating, with great success, all tendencies to weaken the struggle in principle against Social-Democracy, and has fought with all severity against all conceptions that the main offensive within the working-class ought no longer to be directed against Social-Democracy and against all deviations in this field.

"After the coming into power of the Papen Government, certain tendencies to deviation from the general line of the Party in this fundamental question of our policy and tactics manifested themselves among individual comrades in Germany. Our Party leadership set its face severely against the attitude which found its expression in an article entitled 'Change of System'; this article was put before the secretariat, and its publication prevented. This article contains, besides a number of other incorrect formulations, one absolutely false formulation, namely, 'that the bourgeoisie is temporarily renouncing the cooperation of Social-Democracy as its main social support.' In this we see a wholly inadmissible estimation of the role of the S.P.D. [Socialist Party of Germany] in the present situation. The tactical conclusions which have been drawn from the false estimation of the rôle of the S.P.D. in the above-mentioned article, are substantially on a par with the proposals of the Berlin district leadership—proposals which were made to the Social-Democratic Party with a view to the holding of joint demonstrations, and which were rightly rejected by the Central Committee of our Party, and corrected in the case of Berlin.

"The article contains among other things the following passage:

"At the present time, the "democratic" tendency is no longer the dominant one; it is now the fascist wing (?) [All marks of punctuation are Thaelmann's—G.M.] against which the main onslaught of the revolutionary mass struggle must be directed.

"It lies in the nature of things that in directing this offensive we should on occasion come into the same line of action which the specious Social Democratic opposition is operating (!)

"A number of measures which we have recently taken both in the province of parliamentarianism (?) and also in the extra-parliamentary struggle, clearly show the changed tactics which we have begun to employ.

"But above all, the demand of the Berlin-Brandenburg district leadership to the "Iron Front" movement to hold a joint demonstration against fascism, is most appropriate here."

"... It is quite clear that we could not allow an article containing such distortions of our Party line to go out into the Party, or to the wider public, unless we wanted to create the greatest confusion and chaos." (Thaelmann's speech at the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., *The Communist International*, January 15, 1933, pp. 35-36)

Any departure from declaring that *Social Democracy* was in actuality *Fascism* was attacked by the spokesmen of the Stalin-tern:

"Comrade Murphy does not clearly emphasize the interrelations between fascism and social-fascism, and thus the special role of the

latter, when he says 'The last reserves are called up, and as the crisis deepens social-fascism swiftly evolves to pure fascism.'

"Here social-fascism is portrayed as a kind of feeble, undeveloped fascism. That is a very common misunderstanding. Social-fascism in essence, is as little a feeble and undeveloped fascism as social-imperialism, in *its essence*, is a feeble and undeveloped imperialism. Social-fascism is a definite form assumed by fascism, just as Social-imperialism is a definite form assumed by imperialism.

"The error committed by Comrade Murphy in describing the inter-relations between social-fascism and fascism was also made in the *Rote Fabne*—where, by the way, it was immediately rectified. The article in *Rote Fabne* treats the development thus: 'Social-democracy after a short period of time, will be ousted from the government by finance-capital, so as to cede place to open fascism.' That article was based on the non-comprehension of the specific role of social-fascism and its significance for the fascist dictatorship.

"Indeed, social-fascism by no means needs to be developed into 'pure' fascism. It already IS actual fascism." (A. Fogarashi, "The Problems of Fascism and Social-Fascism in the International Communist Press," *The Communist International*, Vol. VII, No. 2-3, p. 101. Emphasis and capitals in the original)

Thus Social Democracy was first transformed into "social-fascism" and finally was declared to be nothing less than actual Fascism.

How well the dastardly scoundrels, in carrying out their filthy work for their master, succeeded in stifling and crushing every sign of Marxist thinking in the Communist Party of Germany, how thoroughly they confused and bewildered their unfortunate victims, the Communist workers, can be seen from the observation made by one of the perpetrators of the monstrous crime, Piatnitsky:

"Apparently, owing to 'Left' sectarianism, the tactics of a united front from below was not followed in the factories, not only as to social democratic workers, under the pretext that they all of them, are 'little' Zorgiebels, but also with regard to the members of reformist trade unions, under the pretext that they are 'the most reactionary section of the proletariat.'" (O. Piatnitsky, *World Communists in Action*, p. 38)

After the incessant din that the Communist Party must direct its *main offensive*, its *main blows* against the Social Democracy, the hypocritical Kuusinens and Piatnitskys, "discovering" that the struggle against the Nazis was neglected, would suddenly crack the whip of "criticism":

"For a long time, the Communist Party of Germany underrated the nationalist-socialist movement; and in part neglected to struggle against it. . . ." (Kuusinen, *Prepare for Power*, p. 96)

The Piatnitskys, Kuusinens and Manuilskys under the leadership of Stalin were striking the lash, instructing, criticising, making the German puppets and their rank-and-file followers jump this way and that until the workers' brains whirled and they were unable to clearly define what was correct, what wrong.

That the whole work was improperly conducted from the point of view of the proletariat was perceived by the workers and admitted by the Kuusinens and Piatnitskys in a tone of censure:

"If the Party and trade union organizations were working *properly*, such shortcomings as there have been in the trade union work, in the work among the unemployed, in the plants, and among the peasants and employees would be impossible." (O. Piatnitsky, *The World Economic Crisis*, p. 105)

"The incorrect estimation of the situation led to incorrect tactics. What were the tactics, at least, the tactics pursued by *Rote Fabne*? The Fascists are the main danger, and the Social-Democrats the main obstacle. This was at the time of the XI Plenum. In carrying out the campaign against the fascists, *they entirely forgot the existence of Social-Democracy*. After the XI Plenum, Social-Democracy was correctly described in the documents of the German Communist Party as the main social bulwark of the bourgeoisie; but then *they forgot the fascists*." (O. Piatnitsky, *Work of the Communist Parties of France and Germany*, p. 31. My emphasis—G.M.)

Life itself was crying out against the viciousness of the united front from below and the theory of "social-fascism." The Communist Party members were apathetic, listless, expressing their lack of faith in the leadership and its theories and policies by leaving the Party by tens of thousands. The functionaries, too, were restless, and even some top-notch leaders felt that the danger of Fascism was real and very close.

It was the pressure of this restlessness and mute disapproval of the line of the "Comintern" that forced Thaelmann and his Central Committee, naturally with the knowledge and consent of the E.C.C.I. and Stalin, to make an exception in their "united front from below only" policy, and issue a call on July 20, 1932, addressed to the Socialist Party and the trade unions, for a political mass strike. But there was a wide chasm between the Stalinist words and deeds. In *deeds* the strike was thoroughly

sabotaged by the Communist Party leadership due to the fact that the masses showed an unmistakable desire towards struggle. This criminal sabotage of their own call for a general strike was admitted in the form of "castigation" of the Communist Party of Germany by Kuusinen, Piatnitsky and others:

"*This slogan was not supported by any organizational measures. Immediately after the slogan was issued, every effort should have been made to launch and organize demonstrations. This would have been quite possible in Berlin, at any rate. Various comrades, who were in Berlin on July 20, have told us that a definite urge towards direct action was to be observed there, among the masses on the streets. But the moment was allowed to pass by.*" (Kuusinen, *Prepare for Power*, p. 99. My emphasis—G.M.)

The tone of criticism fooled the workers into hoping that instructions to carry out correct policies and tactics were being given by the Comintern and the "leader of the world proletariat, Comrade Stalin," to the Communist Party leadership of Germany. Quite cynically Piatnitsky testifies concerning the successful inactivity of the leadership to make as ineffective as possible the July 20, 1932 call for the mass strike:

"*The initiative of the Party and trade union organizations in the factories was lacking. Had there been initiative the outcome may have been entirely different. Not having received instructions from their leaders, some Social-Democrats and reformists in the factories were in favor of a fight, others wavered. Under these conditions, as the conference of Rote Fabne workers correspondents showed, had the Communists and the supporters of the R.T.U.O. and of the Red trade unions, in the factories, taken the initiative and downed tools with the slogans: Repeal the Emergency Decrees directed against the working class; repeal the legalisation of the fascist shock troops who are attacking the working class districts and beating up the workers; repeal the prohibition of meetings and demonstrations and suppression of the press, etc., they would have met with a tremendous response on the part of the workers of all political trends and of no party. Comrade Lensky, who was passing through Berlin on July 20 and rode through the streets on that day, told me that the people were on the streets but there were no leaders. At that moment there were neither police, nor troops on the streets.*" (O. Piatnitsky, *The Work of the Communist Parties of France and Germany*, pp. 37-38. My emphasis—G.M.)

Even very many Socialist and reformist workers were in favor of a fight! Had there been initiative of the "Communist

Party" there would have been a tremendous response from workers of *all political trends* and also of those who adhered to no party. Of this there cannot be the slightest doubt. The Party was paralyzed by the Stalinists, who deprived the masses of leadership at the most critical turns. Piatnitsky admits this fact in more than one of his works.

"The events of July 20, 1932, in Germany, during the fascist coup in Prussia, have shown that had the large enterprises in Berlin contained aggressive cells, sections and groups of the Red trade unions and trade union opposition, *there would have been great protests in the form of strikes and demonstrations, for there was a great deal of discontent among the workers; they were only waiting for leadership.*" (O. Piatnitsky, *The World Economic Crisis*, pp. 87-88. My emphasis—G.M.)

It must be remembered that the influence of the Communist Party in Berlin was enormous. It was the largest political party in the capital of Germany, backed by a *million* voters. The Socialist Party was next in size. The Communist Party's influence extended even into the police, 14% of whom voted Communist. There was a reason why initiative was "lacking," why the moment was allowed to go by. It was the case of the treacherous Stalinist stiletto in the back of the German proletariat.

Those who had been played up as "leaders," who had the Communist Party machine in their hands, who had six million German proletarians behind them, towards whom the Socialist masses were now moving to be led against Hitler, *sabotaged their own hypocritical slogans and calls for a mass strike.* The masses poured into the streets but—*there were no leaders!* Not because these "leaders" feared arrest. "There were neither police, nor troops in the streets." There were no leaders, *because they purposely stayed away to keep the masses from action*, to prevent a possible wave of proletarian upsurge. The sabotage was successful.

The Communist Party organizations themselves were kept from responding to the fake call of the leadership. *This is a fact!* Piatnitsky divulged this shocking fact by way of condemning, not the Executive of the Comintern, and not the leadership of the German Communist Party, but the Party organizations, the lesser functionaries of the Party:

"But the Party organizations did not respond to the call for a strike. That is a fact,—they not only failed to respond in the Berlin-Brandenburg district; not a single organization in any other district responded. This is a fact. Was this unexpected? *Ignoring the work in the factories, in the trade unions and the labour exchanges, sliding on the surface of mass work, abstract slogans and unpopular agitation, could not produce any other results.*" (O. Piatnitsky, *The Work of the Communist Parties of France and Germany*, p. 38. Emphasis in the original)

Some explanation of this astounding paralysis had to be given to the bewildered rank-and-file. The best excuse was to declare, six days after the fake call had been issued, that no struggle against Fascism would result from proposals to Social Democracy, that to believe in such a possibility would be to disarm the workers—this, contrary to the Bolshevik experience in the united front against the Tzarist General Kornilov:

"Whoever would aim to build on the idea that by 'appeals' to the S.D.P.G., or other reformist organizations, a struggle would come about, would disarm the proletariat." ("Statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany," *Rote Fabne*, July 26, 1932)

Although the Nazis had passed the zenith of their influence, and began dipping down the western horizon, their day of power was drawing closer due to the Stalinist and Social-Democratic poison in the veins of the proletariat. A real revolutionary struggle could have stopped Fascism. "Had there been initiative the outcome may have been entirely different." Not only on July 20, but as a whole. In playing their double game, Stalin, Piatnitsky, Kuusinen, Bela Kun and the rest, while making all the necessary moves to prevent a revolutionary struggle in Germany, assured the Communist workers that revolution was close at hand:

"... we now say, and repeat, to our Sections: '*We are approaching revolutionary crisis at a whirlwind pace, we are approaching the revolution...*'" (Kuusinen, *Prepare for Power*, p. 125. Emphasis in the original)

Thus the graph of the Stalinist policy vividly indicates a line of whirlwind fakery, disgusting ballyhoo and mean deception on a grand scale. The sweet voice of the Stalinist charmers never

ceased chanting that the German workers, if they wished to avoid Fascism, should accept the leadership of the German "Communist Party":

"But the Fascist dictatorship has not yet triumphed in Germany and need never triumph if the German working class responds to the lead of its revolutionary vanguard—the Communist Party."

And on the other hand, to paralyze all understanding, the Fascist dictatorship was declared to be in power two years before Hitler's seizure of the German State machinery:

"Fascist Government sets in. Today the Bruening government itself has become a government of fascist dictatorship in its commencing stage." (Ernst Thaelmann, *The Communist*, March 1931, p. 220)

The pressure of the masses upon the treacherous bureaucracies of both the Socialist and the Communist Parties was tremendous. In the Ruhr and other sections of Germany the leading committees of both organizations were defied by the lower committees and the rank-and-file and a united front was formed. The Berlin-Brandenburg District Committee of the Communist Party, on June 16, 1932, issued to the Socialist leaders an appeal for a united front to defend the "Social-fascist" newspaper *Vorwärts* (*The New York Times*, July 5, 1932). This policy was "rightly rejected by the Central Committee of our Party, and corrected in the case of Berlin" (Ernst Thaelmann, *The Communist International*, January 15, 1933). The German Browders, recognizing that the Socialist and the Communist masses instinctively drew to one another for mutual protection, persisted in their disruptive activity. A Leninist party, taking the lead of the toiling masses, would have organized a formidable army of fifteen million proletarians against Hitler. The fact that despite the Stalinist sabotage two million Socialist workers went over to the Communist Party is a fair indication that the key to the overthrow of capitalism in Germany was in the hands of Stalin. But he turned the key towards Fascism instead of towards proletarian revolution.

The closer Fascism approached the saddle of power the louder were the Stalinists' cries that the main blow of the Communists must be directed against the Social Democracy, and not against Fascism:

"On the basis of our class policy we must, in the new situation, apply the strategy of the 'main fire against Social Democracy' *more than ever before*. . . Nothing has changed as far as this principle orientation of ours is concerned. Through our revolutionary practice we must put a stop to all speculations about a change of front, a new departure or a right vacillation on the part of the Communist Party of Germany. . . *It is not possible to carry through the struggle successfully against the main enemy—the Papen Government and its National Socialist myrmidons without the strategy of directing the main fire against Social Democracy*. . . It is absolutely inadmissible to try to palliate or excuse any kind of lagging behind in the struggle against the Hitler Party by the strategic orientation of the main fire against Social Democracy." (Ernst Thaelmann, *Labour Monthly*, September 1932, pp. 586-588-590. My emphasis—G.M.)

The Communist workers were told that conditions could exist that made open Fascist dictatorship a lesser evil:

"A *Social Democratic* coalition government, which confronted an incapacitated, split-up proletariat, would be a thousandfold *greater evil* than an *open Fascist dictatorship*, which came forward against a class-conscious proletariat, determined to struggle and united in its mass." (*Der Propagandist*, September 1931)

The Social-Democratic Party, counting almost a million workers in its ranks, was declared to be a police force assisting Fascism:

"The present role of the Social democratic party of Germany is that of auxiliary police to fascism." (Ernst Thaelmann, *The Communist*, March 1931, p. 222)

With a perfectly straight face Moissaye J. Olgin declares:

"It would have been difficult for Fascism to sweep into power in Germany had there been organized in Germany a powerful united front." (M. J. Olgin, *Trotskyism*, p. 114)

And he adds hypocritically:

"It cannot be denied that there were certain weaknesses in the work of the Communist Party of Germany, but opposition to the united front was not among them." (*Ibid.*)

Olgin reads much. He wrote the statement above after he had gone over a great deal of material on the subject. And Olgin lies. He perverts, twists, and utters falsehoods, *consciously* and *deliberately*, to help his Master conceal the frightful crime.

Olgin *knows* that the Stalinists were not only opposed to forming a united front with any organization not under their control, but that they even branded as *Fascists* those who had the "audacity" to propose a united front with the Socialist Party:

"Whoever demands today a bloc of the C.P. with the Social Democratic Party helps the Social-Fascist leaders in the preparation and execution of their betrayal. Their role, like that of the Social-Fascist leaders, is an immediate Fascist role." (Willi Muenzenberg, *Rote Aufbau*, February 15, 1932)

Trotsky committed a number of serious errors in his analysis and prediction with regard to Germany. In declaring that civil war was inevitable in Germany, he overestimated the spontaneity of the masses and underestimated the paralysis wrought by Stalinism and Social Democracy. He failed to get to the heart of the matter and make a full exposure of Stalin. While all signs indicated a carefully directed and well-disguised infernal scheme to thwart the German revolution, Trotsky was preoccupied with the utopian task of correcting Stalin's henchmen in Germany. Surveying the field of reality, Trotsky, with insufficient insight chanced upon the hidden mechanism when he wrote, "On the very next day after the victory of the German proletariat, even before, while yet in the process of its struggle for power, the hoops that bind the Comintern will burst" (*What Next*, p. 186). Precisely! And had Trotsky pondered over this, truly dreadful for Stalin, prospect, he would have realized that Stalin's line in Germany, as well as elsewhere, hinged on the problem of self-preservation of the bureaucracy, of the hoops of the bureaucratic centralism that bind the "Comintern" and the Soviet Union. He would have realized that there could be no other line for Stalin but the one of the "lesser evil"—Fascism, in preference to proletarian revolution. He would never have given to his followers in Germany the well-meant but utterly unrealistic advice to "change the course and reform the party régime" (*Ibid.*, p. 185), nor declared peremptorily "The about-face of the Stalinists is inevitable" (p. 182). He would not have spoken of "betrayals of the social democracy and the *mistakes* of the C.P." (p. 23. My emphasis.—G. M.), and "the ruinous mistakes of Stalinist bureaucracy" (p. 51).

He would have pointed to the betrayals of both. His line was

false, and he played directly into Stalin's hands when he wrote in a letter to his followers in Germany:

"For us, the victory of our policies depends not upon a weakening but a strengthening of the Communist Party. . . . The Opposition . . . can be victorious only with a revolutionary tide and the influx of masses under the banner of the Party." (*The Militant*, February 1, 1931)

Unwittingly, Trotsky assisted Stalin to dispel any doubt of the sincerity of the German Stalinist section:

"That the German Communist Party is governed by a sincere and burning striving to conquer the Fascists, to break the masses away from their influence, to overthrow Fascism and to crush it—of this, it is understood, there can be no doubt." (L. Trotsky, "Lessons of the Referendum," *Militant*, September 26, 1931, p. 4)

Among Trotsky's chief errors was his failure to point out that united front or no united front of the Stalinist and Social-Democratic organizations, the betrayal of the German proletariat, due to the threat revolution held for both bureaucracies, and due to the absence of a Leninist party, was a foregone conclusion. Yet, because Trotsky dared to declare that the policies of the Comintern and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany were merely wrong, and urged a united front with the Socialists, and because he traditionally had been established as the striking target for Stalin, he bore the brunt of the Stalinist attacks.

"Trotsky actually preached a united front with the Second International, and the Amsterdam Trade Union International. The Soviet Union and the Communist International is asked to collaborate with these two social-fascist associations in order to fight unemployment in the capitalist states by securing industrial orders from the Soviet Union. It would be ludicrous to bestow even the slightest attention on such recommendations of the renegades considered as something which could bring advantage to the proletariat. Such a united front tactic is only an obstacle to the development of a real revolutionary fighting front against the capitalist power.

"Thus under the banner of united front tactic, not merely an opportunist but even a directly counter-revolutionary tactic can be carried through, and consequently we must use every effort to expose the renegades as assistants of the class enemy." (F. Heckert, "United Front From Below," *The Communist International*, Vol. VII, No. 8, pp. 75-76)

"Trotsky has attempted, on more than one occasion, to lead the working-class astray by his writings, by demanding negotiations between the leaders of the Communist Party of Germany and the Socialist Party of Germany. Among other things he said as follows, to quote him word by word: 'One must actually declare complete readiness to form a bloc with the Social-Democrats against Fascism. . . . One must compel Social-Democracy to form a bloc against the Fascists.' This policy would mean that we would abandon our correct Bolshevik policy. . . ." (Ernst Thaelmann, Speech at the Twelfth Plenum, *The Communist International*, January 15, 1933, p. 36)

For a Communist worker to dare state that the chief enemy of the working class was Fascism, was to be branded as a social-fascist, deceiver of the masses. The 300,000 members of the Stalinist "Party" were terrorized by the chiefs of the Comintern with statements such as:

"The Social-democrats, in order to deceive the masses, deliberately proclaim that the chief enemy of the working class is Fascism." (D. Z. Manuilsky, *The Communist Parties and the Crisis of Capitalism*, p. 112)

To make the German workers believe that Hitler would do them no harm, that he was different from Mussolini, that the lessons of Italy were not applicable to Germany, the Stalinists assured the workers of the non-existence of "classic" Fascism. A couple of weeks before Hitler became chancellor, the Stalinist periodical in Germany, *Kommunistische Internationale*, No. 10, January 19, 1933, in the article "The Nature of Fascist Dictatorship," assured the workers that:

"The XII Plenum has demonstrated that so-called 'classic' Fascism does not exist and cannot exist, and that all confusing theories, basing themselves on the history of Italian Fascism, about the Fascist need of first striking down the working class are bloodless abstractions."

When the Fascist fury was unchained by the bourgeoisie against the workers, when the treachery of such ideas as in the quotation above would be only too evident, the Stalinist leaders, in an underground pamphlet, told the German workers that they might as well know that terror is the natural attribute of Fascism:

"Fascist terror against the proletariat is the necessary prerequisite and condition for the social-reactionary attack of the dictatorship."

(*The Fight for Communism in Germany*, Workers Library Publishers, p. 5)

Acting as a powerful deterrent on the masses, the servile dopeddleders, motivated by Stalin's requirements to stifle the proletariat of Germany, at the same time worked for Hitler!

The opportunist confusers and misleaders of the workers, calling themselves "Communists," introduced the illusion that the possibility existed of bringing about peace between the Communists and the Fascists. Heinz Neumann, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany, in October 1930, visited a Nazi meeting. Dr. Goebels, Hitler's lieutenant, calmed the excited Nazi cutthroats and allowed the "Communist" leader to speak. Neumann made an ardent appeal for "cessation of fraternal strife" between the Fascist bandits and the German proletariat.

The leading staff of the Stalintern read Marx, Engels and Lenin in order to employ where they see fit this or that statement of these true leaders of the proletariat, and thus mask Stalin's reactionary policies. To destroy the revolutionary proletariat of Germany, the Stalinists, perverting Marx, made use of his writings. Quoting the founder of scientific Socialism, "The Party of revolution rallied the Party of counter-revolution," Gussev, the same Stalinist agent who back in 1925, acting as a "Rep," had skillfully maneuvered Lovestone into the leadership of the American Party, reassured the alarmed workers that the growth of Fascism was but a natural phenomenon. The struggle would end in revolution. He concealed the fact that Marx's statement did not apply, because in the present instance the "party of revolution" was paralyzing the workers, *assisting* the forces of counter-revolution:

"The development of the revolutionary upsurge and the growth of revolutionary crises cannot take place in any other way. There is not and could not be a revolution which did not have the counter-revolution against it. It is therefore not correct to think that the development of fascism signifies a weakening in the development of the forces of revolution. . . . The forces of revolution are increasing and beginning their offensive, and as a result, the forces of counter-revolution are rallying and passing to the counter-offensive against the forces of revolution. The struggle is blazing up and rising to its highest level—to revolution." (Gusev's speech at the Twelfth Plenum. Paragraph quoted in *The Communist*, April 1933, p. 325)

So everything was as it should have been. And as the decisive hour which was to settle the fate of the German proletariat inexorably drew closer, Gussev, together with the rest of the criminal plotters in the Executive Committee of the Stalintern, directed the "offensive" of the forces of revolution, raising the struggle to its "highest level":

"Therefore, to beat the enemy, the bourgeoisie, we must direct the main blow against its chief social bulwark, against the chief enemy of Communism in the working class, against Social-Democracy, against Social-Fascism.

"It may seem that in Germany, at the present time, for example, the chief social bulwark of the bourgeoisie is Fascism, and that, therefore, we should deal the chief blows against Fascism.

"This is not correct." (T. Gussev, *The Communist International*, No. 19, October 15, 1932, p. 674. My emphasis—G.M.)

The overdose of the deadly poison administered to the Communist workers by Gussev and all the other Piatnitskys three and a half months before Hitler took power, was aimed at stopping all motion and action, of diverting the toilers' attention from Fascism when attention in the direction of this scourge was imperative, of side-tracking the accumulated apprehension and distrust, of inspiring a desperately hostile attitude towards the Socialist workers. The Gussevs greatly facilitated matters for the Nazis. The "Third Period" smoke, confusion, noise, fabrications and snares served as paving-stones on the highway upon which Hitler rode to power.

H. R. Knickerbocker, writing in the *New York Evening Post*, January 1932, of his conversation with a German Communist in Berlin, to his question "Why can't your 6,000,000 oppose Hitler by force?" received a reply which contained this significant sentence: "The Soviet Union is not ready for a German revolution."

To have said more would have revealed the infernal secret of Stalin.

Thus the Communist Party of Germany and its six million followers were very ably disoriented, chloroformed, gagged, blindfolded and shackled by the renegade, the arch-traitor Stalin and his reptiles, and laid at the feet of Hitler. With the historical sabotage of the proletarian revolution by the Socialist leaders, the eight million Socialist workers left to drift, Stalin's game

could never fail. The doom of the German proletariat was assured.

The perplexed bourgeoisie rubbed its eyes at the "strange" policy of the "Communists" assisting Hitler. Never having expected a Nazi victory, in gloom and bitterness awaiting the day of what had seemed the unavoidable and total collapse of the Fascist movement and the rise of Soviet Germany, the bourgeoisie regarded the advent of Hitler as a fairy tale:

"Until well on in the year 1932 German Communists were obeying the strange order that Hitler's seizure of power must be actually encouraged, because the path to Communism must go by way of the rule of Fascism and its collapse. Hence the German Communist Party right to the very end did not direct its fiercest attack against National Socialism but against Social Democracy.

"Thus the Communist Party added its quota to the lack of cohesion among Hitler's opponents. In this very fact lay Hitler's greatest strength. The material and moral forces ranged against him were, taken all together, much stronger than his own. But they were aiming at different goals, were striving against each other, and so to some extent nullifying one another. Only a minimum of political purpose remained among the political opponents of National Socialism, and this was easily overcome even when Hitler's impetus had actually begun to wane. The story of the struggle and the unexpected victory of Nazism shortly before an apparently unavoidable collapse is full to the point of monotony with dramatic events. Its end is a fairy tale that outdoes even the fairy tale with which it had been inaugurated fourteen years earlier." (Konrad Heiden, *A History of National Socialism*, p. 154)

That there had been a possibility of revolution in Germany was later admitted by no less a personage than the vice-chairman of the German Communist Party, Wilhelm Pieck, at the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., December 1933:

"When ten months ago the bourgeoisie handed over the governmental power to fascism, it was confronted with the danger that the counter-revolutionary forces would be overtaken by the forces of revolution."

After the first cautious moves against the Communist Party, the Nazis were reassured by Stalin's negative attitude described in the reports by Duranty and Hitler's correspondents in the Soviet Union. A dispatch from Moscow published in *Der Tag*, February 2, 1933, read:

"Insofar as the measures of the Hitler Cabinet against the Communist Party of Germany are concerned, the official circles appear to be quite disinterested."

It must be remembered that at the time Hitler assumed power his organization had reached the stage of cleavage and dissolution. The clumsy tactics of von Schleicher and von Papen, if anything, made things still more calamitous for Hitler. This was noted even by the *Daily Worker*:

"The tactics pursued by von Schleicher of splitting the Hitler party, have also caused widespread disintegration in the ranks of the Nationalist Socialist Party, with several of Hitler's chief lieutenants breaking away from their allegiance to him." (*Daily Worker*, January 30, 1933)

On the side of German capitalism all the aspects added up to make a fairly hopeless picture for the bourgeoisie. There was one rescuing factor for crumbling Fascism: Stalin. Had there been only the old treacherous Social Democracy, it is very possible that some sort of hopeless struggle on the part of the workers would have taken place at the twelfth hour (Austria). Hell-bent for the prevention of proletarian victory in Germany, the infamous apostate and usurper, Stalin, did a thorough job. Hitler went right ahead. Taking full advantage of the opportunity offered, he tightened up his party and organized the Fascist régime.

Having expected that the lid of German capitalism would be blown off by the proletarian volcano, the whole world was puzzled, and the class-conscious proletariat stood aghast beholding the amazing, unbelievable spectacle of the *largest organized forces of the proletariat in the entire capitalist world* offering no resistance to the Nazi bands.

The Fascists proceeded with boundless self-confidence. In a few dreadful weeks they tore down the gigantic structure of the German labor movement, a structure which the toiling masses had built through heavy sacrifices and which had taken more than three-quarters of a century to erect. It fell, so that another structure, the Stalinist bureaucratic pyramid in the Soviet Union, might be saved.

Having brought the issue to full success, to prevent the heinous outrage from standing out in gruesome clearness, Stalin hastened to cover up the traces of his crime. His hirelings broke

their "mysterious" silence. Early in March, the Moscow *Pravda* published a manifesto reprinted from the Paris *l'Humanite* and dated January 22, a week before Hitler became chancellor, in which the workers were told that the Executive Committee of the Communist International *had accepted* the proposal made by the leaders of the Social Democracy for a united front against Fascism. The knowledge of this manifesto came to the American workers first through *The New York Times*. Browder published the "Comintern" manifesto in full in the *Daily Worker* only on March 18, 1933.

With the exception of Thaelmann, virtually the entire German Communist Party top leadership—Willi Muenzenberg, Fritz Heckert, Wilhelm Pieck and others—pulled out of the country when their job was finished and Fascism as the official government was about to unfold its rage. The thousands of petty functionaries, the hundreds of thousands of workers in the Communist Party and auxiliary organizations—the proletariat of Germany remained in the clutches of Hitler.

Heckert rushed to Moscow to report to the Stalin chieftains. After hearing his reports (the first report no doubt a secret one, and the official one for workers' consumption), they adopted on April 1, 1933, a resolution on Germany.

Fortunately for the Stalinist bureaucracy there was a participant in the ghastly crime, the German Social Democracy. In 1914 Social Democracy had exercised an overwhelming pressure on the working class. In 1918, 1919, and 1921 its power, though waned somewhat, was sufficiently great to keep the proletariat back from overthrowing capitalism. But in 1933 it was eclipsed in influence by the Stalinist Party which played the leading rôle in the sell-out.

Stalin seized the opportunity to unload his lion's share of the betrayal upon the Social Democracy. Since the shoulders of the treacherous Social Democracy were weighted down with previous crimes against the workers, it was a cinch to convince the Communist workers that in this betrayal Social Democracy solely bore the guilt.

As to the Stalinist Party of Germany, the resolution declared:

"The Presidium of the ECCI declares that the *political line* and the *organizational policy* pursued by the C.C. of the Communist Party of Germany, led by Comrade Thaelmann, *before and at the time of*

the Hitler coup, WAS QUITE CORRECT." ("Resolutions of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I.," *Daily Worker*, April 17, 1933. My emphasis—G.M.)

One whose head is full of illusions about Stalin and his flunkys might be astonished and horrified reading the words above. Nevertheless, the line actually *was* correct from the point of view of the interests of Stalin and his numerous crew of the assorted variety of appointed careerists and arch-demagogues recruited from the scum of the petty-bourgeoisie and aristocracy of labor.

Only political children or dim-witted people will argue that the Stalinist leaders, who savagely suppressed all thought and criticism of the line and leadership, innocently made mistakes.

And even Trotsky—when evidence established beyond the peradventure of a doubt that what was witnessed in Germany was a carefully considered course along which the German masses were piloted, an appalling crime executed with skill and caution and well concealed from view—even Trotsky clung to his erroneous interpretation of the Stalinists' words and deeds. Failing to see the mainspring of Stalin's policy, he spoke of the "tragic mistakes of the Stalinists" (*The Militant*, February 24, 1933). "The Stalinist bureaucracy, however, took the path of unconscious but nevertheless actual sabotage of the revolution" (*The Militant*, May 20, 1933). "Blunders of Stalinism have shipwrecked revolutions" (*The Militant*, subhead, May 20, 1933).

Stalin, of course, never advertised his aims, but a thinking worker will ask *what was* Stalin's goal? If his purpose from 1923 on was to fight the world bourgeoisie, then his entire course is a medley of wrong moves, crudest blunders, and amazing stupidities. But if, on the contrary, his design and object was to crush all Marxist and personal opponents and entrench and consolidate his bureaucracy, round out bureaucratic centralism, and eliminate every possibility of revolutionary disturbances, then his line *was correct*. It was perfect. The line in Germany and elsewhere flows from the concrete interests of Stalinism. Isn't one rather forced to conclude that in this work of centralizing the bureaucracy and fixing his personal limitless power Stalin proved an organizational master, and in the field of plotting, deception and intrigue a virtual genius. For if Stalin is a blundering idiot, it really is remarkable that he not only retained power but

steadily concentrated it more and more in the hollow of his hand.

If one views the then existing international juncture from the Stalinist angle, one is led to conclude that the concrete menace of a military attack by imperialism upon the Soviet Union, which is the base of the Stalinist bureaucracy, could have been temporarily prevented by a sudden reversal in the relation of international bourgeois powers. This, of course, excluding the development of proletarian Germany.

France, having a weak Germany on her border, was busily engaged in organizing an imperialist bloc for a war upon the Soviet Union; her vassal State, Poland, to be used as the spring-board for the attack. "Imperialist France stands at the head as organizer and director of the capitalist attack at the present moment" (Earl Browder, *War Against Workers' Russia*).

Stalin's relentless drive against the German proletariat could result only in a strong German bourgeoisie, forcing a general regroupment of capitalist powers. A rising imperialist Germany would place the French bourgeoisie in a dilemma that could be partly solved by an alliance with Stalin to preserve the temporary European equilibrium.

From the extremely perilous situation Stalin extricated himself through a drastic reversal of Leninism, to the detriment of the international proletariat, including the Russian whose destiny is inseparably linked to that of the world oppressed.

The whole Stalinist policy was rooted in practical considerations. Duranty tells of the aftermath of the highly successful derailing and wrecking of the German revolutionary movement—an appalling piece of information about another link in the infamous chain of the Stalinist betrayal of the German proletariat:

"But that is only one aspect of the case. Of greater *practical interest* is the recent agreement concluded by the Deutsche Bank und Disconto-Gesellschaft and the Dresdner Bank to provide \$50,000,000 in new credits to the Soviet Union." (*The New York Times*, March 2, 1933. My emphasis—G.M.)

The Communist and Socialist victims, members and lesser functionaries, by the tens of thousands were being dragged off to concentration camps and prisons. Thousands of others were dying in agony in the torture dungeons of the beastly Hitler-

ites. Thousands were taking their own lives so as not to fall into the bloody clutches of the murderous sadists. And at the moment of the crucifixion of the German working class by the Nazi hangmen, Stalin's bureaucrats received their thirty pieces of silver, credits of fifty million from the financial bandits of Germany as a token of appreciation of Stalin's "honest" sell-out of the German workers. The Iscariots added a ghastly touch of completion to the tragedy they had wrought.

Over the course of many years, through the shady method of buying henchmen, through the process of elimination, sifting and rigorous tests, Stalin enlisted in his service people who were at his beck and call. And so well-chosen were the Browders, Olgins and Cachins that not one of these Stalin-made leaders of the sections of the Comintern cried out in shame, disgust and horror against the midnight-black betrayal. Not one! All the picked scoundrels who had proven their complete lack of devotion to the working class and upon whom, therefore, Stalin could rely without fear of exposure, in a chorus approved the resolution of the "general staff of the world revolution." To the alarmed workers in all countries they handed out a lying prediction of an early proletarian uprising against Fascism in Germany. They repaid Stalin for his confidence in them and for the positions of leadership he gave them. This learned scum of humanity, by screening him in the German betrayal, proved further to Stalin, if further proof was needed, that they were prepared to loyally cover up his crimes against the workers no matter of what monstrous proportions, and were ready to share them with him, and were resigned to serve him, in fair weather and in foul.

In the United States Browder was not neglecting to discharge his duty to his master. Like Lovestone and Wolfe in their day, he called his crew together and echoed back to his big boss in the Kremlin that the "line" the gang at the head of the "Comintern" conducted in Germany had been and was correct:

"The Central Committee expresses its full agreement with the stand of the E.C.C.I. on the situation in Germany, and the perspectives for a new revolutionary upsurge of the German proletariat against fascism under the leadership of the heroic German Communist Party. The German Communist Party, led by Comrade Thaelmann, correctly worked both before and since the ascent of Hitler to power to tear the masses from the treacherous leadership of the German Social-

democracy, the main social support for Fascism, and to win the majority of the working class and the toiling masses for the revolutionary seizure of power for proletarian dictatorship for a Soviet Germany. This position, the touchstone in determining a real Bolshevik attitude, must be widely popularized in the struggle against the social-fascists and renegades." ("Resolution of the Central Committee, C.P.U.S.A., January 16, 1934," *The Communist*, February 1934, p. 178)

The perfidious Presidium of the Stalintern, sensing the general dismay and alarm of the deluded workers everywhere, held out to the proletariat another false hope. They declared that while Fascism crushed and demoralized the proletariat, it at the same time clarified the workers as to the falsity of bourgeois democracy, liberated the masses from the influence of Social Democracy, and hastened the development of revolutionary struggle. According to this reasoning, what the Communist Party had been unable to do was now being accomplished by Fascism:

"The revolutionary upsurge in Germany will inevitably grow in spite of the fascist terror. The resistance of the masses is bound to increase. The establishment of an open fascist dictatorship, by destroying all the democratic illusions among the masses and liberating them from the influence of social-democracy, accelerates the rate of Germany's development towards proletarian revolution." (*Resolution of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I.*, April 1, 1933)

The Thirteenth Plenum of the Executive of the Stalintern went a step beyond predicting an upsurge of revolution in Germany. The Kuusinens and Piatnitskys declared that it had already commenced:

"Revolutionary development is simultaneously hindered and accelerated by the fascist fury of the bourgeoisie. . . . In Germany, the revolutionary hatred of the proletariat is growing at the present moment in less open forms. There, enormous revolutionary energy is being accumulated among the masses and a new revolutionary upsurge is already beginning." (*Thirteenth Plenum*, Workers Library Publishers, p. 8. My emphasis—G.M.)

During the eleven months which elapsed between the date when Hitler became chancellor and the convening of the Thirteenth Plenum, Stalin and all his Manuilskys and Piecks had ample opportunity to weigh all facts concerning the advent of

the Nazis, and examine minutely the work of the German Communist Party in the crucial years, 1930, 1931, 1932. Had there been a grain of honesty and loyalty in Stalin and his bureaucrats they would have made at least a gesture of self-criticism. The brazen renegades and traitors *approved* the resolution they had adopted in April 1933:

"The Plenum *fully approves* the resolution of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. of April 1, 1933, on the situation in Germany and the political line pursued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany, headed by Comrade Thaelmann, before and at the time of the fascist coup." (*Ibid.*, p. 14. My emphasis—G.M.)

They kept up the bluff far beyond the Thirteenth Plenum. In the Spring of 1934, the Heckerts, Piecks and Willi Muenzenbergs, all outside Germany, issued a manifesto to the German proletariat in which they, with brazen mendacity, declared, "You stand on the threshold of the German proletarian revolution."

Incidentally, the misleading titles of Stalinist books and pamphlets have played an important part in the Stalinist game of deception. *Prepare for Power, We Are Fighting for a Soviet Germany, Germany—Hitler or Lenin, The Fight for Communism in Germany, The Revolutionary Crisis is Maturing*, etc., etc., etc.

To abandon the "Third Period" and abruptly change the line immediately after the betrayal would have been too risky for the Stalinist bureaucracy. The Communist masses in Germany, in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, with the memory of the "Third Period" "Communist" phrases still green in their minds, would begin to see through the treacherous game. It was necessary to continue until the clouds of doubt and suspicion blew over. The theory of "social-fascism" therefore, had to linger on, although pressure for its abandonment could be observed in the terrific restlessness in the "Comintern." Thus, at the time when thousands of "social-fascists," both functionaries and rank-and-filers, together with the Communist workers and functionaries were languishing in Nazi prisons and concentration camps, were being tortured to death in police stations, the Stalinists told the Communist workers that *to overthrow fascism the main fire must still be directed against Social Democracy:*

"The principal enemy is the bourgeoisie, dominant fascism, but *in order to overthrow fascism, the principal blow should now be directed against the social democratic parties...*"

"Confusion of the principal enemy (the bourgeoisie) with the direction of the principal blow (against social democracy) actually leads to the *social democratic idea* that the Social Democratic and Communist Parties have *one common fascist enemy*... It is therefore particularly important that this strategic point of Leninism should be driven home to the Party nuclei. Every Party member working in a factory, in a trade union, among the unemployed, must understand that he must carry on individual agitation and organization work, he must understand against whom he is to concentrate his blow in order to overthrow the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie." (Vasiliev, *Inprecorr*, April 23, 1934, p. 641. My emphasis—G.M.)

"Social-democracy continues to play the rôle of the main social prop of the bourgeoisie also in the countries of open Fascist dictatorship." (*Thirteenth Plenum*, Workers Library Publishers, p. 5. Also in *The Communist*, February 1934)

Despite the acceptance by the "Comintern" of the Second International's proposal of January 22, 1933, the cry for united front from below continued:

"Now we need united front from below, not negotiations with top leaders!... Only a united front from below will guarantee the successful fulfillment of the Central task of the world workers movement at the present time." ("May Day Manifesto of the Communist International," *Daily Worker*, April 30, 1933)

"Hence it is necessary that we develop the united front from below still better than hitherto..." (The Central Committee of the C.P. of Germany on the situation in Germany, *Inprecorr*, February 23, 1934, p. 293)

The "correctness" of Stalin's thesis that Social Democracy is a moderate wing of Fascism became in the eyes of his accomplices in the betrayal still more vivid:

"How correct are the words of Comrade Stalin that 'Social democracy is the moderate wing of fascism.'" (*The Communist*, editorial, April 1933)

On top of all the hatred which the treacherous rogues instilled within the Communist section of the proletariat of Germany towards the Social-Democratic section, they were cynical enough, heartless enough, to pin the responsibility for the failure of the united front even upon the Social-Democratic workers:

"Can it be said, however, that the Social Democratic workers as a whole do not bear any political responsibility for the practical refusal to participate in a United Front against Fascism? No, one cannot say that." (O. Piatnitsky, *Daily Worker*, November 21, 1933)

Loudly proclaiming their own "incorruptibility," the corrupt leaders of the Stalintern asserted that the German proletariat could not very well blame them, for they had warned the masses in advance what would happen, and admonished the toilers not to believe Hitler's promises. The German workers had only themselves to blame for their dreadful fate:

"As the incorruptible disciples of Marxism-Leninism, we warned the German proletariat long ago of the present course of affairs." (*The Fight for Communism in Germany*, Workers Library Publishers, June 1933, p. 4)

"The toiling masses must atone heavily for having believed the promises of Hitler." ("Manifesto of the Brussel Conference of the C.P. of Germany," *Daily Worker*, January 2, 1936)

Everybody was blamed for Hitler's coming into power: Social-Democratic leaders; the Socialist and Communist workers themselves; Trotsky—everybody, except Stalin and his tools who absolved themselves from all responsibility. Their line was "correct."

It is apropos to show how the Lovestoneites shielded the traitor Stalin, instead of exposing him. After the German betrayal they criticized the ultra-Leftist line of the leaders of the German Party, *but not a word did they utter to inform the workers that these leaders had been appointed by Stalin!* Not a hint that it was Stalin and his pack of loyal hounds, the Piatnitskys and Kuusinens, who had forced upon their German puppets the policies that assured the disruption of the revolutionary development in Germany. The Lovestoneites went to the extent of introducing a piece of rascality: they quoted *Stalin* on Communist honesty as though they were quoting Lenin or Marx:

"'A Party that hides the truth from the people, a Party that shrinks from criticism and from the light of day, is no party but a clique of deceivers, condemned to destruction.' Thus wrote Stalin in 1927. And these words sound a warning that can be dismissed only with the most fatal consequences. It is not yet too late! The Communist Party of Germany can still measure up to its tasks—but it must make a clear sweep of the policies and leadership that paved the

way for Fascism with ultra-left self-deception." (*Workers Age*, March 15, 1933, article from *Gegen dem Strom*)

Follow Stalin's wisdom. It is not yet too late. The Party can measure up to its tasks—as though it didn't, to the full satisfaction of Stalin! Make a clear sweep of the policies and leadership—as though it was within the power of the German Party membership to change the policies and dismiss the leadership of the German Communist Party! Such possibility has not existed in the "Comintern" since 1924, when Stalin began to make and unmake leaderships, as the Lovestoneites so well know. They keep this fact from the light of day as they keep mum about their own participation in the Stalinist betrayals. This quoting of Stalin's words is tantamount to a subtle whitewashing of the powerful dictator by his former favorite courtesans who are still casting ardent glances in his direction. As if Brandler, Lovestone, Wolfe and Herberg do not know hundreds of the *original* quotations bearing on Communist honesty from Marx, Engels and Lenin! They must bring into the German betrayal, *in such a manner*, the very perpetrator of the black crime, renegade Stalin. By criminally concealing the filthy history and the treacherous nature of official Stalinism, these cast-off political concubines conceal their own treacherous past and their own wicked, anti-workingclass rôle in the labor movement.

A masterly campaign to shroud the facts in a mist of verbiage and hysterical shriekings against "renegades," was launched by the Piatnitskys, Piecks, Browders, Weinstones and Sam Dons. There was also a stupendous outburst of words against the Nazis. The world proletariat was treated to the detestable spectacle of the Stalinist chiefs weeping over the corpse of the German proletarian revolution which they themselves had knifed.

The hack pen-pushers, destitute of moral, spiritual and material responsibilities to the workers, with "revolutionary" phrases covered up reaction in practice. The *Daily Worker*, splashing Red across its pages, bristled with pointed thrusts against Hitler. In almost every paragraph the scribbling team, seething with "Communist" fervor, called for a struggle against Fascism. All this was trimmed with loud outcries against wage-cuts, for unemployment insurance, for the overthrow of capitalism. From the mixture of bits of truth with chunks of falsehood emerged the Stalinist smoke screen.

I heard Browder and his flunkies delivering fiery denunciations of Hitler. What intense conviction vibrated in their voices! With deepest "sympathy" they grieved over the tragedy of the German masses, reaching deep into their hearers' hearts. With their features contorted with "pain" and enormous gobs of glycerine tears streaming in profusion down their hypocritical faces, they appealed to the workers to contribute to "the Party fighting Fascism." Then, in a flaming outburst, in tones that allowed no doubts, these competent liars flashed before their spell-bound listeners pictures of struggles rising in Germany, with Hitler's fall only a few weeks distant. They assured the workers that the Stalinist "Party," the very organization that had misled and betrayed the German proletariat, was intact, 100,000 strong, fighting for a Soviet Germany.

These efforts of the Browders, owing to the total absence of genuine Leninist exposure, accomplished the purpose of retaining for them the leadership over the Communist workers. The glib-tongued demagogues loosed a barrage of wild vehemence against all critics, particularly against Trotsky; and so great was the flurry of slander and lies that they succeeded in completely befogging the workers.

Slander plays a rôle in history. Reiteration of falsehoods and calumny results in that "something will stick," as Lenin pointed out in his article "The League of Liars." The purpose, Lenin explained, is "to drown the truth, to prevent it from being heard, to drown it in a torrent of vituperation and abuse, to prevent an earnest elucidation of facts."

Stalin's tight-rope walking between proletarian revolution and imperialist intervention did not begin with the German betrayal of 1933. It had its starting point in the revolutionary situation in Germany in 1923. In August of that year, in a letter to Zinoviev and Bucharin, Stalin wrote of the German Communists: "In my estimation the Germans must be restrained, not spurred on."

Thus, to preserve the bureaucratic centralism in the Soviet Union, the Stalinist clique ten years later sacrificed to Fascism *the most trustworthy ally of the Russian revolution!*

"The German proletariat is the most trustworthy, the most reliable ally of the Russian and the world revolution." (Lenin, *Farewell Letter to the Swiss Workers*)

Another obvious application of Stalin's sabotaging policy, prior to the "Third Period," was seen in his unity with the top leaders of the reformist British trade unions. Stalin struck up a bargain with these agents of British imperialism. In essence, Stalin pledged not to disturb the rule of the British bourgeoisie and in return received the promise that these labor fakery would keep imperialism from interfering within the Soviet Union. This can be gleaned from the resolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee adopted at its Berlin conference, April 1927:

"The fraternal union between the trade union movements of the two countries, incorporated in the Anglo-Russian Committee, cannot and must not violate or restrict their rights and autonomy, or the directing organs of the trade union movement of the respective countries; nor interfere in any manner whatsoever in their internal affairs."

The Browders and Lovestones supported Stalin's machination with the trade union agents of British imperialism. The American lackeys of Stalin resented any criticism of the Purcells, Bromleys and Ben Tillet—"The latest and most contemptible attack made on Purcell... the British workers have confidence in him." (*Daily Worker*, September 25, 1925)

The opportunists in the Comintern called the treacherous British misleaders "comrades" and "leaders of the international proletariat." "Comrade Purcell's speech" (*Inprecorr*, December 16, 1924); "the president of the British Trade Union General Council, Comrade Swales" (Lozovsky, *Daily Worker*, July 4, 1925); "Purcell, famous leader of international labor, speaks at Kansas City on Nov. 4" (*Daily Worker*, October 21, 1925).

During the fake show at the Scarborough Congress in 1925 Earl Browder wrote an article, "British Labor Breaks With Imperialism," in which he lied to the workers, "and now, almost without warning, the fundamental support of imperialism is withdrawn by the Trade Union Congress. The British bourgeoisie is astounded. It weeps copious tears alternating with stormy threats."

After the foul betrayal of the British General Strike in 1926 by Purcell and Co., Stalin continued for a year his treacherous agreement with them, finally abandoning it, to save his face before the Communist workers.

At this stage of the development of Stalinism anything akin

to the "Third Period" would have ruined the process. Only following the expulsion of the Left Opposition and the crushing of the "democratic" bureaucrats could the "Third Period" be used effectively, as it later was.

Viewed in the light of the German experience, the hideous betrayal of the Chinese workers and peasants in 1925-1927 to the Chinese bourgeoisie by Stalin is revealed sharply. The situation was altogether different from that in Germany. In Germany Stalin's task was to keep the vast, class-conscious proletariat from action. This was successfully accomplished by ideological confusion, by isolating the advanced workers from the backward, and by direct and silent sabotage in the moments when revolutionary action was imperative. In China the whole proletariat and tens of millions of the peasantry were in revolt against feudalism, against the imperialists and the native bourgeoisie. Only the axes of the executioners and the machine guns of the generals could prevent the toilers from sweeping away the ruling classes. Clearly, the tactics applied later in Germany were not suited for the greatest revolutionary upheaval in the history of the Orient. There was no Social Democracy and consequently no need for the "theory" of "social-fascism" and the tactic of the "united front from below only." The masses, inspired by the shining example of the October Revolution, looked up to the Chinese Communist Party, to the Comintern, to the Soviet Union. Communism was the word, the program that spread like wildfire among the Chinese workers and peasants, particularly among the Chinese youth. And to the official leader of the Soviet Union, of the Comintern, Stalin, they entrusted their destiny. Stalin actually steered the course of the Chinese Revolution.

In the case of China Stalin's task was to strangle the Communist Party and to strengthen the bourgeois Kuomintang. He accomplished this in the following manner. The Chinese bourgeoisie, its party, the Kuomintang, and its General Chiang Kai-shek were declared to be revolutionary, fighting against imperialism and reaction. The Browders were diligently spreading the poison of confidence in the Kuomintang. Stalin established friendly connections with Chiang Kai-shek, exchanging portraits with him. A united front *from above* was consummated with the Kuomintang. This bourgeois organization was officially taken into the Comintern as a fraternal section. In turn, the Chinese Communist Party was ordered to join the Kuomintang

and submit to the ideological and political influence and organizational discipline of the bourgeoisie. While the bourgeoisie had ample means of propaganda and disseminated their poison with a free hand, the Communist Party of China was deliberately prevented by the Stalinist Executive of the "Kuomintern," as the Trotsky-Zinoviev Opposition began to call the Comintern humorously, from issuing a daily paper for the masses hungry for information of a Communist nature. Even the weekly organ of the Communist Party of China was sabotaged, appearing irregularly. The demand of the Opposition for the creation of workers', peasants' and soldiers' Soviets and for the arming of the proletariat was stubbornly fought by Stalin. The Opposition's demand for the independence of the Chinese Communist Party from the Kuomintang was stifled in a storm of "theoretical" arguments.

The leaders of the Chinese bourgeoisie took advantage of the opportunity offered by Stalin. On March 20, 1926, Chiang Kai-shek carried out his first coup d'état in Canton, arresting scores of Communists and savagely suppressing the workers' movement. Another attempt at a coup was made in Shanghai.

The counter-revolutionary moves by the Chinese bourgeoisie were not decisive; the back of the proletariat was far from being broken. Stalin realized that and continued his policy of strangling the Communist Party within the Kuomintang, flatly rejecting proposals to form Soviets in China. Eight months after the Kuomintang unmistakably showed its counter-revolutionary claws, Stalin argued:

"It is said that the Chinese Communists ought to secede from the Kuomintang. This is pure folly, comrades. It would be the greatest mistake for the Chinese Communists to leave the Kuomintang. . . . Comrade Mif believes that we ought at once to issue the slogan of the formation of Soviets, of peasant Soviets, in the open country. I believe that this is a mistake." (Stalin's speech in the Chinese Commission, November 30, 1926. Printed in the *Daily Worker*, January 15, 1927)

In this speech the treacherous Stalin suggested that the Chinese youth be turned over to the Kuomintang to be put into the *ideological* and *political* bondage of the bourgeoisie:

"The young people at the universities (revolutionary students), the young workers, the young peasants—all of them form a force which might drive the revolution forward with giant strides, if the young

people were brought under the *ideological* and *political* influence of the Kuomintang." (*Ibid.*)

Stalin, very apprehensive of the youth, understood that the Chinese Communist Party directed by Browder, Doriot, Neumann and others must succeed in chaining the youth to the bourgeoisie; else this most oppressed and rebellious section of the Chinese masses would be set afire by the ideal of Communism and no one on earth would be strong enough to stop the Red conflagration. In the same speech Stalin pointed this out, without revealing the mainspring of his policy:

"It must be borne in mind that there are none who experience the oppression of imperialism so deeply and so vitally, none who feel so sharply and so painfully the necessity of fighting against oppression, as the young people in China. This circumstance should be taken into consideration in every respect by the Chinese Communist Party and Chinese revolutionaries in order to bring about an intensification of work among the young people throughout the country."

Intensify your work among the most militant section of the masses! Help Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek bring the youth under the political and ideological influence of the Kuomintang!

All along, Chiang Kai-shek was presented to the workers as an incorruptible revolutionist:

"A Revolutionary like Chiang Kai Shi [Chiang Kai-shek] will not act in co-operation with the counter-revolutionary Chang Tso Lin, as the imperialists had hoped, in order to fight against the liberation movement." (*Inprecorr*, March 31, 1927, p. 446)

In April 1927 Chiang Kai-shek struck a heavy blow at the proletariat of Shanghai. Communist workers were beheaded, shot, tortured to death in the streets of the city. This time Chiang Kai-shek was exposed to the whole world as a Chinese Galifet. But the Stalinists continued instilling confidence in the butcher of the workers. Earl Browder, at that time serving Stalin and the Chinese bourgeoisie, in order to prevent the proletariat from freeing itself from the grip of the ruling classes, taught the workers to forgive the crimes of their executioners. Arguing that Chiang Kai-shek and his agents were fighting foreign imperialism, Browder urged the workers to continue with them in the united front:

"We watched all these violent actions of Chiang Kai-shek and his agents with great anxiety, but *hoped* that he would hesitate to

turn a *bare-faced* traitor to the nationalist movement. At this critical period of the Nationalist revolution preservation of the united front is so imperative that all crimes of those who fight against imperialism can be temporarily overlooked." (*Chinese Correspondence*, May 1, 1927, Declaration of the Delegation of the Communist International—Earl Browder of U.S.A., Jacques Doriot of France, Tom Mann of England. Emphasis mine—G.M.)

In the quotation above, Browder inadvertently lets his inner thoughts come to the surface. He shows that there was no doubt in his mind that Chiang Kai-shek was a traitor. He watched the anti-workers terror of Chiang "with great anxiety" but he *hoped* that this bloody butcher continue a *hidden* traitor! Of course, even after Chiang tore off his mask, Stalin's policy had to be continued for awhile; therefore, all crimes committed by Chiang Kai-shek should be overlooked—temporarily, until further instructions from the Chief in the Kremlin. But Chiang's unintermittent terror forced Stalin to abandon this "revolutionary" general and the "Right Kuomintang."

The lessons of the past the Stalinist bureaucrats utilized in their own interests. To send representatives of the proletariat into bourgeois government (Milerandism), it was explained as far back as 1904, is to assist the bourgeoisie to conduct its struggle against the toilers. Stalin sent two Chinese Browders into the bourgeois government of the "Left Kuomintang" headed by Wang Chin Wei, with its seat at Hankow. One as Minister of Labor to suppress the workers, the other as Minister of Agriculture, to suppress the peasants. The scoundrels carried out the tasks they were assigned to by Stalin and the Chinese bourgeoisie. The Communist Minister of Agriculture, Tang Ping Shan, in his dastardliness went as far as to personally lead a body of armed men and mow down the peasants who rose against the feudal oppressors.

Even after the whole world saw that the Kuomintang was a counter-revolutionary party of the Chinese bourgeoisie, Stalin's clerks in the Executive of the "Comintern" rejected the demand of the Opposition for withdrawing from that reactionary organization:

"The E.C.C.I. resolutely rejects all demands for the Communist Party to leave the Kuomintang." (Eighth Plenum of the Executive of the Comintern, May 1927)

And the organization of workers and peasants was to be carried on with the perspective of sending them into that bourgeois trap:

"The E.C.C.I. insistently calls the attention of the Chinese Communist Party to the necessity of all possible measures for the strengthening and developing of all mass organizations of workers and peasants. . . . Within all these organizations it is necessary to carry on an agitation for the entrance into the Kuomintang." (*Ibid.*)

The Stalinists continued poisoning the masses with the belief that the Kuomintang represented *unity* of various classes, *including the proletariat*:

"And the Kuomintang, as the symbol of the unity of workers, peasants, and petty bourgeoisie of the cities is by no means dead." (Earl Browder, *New Masses*, September 1927)

To put an end to the dragged-out menace, Stalin engineered the Canton adventure which was directed by his agents from Hong Kong. The despicable Heinz Neumann, who later talked of fraternal peace between the Nazis and the Communists, was there among the other Stalinist agents. In the wake of defeats already suffered, this treacherous putsch was launched by Stalin's *appointed* "Soviet." Afterward, the E.C.C.I. with the scapegoat system in full operation, criticized the representatives of the Comintern for the "absence of an *elected* Soviet as an organ of insurrection" (*Resolution of the E.C.C.I.*, February 1928).

The wretched and doubly oppressed coolies and workers of Canton, seeing a glimmer of hope to break the shackles of untold misery and slavery, rose in insurrection. Chiang Kai-shek's cutthroats fell upon the proletarians of Canton. Thousands were shot, butchered, beheaded. Bleeding corpses were piled up in the streets of the vast city. With the frightful blood-letting in Canton, followed by a wave of White terror in other cities, the entire Communist proletariat was wiped out. The Chinese Revolution was terminated.

Deluded by the facade of Red phrases, having no clear picture of the political developments within the Soviet Union since Lenin's death, far from knowing the skillfully hidden fact that the Comintern became a paradise for intellectual pirates, the Chinese workers and many of their leaders took the "greatest disciple of Lenin" and his confederates at their word. The nega-

tive policy shackled the vanguard of the Chinese masses and set free the beast of counter-revolution. The collapse of the great upheaval was the culmination of a series of moves and measures by Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek.

The ragged, hungry workers of China, while their heads were being severed by the beheading swordsmen of "Comrade" Chiang Kai-shek, were remote from the slightest suspicion that they were victims of the worst Judas in history; that the real assassin was thousands of miles away lurking in the shadows of the Kremlin Palace.

How great was the number of the victims of Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek in China? One can gather from Kuusinen's report:

"I want to give the following figures from the statistics of the International Labor Defense: On January 1, 1932, the number of proletarian political prisoners was 192,673. From 1925 to 1931 the number of arrests was 1,223,052, the number of those mishandled—630,159; of those murdered and tortured to death—1,040,608." (Kuusinen, Report at the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. My emphasis—G.M.)

This was before the German betrayal. The majority of those murdered and tortured to death were *Chinese proletarians!* How many? The exact number will never be known—as it will never be known how many trusting German workers fell victim to Stalin and Hitler.

Throughout the entire period in which the atrocious scheme to destroy the Chinese Revolution was being put into practice, Stalin and his myrmidons never tired of repeating that their line in China had been correct:

"The line adopted was the only correct line." (J. Stalin, "Problems of the Chinese Revolution," *Pravda*, April 21, 1927)

"The national bourgeoisie has deserted to the camp of the counter-revolution and has lost contact with the broad masses of the people. . . . Is it not clear that only a correct policy could have led to such results?" (Stalin, quoted in *Heroic China*, by P. Miff, p. 43, Workers Library Publishers. My emphasis—G.M.)

"The E.C.C.I. states that the events fully justified the prognosis of the Seventh Plenum." (*Resolution on China*, Eighth Plenum of the Executive of the Comintern, May 1927)

All the hypocritical souls in the Comintern, all the educated petty-bourgeois leeches on the body of the revolutionary proletariat, from Earl Browder to Bertram D. Wolfe, defended Stalin's course in China.

At the Sixth Congress of the Comintern with the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Opposition ousted, dispersed and silenced, the Lovestones and Fosters, suddenly becoming victims of amnesia, not once recalling that they themselves had agreed that the line in China had been "the only correct line," unloaded their guilt upon the Chinese Communist Party itself and voted *unanimously* for the following:

"The Communist Party of China has suffered a series of severe defeats due to a number of grave opportunist errors committed in the past, viz., lack of independence from and failure freely to criticize the Kuomintang; the failure to understand that the revolution was passing from one stage to another, and the necessity for timely preparations for resistance, and, finally, its retarding of the agrarian revolution." (*Thesis on Retrospect of Work Done*, Sixth Congress of the Communist International, 1928)

But it was not the miserable collection of Chinese "Communist leaders" who wrecked the Chinese Revolution through "grave opportunist errors"; it was the powerful Stalin who stubbornly and persistently guided the Chinese Revolution of 1925-1927 into the fire of Chiang Kai-shek. A flunkey of Stalin, who cringingly puts his master's name before that of Lenin's, admits that much:

"Stalin *together* with Lenin [My emphasis—G.M.] developed the theory and guided the practice of colonial revolutions, that is to say revolutions in countries fully or partly subjugated by imperialist powers. But *it was Stalin who guided* [My emphasis—G.M.] the great Chinese Revolution of 1925-1927." (M. J. Olgin, *Daily Worker*, November 2, 1935)

The Chinese Revolution, having lost its proletarian army, retreated from the coastal commercial and industrial districts into the interior of immense China. The temporary existence of the Red-peasant areas is credited by the Stalinists to themselves. Meanwhile the lynx-eyed Stalin is watching. If revolution unrolls once more over China, Stalin will "guide" it again. In *words* for one reason, he will support it, in *deeds*, for another reason, he will strangle it. The line, of course, will be "correct."

Only people destitute of light, who blindfold themselves or are blindfolded by the Browders, will say that Stalin committed an error in China, that he did not realize what he was doing. Only fools will think that Stalin is a fool. After all, it does not require deep penetration to grasp that a Soviet China with its four hundred million slaves liberated would set afire the billion colonial wretches of all Asia, more than half of the population of the earth! India would break the neck of the British blood-suckers. The proletariat of Japan would follow suit at once. The repercussions would arouse America and Europe; Russia would inevitably be pushed into the background. Burocratic centralization of the first workers State would become a thing of the past.

No, Stalin wasn't so stupid as not to see in a successful Chinese revolution a great danger to himself and his rising pyramid. Especially in view of the fact that the process of centralization had not yet been completed, the turn towards Workers Democracy would have been a certainty. The Trotsky-Zinoviev Opposition Bloc, still within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Comintern, in the event of revolutionary success in the capitalist world would have arrested the growth of Stalinization, weeded out "the wild grass of burocratism" and carried out Lenin's will—removed Stalin! No, Stalin's line in China, as later in Germany, was absolutely "correct."

To the long and bitter story of betrayals of the oppressed were added two chapters, more terrible, more stark and hideous than anything ever seen throughout history. And very few workers have learned the bloody lesson of Stalin's delivery of the Chinese and the German toilers to the hangmen of the exploiting classes.

CANNON AND SHACHTMAN LEND COMFORT TO BROWDER

IN THE Spring of 1933 I left Browder's "Party"—that vast and noisy burial ground crowded with graves where lie the murdered hopes and enthusiasm of over a hundred thousand workers who have gone through it since its foundation. Sincere and trusting, attracted by the vigorous pseudo-Communist language, the workers mistook this field of death for the camp of the revolutionary army of their class. They failed to discern the true nature of the burocratic gate-keepers, to discover the wolfish fangs hidden by the Red bonnet. Having experienced the blighting touch of the icy fingers of Browder and his Stachels and Trachtenbergs, they departed in confusion, gloom and disappointment, leaving their places to other unsuspecting victims of the Stalinist guiles.

For some months I remained unaffiliated with any political organization, continuing my study and investigation. Life furnished me with every reason for not following Stalin, Browder, and Olgin, and certain grounds for siding with Trotsky. I was not in agreement with many of Trotsky's views. I was quite aware that nearly two decades ago Trotsky had been a Menshevik. Lenin in his Testament advised not to hold this against Trotsky. No one is born a Marxist. To become one is a process of development, and the greatest minds might commit errors. I remembered that Marx had been a bourgeois democrat, and five years later produced one of the greatest proletarian documents in history, *The Communist Manifesto*. As to Trotsky's fight with Lenin—who better knew Trotsky's sharp darts against Lenin, including the letter to Cheidze, than Lenin himself! Yet when Trotsky became a Bolshevik, Lenin did not in a petty way rake up the memories of bitter disagreements of yesteryears; did not engage in slander and revengeful abuse. In a truly Leninist

way he recognized that the man had erred and now honestly took up a correct position. The sudden publication of Trotsky's letter to Cheidze by the Stalinists immediately after Lenin's death, when the masses, deeply grieved, mourned their departed leader, was a fair indication to me of the dishonesty and frame-up methods of Stalin. It was enough to recall how readily I had believed the authenticity of the Wrangel officer conspiracy. In 1927 the Communist Youth Left Oppositionists in the Soviet Union were detected, the story went, to be in a counter-revolutionary plot with a former White Guard officer of General Wrangel. What was omitted from the information given us in the Communist Party by Browder, Weinstone and others, was the "tiny" fact that this ex-White Guardist was an agent of the G.P.U., planted among the Oppositionists by Stalin for the frame-up. The Wrangel officer plot was indirectly admitted by Stalin:

"There is talk of a former Wrangel officer who is in the service of the G.P.U. in order to discover counter-revolutionary organizations. The Opposition is excited over this and makes a great fuss because a former Wrangel officer, to whom the allies of the Opposition, all these Cherbakovs and Tverskys applied, turned out to be an agent of the G.P.U. What is there bad about that, if this same former Wrangel officer is helpful to the Soviet power in discovering counter-revolutionary conspiracies?" (J. Stalin, *Inprecorr*, November 17, 1927, p. 1431)

Posing the question as Lenin did in 1917, I examined Trotsky's position. My conclusion was that his main policy, that of building a new Communist International, was correct. My duty, therefore, was to stand shoulder to shoulder with him.

When I had arrived at my political deductions I went over to see James P. Cannon, the leader of the Communist League of America (Trotskyites).

I told Cannon frankly that I disagreed with Trotsky on the question of proletarian literature and I believed that Trotsky underestimated the criminal nature of Stalinism. However, I was convinced, as was Trotsky, that the Third International was beyond redemption, that it had gone the way of the Second International and had historically become a reactionary organization and an obstacle to the proletarian revolution. We talked it over and concluded that my differences with the "Old Man" did not constitute a barrier to my joining the League.

When my new political affiliation became known to Browder and his henchmen, they thought up the vilest of all their slander and broadcast it among the workers. *The Road* was now "counter-revolutionary"; and its author a degenerate, a White Guardist, a Hitlerite. This, too, was done through subterranean channels. Officially, silence was maintained as before.

And now within the Trotskyist organization I came upon a new, very instructive experience which made clear to me that I had learned much and yet had much to learn.

It taught me that capitalism, due to diverse interests of classes, groups, castes and sections within each class and group, produces various species of demagogues and dissemblers, some so subtle, sinuous and elusive that a worker's brain must make a vigorous exertion to separate substance from outward manifestations that tend to deceive the mental eye.

Making myself familiar with the life in the Communist League of America, I was struck by the complete lack of animation among its members, and particularly among the leaders. The organization was steeped in apathy. Cannon, who at public meetings seemed a raging lion ready to tear limb from limb every Browder and Stachel, privately told me, to my immense astonishment, that there was no hope of breaking Stalin's and Browder's grip on the workers. The Stalinite workers, he said with conviction, were impervious to argument.

I was shocked. Such a statement could denote only one thing: no faith in the work of building a new Communist Party. Further observation convinced me that the Communist League of America was conducting the *minimum* not the maximum of struggle against Stalinism. The remark "We must turn our back upon the C.P." which I heard more than once, indicated that the League felt too impotent to combat Browder's huge opportunist machine.

The truckmen's strike in Minneapolis, led by the Trotskyites, stirred for some brief moments the stale air of political stagnation. Later the attention of the organization was focused on the fusion negotiations Cannon carried on with Muste, leader of the American Workers Party.

Of a sudden something happened that galvanized the League. The organization throbbed with life. The atmosphere of futility was dispelled as though by magic. Everybody talked and discussed, and many members, particularly Cannon and Shacht-

man, beamed. The electrifying news was the now famous "French Turn."

Historical moves bring out political tendencies. I discovered three distinct groups within the League which reacted differently toward the "French Turn" and fusion with Muste. The Cannon-Shachtman group, the Weber group—both groups, generally speaking, standing on the same political platform and accepting the "French Turn"—and a Left group, led by Hugo Oehler, in sharp opposition to the first two groups and dead against the "French Turn."

The "French" orientation, in brief, was Trotsky's move to send his followers in France into the French Socialist Party; and later his entire organization into the Second International.

In a letter of the International Secretariat of the League to all sections, dated Geneva, July 24, 1934, the following was stated:

"Comrade G. [Trotsky], along with others, thinks the time has come for the French organization to take its place in one of the camps of the United Front, working for probable organic unity. The Stalinist camp being closed, the only way open is that of entry into the S.F.I.O. (Socialist Party of France)."

The reason for this astounding step was the consummation of the united front by the Stalinists and Socialists in France, and the Trotskyites' fear of remaining out in the cold. Rejecting fraction work in the two Internationals, the liquidation of independence was decided upon with the object of working for the unification of bankrupt Stalinism and bankrupt Social Democracy.

The theoretical justification for the "French Turn" was provided by Trotsky in the article "Bolshevik-Leninists and the S.F.I.O." In it Trotsky sharply departs from Leninism, presenting the Second International as a force which will break with the bourgeoisie because the latter discard the "democratic" method of rule, and which will put up a decisive struggle against Fascism—for the overthrow of capitalism. Why will that be so? Trotsky explains:

"The crisis of the democratic state and the crisis of the Social-Democratic Party develop in parallel, but opposite directions. Whereas the state marches toward Fascism across the Bonapartist stage, the Socialist Party approaches a life and death struggle with Fascism

across a 'loyal,' quasi-parliamentary opposition to the Bonapartist state. An understanding of this dialectic of the reciprocal relations between bourgeois state and social democracy is an indisputable prerequisite for the correct revolutionary policy; this is just the question on which the Stalinists broke their neck." (*The New International*, September-October 1934)

The argumentation above is incorrect. In the first place the Stalinist bureaucrats *saved their neck* not only through their own policy but also due to the fact that Social Democracy is no instrument of struggle against the bourgeoisie. Secondly, when the bourgeoisie is preparing its State to operate on Fascist lines, Social Democracy finds itself in a panic. Since its rôle as the agent of bourgeois democracy is over, it flings itself hopelessly and impotently this way and that, retreating before triumphant Fascism. Finally, at the twelfth hour, Social Democracy either yields to the new manager of the bourgeoisie without lifting a finger (Germany); or with the Fascist knife drawing closer to its petty-bourgeois democratic throat, pressed from below by the enraged, deceived workers, Social Democracy throws itself in utter despair against the victorious Fascist monster (Austria); or, having fulfilled its traditional function of preventing the Leftward development toward the overthrow of capitalism, Social Democracy attempts to hold back the Fascist intruder for whom it has left the door wide open. The mortal conflict of Social Democracy with Fascism is of the same nature as the mortal conflict of a cornered rat with a terrier. In the final analysis *it is mortal for Social Democracy*.

But Trotsky has suddenly "discovered" that the opposite is true, and to such an extent that the destiny of the proletariat, now that the Third International is anti-Marxist, is bound up with the destiny of Social Democracy:

"The destiny of the proletariat depends, in large measure, in our epoch, upon the resolute manner with which the social-democracy will succeed in the brief interval which is vouchsafed it by the march of development, in breaking with the bourgeois state, in transforming itself and in preparing itself for the decisive struggle against Fascism." (*Ibid.*)

This is a reevaluation of the entire Leninist conception of Social Democracy. It is false through and through! It is not Social Democracy that breaks with the bourgeois State; it is *the*

bourgeois State that at a certain historical moment *breaks with Social Democracy*. Social Democracy will not "transform itself," and will never show resoluteness in overthrowing the bourgeoisie.

The qualm of hopelessness compels Trotsky to sow confusion and raise false hopes among the workers. By binding the destiny of the proletariat to that of Social Democracy, Trotsky tends to instill discouragement in the minds of revolutionary workers. If the Social Democracy in a brief period of time does not become a Bolshevik force, then, in Trotsky's judgment, virtually all hope must be abandoned. However, with his mind in an inexplicable flutter, Trotsky holds out another utopian solution. The Fourth International might develop through the unification of both opportunist organizations through "purging" and "tempering":

"It may be born—theoretically it is not excluded—out of the unification of the Second with the Third, by means of a regrouping of the elements by the purging and tempering of their ranks in the fire of struggle." (*Ibid.*)

Finally Trotsky sees the possibility of the "proletarian kernel" within the Social Democracy becoming radicalized and giving birth to the Fourth International; the Stalinist organization, meanwhile, "decomposing":

"It may be formed also by means of the radicalization of the proletarian kernel of the Socialist Party and the decomposition of the Stalinist organization." (*Ibid.*)

The thought in the quotation above is a wishing away of Stalinism, which can result only in the abandonment of any serious effort to remove Stalin's bureaucratic machine since it is decomposing, it is liquidating itself:

"Having liquidated all the theories of revolutionary Marxism, the C.P. is now engaged in liquidating itself... in its work of self-liquidation we cannot but wish the Stalinists godspeed." (*The New International*, March 1935, p. 37)

Trotsky's outlook for the formation of the Fourth International includes the following variant:

"But it may also be formed considerably later, in a number of years, in the midst of the ruins and the accumulation of debris following upon the victory of Fascism and war." (*The New International*, September-October 1934)

Confusion and hopelessness had suddenly seized hold of Trotsky's mind after the German events. If the revolutionary workers accept Trotsky's first two variants as possibilities, the last one will become an inevitability.

Trotsky's struggle to correct the Stalintern proved futile, historically impossible of achievement. Arriving at the recognition of this pitiless fact, Trotsky took up the stand for an independent revolutionary international, but not for long. For him it became a transitory position, a bridge upon which to go over from being a faction of the Third towards becoming a faction in the Second International, to engage in another historically impossible task of "reforming," "capturing," "transforming" Social Democracy. In essence, Trotsky gave up the idea of creating an *independent* international organization.

In 1903 Lenin created the germ of the International he organized in 1919. With respect to building an independent organization, Lenin's precept was:

"We must work at forming a militant organization and conducting political agitation even in 'drab' and peaceful conditions, and even in the period of 'declining revolutionary spirit.' More than that, it is precisely in such conditions and in such a period that this work is necessary, because in the moment of outbreaks and outbursts it will be too late to set up an organization. The organization must be ready, in order to be able to develop its activity immediately." (Lenin, *Where to Begin*)

Without Lenin's working along the line of the *independence of the Marxist organization*, the October Revolution would have never been.

The Communist International in the days of Lenin emphasized the need of an independent political party of the proletariat:

"The Communist International emphatically rejects the opinion that the workers could carry out a revolution without having an independent political party of their own." (Second Congress, July 1920)

Lenin could not have formulated the essence of Social Democracy better than Trotsky himself did in the following sentences:

"At first the Social Democracy was for reform against the revolution; now it is even against reform out of fear of revolution. Social Democracy is always against revolution." (*The Militant*, June 28, 1930)

"The Social Democracy, the hanger-on of the bourgeoisie, is doomed to wretched ideological parasitism." (Leon Trotsky, *What Next*, p. 20)

Trotsky, two months before his dreadful step, spoke true Leninist words about the Centrists, and not about merely Centrists but *Left* Centrists:

"The left centrists, who are in turn distinguished by a great number of shadings (S.A.P. in Germany, O.S.P. in Holland, I.L.P. in England, the Zyromski and Marceau Pivert groups in France and others) arrive in words at the renunciation of the defense of the fatherland. But from this bare renunciation they do not draw the necessary practical conclusions. The greater half of their internationalism, if not nine tenths of it, bears a platonic character. They fear to break away from the right centrists; in the name of the struggle with 'sectarianism' they carry on a struggle against Marxism, refuse to fight for a revolutionary International and *continue to remain in the Second International* at the head of which stands the king's footman, Vandervelde. Expressing at certain moments the leftward shift of the masses, *in the final analysis* the centrists put a brake upon the revolutionary re-grouping within the proletariat and consequently also upon the struggle against war." (*War and the 4th International*, pp. 16-17. My emphasis—G.M.)

Immediately upon uttering this lucid formulation, Trotsky sent his followers into the Second International at the head of which stands the king's footman, Vandervelde, and within the folds of which reside such arch-enemies of Lenin and Bolshevism as the renegade Karl Kautsky and the Russian Menshevik Abramovich.

When Trotsky declared for the Fourth International his attitude towards the Second was solid Leninist. In the appeal for the Fourth International, printed in *The Militant*, March 31, 1934, the words were clear:

"Is it possible to *reform* or *renew* the Second International, pervaded by crimes and treacheries? The war and all post-war events answer: 'No!'... Social Democracy is devoted in body and soul to the bourgeois regime."

The Pre-Conference of the Left Opposition in February 1933 in Paris, adopted the Eleven Points of principles. Point one reads: "The independence of the proletarian party, always and under all conditions."

Independence, Trotsky wrote before his "French Turn," is one of the basic qualities of Bolshevism:

"Not a soulful 'optimism,' but intolerance, vigilance, revolutionary distrust, and the struggle for every hand's breadth of independence—these are the basic qualities of Bolshevism." (L. Trotsky, *Strategy of the World Revolution*, p. 62)

"Had not the Communist Party broken definitely and irrevocably with the Social democracy, it could have never become the party of the proletarian revolution." (L. Trotsky, *Five Years of the Comintern*, p. 375, Russian edition)

"The Communist Party cannot fulfill its mission except by preserving, completely and unconditionally, its political and organizational independence apart from all other parties and organizations within and without the working class. To transgress this basic principle of Marxist policy is to commit the most heinous of crimes against the interests of the proletariat, as a class." (Leon Trotsky, *What Next*, p. 42)

What illusion prompted Trotsky to go back to the Second International? Was it the possibility of overpowering or outmaneuvering the giant bureaucratic machine? That the rank-and-file would free itself mind and body, from the reactionary leadership and drive out this leadership? Then he forgot 1914, and how he himself had clearly seen the paralyzing power of the Socialist bureaucracy:

"On the eve of the imperialist war, we saw with remarkable distinction how the formidable Social Democratic apparatus, protected by the authority of the old generation, became the most powerful hindrance to the revolutionary development." (L. Trotsky, *Letter to the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.*, October 1923)

Of the "value" of Social Democracy to the toiling masses in times of social crisis, war, etc., Trotsky spoke quite clearly:

"The social democracy, though composed of workers, is entirely a bourgeois party, which under 'normal conditions' is led quite expertly from the point of view of bourgeois aims, but which is good for nothing at all under the conditions of a social crisis." (Leon Trotsky, *What Next*, p. 26)

Social Democracy will transform itself and will break with the bourgeoisie? But Trotsky himself correctly stated that Social Democracy, like Fascism, and I may add, like Stalinism, *is a tool of the bourgeoisie*:

"Both Fascism and the social democracy are tools in the hands of the bourgeoisie." (*Ibid.*, p. 59)

The opportunist "French Turn," induced by the fear of isolation, brought results opposite to those expected, and in the struggle against Stalinism and the bourgeoisie rendered Trotsky completely ineffective. The Stalinist workers, on some questions, are undoubtedly far to the Left of the Socialist workers. The Stalinist worker is free of the Social-Democratic deception regarding the possibility of overthrowing capitalist slavery by peaceful means. The Socialist worker, still harboring bourgeois-democratic illusions, is quite aware of the reformist nature of the Socialist Party which does not pretend to be a Leninist organization. The illusion of the workers entering the Stalinist Party is that Stalinism is Leninism. Through the "French Turn" the Stalinist worker is invited into the Trotskyist faction of the Socialist Party. It means he must become a member of that Party, a Social Democrat. That step backward the average Stalinist worker will never take. The Leftward-moving Socialist worker, when realizing that the Socialist Party is hardly a weapon against capitalism, will either go over to the "Communists" or, if he becomes convinced that a new revolutionary party is needed, will remain in the Socialist Party to "reform" it, since the "Fourth Internationalists" are pursuing this task.

From the day it was propounded the "French Turn" has been a confuser of the workers and a hindrance to the creation of the Fourth International. Objectively it has played into the hands of Stalin and the Social Democracy, and therefore the international bourgeoisie. Trotsky's false policy of peacemaking with the rigid and uncompromising bureaucratic centralism of the workers State flowed from his erroneous estimation of Stalinism; his "French Turn" is the consequence of his reevaluation of Social Democracy.

In connection with Trotsky's failing it is necessary to point out one very significant fact. During the World War, the October Revolution, and for many years after, every position Trotsky held, every proposal he made, correct or wrong, he defended openly. The thesis reevaluating the Social Democracy was made public not over his well-known, recognized name, but over an enigmatic initial "V." And even the internal League documents containing directives to his followers to enter the Socialist Parties were hidden behind various pseudonyms. What other explanation of this procedure is there but that the thesis and the documents were written in a trembling hand, in defiance of the

indignant shade of Lenin whose condemnatory finger was pointing at the false words which carried with them a great injury to the working class.

From the opportunist position on the extreme Left of the bankrupt Second International during the World War to the correct Marxist position in Lenin's Party in 1917; through the uncertain fight against the degeneration of the Party and the Comintern first as an inside faction (1923-1927) then as a faction outside the Stalintern (1927-1933); through the stand for a Fourth International, breaking with and maintaining a position independent of both stinking corpses; back to the rôle of a faction on the extreme Left of the Second International—such is the road Trotsky has travelled—so far.

One might argue that there was some excuse for Trotsky during the war in opposing Lenin's correct position. He did not then fully understand and accept Bolshevism—hardly anyone did. But when after witnessing for two decades a whole series of black Social-Democratic betrayals which concretely established the unmistakable counter-revolutionary rôle of Social Democracy, after the correctness of Leninism has been brilliantly demonstrated by the founding of the first proletarian republic, Trotsky furnishes a "revolutionary" screen to the treacherous Second International, then he must be severely criticized and mercilessly combated. Whether Trotsky returns to Leninism or sinks deeper into the mire of Social Democracy the future will show.

In the Workers Party, the product of the fusion of Cannon's and Muste's forces, Cannon, Shachtman and Co. adopted an unspeakably revolting attitude of pampering Budenz, Lore and other reactionaries, opportunists and Bohemians. Budenz made a sally upon Marxism by proposing to accomplish the abolition of capitalist slavery in America through an amendment to the Constitution. Here is what Louis F. Budenz, then a prominent member of the Workers Party, now labor editor of Browder's *Daily Worker*, wrote in *Modern Monthly*, March 1935:

"But how would such an American revolutionary movement proceed to its task? First of all, it will safeguard its integrity and give a focal point to the struggle by basing itself on a proposed amendment to the Constitution. This amendment will strike a death blow at the Profit System, even as the Thirteenth Amendment did to Chattel Slavery."

Budenz openly invited outright expulsion; instead, he was allowed to remain in the Party. But his opportunist eye was caught by the inviting warren of the Stalinern, far richer in game than the barren Workers Party. With a show of defiance he threw his resignation into the faces of Cannon and Muste. Instead of replying with an expulsion Cannon tried to persuade Budenz not to go to the Stalinites but stay and thrash out his differences.

What prompted Cannon, a rank opportunist, to become "honest" overnight and join the Russian Left Opposition in 1928?

With Cannon, as with Lovestone, it was speculation on the struggle within the Soviet Union, and, like Lovestone, he miscalculated. He took a longer perspective and banked on Trotsky, believing, as Trotsky believed, that the Russian proletariat, having exhibited enormous revolutionary energy and self-reliance, would not stomach Stalinism, and in a year or two would put the Opposition in power. In that case Cannon's prestige would have been immense. But Stalinism got a long lease on life. It grew stronger year by year and its inevitable collapse was shrouded in the dim future.

When it dawned upon Cannon, after the exile of Trotsky from the Soviet Union early in 1929, that he had miscalculated, that victory was far away, he, one of the most energetic figures in the old Communist movement, lapsed into passivity and indifference. This sterling "revolutionist" whose heart "aches" for the oppressed proletariat, whose mind, as one is led to believe listening to his speeches, is aflame with the desire to overthrow Stalinism, and even the American bourgeoisie, at that time contemplated giving up political life and retiring to a farm. All this is common knowledge among the old League members. A few quotations from a very illuminating internal League document, *The Situation in the American Opposition: Prospect and Retrospect*, by Max Shachtman, Albert Glotzer and Martin Abern, June 1932, tell something about it. When Cannon and others, having gone over to Trotsky, were expelled by Lovestone from the Communist Party—

"... all the comrades, collaborated intimately, amicably and above all, energetically. Unfortunately, this condition lasted only for the first few months. After the first wave of expulsions, the Committee began to drop due to the steady reduction of activity of the outstanding leader of the Opposition, Cannon. ... We began at that time to hear

incessantly about our work being a 'protracted up-hill struggle'... On the very eve of our First National Conference (May 1929) Comrade Cannon... proposed to quit the Center entirely, retire to the West (Missouri)... Right after the Conference, we were given a more striking illustration of how Comrade Cannon interpreted in practice the otherwise general phrase about the 'protracted' character of our fight. Without the slightest reason, the administrative work of the League was grossly neglected...

"Comrade Cannon, evidently under the impression that the absence of one comrade would not affect our work in a period of 'protracted uphill struggle' thereupon simply and literally deserted the League entirely... we had to cope in addition with the passive sabotage of Cannon..."

"As for Cannon, he never gave an explanation of his conduct."

I guess not! An opportunist will never reveal his innermost designs and secret reasons for disappointments. The document quotes a letter by Swabeck to Cannon:

"Your complete absence from all activities in our movement for a long time has become noticeable... I am speaking of complete absence because this is what it practically amounts to when one compares the past with the present..."

Of course it is difficult to surmise what Cannon's plans were. That Cannon would not get out of the labor movement entirely, is clear. Whether he figured to go back to the Communist Party or move towards the Socialist Party no one knew except himself. His "strange" inactivity brought up the question of his *expulsion* from the League. The document states:

"When the state of affairs in the resident National Committee had been discussed, it was Swabeck who finally declared that he believed it might be necessary for us to expel Cannon publicly from the League so that—to use his words—Cannon would be unable to sneak out of the movement quietly! The other comrades, notably Comrade Skoglund, expressed themselves in a similar sense."

The document quotes a letter by Spector of Canada to Abern. In this letter Spector indicates that Cannon was after organizing an outfit for himself:

"And in these circumstances, one must ponder the political basis for C's attitude of hostility and passivity. What game is he playing? ... C will be making the biggest mistake in his political career if he entertains the vision of reconstituting himself as leader of a group of his own on the basis of the old Lovestone-Cannon-Foster triangle."

To cover his opportunist jump to Trotsky, Cannon averred that his faction had been gestating within the Communist Party to become supporters of the Russian Left Opposition:

"We were 'prepared by the past' for our place under the Banner of the International Left Opposition. . . . The rich experiences of the international struggle were realized for us, as it were, in advance. . . ." (*The Militant*, May 10, 1930)

But the document by Abern, Glotzer and Shachtman says that the opposite was true:

"The Cannon group stood upon the platform of international Stalinism, sometimes a little to the Right of it and sometimes a little to the Left of it . . . if anything, it was the least 'international' of all the party groups, and concerned itself less than any others with such questions as the British General Strike, and the Anglo-Russian Committee, the Chinese Revolution, or the struggles within the Russian Party. . . . It spent more time upon secondary tactical questions in this country than upon a discussion of the theory of socialism in one country, upon which it did indeed spend no time at all."

The seasonal peregrinations of the Cannon group during the pot-and-kettle wars within the Stalinist Party were from one clique to the other. Now with Pepper-Lovestone-Bedacht, now with Foster-Browder-Bittelman, always for Cannon, at no time for the proletariat.

Having sided with Trotsky, the Cannon clique of opportunists set themselves down to study what it was all about, including the Permanent Revolution. Trotsky's persistence revived Cannon's dream. He reconciled himself to the long-term perspective, and his opportunist spine stiffened. Within and around the League there developed a discrepancy of purposes, and two distinct entities: the leaders, who had their special opportunist interests; and the few hundred ranks and sympathizers, who carried within their hearts the hope for the resuscitation of the Communist movement.

This contradiction was obscured by the powerful "anti-Stalinist" demagogy of Cannon and Shachtman and the vicious unpolitical attacks of Browder against Trotsky.

It is very difficult to know the real Cannon behind his neatly adjusted Red mask. An unusually subtle, calculating demagogue, Cannon, without the backing of the world-famous figure, would have been an inconspicuous, average political adventurer seeking

a field of action in a workers' organization. He must stick to Trotsky. He knows that the Russian Revolution is not ended yet. If it surges forward, as we all hope and believe it will, Trotsky may come back. Cannon's accumulated political capital, he figures, will then bring returns.

However, it would be erroneous to say that Cannon on every question agrees with Trotsky. On organizational questions as to who should be at the head of the American outfit, whom to expel, whose articles to suppress, outside of Trotsky's of course, Cannon presents an independent position to which he clings with the tenacity of a bulldog. He puts out Trotsky's works, as Trachtenberg publishes Lenin's, Thomas, Marx's. They all do it for opportunist reasons. Cannon's method of rule to a degree resembles that of Lovestone's. Cannon practices a spurious "democracy" within the organization, exercising a factual control through his bureaucratic machine.

The only fight that Cannon sincerely carried on was the fight against the Lefts who exposed his opportunist political line and his bureaucratic methods. Against the Left the Cannon clique employed typical Stalinist methods: raids upon members' homes, lies and slander, planting of stool-pigeons, brutal gangsterism and expulsion.

Cannon's record in the Communist Party is as filthy as that of any of the Stalinist careerists. He shared with the others the crime of suppressing Left Opposition documents, thus participating in the building up of the Stalinist pyramid. His clique alliances with John Pepper in 1923, with Lovestone in 1925, his "national Opposition Bloc" with Weinstone in 1927, with Foster and Browder time and again, mark his opportunist course. His protectionist policy in the Workers Party towards the incurable opportunist Ludwig Lore was far from being accidental. Cannon and Lore were not strangers in the Workers Party. They had been in alliance in the Communist Party.

The Trotskyites' false position of organizationally being with the Socialists compels them to do both, criticise the Socialists as opportunists and at the same time make the Socialists appear as Leninists fighting for a workers republic.

"The Socialists and Communists, those whom Mussolini has killed, whom 'Il Duce' has persecuted, imprisoned and tortured, *fight for the workers state.*" ("Manifesto of the Italian Bolshevik-Leninists," *New Militant*, November 16, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

To say that both Communists and *Socialists* are fighting for a workers republic is a pure distortion of Leninism. But then something different, and quite correct, is stated in a Workers Party pamphlet:

"The parties of the Second International engineered the great betrayal in 1914. *Nothing fundamental has altered in their position since that time. . . .*"

"Throughout the world, social-democrats of *all shades* support the rottenest types of pacifist organizations. . . . There is only one conclusion to be drawn about the Second International and its parties. They are rotted to the core." (John West, *War and the Workers*. Emphasis mine—G.M.)

Do Cannon, Swabeck, West and Co. repudiate what Trotsky said about the fate of the proletariat depending upon the resolute manner, etc.? No, that was the argument used to enter the Second International. That stands!

But something about the Second International "transforming itself" into a Marxist, revolutionary organization must be told occasionally to the workers. So one can read in the *New Militant*, August 31, 1935:

"SOCIALIST YOUTH OF PARIS RAISE BANNERS
OF REVOLUTION!"

"Editors' Note: . . . Together with the Bolshevik-Leninist group they (the Socialist Youth of Paris) raised the only revolutionary voice in all of France. . . . The spirit that animates 'Revolution' (organ of the Socialist Youth) is the spirit that animated the Bolsheviks in October 1917. Not all of the combined Mensheviks in France in 1935 will be able to withstand its irresistible force."

The banner of what kind of revolution can be raised in France? Obviously *proletarian* revolution. Does it mean then that the Socialist Youth of Paris have cast overboard their former program with its Menshevik conception of the State and have adopted the Leninist position of Soviets against Parliaments, and the dictatorship of the proletariat—have become Bolsheviks? Have they declared against Stalinism and Social Democracy and for the Fourth International? Where? When? In what papers or documents? A few Red words by the Socialist Youth and Social Democrats have been transformed by Cannon into Bolsheviks.

Cannon is not so ignorant as not to know that the Young

Socialist International, fundamentally, carries out the program of the Second International which has no revolutionary line. Cannon knows that essentially the line of the Second International *in all its sections* is the line of the bourgeoisie, and the Red phrases are employed by the Social-Democratic leaders to deceive the workers.

When Trotsky was a million miles from the abyss into which he has now fallen, his words on Social Democracy were clear as a bell:

"The social democracy at present is a parasitic party, in the broad historical sense of the term. Fulfilling the work of guaranteeing bourgeois society from below. . . . The present social democracy has not and cannot have a line of its own on the fundamental questions. In this domain, its line is dictated by the bourgeoisie. But if the social democracy simply repeated everything said by the bourgeois parties, it would cease to be useful to the bourgeoisie. Upon secondary, intangible, or remote questions, the social democracy not only may but must play with all the colors of the rainbow, including bright red." (Leon Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin*, pp. 232-233)

Trotsky and his followers are now helping the Social Democracy to deceive the workers with "bright red." By means of confusion and crude phrase-juggling they must justify the "French Turn."

Since no opportunist can survive amidst revolutionary workers without sly and subtle demagoguery of Leninist-sounding phrases, the Cannon clique attempts to cover its glaring anti-Bolshevik position with this kind of hypocritical verbiage:

"Bolsheviks do not fight only for ideas and programs. They also draw organizational conclusions from their policy. *Had not the Communist Party under the leadership of Lenin broken definitely and irrevocably with social-democracy it could never have become the party of proletarian revolution.* This was the cardinal difference with Social-democracy. For the revolutionary party this difference remains in full force today. (Arne Swabeck, *The New International*, October 1935, p. 180. My emphasis—G.M.)

"It is always essential for the revolutionary Party to maintain its political and organizational independence." (*Ibid.*, p. 181)

After the Workers Party convention in March 1936, during the time when they were entering the Socialist Party in small batches, the hypocrites urged a break with the Social Democracy:

"It is necessary not merely to understand that social-democratic reformism is bankrupt; but, positively, to break sharply from Social-Democracy." (John West, *New Militant*, April 18, 1936)

Six weeks later the Trotskyist leaders, including John West, "broke sharply" with the Social Democracy by joining its ranks. And when they publicly announced the liquidation of their wretched organization into the Socialist Party, these treacherous demagogues declared:

"We obligate ourselves to work loyally and devotedly to build the Socialist Party into a powerful, united organization in the revolutionary struggle for socialism." (*New Militant*, June 6, 1936)

The frightful decay of the Comintern affords Cannon, Shachtman and Co. a unique opportunity to pose as Leninists before some workers. Behind the Red curtain of their often brilliant and unusually powerful imitations of criticism of Stalin, they skillfully conceal another deadly trap for the proletariat, the Social Democracy.

The ranks follow Cannon not because they are enamoured with this lawyer-politician or are enraptured with the "French Turn." They will follow Cannon and accept any turn Trotsky might introduce because they are attached to Trotsky emotionally, as the ranks follow Browder and Stalin out of their attachment to the Soviet Union.

Opportunism, no matter from what quarter, serves the bourgeoisie. Cannon and his Shachtmans, although operating from a different avenue, are *essentially* of the same tribe as Browder, Lovestone and Co. and in the present juncture, objectively, play into the hands of Browder and reaction. The various bands of opportunists have split up among themselves the vanguard of the proletariat. Cannon and his erudite associates are leeches on the back of Trotsky, as Browder and his eloquent Olgins and Hathaways are leeches on the back of the Soviet Union.

THE "SEVENTH CONGRESS"—A MILESTONE OF RENEGADISM

THE Stalinist degeneration has been proceeding rapidly and progressively along all lines. Lenin's thesis on imperialism has been substituted for by Stalin's which divides the nations controlled by the rapacious bourgeoisie into war-promoting (Germany, Japan), outside the League of Nations, and peace-preserving (France, England), members of the League. Accordingly, the workers republic, "in order to help preserve peace," was led by Stalin into the comity of the imperialist League of Nations, to side with the French and the British imperialists.

Lenin called the League of Nations a "group of wild beasts," the "Thieves' Kitchen at Geneva," and similar merited names. No revolutionary worker should ever forget that the first victim of the League of Nations was the Hungarian Soviet Republic. When Lenin lived, Germany was not a member, and certainly it was not only the Japanese robbers who imparted to the League its rapacious imperialistic character. When the Third International was founded, its leaders, Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Radek and others, warned the masses against the League of Nations:

"Under the name of 'League of Nations' the joy of social-patriots and social-opportunists, the great Powers, especially France, simply intend to redivide the world, according to their greed and insatiable appetite. The League of Nations is a new Holy Alliance of capitalists against proletarians and revolution. And the newly formed Communist International was perfectly right in pointing out the dangerousness of this weapon in the hands of the social-traitors, who strive to split the proletarian forces and help the imperialistic counter-revolutionaries." (*The Communist International*, No. 1, p. 71)

Olgin, who, until told otherwise, wrote Leninist phrases on the subject, exposed the hypocrisy of the Socialists with respect to the League in these words:

"The Socialists say they are against war. They demand 'the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations' as a guarantee of peace. Their very reference to the League of Nations as an instrument of peace at a time when the League of Nations is an instrument of war against the Chinese people and the Soviet Union and when a League body (the Lytton Commission) condones and recognizes the forcible taking away of Manchuria from China, is in itself an indication of how earnest the Socialists are about actual peace." (M. J. Olgin, *The Socialist Party, Last Bulwark of Capitalism*, p. 20)

When the power of the bureaucracy had not yet reached the high voltage of centralization, Stalin, in his report at the Fourteenth Congress of the All-Union Communist Party printed in the compilation *Leninism*, spoke these true words of the League:

"The leaders of the Second International do their utmost to persuade the workers that Locarno is an instrument of peace, that the League of Nations is a shrine of peace. . . ." (p. 365)

"That is why we do not want to join the League of Nations. For the League of Nations is an organization designed to mask preparations for war." (*Ibid.*, p. 381)

In *Questions and Answers (Inprecorr, Vol. 7, No. 66, November 24, 1927, p. 381)* Stalin said:

"The Soviet Union is not prepared to become a part of that camouflage for imperialist machinations represented by the League of Nations. The League is the rendezvous of the imperialist leaders who settle their business there behind the scenes. The subjects about which the League speaks officially, are nothing but empty phrases intended to deceive the workers."

In this Stalin still adhered in words to the thesis of the Second Congress of the Comintern drawn up with Lenin's participation. The thesis stated: "The so-called League of Nations is nothing but an insurance policy in which the victors mutually guarantee each other their prey." Even the Sixth Congress, already corroded by Stalinism, still adhered to Leninist phraseology on the League of Nations:

"The fight against the danger of imperialist wars between capitalist states and imperialist wars against the U.S.S.R. must be conducted systematically from day to day. It will be impossible to conduct this fight without exposing pacifism, which, under present conditions, is an important instrument in the hands of the imperialists for their preparations for war and for concealing these preparations. It will be impossible to carry on this struggle without exposing the 'League of Nations' which is the principal instrument of imperialist pacifism." (*Thesis on the International Situation*, adopted at the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, 1928)

And during the wildest phase of the "Third Period":

"There is today no greater danger than to proceed from the mistaken assumptions that the widest masses already know that the League of Nations consists of outspoken representatives of the imperialist warmongers, that the League of Nations is an imperialist swindle, that pacifism is a deception, that the II International is an organ of the bourgeoisie for the preparation of war. These truths must first be proven before the masses on the grounds of the facts and the contrast between words and deeds." (*The Communist International*, No. 4-5, March 1932, pp. 135-136)

And after Hitler's advent to power, when Japan had withdrawn from the League, the League remained what it was:

"The organization of the League of Nations was a part of the Versailles work of robbery, a part set up to conduct a struggle against the proletarian and national revolutions." (Bela Kun, *The Second International in Dissolution*, p. 10)

The beginning of the open change of the "Comintern's" attitude towards the League of Nations and therefore towards international imperialism was indicated by Stalin in his interview with *The New York Times* correspondent, Walter Duranty, December 25, 1933:

"Duranty: Is your attitude towards the League of Nations exclusively negative?"

"Stalin: We do not always in all conditions take a negative attitude towards the League. Perhaps you do not quite understand our viewpoint. Despite the withdrawal of Germany and Japan from the League—or perhaps because of it—the League may well become to a certain extent a *brake to retard or prevent military actions*. If that is so, if the League proves to be a small barrier, somewhat to slow down the drive for war and help peace, then we are not against the League. In fact, should historical events take this course, it is not excluded

that *we should support the League*, despite its colossal deficiencies." (*Inprecorr*, Vol. 14, No. 2, January 12, 1934, p. 43. My emphasis—G.M.)

The Stalinites went the whole hog a few months later:

"Now the withdrawal of Germany and Japan from the League have proved the latter incapable of becoming the political expression of 'organized' capitalist world to adjust its interests and direct its expansion against the U.S.S.R. . . .

"France defends her position in Europe and her position as a world power. But defense of these positions demands defense of peace. . . . All that the Bolsheviks said about it when the League of Nations was founded has been fully confirmed. But those powers remained in the League who are interested in the maintenance of peace.

"This is how historical development reversed the rôle of the League." ("Radek Writes on History of League of Nations," *Daily Worker*, June 1, 1934)

Italy and the other robber imperialist nations remaining in the League are interested in peace! So repellent a mockery of Lenin's teachings, of the interests of the colonial slaves and the working class one can come upon only among the crassest renegades from Marxism! This is how "historical development" perverted the former Marxist, Karl Radek!

The argument that Germany's leaving the League transformed the "Thieves' Kitchen at Geneva" into a temple of peace was shallow demagoguery, was a shabby excuse the Stalinists made to swing more openly to the international bourgeoisie. This can be seen from the words of Litvinoff:

"In common with the other members of the League we sincerely regret the incompleteness of the League and the absence from it of some great countries, particularly in Europe.

"We shall welcome the return into that midst of Hitler's Germany as well if and when we are convinced she has recognized those fundamental principles on which the League rests and without which it would not only cease to be an instrument of peace but also eventually might be transformed into its opposite. Among these principles in the first place are the observance of international treaties, respect for the inviolability of the existing frontiers, recognition of the equality of all the members of the League, support of the collective organization of security and renunciation of the settlement of international disputes by the sword." (Text of Litvinoff's Statement to the League Council, *Daily Worker*, March 19, 1936)

True to themselves, but false to every principle Lenin fought for, the Stalinites show that deceit and treachery are the pattern and rhythm of their system. Having entered the "Thieves' Kitchen" they extend an invitation to Hitler. Abandoning all decency they insist that the German imperialists observe the bourgeois treaties and existing frontiers and—a flawless opportunist gem—renounce war! Not a cell in the brain of the Stalinites has been left untouched by ideological decay!

As Lenin cited pacifist priests whose explanations of the causes for the World War were far closer to the truth than those of the foremost "theoreticians" of the Second International, so can one today point out bourgeois politicians who are much nearer to facts than the sorry "Leninists," Stalin, Radek and Litvinoff. Speaking of the League of Nations, Senator Borah asserted:

"It has become a screen for the hypocrites who are trying to divide the territory of Europe." (*The New York Times*, September 27, 1935)

This, of course, is only partly correct. The League of Nations has always been a screen, not for dividing only the territory of Europe but of the whole world. One cannot expect bourgeois statesmen to reveal that the League of Nations is a screen to hide bourgeois plots and crimes from the proletariat. That is the duty of Communists. Many years ago, in 1927, at the "Expulsion Congress," Stalin still used Leninist phrases in dealing with the League of Nations:

"Let us take the League of Nations, which, according to the lying bourgeois Press and the equally mendacious Social Democratic Press, is an instrument of peace." (J. Stalin, *Report of the Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 27)

The following statement is an index of the depth of degeneration Stalin has reached:

"I believe that the position of the friends of peace is strengthening. The friends of peace are able to work in the open. They base themselves upon the force of public opinion. *They have at their disposal such instruments as, for instance, the League of Nations.* This is to the advantage of the friends of peace." ("Stalin-Howard Interview," *Daily Worker*, March 6, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

Stalin uttered this at the very moment when Fascist Italy, a member of the League, was driving its imperialist dagger into

the heart of prostrate and bleeding Ethiopia, another member of the League.

The bourgeoisie, of course, grasped at this valuable piece of pacifist opium coming from "Lenin's greatest disciple" himself.

"... the Stalin interview had the widest publication of any similar news story in the history of journalism." (*Soviet Russia Today*, April 1936, p. 4)

The renegade Stalin has become transformed into a contemptible liar, *consciously* helping the bourgeoisie and Social Democracy spread illusions about the League of Nations.

That Stalin and his Browders are deceiving the workers *consciously* and *deliberately*, and are not innocently making "Centrist mistakes," as the naive and hopelessly bemuddled Trotskyites imagine, can be seen from the following assertion appearing in Browder's paper long after Fascist Italy had crushed Ethiopia, after the League of Nations rejected Haile Selassie's plea for "justice," after the farce of sanctions had been terminated and Mussolini's enslavement of the Ethiopians tacitly accepted by the imperialists and by that "greatest disciple of Marx and Lenin, Joseph Stalin":

"Whatever its faults and its inner antagonisms, the League of Nations can be an instrument of struggle against the aggressor, for collective security in Europe and in the entire world, for the defense of peace." (Shvernik, Secretary of the Soviet Trade Unions, speaking at the Buffalo Stadium in Paris, *Daily Worker*, July 10, 1936)

Before the "Seventh Congress" the Stalinists correctly described the rôle Social Democracy plays with regard to the League of Nations:

"... the international organization of imperialism, the *League of Nations* whose agency the Second International has been ever since its reestablishment after the World War." (Bela Kun, *The Second International in Dissolution*, p. 8)

Today a far more powerful agency has been enlisted by the international organization of imperialism—the Stalinist "International."

The imperialist diplomats, realizing that Stalinism is a powerful brake upon the proletarian revolution and historically a savior of the capitalist system, something which the world pro-

letariat has not yet grasped, elected Stalin's man Friday, the bourgeoisified Communist, Litvinoff, to the post of President of the Council of the League. Immediately he performed "distasteful" services to the enemies of the proletariat. The *New York World-Telegram* in a dispatch from Geneva, May 20, 1935, reported:

"Maxim Litvinoff, Soviet Foreign Commissar, performed two distasteful tasks today as President of the Council of the League. In the morning he announced adoption of the Refugee Commission's report urging aid for White Russians, enemies of the Communists. In the afternoon he delivered a eulogy of the late Marshal Josef Pilsudski, of Poland, who repulsed the Bolsheviks in 1920 and was hated by the Russians."

The spectacle of Litvinoff asking the bourgeois diplomats to stand in silence in memory of the bloody Polish Fascist dictator Pilsudsky, must have given immense satisfaction to the rapacious bankers and generals. The bourgeois press, wisely, made no special splurge about Litvinoff's "distasteful" services to the Russian White Guards. Stalinism is a godsend to the bourgeoisie, why disillusion the workers? Browder's *Daily Worker* naturally ignored Litvinoff's vile performance at Geneva. Browder's task is to direct mock attacks against the capitalist system in order to cover up Stalin's collaboration with the international bourgeoisie.

When, through brutal Nazi terror and the connivance of the League of Nations, Hitler won the Saar in the referendum on January 13, 1935, Litvinoff on January 19 delivered a speech at the Council of the League. In this oration he freely mixed words of hypocrisy with words of servility to the bourgeoisie:

"With great satisfaction we can today record the success of the application of the right of self-determination of the peoples, which represents one of the basic principles of the international policy of my government. . . . The great majority of the Saar people has told us that it wishes to remain German and that it wishes to share the destiny of its countrymen in every respect. We must confine ourselves to respecting such a decision and to congratulating the German people upon the return of its sons in the Saar."

Into the arms of the imperialists the Stalinist incubus has fallen, on the heels of the German betrayal. After the entry into the Thieves' Kitchen at Geneva, the Franco-Soviet Pact.

With the Pact came the Stalin-Laval Communique. Hitherto Stalinism had betrayed Leninist principles and with them the international proletariat under the cover of Leninist phraseology. Now the abandoning of the principles was performed not only in deeds but even in words. The statement issued by the "leader of the world revolution" and the Premier of France is in open support of the armaments policy of the French bourgeoisie.

The exact phrasing is:

"M. Stalin understands and fully approves the national defense policy of France in keeping her armed forces at a level required for security."

This gave a powerful weapon to the French imperialists in their struggle against the French workers. The bourgeoisie of France could only rejoice. Unity with the proletariat to protect the interests of French imperialism was now a fact. *All classes* approved Stalin's anti-Leninist declaration:

"The proletariat, the toilers of the Red suburbs and *the whole people of France* approved Comrade Stalin's declaration." (Maurice Thorez, *The People's Front in France*, p. 65. My emphasis—G.M.)

Notwithstanding the explanations, assurances, hopes and promises of the Stalinist mesmerists, the horrible sell-out of the German working class was keenly felt by the world proletariat. The illusion that "the united front would have prevented it" began to make inroads into the ranks of the "Comintern," in some instances affecting the highest circles of the bureaucracy itself. Even the Trotskyites, due to their incorrect estimation of Stalinism, were victims of this illusion:

"Had the German proletariat been mobilized in the united front movement for which we agitated unremittingly, and for which we were condemned as counter-revolutionaries and 'Social-Fascists,' the Brown Shirts would have been crushed." (Max Shachtman, *Ten Years*, p. 4)

Fascism was no laughing matter, and workers felt the need for real protection. After Germany and Austria were overwhelmed by Fascism, France and Spain, it was universally believed, were threatened next. In France Stalin faced an opposition within his "Party" manifested by the rebellion of Doriot, followed by

the appearance of a secret inner-Party magazine, *Que Faire*, and other warning signs.

"At the meeting of the C.C. of the C.P. of France, which was held in January last, Comrade Doriot attempted to raise to a theory the shortcomings which had been overcome and to set up a *politically opportunist platform*. This platform was based on a fundamental pessimism in regard to the revolutionary upsurge of the masses and the possibilities of a break-up of the socialist party. Comrade Doriot, declaring that there was 'one single point' of the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. with which he was not in agreement, proposed to 'supplement' the tactic of the united front from below, which in his opinion was impotent, by proposals to the leaders. Failing to take into account the movement of the masses of socialist workers evoked by the carrying out of the correct policy of the C.P., he based his hypotheses on 'fundamental' differences of opinion which, in his view, existed between parts of the Socialist Party of France in regard to the united front and not between the workers and the whole of their leaders.

"The C.C. unanimously rejected such a theory. . . . It pointed out that not to place the bitter fight against the social democracy in the fore-front means to *revise the whole policy of the C.P.F.* and of the Communist International, and called upon Doriot to abandon his platform and defend the standpoint of the C.C.

"Comrade Doriot did nothing of the kind." ("The Fight Against Opportunism in the C.P. of France," *Inprecorr*, May 4, 1934, p. 702)

For daring to propose a change of policy for the Communist Party of France without orders from the Master in the Kremlin, Doriot—loyal rat and scoundrel Doriot! who together with Browder served Stalin so well in China teaching workers to forgive Chiang Kai-shek—was cast out. The whole St. Denis District left the Communist "Party" and followed Doriot.

A few weeks before Doriot's expulsion, the leader of the Spanish Stalinist "Party," Communist deputy Balbontin, broke with Stalin on the question of the united front. In the pamphlet he issued, he declared:

"I could not struggle within the Communist Party for the true united front, because I was immediately, from the first moment, threatened with expulsion. I have chosen to withdraw in order to meditate dispassionately. I did not have the good fortune of the French Communist deputy Doriot, who was allowed to hold within the Party the same position on the united front which I am obliged to defend from outside its ranks. However, I do not doubt that in the end Doriot will be expelled. . . ." (Jose Antonio Balbontin, *The Proletarian United Front*, p. 14)

Stalin perceived the danger. It was necessary to prevent a plethora of Doriots and Balbontins. It was imperative to check the growth of opposition—a danger which, if not averted, would find its repercussions in the Soviet Union. The “Third Period” had to be scrapped.

Besides, the Stalinist incubus faced a fresh perspective. The Western imperialists, who had long recognized in Stalinism the opposite of Leninism, confronted with the exigency of a balance of power against a rearmed Germany, welcomed the entrance of Stalin into high politics in the international arena. Stalin now leaned upon the French, and, to a degree, upon the British bourgeoisie. He could effectively employ the sections of the “Comintern” to support his pacts and policies and jointly with the petty and the liberal bourgeoisie chain the proletariat to those imperialists who concluded an alliance with him.

Stalin followed up his German crime with another abominable step: unification of the French proletariat with the French bourgeoisie and an alliance of the Russian proletariat, through the Stalinist bureaucracy, with French imperialism.

The Stalinist pyramid was now fully completed. It stood high, and more or less solid. With the proletarian opposition and the “democratic” bureaucrats completely wiped out, the “Third Period,” having served its purpose, could now be safely abandoned. The sabotage of the proletarian revolution could be organized jointly with Social Democracy. The reintroduction of the “sensible” united front tactic, practiced with such “success” previously by Stalinism in England and in China, was comparatively easy. *Presto changeo*, and the general staff of the bureaucratic distortion made a wide swing from ultra-Left to ultra-Right, shunning, as ever, the Leninist path. After the apparently “inexplicable stupidity” of the “theory” of “social-fascism” and the tactic of the “united front from below only,” the blinded followers of Stalin, with a sigh of relief, welcomed the changed line.

But did the treacherous Stalinist leaders declare that the tactic had been wrong for the international, for the German proletariat? Did they at least agree that the results had been negative? Nothing of the kind. According to these corrupt, perverted self-seekers, just because the “fight” for the united front from below had been “successful,” the Stalinist and the Socialist misleaders organized a united front:

“The united front in France between the Socialist and Communist Parties resulted precisely from a successful fight by the Communists for the united front from below.” (Alex Bittelman, *The Advance of the United Front*, p. 10)

And brazen-faced Browder, with impudence that is really matchless, with arrogant contempt for truth, lied blandly:

“We have *never* classed the members and adherents of the Socialist Party as Social Fascists, but on the contrary consider them *our class* brothers. We have *nothing to repudiate or correct* in our expressed positions on this question, nor in the *clear and authoritative* words of Comrade Stalin which you quoted.” (Browder’s reply to the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, *Daily Worker*, September 15, 1934. My emphasis—G.M.)

How does that statement compare with the following?—

“When we speak of the Socialists as social fascists, we are not merely abusing them, we are giving the scientific description. . . . Socialists in words, fascists in deeds! That is what social fascism means. It is an accurate, scientific, descriptive term applied to the Socialist Party.” (Earl Browder, *The Meaning of Social-Fascism*, pp. 14-15)

“But it is the demagogy of the Social-fascists, the Socialist Party . . . which is politically most dangerous because it is most deceptively masked, most liable to mislead and confuse the vanguard itself. Therefore it is the social-fascists (especially the ‘left’ variety) which constitute the main enemy in the struggle against demagogy.” (Earl Browder, “How We Must Fight Against the Demagogy of Fascists and Social-Fascists,” *The Communist*, April 1931, p. 300)

Today in America Browder is the main enemy in the struggle of revolutionary workers against demagogy, because he is most deceptively masked, misleading the vanguard itself.

Browder’s demagogy and shameless lying leave one for a spell utterly speechless. And this despicable political charlatan, whose writings are brimful with downright fakery, stupefying distortions and foul slander against anyone daring to breathe a word of criticism, is considered by thousands of workers to be “the foremost Communist in America”!

Stalin’s statement characterizing Fascism and Social Democracy, a few words from which the Socialist leaders quoted in their correspondence with Browder, is as follows:

“Fascism—said Comrade Stalin—is a fighting organisation of the bourgeoisie, an organisation that rests on the active support of Social-

Democracy. Social Democracy is objectively the moderate wing of Fascism. There exists no reason for supposing that the fighting organization of the bourgeoisie can achieve decisive success in their struggles or in their leadership of the country without the active support of Social Democracy. And there is just as little reason to suppose that Social Democracy can achieve decisive successes in its struggles or in its leadership of the country without the active support by the fighting organization of the bourgeoisie. These organizations do not contradict each other but complete each other. They are not antipodes, but twins." (Fritz Heckert, *What Is Happening in Germany*, p. 21, Workers Library Publishers)

The lowest depth in the degradation and degeneration of the "Comintern" was reached at the "Seventh Congress." All Leninist positions were abandoned. Stalinism put forth a program for peace and capitalist democracy, covered, to be sure, with a few pink phrases.

The "Seventh Congress" of the "Comintern" (Third Congress of the Stalintern), where renegacy, social-patriotism, flunkyism and hypocrisy played riot, where Browder, for his loyalty to the "cause," his ability to play the necessary double game, was elevated to membership on the Presidium and thus draped with an exceptionally bright Red cloak, differed from the first four Congresses held under Lenin as a black night differs from a bright day. Gone were the great scholars of Marxism—scattered or destroyed by Stalin. An entirely new set, still calling themselves Bolsheviks, occupied the stage. Grouped around the "greatest disciple" and the "leader of the world proletariat," in an intensely debasing bureaucratic atmosphere, were the characterless demagogues, paid officials, yes-men and errand-Browders of Stalin. All of Stalin's choice, all frantic adherents of the Stalinist Order, they stood ready to destroy any one in their midst failing to carry out implicitly, faithfully, rigidly, the will of the Master. These ex-bosses of the former factional cliques, now loyal drill-sergeants in their respective sections, creatures without heart or conscience, cynically indulged in raping Leninism. Highly organized, with stern formality, Stalin's hardy crew, firm and dexterous, played their gigantic game, continuing to transform the most revolutionary class in history into a helpless body, weighting it down with confusion, stupendous defeats, demoralization and misery.

Before commencing the orgy of new deceptions and treachery

on the floor of the "Congress," Stalinism, to cover up the appalling brand of infamy burnt indelibly on its hideous forehead, sought a half-decent mask. It found such a mask in Dimitroff, with Stalin, of course, running the show.

Dimitroff had been in Germany prior to and during Hitler's advent. Did he try to prevent the betrayal of the German workers? Did he write a single article that would admit some light into the darkened mind of the misled masses? On the contrary, he assisted Stalin to carry to its tragic conclusion the "correct" line in Germany. Without having been officially elected, Dimitroff, appointed by Stalin behind the scenes, emerged as the leader of the "Seventh Congress."

Were Dimitroff devoted to the German, to the international proletariat, he would have risen to his full height, pointed his accusing finger at a certain man, and, throwing the assembled Browders and Piecks into a paralyzing terror, would have said in distinct, measured tones: "You, scoundrel, you, Judas, have organized the fiendish crime against the Chinese and the German masses. You did it to safeguard your Jesuit system! And every one of us here assisted you to carry out those atrocious deeds. The most heinous crimes have been committed behind the back of the proletariat. Furthermore, today you are laying a trap for your next victims, the Spanish and French proletariat. The diabolical contrivance is being constructed right here, now!"

As a result, Dimitroff, of course, would have gone down under a hail of bullets from one of Stalin's firing squads. But he would have performed an invaluable service to the toiling masses.

Dimitroff, however, is a devout Stalinist, serving the Order and the Supreme Master. He therefore applied another coat of whitewash to Stalin:

"Was the victory of Fascism inevitable in Germany? No, the German working class could have prevented it.

"But in order to do so, it should have compelled the establishment of a united anti-fascist proletarian front, forced the Social-Democratic leaders to put a stop to their campaign against the Communists and to accept the repeated proposals of the Communist Party for united action against fascism." (Dimitroff, Seventh Congress of the Comintern, *Daily Worker*, August 24, 1935, second section, p. 2)

What can be more hypocritical than the words above! Everything was "forgotten" at one blow—"social-fascism," "united

front from below only," "little Zoergiebels," the "work" of the Red factory committees, the *main* line of fire against Social Democracy, the sabotage of the general strike of July 20, 1932, Red Referendum—literally everything!

And what did Dimitroff mean by the "German working class"? We know that fifteen million class-conscious voting workers were divided between the Stalinist and the Social-Democratic bureaucracies under whose influence they were, ideologically and organizationally. Did he mean the Communist workers? But they were told that they must never make a united front with the leaders of the Social Democracy. Did he mean that the Socialist membership should have broken away from the influence of the reformist leaders? But at the same "Seventh Congress" one of the German knaves explained that:

"The weakness of the Communist Party of Germany hindered the freeing of a majority of the working class from reformism, notably the tendency to identify the Socialist Party membership with leaders like Zoergiebel." (Franz, *Report for the German Communist Party*, Seventh Congress of the Comintern)

Certain other "weaknesses," like the splitting of the trade unions, voting with the Nazis in the Prussian Diet to oust the Social Democrats from government, the united front with the Fascists in the Berlin street-car strike against the Socialist city administration, voting with the Nazis to oust the Socialist chief of police, Grjezinsky, were not mentioned.

At the "Seventh Congress" it suddenly became "clear" that joint action of the Second and the Third Internationals would help to stop Fascism. Said Dimitroff:

"Is it not clear that joint action by the adherents of the parties and organizations of the two internationals, the Communist and the Second International, would facilitate the repulse of the masses to the Fascist onslaught?"

But, if it is "clear," why then was joint action persistently sabotaged by the E.C.C.I. and the Central Committee of the German Communist Party?

The French Browder, Maurice Thorez, in his speech at the "Seventh Congress," did his share of wiping up the traces of this sabotage:

"Unfortunately, the summons of Thaelmann and of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany for the organization of the united front was not realized." (Maurice Thorez, *The People's Front in France*, p. 30)

The assertion is an impudent lie. What about the harsh criticism by the Central Committee leveled against the Berlin and the Ruhr Districts for daring to propose to the Social Democrats a united front against Hitler? The "summons" amounted to fake strike calls which were criminally sabotaged by the Stalinist leadership.

An unequivocal declaration of support of one kind of national Fascism against another kind of Fascism was made at the Congress:

"Should German Fascism attempt to conquer the small European States their war against Fascism will be a righteous war which we will support." (Wilhelm Pieck, speech at the Seventh Congress, *Daily Worker*, July 27, 1935)

Who does not know that the overwhelming majority of the small European states are today either Fascist or almost Fascist! Fascist Austria, semi-Fascist Poland, feudal-militarist Jugoslavia, reactionary Finland. It is the *degree* of reaction that counts:

"The most reactionary variety of fascism is the *German* type of fascism." ("Resolution of the Seventh Congress," *Daily Worker*, September 14, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

The Menshevist policy of supporting a Kerensky form of government, which was pursued by Stalin prior to Lenin's arrival in Petrograd in April 1917, has been reestablished by the "Seventh Congress." This policy which the Mensheviks covered with "revolutionary" phrases was really the policy of the bourgeoisie. Even the extreme reactionaries in Russia understood this and utilized the "revolutionary" cloak to fool the toiling masses. During the resumption of war by Kerensky in the Summer of 1917, the Tzarist cossack General Kornilov swore to carry the Red Flag to victory over the Kaiser's Germany. The Stalinist, adopting the pro-bourgeois position, conceals it behind phrases against Fascism:

"If with such an upsurge of the mass movement it will prove possible and necessary, in the interests of the proletariat, to create a

proletarian united front government, or an anti-fascist people's front government, which is *not yet a government of the proletarian dictatorship*, but one which undertakes to put into effect decisive measures against fascism and reaction, the Communist Party must see to it that such a government is formed." ("Resolution of the Seventh Congress," *Daily Worker*, September 14, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

A revolutionary worker who has learned the lessons of Leninism, who, therefore, *knows* how bitterly Lenin fought against any coalition government which was not and could not be a proletarian dictatorship, reading the words quoted above will immediately demand: What *class* government will it be, this not-yet-a-government-of-the-proletarian-dictatorship? Will it be the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, or something in-between?

"In a capitalist society, when it is developing, when it stands solid or is perishing, all alike, there can be *only one* out of two kinds of powers: Either the power of the capitalists or that of the proletariat. Every intermediary power is a dream. Every attempt to create something third leads to the situation where people though sincere, roll down upon one or the other side." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVI, p. 297, Russian edition. My emphasis—G.M.)

Government is an instrument of a *class*. In Fascist, as well as in bourgeois-democratic countries it is the instrument of finance capital. To support any other government but the dictatorship of the proletariat is to support imperialism *against* the proletariat and the colonial slaves. In capitalist society, when the conflict of class interests reaches the highest point of tension, the question, In the hands of which *class* should the power rest, is on the agenda of history. Then the bourgeoisie, unable to rule as of old, changes the *form* of its rule and strikes out at the proletariat, dashing into civil war if need be, to save its domination. The introduction of Fascism becomes a life and death question for the bourgeoisie. On the other hand, a struggle against Fascism is in fact a struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Stalinism supporting a *non-proletarian government* in the face of *growing* Fascism, no matter if the "Seventh Congress" defines such a government with the phrase "anti-Fascist people's front government" or with any other imposing, reassuring, flowery phrase, is in reality holding up a screen behind which finance capital is organizing its armed

Fascist forces to wipe out the vanguard of the proletariat in blood. In Austria, Social Democracy, while "building Socialism" in Vienna allowed the bourgeoisie to organize Fascism which crushed the workers together with Social Democracy. The coalition government of Socialists and Communists in Saxony in 1923 served as a brake upon the proletariat and gave to the armed forces of the bourgeoisie a breathing spell in which to consolidate themselves and subdue the proletariat. In Hungary the bloc of Bela Kun, John Pepper and Left Socialists facilitated the destruction of the Hungarian workers State:

"No Communist should forget the lesson of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. The unity between Hungarian Communists and the so-called Left Social Democrats cost the Hungarian proletariat very dearly." (*Thesis of the Second Congress of the Comintern*, July 1920)

Brushing aside Stalin's line in 1917, unswervingly pursuing the Marxist policy of struggle against the bourgeoisie no matter how "democratic" its rule, Lenin brought about the overthrow of the Russian capitalists, destruction of their State machinery and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The lessons of the establishment of the Soviet government in Russia are of prime importance. A week after the seizure of power in Petrograd, an acute crisis broke out in the Bolshevik Party. A part of the leadership, alarmed by the fact that they were in power only in Petrograd, imagined themselves isolated and demanded a bloc with the Mensheviks and S.R.'s and the establishment of a coalition Socialist government. Lenin sharply opposed this, declaring "Our slogan now is: no compromise, i.e., for a homogeneous Bolshevik government!" The compromisers, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Riazanov, Lunacharsky and others, brought terrific pressure to bear upon Lenin, resigning from the Central Committee of the Party and from the Soviet of People's Commissars. Lenin declared that were the Bolshevik-compromisers to get the majority he was ready to split the Party and go for support to the revolutionary sailors who had played an important rôle in capturing power in Petrograd. Occupying almost an identical position with the Bolsheviks on the agrarian question, were the Left Socialist Revolutionaries, the extreme Left of all the petty-bourgeois democratic Socialist parties. The Bolshevik Central Committee extended an invitation to this Party to enter the Soviet government, not on the

basis of equality, however, but *with the Bolshevik majority guaranteed*. The Left S.R.'s refused to enter without all other "Socialist" parties. When it became obvious that the Bolshevik uprising was sweeping Russia, the Left S.R.'s accepted the offer. They were given four posts in the Council of People's Commissars. The inclusion of this Party into the government of the proletarian dictatorship was a "slight" deviation from Lenin's intransigent position.

Several short months elapsed and after the conclusion of peace with imperialist Germany, while the Soviet Union was being attacked by the Czechoslovaks, the White Guards and the international bourgeoisie, the Left S.R.'s suddenly rose in rebellion against the Bolsheviks. Their being inside the government brought almost fatal consequences for the proletariat. In Petrograd the Left S.R.'s attempt was nipped in the bud. But in Moscow they captured the telegraph offices, arrested Djerjinsky and other Bolshevik leaders, shelled the Kremlin, and killed the German Ambassador von Mirbach to provoke an attack by Germany upon the Soviets. The commander-in-chief of the Red troops on the Volga, Left S.R. Muraviev, having received instructions by telegraph from his Party leaders in Moscow, ordered the army to turn back and march upon Moscow, to wipe out in blood the revolutionary proletariat and their leaders, the Bolsheviks. A wide gap was opened in the front before the advancing Czechoslovaks and White Guards. Had it not been for the quick and decisive action by Lenin and the Bolsheviks and the revolutionary loyalty of Muraviev's troops who, after terrible confusion and a partial retreat, refused to recognize him further as their commander, the treacherous Left S.R.'s would have torn down the Soviet Republic and re-established the bourgeois dictatorship.

Thus it was demonstrated historically that a "slight" deviation of giving a small share of power to the extreme Left representatives of a non-proletarian class, the peasantry, or poor farmers, spells disaster. But to give a share of power to the Social Democrats (Mensheviks), who base themselves upon the city shopkeepers and the aristocracy of labor, no matter how terribly "Left" they might sound and look, is out of the question altogether. Leninism directs *real* revolutionists to split the Communist Party if a section takes up a position of compromise with Social Democrats in the formation of a Soviet

government. Only *Communist* party rule can lead the proletariat and with it the poor farmers and oppressed colonial peoples out of the hell of capitalism. Lenin virtually admitted his mistake:

"That it would reach the stage of an uprising or such occurrences as treason of the Commander-in-Chief, Muraviev, Left S.R., I must confess, I never expected." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XV, p. 606, Russian Edition)

For the workers in Russia the question was settled. They clearly saw that only *one* Party must hold power, undivided—the Bolshevik Party. With the peasants it was different. They were vacillating time and again under the pressure of the Mensheviks and S.R.'s who constantly agitated for a "united front Socialist government."

"The peasants are being frightened (especially by the Mensheviks and S.R.'s, by all of them, even the 'Left') by the bugbear of the 'dictatorship of one Party' the Party of Bolshevik-Communists"—

wrote Lenin in 1919, a year after the experience with the Left S.R.'s

"Either dictatorship (i.e. iron rule) of landlords and capitalists or dictatorship of the working class.

"*There is no middle*. About the middle are empty dreaming gilded youths, petty intellectuals, little bosses, who studied poorly in poor books. Nowhere in the world is there a middle, and there *cannot be any*. Either dictatorship of the bourgeoisie covered with flowery socialist-revolutionary and Menshevik phrases about people's rule, about constituent assembly, and all sorts of liberties, etc., or dictatorship of the proletariat. Whoever has not learned this from the history of the entire Nineteenth Century is a hopeless idiot." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVI, p. 306, Russian Edition. My emphasis—G.M.)

But Browder, who is far from being an idiot, teaches the workers something altogether different. Carrying out the line of the "Seventh Congress," he speaks of a *united front government*, as something in-between a bourgeois government and a Soviet government:

"We openly declare that such a government will not be able to introduce Socialism, which is possible only with a really revolutionary government, but that *it can prevent fascism from coming to power*, it can protect the democratic liberties of the toiling masses, *it can*

fight off hunger and economic chaos, and it can thus give the toiling masses time to learn through their own experience and not through the horrors of a period of fascist barbarism what is that larger more deep-going program which they must adopt in order to realize socialism, which alone is the final solution of their problems.

"It is clear that here we are speaking of a *transitional form of government* before the victory of the proletarian revolution. Such a government should not be confused with the possible *Soviet government, formed on the basis of a bloc with Communists, Left Socialists, etc.,* which had *jointly participated* in a victorious revolution. We speak of the possible formation of *the united front government before such a victory.*

"The special character of such a government would be that it is primarily a government of struggle against fascism and reaction. It could only be a government arising as a result of the united front movement, and therefore in no way restricting the activity of the Communist Party and the mass organization of the working class, but on the contrary, **ACTING AGAINST MONOPOLY CAPITAL AND FASCISM.**

"Such a government could come into existence *only under conditions of a political crisis, when the ruling classes are unable to deal with the powerful upsurge of the masses.*" (Earl Browder, Report of the Seventh Congress delivered in Madison Square Garden, *Daily Worker*, October 6, 1935. Capitals and emphasis mine—G.M.)

Since in the words of Browder, such a government would not be a *Soviet government*, which, Browder says, is possible "on the basis of a bloc with Communists, Left Socialists, etc. [who are these etc.?—G.M.]," it would be, according to Lenin, a government upholding the bourgeois dictatorship:

"Whoever has failed to grasp, in reading Marx, that in the capitalist society, during each moment of acute struggle, each serious collision of classes there is possible either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat, has understood nothing in both economic and political teachings of Marx." (Lenin, *The Third International and Its Place in History*)

It would be just the kind of government Browder speaks of that the bourgeoisie, unable to deal with the revolutionary tide, would need to hold the masses in check, to prepare its armed forces with which to hack to pieces the proletarian vanguard.

Living in the pre-Stalinist era, Lenin allowed the possibility of some sincere people in the Socialist and other petty-bourgeois parties having illusions about establishing some sort of a *tran-*

sitional government between the bourgeois and proletarian dictatorships:

"The best people in the intermediary parties dream, quite sincerely, about the 'middle.' But we know through the experience of entire countries, through the experience of the people that this is purely dreams. Every middle line will lead to the domination of the bourgeoisie and monarchy." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVI, p. 266, Russian Edition)

"The economy of capitalist society is of such nature that the dominating power can be either capital or the proletariat overthrowing capital. There are no other powers in the economy of capitalist society." (*Ibid.*, p. 217)

"When we are reproached for the dictatorship of one party, and are offered, as you have heard, a united Socialist front, we say, 'Yes, dictatorship of one Party!'" (*Ibid.*, p. 296)

There is no *transitional* form of government between the dictatorship of finance capital and that of the proletariat, even up to the very hour of the victory of the workers. Kerensky's government on the eve of November 1917, one day before its overthrow, was a government of Russian imperialism.

Left Socialists, "etc.," do not participate *jointly* in a victorious proletarian revolution. All this is very well known to Browder. There was a time when there was no Stalinism, and Browder subscribed to the Leninist conception of *class* distinction in the rôles of Communists and Social-Democrats. True, under Lenin there was no "social-fascism," but neither was there any misrepresentation as to the anti-revolutionary rôle played by the Social Democracy:

"What the Socialists completely fail to understand and what shows their theoretical shortsightedness, their dependence on bourgeois prejudices, their political treachery to the proletariat, is, that in capitalist society, with the sharpening of the class struggle which lies at its foundations, there can be no middle ground between dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and dictatorship of the proletariat. Any dream of a third possibility is a reactionary lamentation of a petty-bourgeois." (Lenin, *Bourgeois Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship*, Thesis adopted by the First World Congress of the Communist International, 1919)

"The distinction lies in the fact that Social-Democrats hinder the actual development of the revolution by rendering all possible assistance in the way of restoring the equilibrium of the bourgeois state

while the Communists, on the other hand, are trying to take advantage of all means and methods for the purpose of overthrowing and destroying the capitalist government and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat." (Third Congress of the Comintern, *Thesis on the International Situation*, adopted at the Sixteenth Session, July 4, 1921. Emphasis in the original)

The Stalinists are obliterating the distinction between Socialists and Bolsheviks. Browder speaks of creating for the workers an anti-Leninist, petty-bourgeois hodge-podge party, which will make the victory of Fascism, not merely a possibility, but a certainty. Browder declares:

"To the degree that we successfully achieve unity of action with the Socialists, for the building of the Farmer-Labor Party, and for the immediate current struggles of the masses for their economic and political interests, for the fight against Fascism and war, to that degree we are opening up perspectives for the organic unity of Socialists and Communists in one revolutionary party of Socialism." (*Daily Worker*, October 6, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

The entry into the period of joint betrayal of the international proletariat by Stalin and Social Democracy, Browder announced in the following words:

"We are coming to the end of the period, which began with the World War and the Russian Revolution, of the world-wide split in the Socialist [?—G.M.] movement. We are entering the period of the healing of the split. . . ." (*Ibid.*)

Browder's flunkeys were of course just as much in ecstasy over his promise of "healing" the "wounds" of 1919, "organic unity" with the Social Democrats, as they had been over the "Third Period," "social-fascism" and "no united front with the Socialist leaders."

How long is it since the Stalinists growled about "The pressure of the damnable tradition of 'unity'!" (*The Communist International*, April 1932, p. 239)

Until the "Third Period" lingo is brought into play in another "Left" turn to cover up the new betrayals, one will search in vain for the term "social-fascism" in the Stalinist press. Even the extreme Right-wingers have become merely "Old Guard Socialist leaders":

"Nothing stirred the vast audience as much as the question of the united front. The deep spring of desire for unity in the breasts of the

working class was touched by that more than anything else. The wounds of the old 1919 split, caused by the policies of the present Old Guard Socialist leaders, are still fresh, it seems. When Browder spoke of the possibilities of 'organic unity' of one party of supporters of Socialism, that 'we are entering the period of the healing of the split,' there was profoundly deep, moving applause. . . ." (S. W. Gerson, *Daily Worker*, October 9, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

Here is how Ramsay MacDonald, at the time (1919) a Left Socialist leader in the Second International, and Lenin, founder of the Third International, expressed themselves about the split:

Ramsay MacDonald: "The appearance of separatist tendencies in the national and international policies of Socialism was a misfortune for the whole socialist movement. . . . In Moscow has been established a new International. Personally, this fact grieves me very deeply; the one who introduces a split into the International, taking as a guide the experience of one nation, demonstrates a criminal narrow-mindedness."

Lenin: "With such people the split is necessary and unavoidable, because it is impossible to carry on the work for the Socialist Revolution hand in hand with those who are pulling on the side of the Bourgeoisie. The Berne International is in fact, by its actual historical and political rôle, regardless of good intentions and innocent wishes of some or another of its members, an organization of agents of international imperialism, acting within the working class movement, spreading in it bourgeois influence, bourgeois ideas, bourgeois lies and bourgeois corruption." (Lenin, *Problems of the Third International*)

Cowardly hiding the fact that anti-working class policies were pursued not merely by the "present Old Guard" in America but by the international Centrists as well, that it was Lenin who demanded the split from the "International of Traitors," Gerson, by implication, condemns Lenin for this policy. Lenin was particularly insistent upon splitting from the Centrists.

After the "Seventh Congress" the Communist workers are being trained by the chameleons of the "Comintern" to look upon both the Stalinist and the Socialist Parties as "our" two parties:

"... to work for the united front, for immediate common action of our two parties. . . ." (A. B. Magil, *Daily Worker*, October 31, 1935)

The Socialist Party, according to the new Stalinist line, has become the second party of the proletariat. But such conceptions were condemned as pure "Trotskyism" in only 1934!

"We Communists look upon the Social-democracy as a third party of the bourgeoisie, a party especially dangerous because it operates among the workers and covers itself with Socialist phraseology. The Trotskyites, on the contrary, look upon the social-democracy as a mass political organization of the working class; in other words, as the *Second party of the proletariat.*" (*The Communist*, January 1934, p. 66. Emphasis in the original)

The Stalinist "unity" poison and the overthrow of Leninism was welcomed and passed on to the workers everywhere by all other shades and stripes of opportunists. Writes Ludwig Lore:

"How much better for the world if the International had come to this understanding sooner." (*New York Post*, July 29, 1935)

Lore helps strengthen the poisonous illusion that "the united front could have stopped Hitler":

"The new united front is an honest effort to combine the forces of labor in a decisive battle against Fascist front. Only the uncompromising old guardist or the anti-revolutionary trade unionist will doubt its sincerity." (*Ibid.*)

The paralyzation of the proletariat by the two rotten and treacherous bureaucracies Lore calls an *honest* effort against Fascism. And further, in complete agreement with Browder and Gerson:

"The unity of action must be followed by organization unity, by a united party that will do away with the factions and splits which sapped the life blood of the labor movement in the past." (*Ibid.*)

Declares Norman Thomas:

"Communist friends, I think you are sincere in your new line." (Norman Thomas in Browder-Thomas debate, *Daily Worker*, December 14, 1935)

The bitter, heroic fight Lenin waged, virtually alone, to separate the wholesome revolutionary grain from the putrid opportunist chaff, to build a real revolutionary International, is liquidated by the Browders, Lores and the Cannons. This separation caused "wounds" to the proletariat say the treacherous destroyers of Marxism. The "injury" must be healed. The divided past must be buried. The war to annihilation, carried on by Lenin against the Second International as against the greatest

obstacle to revolution in his day, is today called off by the Stalinites and the "French Turners," themselves now among the obstacles to revolution. To defeat Fascism, say the misleaders of the proletariat, it is necessary to unite the traitors into one organization.

Thinking workers will not be snared by the Stalinist "organic unity" from above, or by Trotsky's "organic unity" from below, of the two reactionary Internationals. And no real Leninist will be dismayed by the word *split*. The iron necessity of ideological and organizational separation from the opportunist Internationals is dictated by history, on the peril of bloody penalties. Lenin set upon this course in Russia in 1903 and on an international scale in 1914. This "sectarian" line made the creation of the Soviet Republic possible. The numerous treacheries of opportunism proved beyond cavil the correctness of Lenin's path.

Clear and unequivocal were the words of the Communist International during Lenin's life:

"It is the task of the Communist International to wage relentless war against the Two and a Half International [Centrists] as well as against the Second International and the Amsterdam Trade Union International. Only by means of such an unrelenting struggle, daily proving to the masses that the Social Democrats and Centrists are not only unwilling to fight for the overthrow of capitalism, but not even for the simplest and most urgent needs of the working class, will it be possible for the Communist International to liberate the working class from the grip of these lackeys of the bourgeoisie. It cannot wage this struggle successfully except by nipping in the bud every Centrist tendency or inclination in its own ranks..." (*Thesis and Tactics*, Third Congress of the Communist International, July 1921)

That was the task of the revolutionary workers then and is the task now.

There was no theory of "*social-fascism*" obscuring the true nature of the petty-bourgeois Social Democrats. There was no "healing of the wounds," no "organic unity," from below, above or any other way. Ideological and organizational separation from opportunism was the Lenin line. Through exposure, by leading the struggles of the workers both independently and with the aid of the tactic of the Leninist united front, exercising full right of criticism of the "allies" to the extent of merciless denunciation of the Centrists and social-patriots, was the Com-

munist International to win the masses for the proletarian revolution:

"All the groups, parties, leaders of the Labor movement, fully or partially on the side of reformism, the 'center,' and so on, turn inevitably, during the most acute periods of the struggle, either to the side of the bourgeoisie or to that of the wavering ones, and the most dangerous are added to the number of the unreliable friends of the vanquished proletariat. Therefore the preparation of the dictatorship of the proletariat demands not only an increased struggle against all reformists and 'centrist' tendencies, but a modification of the nature of this struggle.

"The struggle should not be limited to an explanation of the fallacy of such tendencies, but it should stubbornly and mercilessly denounce any leader in the Labor movement who may be manifesting such tendencies; otherwise the proletariat will not know whom it must trust in the most decisive struggle against the bourgeoisie." (*Thesis of the Second Congress of the Communist International, July 1920*)

Such was the line of the Leninist Comintern, prior to the Stalinist plague with its "Third Period" and "organic unity"!

"The imperialist epoch does not tolerate the existence in one party of both the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat and the semi-petty-bourgeois aristocracy of the working class which enjoys crumbs from the privileges of 'its' nation situated as a 'Great Power.' The old theory about opportunism being a 'legitimate shade' of a united party, a party that avoids 'extremes,' has now turned into the greatest deception of the workers and the greatest hindrance to the labor movement." (Lenin, *Collapse of the Second International*)

Shrewd Stalin, motivated only by the need of perpetuating the bureaucratic political and economic domination of the Soviet Union, in introducing the fake of organic unity of his own forces with Social Democracy, again scored a success. The masses want united front? Stalin goes them one better and *talks* organic unity, which never will and never can take place anyhow. The interests of the loosely connected national parties of Social Democracy are rooted in the aristocracy of labor and the bourgeoisie of each capitalist country. Stalinism is an entity separate and distinct from every other existing tendency. The interests of every existing Stalinist "Party" are rooted in the Soviet bureaucracy. But what harm can there be in leading the masses by the nose through the talk of organic unity? On the contrary,

talking about it makes the Trotskyites, the Lovestoneites, the Socialists, every class-conscious worker, talk about it, criticize, discuss the possibility. Meantime Stalinism lives on. Is this something new? The shrewd bishops in the Middle Ages argued how many angels could dance on the point of a needle. And everybody discussed this "problem." The merchants and artisans in the city, the peasants in the village. Meantime the dignitaries of the church lived and prospered.

In the material on the "Seventh Congress," the cautious and far-sighted Stalinists repeat—for the record and should the need arise to revert to the clap-trap of the "Third Period"—Stalin's assertion that Social Democracy is the twin brother of Fascism:

"Some think that in raising the question of a united front between Communists and Social Democrats for the struggle against fascism, we are revising Lenin's description of the role of Social-Democracy as the principal social bulwark of the bourgeoisie, and that we are abandoning Stalin's thesis that the fascists and Social-Democrats are not opposites, but twins. . . . By its whole policy of class collaboration, which paved the road to fascism, Social-Democracy demonstrated the truth of the thesis that it is not the opposite but the twin of fascism." (D. Z. Manuilsky, *The Work of the Seventh Congress*, p. 17)

This, of course, does not prevent the Stalinites from speaking of the possibility, nay, necessity, of organic unity of the Stalin-tern with the twin of Fascism, the moderate wing of Fascism.

The mercenaries of Stalinism, naturally, realize that many a Communist worker is trembling at the thought of organic unity with Social Democracy. They hasten to trot out a very simple explanation:

"This question is giving rise to considerable doubt even in our own ranks. 'What! Unite with the Social-Democrats?' some comrades ask in perplexity. 'But why have we been waging an irreconcilable struggle against Social-Democracy during the whole of the post-war period? Why have we worked so hard to Bolshevize the Sections of the Comintern? Why have we been fighting against opportunist deviations in our own ranks, i.e., against the slightest deviation of unstable elements in the direction of Social-Democracy . . . ?'

"By our struggle against all forms of opportunism we steeled our Parties and built the main Communist framework, and consequently, we are now able boldly to take the initiative in the creation of a united political party of the working class." (*Ibid.*, p. 39)

Lenin's reply to this treacherous statement is:

"Unity with opportunism means unity of the proletariat with its national bourgeoisie, i. e.: it means submission to the latter, it means a split in the international revolutionary working class."

Unity with either Norman Thomas, Browder, Cannon or Lovestone is in the final analysis unity with the American bourgeoisie against the international proletariat.

Let opportunist Stalinism and opportunist Social Democracy hypocritically embrace each other as they *talk* "organic unity." The revolutionary workers will form an *independent Leninist party* to remove all obstacles to the proletarian revolution.

Reading Browder's report on the "Seventh Congress" containing the proposition of the middle-of-the-way government, a revolutionary worker will cry out a loud shout of warning: Fellow-workers, these people, the Browders and Thorezes, are leading you to destruction! They are leading you into a bloody Fascist hell of unparalleled oppression out of which there is no return for a *long, a very long time*. Away with this scum of opportunism, the reactionary Stalinist bureaucracy! Make wide the ideological and organizational separation between Marxism and opportunism! Clear the road for a new Leninist Party to turn back the tide of reaction and march forward towards the proletarian revolution! The great leaders Marx, Engels and Lenin are dead, but they have left us their revolutionary teachings. Study them, open your eyes before it is too late!

That will be the voice of a real proletarian revolutionist. It will be the voice of a worker who thinks along Marxist lines. It will be the voice of a worker who is attached with his mind to the international proletariat, the toiling peasantry, and the colonial slaves, not to a bureaucracy. If Browder, Norman Thomas, Lovestone, Muste and all the rest of the Cannons, Wolfes and Olgins, continue to mislead the proletariat, they may land in a Fascist prison as did Thaelmann, Karl Zeitz and many others. That, however, won't make the lot of the proletariat under the blood-bespattered iron heel of Fascism any easier. It will be far better for the masses if these misleaders are exposed and driven out by the revolutionary proletariat rather than destroyed by the Fascists.

Stalin and his clique of scoundrels are not hopeless idiots; they are shrewd bureaucrats holding to their special interests. They worked out the plans for China and Germany, for seizing the Comintern. And today, although there are no more "Corridor"

Congresses, there are Stalin's chambers behind the official stage.

Is it not clear that the new line, this poisonous witches' brew calculated to dim the mental vision of the proletariat and paralyze its revolutionary muscles, is a secret concoction of Stalin and his competent aides? Can one doubt for a single instant that Stalin groomed his reptiles, before the curtain's rise, for the great political show on the floor of the "Congress," and that all the rôles on the stage had been distributed in advance, including Stalin's?

The "greatest disciple of Lenin" was the "mystery man" of the "Comintern" during the entire proceedings. Listening approvingly to the speeches, joining in the general applause, Stalin himself remained silent. And that was understood and tacitly accepted by his idolaters. The central issue at the "Seventh Congress" was France. Stalin naturally perceived the sharpening of class antagonisms in France, which will ultimately resolve either in the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat or in the continuation of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie through Fascist means. Stalin, of course, does not want a Fascist France, for it would abrogate the Franco-Soviet Pact, but the ever-sharpening economic, military and political crisis poses on the edge of a razor the question of class-explosion in France, forcing Stalin to choose. Stalin and his bureaucracy must be prepared to weather another storm, to prevent the French workers from seizing power.

The Browders, conceding that the "Seventh Congress" marked a change of tactics of the "Comintern," explained that it was necessitated by changed conditions. Can there be any doubt that history will prove the "correctness" of the new line as it did the theories and tactics of the "Third Period"!

Stalinist smoke-screen zigzags, invariably marked by lack of consistency, involve their executors in irreconcilable contradictions. Want of logic and compatibility, conflicting ideas, contrary declarations, perplex the Stalinist workers, blur their vision and make systematic thinking impossible. Those who hang on to Stalin, in their belief that they are rendering a service to the Soviet Union and the international proletariat, of necessity abandon all independent reasoning and accept as truths ideas which only yesterday they rejected as falsehoods.

During the "Third Period," for example, the Stalinist leader-

ship inveighed against the "lesser evil" policy of the Social Democrats of whom they wrote:

"Under the mask of opposition to fascism, they in reality pave the way for fascism to come to power. They disarm the workers by the theory of the lesser evil..." (Earl Browder, *The Meaning of Social-Fascism*, p. 4)

"The renegade Trotskyites gave direct aid to the theories of the 'lesser evil' propounded by the German social democrats calling for united front action of the Communists and Social Democrats on the basis of those policies." (*The Communist*, April 1933)

After the "Seventh Congress" the non-Leninist theory of the "lesser evil" was declared to be correct, but a revelation was made that the Social Democrats had not been sincere in advocating the policy of the "lesser evil":

"The Social-Democrats say: 'Since the Communists prefer bourgeois democracy to fascism, they, too, are becoming adherents of the "lesser evil" policy.' Yes, we Communists prefer the 'lesser evil' to the greater evil. It is not this that separates us from Social-Democracy. We expose the Social-Democratic 'lesser evil' policy because that policy meant *the betrayal of bourgeois democracy and directly helping fascism.*" (D. Z. Manuilsky, *The Work of the Seventh Congress*, p. 20. Emphasis in the original)

But three months after Hitler became chancellor, the Social Democrats were criticised by the Stalinists precisely for defending bourgeois democracy!

"The social fascists on the other hand propose the enforcement of the Weimar Constitution, protection of the rights granted under the bourgeois democracy, the maintenance of the bourgeois democracy, counterposing the concealed bourgeois dictatorship as something diametrically opposed to fascism." (*The Communist*, April 1933)

Today the Stalinists are the sincere champions of the concealed bourgeois dictatorship.

Lenin never preferred the lesser evil. He maneuvered, true, but *always aimed at the enemy class, at the bourgeoisie*, no matter through what form it exercised its domination. He separated neither the White Guard government nor the "democratic" government from the exploiters. When the cossack General Kornilov led the Wild Division upon Petrograd to overthrow the "Socialist" Kerensky, Lenin warned that even at this moment, while

fighting Kornilov, the proletariat must not defend the "democratic" government of Kerensky, but expose it in order to replace it with the government of the toilers.

The Soviet bureaucrats need bourgeois democracy within bourgeois countries. It allows them elbow room to corral a section of the proletariat and petty-bourgeoisie and use them as a lever in their deals with finance capital. Fascism deprives the Stalinists of this advantage. And the memory of the frightful murders and torture chambers of Fascist Germany and Austria weighs heavy on the minds of the Stalinist bureaucrats in the capitalist countries (not on Stalin's mind!). They hate and fear Fascism no less than do the Social Democrats. The Stalinists and Social Democracy doubtless prefer bourgeois democracy to Fascism. Both opportunist Internationals support the theory of the "lesser evil." Having profited by the dreadful experience, they will fight against an open attempt to introduce Fascism to prevent their own extinction and defend the favorable economic position they occupy within capitalist society. But they will also fight against the dictatorship of the proletariat, for bourgeois democracy. The bourgeois State, finding itself in a continuous crisis of power, eventually *must* introduce Fascism. *Historically*, therefore, the "lesser evil" for both Stalinism and Social Democracy is not bourgeois democracy rather than Fascism, but Fascism rather than proletarian revolution.

The "Seventh Congress" put the stamp of approval upon Plekhanovism with respect to the French bourgeoisie. After the overthrow of the Tzar, the renegade Plekhanov attempted to poison the minds of Russian workers with Russian and French chauvinism:

"We have treaties with democratic France. (cries from the floor: 'a bourgeois France!') Yes, Comrades, a bourgeois France, but remember that Schedrin has said that every Russian that loves his country has two fatherlands, Russia and France. . . . Yes, France is a bourgeois country to the highest degree, but Marx and Engels have already shown us the revolutionary part played by the bourgeoisie in history, and by the French bourgeoisie particularly." (Plekhanov, speech at the Convention of Delegates from the Front, May 16, 1917)

Marx declared that the workers cannot consider the capitalist country they are slaves in as their fatherland. Wrecking every clearcut proletarian principle, the vile Stalinists under flowery phrases "Defend the spiritual wealth of France," and the like,

poison the workers with social-chauvinism of the blackest of 1914-1918 hues:

"If the workers, to take Marx's words, have no fatherland, they, the internationalists, have something to defend *from now on*, it is the *cultural inheritance of France*, it is the *spiritual wealth* accumulated through all that *her* artists, *her* workers and *thinkers* have produced." (*L'Humanite*, April 13, 1935, article by the editor, Vaillant-Couturier. My emphasis—G.M.)

For the first time in the history of the struggle of the French toilers against their exploiters and oppressors, the bourgeois tricolor flag and the proletarian Red Flag have been mingled together by the Stalinists. *L'Humanite* in the June 28, 1935 issue, in the item about the preparation for the July 14 People's Front parade, referred to the bourgeois flag as the "tricolor flag, the emblem of the French revolutionary traditions," adding, "and the Red Flag."

An attack by the Fascists upon the bourgeois flag was denounced by the Stalinists as an outrage:

"... they outrage the tricolor flag which the workers placed at the head of their procession beside the red flag on July 14." (*L'Humanite*, August 10, 1935)

The unity of the wage-slaves and their bloodsuckers in France has been brought about by Stalin and his agents. The tricolor flag! Two million French workers paid with their lives in the interests of French imperialism in the World War under that flag! The flag under which the French troops crushed the Vladivostok Soviet in 1918; under which General Weigand assisted Pilsudsky in defeating the Red Army in 1920. The flag which the victorious Thiers and Galifet triumphantly waved over the thousands of bleeding corpses of the heroic defenders of the Paris Commune of 1871. This emblem of oppression and hypocrisy, the emblem of the rapacious French bourgeoisie, the despicable Stalinist degenerates teach the grandsons of the Communards to respect, to consider as their own.

A well-disguised agent of the capitalists can accomplish more for them than they themselves can. The French bourgeoisie could never have succeeded in inducing the workers to mix the Red Flag of the Commune with the tricolor of the Commune's assassins:

"It was the Communists who proposed the intertwining of the Red and the Tri-colored flags." (Maurice Thorez, *Daily Worker*, June 13, 1936)

The French reactionaries feel ashamed and enraged that their flag and the flag of the proletariat whom they despise, have mingled. But the Stalinists lie that the tricolor is not the flag of the entire French bourgeoisie, but only of the petty-bourgeoisie with whom the Stalinists have made an alliance *for the defense of the tricolor*:

"The reactionary press thundered against the presence of the tricolor alongside the red flag at the head of the July 14 demonstration. The reactionary bourgeoisie understands quite well that this is the symbol of the alliance of the petty-bourgeoisie with the working class, an alliance which it fears more than anything else in the world. We do not intend to let fascism have the flag of the Great Revolution, nor the Marseillaise of the soldiers of the Convention. (Applause.)" (Maurice Thorez, speech at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern)

Proletarian traditions have given place to bourgeois traditions. Not liberation from wage-slavery, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the defense of the democratic form of rule of the oppressors has today become, due to Stalinism and Social Democracy, the chief aim of the workers of France, and for that matter of Spain, England, the United States and other "democracies."

The Third Republic, established by the bloody bourgeoisie on the bones of thousands of martyrs of the Commune, and the constitution guaranteeing capitalist private property which is the basis of the enslavement of the French proletariat, are being defended today by the so-called Communist Party of France:

"Let the workers organize into committees for the *defense of the Republic*." (Marcel Cachin, quoted in the *Daily Worker*, December 9, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

"On July 7, in agreement with the organizers of the people's rally of July 14, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France, through its delegate to the anti-fascist assembly of the Paris regions, proposed the establishment of *soldiers' committees for the defense of the constitution and the Republic*..." (A. Marty, speech at the Seventh Congress, *The People's Front in France*, p. 93. Emphasis in the original)

How long since the defense of the bourgeois democratic institutions was condemned by the Stalinists as crude Right wing mistakes! Here is their former stand, a year after Hitler!

"Right wing mistakes of a very crude character were committed by Communists in many countries recently in applying the tactics of the united front. Here is an example from France. An anti-Fascist meeting held in the town of Troyes on April 15 unanimously passed a resolution condemning propaganda which—I am quoting word for word—is being carried on in the country in various forms against democratic institutions, against social and labor legislation, and against all that which is the attribute of a free republic created and consolidated at the price of the revolutions of 1789, 1848, 1871, against institutions which every citizen should protect and perfect, and not destroy."

"At this meeting a number of our comrades spoke in the fine company of representatives of the radical socialist party, and of other parties, and yet a resolution was unanimously adopted to the effect that it was necessary to protect the existing bourgeois institutions of France, apparently on the assumption that since there have been three revolutions in France already, a fourth must be prevented." (Kuusinen, report at the Thirteenth Plenum, *Inprecorr*, January 30, 1934, p. 113)

Laval, the political leader of finance capital of the bloody French imperialism which stifles, exploits and crushes the Moroccan, Syrian, Indo-Chinese, the French and other peoples, whose troops fired on the French workers in Brest and other cities, since the Franco-Soviet Pact and the Stalin-Laval Communiqué, has begun to speak altogether "unwillingly," yet with the voice of the French masses:

"In an unwilling but quite definite speech, Premier Laval has spoken with the voice of the French masses, and not his own nor that of the de la Rocques and the de Wendels, of the Comite des Forges [organization of the steel and finance oligarchy of France—G.M.] the war munition makers of the pro-Fascist exploiters." (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, September 1935)

Class lines have been blurred by the "Seventh Congress," and in France virtually obliterated. There exists according to the de-generated Stalinists only French Fascism and French democracy:

"Everyone who raises his voice among the masses to cast suspicion on the Franco-Soviet Pact is helping Colonel de la Rocque and his fascist bands in their preparations to crush *French democracy*." (Earl Browder, *Daily Worker*, October 6, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

Not so long ago the Stalinists penned some words of truth about French imperialism:

"French imperialism, like its agents from the Second International, is now striving to raise the prestige of bourgeois France as 'the bulwark of democracy against fascism' . . ." (*Germany—Hitler or Lenin*, p. 23)

But that was before the Stalin-Laval Communiqué. Lenin's language was still adhered to. "All of these Social-Democrats and Radical and Republican Socialists support French imperialism in every way" (O. Piatnitsky, *The World Economic Crisis*, p. 97).

Now all these agencies of French imperialism are in the "People's Front," and finance capital has acquired another agency more powerful than the Social Democrats, the Radical and the Republican Socialists—the "Communist Party" of France.

Adhering closely to the line of the "Seventh Congress," the leader of the French Stalinist Party, after the elections in May 1936, had the following to say of the former "social-fascists":

"The Socialist Party is going to take charge of public affairs. The Communist Party will assure it our entire and loyal cooperation in the Chamber and the country." (Maurice Thorez's statement after the French elections, *New York Herald Tribune*, May 7, 1936. Confirmed in the *Daily Worker*, May 30, 1936, by J. Berlioz)

No wonder the bourgeois-liberal Radical Socialist Party of which Edouard Daladier, former Premier, is president, spoke of the Stalinites in tones of esteem:

"The future generation should be grateful to the Communist Party for the tremendous rôle it played in forming the People's Front." (*La République*, January 7, 1936)

Some years ago, before the decadence of the Comintern had reached the present state of perniciousness marked by Stalin's objective and subjective support of capitalism, the French bourgeoisie depicted a Bolshevik as an enemy. After the "Seventh Congress" a "Bolshevik" is a trusted friend and a safeguard of capitalist France:

"Four years ago a Bolshevik could be represented with a knife in his mouth and as an enemy of the middle class. Now he is being represented with a rifle on his shoulders as a safeguard for France." (*The New York Times*, May 3, 1936)

The trusted Stalinite pen-prostitute, Michael Gold, was instructed by the Browders in the new line. Accordingly, he struck the Plekhanovist note in his column in the *Daily Worker*, August 29, 1936. He wrote of capitalist France:

"It is the most democratic land I have ever been in, outside the Soviet Union."

Distinction between proletarian and bourgeois democracy cannot be detected here with a microscope. The Soviet Union is more democratic than France. France more than England. England more than the United States.

What Lenin taught about the bourgeois democratic republics was always emphasized by the Comintern before the Stalinist corruption; the opposite is being done today. The Leninist conception has been eliminated by the reactionary "revolutionists" of the Stalinintern. Lenin explained that:

"The most democratic bourgeois republic never was and never could be anything else than a machine for suppressing the toilers by capital, than the tool of the political power of capital, dictatorship of the bourgeoisie." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVI, p. 186, Russian Edition)

To carry out the subtle paralyzation of the class-struggle and the line of conciliation of the workers with their capitalist oppressors, Gold gives the impression that the bloodthirsty French bourgeois regrets the ferocity his grandfathers displayed in crushing the first attempt at establishing a workers' republic, the Paris Commune:

"Every Paris worker has some relative in the Commune and every bourgeois also has *unhappy family memories* of the same event." (*Daily Worker*, August 29, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

No, the French bourgeois feels quite happy that the Commune is dead: and he will repeat the terrible butchery of 1871 a dozen times over to preserve his rule.

Speaking of war-fears in Paris, Michael Gold writes:

"I made the acquaintance of one charming bourgeois family where the intelligent mother, formerly a fine artist, had gone completely neurotic under the strain. . . ."

So what! will exclaim some Stalinist, a worshipper of the "great" "proletarian" writer. Perhaps this woman is a Commu-

nist sympathizer, a friend of the working class and the Soviet Union? So I quote Gold himself:

"The lady was an ardent royalist, and blamed all the trouble in the world on democracy and the working class." (*Daily Worker*, August 24, 1935)

Let Gold and his ilk discover *charming* royalists, second cousins to Fascists. The revolutionary proletariat has only one feeling for such a "charming" bourgeois, the feeling of intense hatred.

Michael Gold, obediently following the instructions of the "Seventh Congress," views French imperialism and its army in a somewhat new and "unique" light:

"France now has the largest standing army in Europe. It is a conscript army of young peasant boys with fresh naive faces, just up from the provinces. They were the least militaristic soldiers I have known—no swagger or toughness, just boys in uniforms, sons of the people. The fascists will not easily turn this army against the people." (*Daily Worker*, August 29, 1935)

What is the army in bourgeois countries, "democratic" France included? Lenin explains:

"The army is the most petrified instrument of support of the old regime, the most hardened pillar of bourgeois discipline, support of the domination of capital, conservation and fostering of slavish submissiveness and docility to capital among the toilers." (*Kautsky the Renegade*)

What is the true nature of French imperialism? Before its alliance with Stalin made it "peace-loving," the Stalinites wrote the following:

"French imperialism is the most aggressive imperialism in Europe." (*The Communist International*, September 1, 1932, p. 582)

The *Daily Worker*, prior to the entry of Stalin into the League of Nations, the Stalin-Laval Communique and the Seventh-Congress Plekhanovism, correctly, though of course hypocritically, criticised the Social Democrats for spreading deception among the workers regarding the nature of the bourgeoisie of France and of other "democracies":

"According to the Socialist leaders, the capitalist class of France, Britain, Japan and the United States are 'anti-militaristic,' and love

peace. France, which has the largest military machine in Europe—France whose bayonets and machine guns enforce the slavery of the German workers to the Versailles Treaty—this France, according to the New Leader and the French Socialist leaders, loves peace and is anti-militaristic.” (*Daily Worker*, June 1, 1933)

The line has been changed. Gold in writing of the French imperialist army tells the workers of “fresh naive faces” and “just boys in uniforms.”

Very touching, indeed, especially when one recalls that the French bourgeoisie used primarily the naive peasant soldiers to crush the Paris Commune, to subdue Morocco and Syria. French imperialism, Gold deludes the workers, does not have full control of its army and fears to use it against the proletariat:

“The regular army boys, sons of the people cannot be trusted to do this dirty work for capitalism.” (*Ibid.*)

Gold speaks of an “anti-Fascist government.” But what will this “anti-Fascist government” do, granting, for argument’s sake, that such a government is possible? Will it arm the workers and crush the bourgeoisie with an iron hand, as does victorious Fascism, shoving aside all *legality*, crush the workers? The Stalinist Party of France citing the *bourgeois* law tells the workers how such a government will act:

“Here then, *drawn from the archives of the bourgeoisie* [My emphasis—G.M.] are texts which will serve the municipal governments of the Peoples Front for the organization of LEGAL [emphasis in the original] defense against armed attacks and Fascist raids.” (*l’Humanite*, October 22, 1935)

The bourgeoisie is making preparations to induct into its government office the Fascist monster, and the treacherous Stalinists fearing the proletarian revolution tell the workers the fight against this monster will be carried on through bourgeois laws! This in the face of real Fascist danger. The trap is set. Dimitroff himself stated that the Fascists already hold strong positions in the entire State of French “democracy”:

“The most powerful fascist organization, the Croix de Feu, [“dis-solved” by the “democratic” government, but in fact reorganized by de la Rocque—G.M.] now commands 300,000 armed men, the backbone of which consists of 60,000 officers of the reserve. It holds *strong positions* in the police, the gendarmerie, *the army*, the air force and in

all government offices. The recent municipal elections have shown that in France it is not only the revolutionary forces that are growing [He means Stalinist forces—G.M.], but also the forces of fascism. If fascism succeeds in penetrating widely among the peasantry [Unfortunately, according to latest information Fascism is making gains among the French peasants—G.M.], and in securing the support of one section of the army, while the other section remains neutral, *the French toiling masses will not be able to prevent the fascists from coming to power.*” (Dimitroff’s report at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, p. 42. My emphasis—G.M.)

Reserve officers, almost all Fascists, have been granted the right by the “democratic” government to keep arms. Laval manipulated the garrison in Paris and brought in 50,000 backward Vendéans, Bretons and reactionary elements. It is an open secret that the 336,400 rifles that “disappeared” from the Versailles arsenal in 1934, were turned over to the Croix de Feu. The majority of the General Staff are known to be strongly in favor of Fascist dictatorship. But the Stalinites arouse the hope of the workers of finding allies against the Fascist Colonel de la Rocque among the imperialist generals who are “above politics”:

“There is however a section of the General Staff which puts national defense above politics, and which deplors the sight of the army being ‘ruined’ by the agents of the colonel.” (Vaillant-Couturier, *l’Humanite*, October 23, 1935)

In accordance with the Stalin-Laval Communiqué and the slogan, Drive the Fascists Out of the Army, the Thorezes in France pursue the policy, not of class-struggle within the imperialist army by rousing worker and peasant soldiers against bourgeois officers, but of “fighting to *purify the army*” (Maurice Thorez, *People’s Front in France*, p. 69. My emphasis—G.M.).

Only under the dictatorship of the proletariat can there be a people’s army, the Red Army. In a bourgeois State the army, “purified” or otherwise, is an instrument in the hands of the capitalists. “A new social class rising to ascendancy never could and cannot now achieve domination and strength otherwise than through completely decomposing the old army” (Lenin, *Kautsky the Renegade*). But the Stalinists, interested in *preserving* the old army in order to prevent proletarian revolution in France, deceive the workers by telling them that they can “win over” the imperialist army. The question of the army is put not in the form, For the bourgeoisie or for the toilers, but, For Fascism or

for the *people*, that is, for the imperialist butchers who are either openly or secretly for Fascism:

"That is why our Party has set as one of its most urgent tasks the conquest of the army for the people, both to prevent its use against it and to ensure the application of the France-Soviet treaty of peace. . . .

"Winning the army for the people is the highest guarantee that the French [!—G.M.] army will not be employed against the people; it is the guarantee that 1918 shall not happen again, when the French army, marching into Germany at the time when the proletarian revolution broke out, dissolved the soldiers' councils, as was the case at Mainz, for instance; it is the guarantee that 1919 will not occur again, with its attacks against the Soviets in Hungary and Russia." (A. Marty, speech at the Seventh Congress, *People's Front in France*, pp. 93-94)

On the contrary. This Stalinization of the workers' understanding of the army guarantees that the French exploiters will crush any attempt on the part of the German, French and other workers to establish a proletarian republic. It was the army not of Fascist but of "democratic" France that played the most counter-revolutionary rôle in Europe during the Russian, German, Hungarian and other revolutions—"democratic" France so much adored during the imperialist war by renegade Plekhanov and today by renegade Stalin. And it is the army of French imperialism, not at all "purified," but as it is, the mainstay of capitalist power, citadel of reaction, hotbed of Fascism, that on July 14, 1936, was applauded by all patriotic factions, Stalinist included.

Were Gold a Communist he would demand a policy of completely decomposing the bourgeois army. He would bend his pen towards rousing the workers' vigilance, warning them that the treacherous French bourgeoisie, under the cover of its hypocritical democracy, is preparing the transfer to Fascist rule. Gold is a Stalinist. He covers up the preparations of the bourgeoisie for a Fascist coup d'état. He helps prevent the overthrow of capitalism in France.

Proletarian revolution in France would be a hundred times more thorough-going than the bourgeois Great French Revolution of the Eighteenth Century. It would cause a rising in Morocco, Syria, Indo-China and other parts of the French empire, with repercussions in India and China. It would give the signal to the German and Austrian workers to rise like a mountainous

wave and wash away capitalism forever. In Soviet France itself, a workers democracy would be established surpassing that of the early days of the Russian Revolution: Soviet Russia immediately would become a backward, "in the Soviet sense," country. The bureaucratic distortion would be amputated at once.

The French bourgeoisie, finding itself in a financial crisis, has been making desperate efforts to continue its domination and exploitation of the proletariat. A *Communist* party would utilize the crisis to rouse the workers to a struggle against their oppressors with a view to the overthrow of French capitalism. The Stalinites rush to the rescue of imperialism, preventing the bankruptcy of the bourgeois State by helping to stabilize the franc:

"Then our Party made the following declaration, which was published in the *l'Humanite*. . . .

"The Communist Party, reaffirming its previous declarations regarding its eventual attitude towards a Left government, recalls that it is ready to support, within the Chamber and throughout the country, every measure suited to safeguard the franc. . . ." (Maurice Thorez, speech at the Seventh Congress, *The People's Front in France*, p. 54)

A few months after the "Seventh Congress" the Stalinist agents of French imperialism forged another link in the chain fastening the proletariat to the bourgeois chariot. The exploiters and oppressors were to be "united" with the toilers. Both were now comprising the "French people." The entire *capitalist class* of France has been "reduced" by the Stalinists to 200 families:

"The Communist Party of France yesterday concluded its Eighth Congress with the issuance of a ringing manifesto entitled 'For the Welfare of France,' calling for the uniting of the French people on the basis of a program of action, against the 200 families of financiers that today dominate France, for a happy, free, strong France." (*Daily Worker*, January 27, 1936)

It is clear that the policies Stalin laid down at the "Seventh Congress," for Stalinism, are absolutely correct. How far the reactionary Stalinists will go to save capitalism and their own system can be seen from the development since the "Seventh Congress." When the Greek military dictator Kondylis, to stabilize the rule of the bourgeoisie, reestablished the monarchy, the Stalinites at once pledged support to this "anti-Fascist" régime:

"A STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE

"A delegation of Communists appeared at the Royal Palace. It made a statement that the Party which the delegation represented would cooperate with the functionaries of the regime, since it considered King George II a bulwark against fascism and against any autocratic regime." (*L'Humanite*, January 8, 1936)

The news having caused a sensation among workers, the Stalinist pen-prostitutes hastened to assure their readers that the whole affair had been a frame-up by the Havas News Agency serving French imperialism. But the hard fact that the editors of *L'Humanite* printed the dispatch and made no comment on its contents is indicative that such an act on the part of "Communists" was accepted by them as a matter of course. The shabbiness of the Stalinist "explanation" is self-evident.

Fired by the Stalin-Laval Communique, in their zeal for the new line, the Stalinists came out approving war preparations of the bourgeois countries allied with France:

"The Minister of National Defense brought forward in the Defense Committee the program of material demands of the Army Administration. These demands are numerous, but *they are necessary!* . . . *Everyone: the workers, the small traders, peasants, civil servants, officials must make sacrifices for the army.*" (*Rudo Pravo*, central organ of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, November 27, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

This of course produced a furor among advanced workers. The leaders of the Stalintern came down with the pasteboard club of "self-criticism" upon the silly second-rate fakers in the Czechoslovak "Communist Party" who had not yet learned how to paint Red their anti-workingclass, pro-bourgeois policies.

Far greater masters of phrase-juggling are the American and the French Stalinist mountebanks. Early in May 1936, following the elections in France, the leaders of the French Stalinists gave out an interview, stating their aims and policies. Thorez, general secretary of the "Communist Party" of France, admitted the following, according to the report of a bourgeois correspondent:

"Thorez also made the important admission that the Communist Party would abandon its policy, hitherto rigidly pursued, of voting against military credits, and in the future would support appropriations for the army, navy and air force." (*New York Herald Tribune*, May 7, 1936)

This produced a distinct shock among workers. Browder naturally cannot compel the capitalist reporters to exercise care and forethought, have their dispatches skillfully worded to cover the Stalinists' double game of serving the bourgeoisie and posing as Communists before the workers. He hastily ordered his hirelings, nimble in their ignoble calling, to set things "right" in the following manner:

"Both the man and the fact were falsely reported. The interview was a joint one by Thorez and Jacques Duclos, another Communist leader. It was Duclos who answered the question of war credits. As reported in our special cable from Paris yesterday, Duclos reiterated the traditional Bolshevik policy that the French Communist Party would continue to *refuse to vote* for war credits for *imperialist purposes.*" (*Daily Worker*, May 9, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

Attention must be called to the phrases "refuse to vote" and "for imperialist purposes," for therein lies the Stalinist renegadism, duplicity and their obvious rôle as agents of imperialism. The traditional Bolshevik policy is not "refuse to vote," but vote *against* credits. The little phrase "for imperialist purposes," tacked on at the end of the sentence which speaks of war credits, indicates how well advanced in skill and technique of low cunning the Browders and Ducloses are. The pen-prostitutes of the *Daily Worker* were careful not to omit the phrase which occurred in the special cable to the *Daily Worker* as follows:

"... Jacques Duclos, another leading Communist, told the interviewers that the Communists would refuse to vote armament credits which would be used for *imperialist purposes.*

"We are for the *safety* and *freedom* of our country,' he declared, 'we do not want to vote credits *blindly.* We want to know what is done with them.'" (*Daily Worker*, May 8, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

Poor innocents. They have never heard what a bourgeois government uses armament credits for. And for what other but imperialist purposes can the French empire use armament credits! But the French bankers and munitions makers can't expect their "Reds" to vote appropriations *blindly.* If for imperialist purposes, no vote; if, on the other hand, the armament credits are intended for "defense" of the "freedom" of "our" country, that is altogether a different matter; then, by all means, more artillery, tanks, bombing planes and battleships. The reac-

tionary Stalinists eventually voted with the bourgeois and Social Democratic deputies for a ten and a half billion franc armaments appropriation; and for a substantial financial aid to the Polish army.

With Stalin fully approving and promoting French armaments, the bourgeois army of France, the mainstay of capitalism, will not be decomposed but will be strengthened by Stalin's lackeys.

It did not take very long after the "Seventh Congress," for the Stalinists to become direct and open recruiting sergeants for and builders of the military machine of French imperialism:

"A demand that France establish military training for its youth under conscription age and create a billion-franc fund to finance the project was presented to the Military Affairs Committee by Communist Deputy Marcel Gitton." (*The New York Times*, August 29, 1936)

When the Stalinites had not yet reached their present low level of degeneration they spoke true Leninist words about their present rôle in the labor movement:

"The struggle against militarism cannot be put off until war actually breaks out, for then it is already too late. The struggle against war must be carried on right now, immediately, from day to day. The first requirement of such a struggle is to refuse confidence and support of the bourgeois governments, to vote against the budget. Any socialist who enters a bourgeois ministry, any deputy who helps a bourgeois government to collect its taxes, or who draws the workers and peasants into military service—is a traitor and a villain. There can be no place for such a person in the ranks of the working class. We must drive from the trade unions every leader who directly or indirectly aids, justifies, or supports militarism. We must clean the proletarian organizations of political strike-breakers." ("Class War Against Imperialist War," Manifesto, Issued by the Fifth World Congress of the Communist International on the Tenth Anniversary of the World War, *Daily Worker*, September 8, 1924)

Stalin's line of the "Seventh Congress," having brought peace between the tricolor flag and the Red Flag, has transformed the White Russian émigrés in France into "workers," fraternally uniting them with the Communist and Socialist workers and the Fascists, has instilled respect for bourgeois law and defends order and property:

"The tricolor fraternizes in the factory with the red flag. The workers are unanimous in the fight for their general demands: Croix

de Feu, Christian, White Russians, foreigners, Socialists, Communists, all fraternally united for the defense of bread and respect for the law! Le Temps speaks of attack on order and property. It is evident that it is greatly distorting the truth." (M. Cachin, *l'Humanite*, May 30, 1936)

And if some confused worker does not believe that the Stalinist bureaucrats are helping the capitalists perpetuate the enslavement and misery of the toiling masses, that Stalinism condemns civil war against the bourgeoisie, thus opening the path for Fascism, let him read this open admission of counter-revolution:

"The radicals *are right* when they declare that they will not permit any threat against private property, and we communists do not hesitate to proclaim that *this is equally our concern*, and we add that what threatens private property today is the mighty economic dictatorship of the 200 families against whom we will struggle with all our might. . . . Civil war, which the French people do not want and which we communists condemn because we are concerned for the future of our country. . . ." (J. Duclos, *l'Humanite*, June 27, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

To completely muddle the minds of their trusting rank-and-filers, the Stalinist bureaucrats, with incredulous disregard for simple logic, declare that the basis of capitalist enslavement of the French workers, the institution of private property, is being undermined by the most powerful capitalists themselves, and *only* by them! The Stalinist bureaucrats will fight against these financiers. With what object in mind? To prevent the capitalists from undermining capitalism in France!

The intensification of the crisis in France raises the spectre of proletarian revolution which terrifies both the Stalinist bureaucracy and the French bourgeoisie. While Stalin's agents are chloroforming the toilers, are teaching them to respect bourgeois law, order and property, and are making the workers extend their hand of friendship to the worst enemies of the proletariat, the French bourgeoisie is sharpening the Fascist knife.

The only hope for the French workers is in a new Communist party.

The united front tactic the "Seventh Congress" introduced has, of course, nothing in common with Leninism. It is a "people's front," and every bourgeois who "fights" Fascism with a few watery phrases is eligible. The aim of Lenin's tactic of

united front was, as applied concretely during the Kornilov putsch, to expose in the process of struggle the fraud of the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries, to win the masses to Bolshevism and eliminate these petty-bourgeois parties. A partly correct formulation was once made by Browder himself:

"The united front is not a peace pact with the reformists. The united front is a method of struggle against the reformists, against the social fascists, for the possession of the masses . . . the reason why we have made the united front with them is because we have to take their followers away from them." (Earl Browder, *The Communist*, August 1933, pp. 752-753)

And back in 1928 the Stalinites in characterizing Social Democracy employed not "social-fascism," but plain Leninist words:

"The so-called Left leaders of Social Democracy were characterized by the VIII Plenum as the most dangerous enemies in the labor movement. This characterization has been completely confirmed. . . It is precisely they who, under 'Left' phrases, seek to save both the bourgeois and Right reformist leaders in critical situations." (*The Struggle Against Imperialist War*, Resolutions, Sixth Congress of the Communist International)

After the "Seventh Congress" Browder "forgot" the Leninist united front:

"No, we do not look upon the united front as a means of doing away with the Socialist Party." (Earl Browder, *Daily Worker*, October 19, 1935)

A long stride is this from Leninism. In fact, the line of the "Third Period" was calculated, as has been the line of the "Seventh Congress," to preserve rather than to eliminate the Social Democracy. Lenin's aim was to win the toiling masses away from the misleading petty-bourgeois democrats, the Socialists. The Communist International set out to bring Marxist clarity and *revolutionary* unity within the proletariat through the destruction of the opportunist obstacles to the proletarian revolution, particularly through the elimination of the Socialist Party. But according to Browder, who must instill harmful illusions in the minds of the workers, the decline of the Socialist Party, which, in the opinion of various "experts," is becoming a revolutionary organization, would cause more confusion and disunity:

"There is grave *danger* of disintegration and decline of the Socialist Party. We Communists *do not want that*, because that would mean only *more confusion* and *disunity* among the workers." (Earl Browder in Thomas-Browder debate, *Daily Worker*, December 14, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

Browder, of course, is not wasting his deadly anti-Leninist poison on the desert air. Workers imbibe his poison. And although Browder's gang of flunkies receive it with slavish unconcern, there are many among the Stalinite workers to whom this criminal pollution is distressing. Browder goes on to assert that a strong Socialist Party is an asset to the working class. There is a need to strengthen the Socialist, and, of course, the Stalinist Parties, which will result, Browder asserts, in strengthening the proletariat:

"Communists do not want a weak Socialist Party which is no asset to the working class. They urge Socialists to join the struggle for the united front because it will strengthen both the Socialist Party and the Communist Party and thus strengthen the working class." (Earl Browder, *What Is Communism*, p. 111. Second Edition, p. 88)

Although the Trotskyites' criticism of Stalinism has been imperfect, confusing and utterly ineffective, their admission into the Socialist Party is decried by the Stalinists because, notwithstanding the Trotskyites' break with Leninism, they differentiate between Lenin and Stalin, between Communism and Stalinism, which the Socialists do not. Great concern has been evinced by the Stalinists for the Socialist Party's "revolutionary" purity:

"They are admitting the disruptive Trotskyites, a deadly counter-revolutionary group which will poison the whole Socialist Party." (*Daily Worker*, July 10, 1936)

Lenin taught the workers that the function the Socialist Party performs is *essentially* that of an agency of imperialism. But the Stalinites, setting the workers' mind in a whirl, assert that the Trotskyites *prevent* the Socialist Party from fulfilling its "proper function":

"... the counter-revolutionary Trotskyites, who have penetrated the Socialist Party and are ham-stringing it every time it tries to fulfill its proper function." (*Daily Worker*, January 15, 1937)

This is the sort of stuff that passes for Bolshevism! Indeed, the line of the "Seventh Congress" is worthy of its sire. How

treacherous and disloyal this language sounds when compared with the resolute, revolutionary language of the *real* Comintern of Lenin's times:

"The Communist International has declared a decisive war against the entire bourgeois world, and all the yellow Social Democratic parties. It is indispensable that every rank-and-file worker should be able clearly to distinguish between the Communist parties and the old official 'Social Democratic' or 'Socialist' parties, which have betrayed the cause of the working class." (Conditions of admission to the Communist International, Point 17)

Honest workers in the Stalintern are not conscious of the night-and-day difference between Bolshevism and Stalinism. If they were, they would understand that Stalin and his Browders have long since violated the basic principles of the old Communist International, including the conditions of admission to membership. Stalin and his Browders would have been driven out of the Leninist Comintern. After Lenin's death, the Comintern was transformed into a seat of anti-workingclass bacterial growth. The war waged by Lenin against the Social Democracy and the bourgeois world has been terminated. Instead, a policy of collaboration and friendship has been adopted.

"The United Front and the Peoples Front has not cost the Socialist Party any losses. The Socialists gained four seats in the election. The Communist Party gained. Collectively the forces of the people of France fighting against the establishment of Fascism gained a mighty victory." (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, October 22, 1935)

These gains are a sign that the forces of opportunism among the proletariat are growing alarmingly.

The Socialist Party, a petty-bourgeois democratic party within the working class, before the "Seventh Congress" was "the third party of the capitalist class":

"But the Socialist Party is only the third party of the capitalist class. It is no more the party of socialism than is the Democratic Party the party of democracy. It is the party of the betrayal of socialism . . . the Socialist Party is the bitterest enemy of the Soviet Union." (Earl Browder, *Communism in the United States*, p. 100)

All this is temporarily shelved by the Browders, until the consummation of the betrayal in Spain and in France, which in all probability will usher in the "Fourth" or "Fifth" period, with

the entire blame once more thrown upon the "social-fascists." But in the trough between the periods, after the "Seventh Congress," the character of the Socialist Party has suddenly "changed." Today the Stalinites spout honeyed phrases about the former "social-fascists":

"Hailing the victory of the Socialist Party [in Reading, Pa.] as a success for the working class and all anti-fascists and as a tribute to the power of unity, the Section Committee of the Communist Party has appealed to the Socialist Party for permission to march in the parade." (*Daily Worker*, November 21, 1935)

The very parties that treacherously surrendered the masses to Hitler are now played up as the "leading fighters" of the proletariat:

"The resistance of the Jewish people against Hitler terror must be waged in common struggle with all the oppressed, and, in the first place, in united front with the working class and with its leading fighters, the *Communists* and *Socialists*." (*Daily Worker*, February 7, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

Were the Browders telling the truth about the petty-bourgeois Social Democracy, either before or after the "Seventh Congress"? For instance:

"These recent evidences emphasize more than ever the correctness of the Communist designation of the social democracy as social-fascist; the main social support of the bourgeoisie, not only before the advent of fascism, but its main social support in maintaining the monstrous rule of fascism." (Earl Browder, *The Meaning of Social Fascism*, F., p. 14)

The Jewish people are advised to wage their resistance to Fascism by forming a united front with the force "maintaining the monstrous rule of fascism"!

It is clear that the Browders were lying before and have been lying since the "Seventh Congress," are *always* lying to the oppressed masses.

A long, a "very" long time ago, about a year and a half before the "Seventh Congress," it was outright "counter-revolutionary Trotskyism" to say that Social Democracy and Fascism are opposite forces:

"The Trotskyites, on the contrary, look upon Social-democracy and fascism as two basically opposed forces; therefore their position is: 'To

reject and condemn the theory of social fascism.'” (*The Communist*, January 1934, p. 67)

The *two* opportunist parties, the Socialist Party, “unified” and “revolutionary,” hand in hand with the “Communist” Party, will direct the overthrow of capitalism. The united front, the Stalinites declare—

“... is the path to a strong, unified, revolutionary Socialist Party, which hand in hand with the Communist Party, will lead the people of the United States to emancipation.” (*Daily Worker*, November 21, 1935)

This is a mutilation of Bolshevism that defies words of criticism. The ABC of Marxism is that there can be only *one* party to lead the working class towards the overthrow of capitalism.

The Stalinites adhered to this correct conception, on paper, of course, only a year and a half before the “Seventh Congress”:

“For the worker who is not blinded by demagogy there is and can be only one party of the proletariat; only one political organization of the working class which leads the proletariat in struggle. Such an organization, such a party is the Communist Party of every country and the Communist International on a world scale.” (*The Communist*, January 1934, p. 67)

The last sentence correctly states what was true during Lenin’s days, before the destruction of the Communist International by the virus of Stalinism, before the Stalinites succeeded in blinding the minds of thousands and thousands of workers.

Historically, peace with the Social Democracy was made by Stalin at the time when the fiery poison of personal power had entered his veins. The delirious shouts “social-fascists” during the “Third Period” were palmed off on the Communist workers as a “struggle” against Social Democracy, a Leftist fake, just as “organic unity” is a Rightist fake. “Making peace with Social Democracy” in those days was condemned because it meant dropping the theory of “social-fascism” and of the tactic of the united front “from below only.” It meant direct negotiations with Socialist leaders. The Communist workers were warned to reject the united front if it led to negotiations with the Socialist Party, as in the case of Berlin in 1932:

“Should our comrades anywhere... pursue the policy of the united front in such a way that it may lead to making peace with social-

democracy, then we would say to them: ‘Rather reject the “united front” altogether.’” (Kuusinen, *Prepare for Power*, p. 115)

The “Third Period” line during the tragic years in Germany, when the proletariat was being sapped of its strength, was accepted by the bulk of the Communist workers without a murmur. Those few who disagreed were ruthlessly expelled as dangerous “social-fascists” and “enemies” of the Soviet Union. Today if a member of Browder’s “Party” rejects the new line of “organic unity,” “transition government” and all the rest of the fakery and betrayals-in-the-making, he will be expelled for “ultra-Left sectarianism.”

In Lenin’s day when the petty-bourgeois Social Democracy won a victory it was a defeat for the revolutionary proletariat. Under Stalin, after the “Seventh Congress,” the opposite is declared to be true:

“The working people of Reading came *into their own* last night. In one of the most militant and enthusiastic demonstrations ever held here they celebrated *their* great election *victory* which resulted in the Socialist Party making a clean sweep of all city offices and for the first time gaining a foothold in the county government.” (A. B. Magil, *Daily Worker*, November 23, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

This same Magil, a hypocrite and journalistic prostitute, who now poisons the minds of the workers with the delusion that the victory of the Socialists is a proletarian victory, who speaks of “our two parties,” only recently applied the “Third Period” line, and with such thoroughness that he even criticized Olgin—yes, *Olgin!*—for “serious shortcomings”:

“A serious shortcoming of the pamphlet is its failure to expose the ‘left wing’ of social-fascism, the Musteites and the ‘Militant’ group who are being forced by the radicalization of the workers and the mounting resentment of the S.P. rank and file to resort to revolutionary phrases and gestures in order to carry out their betrayal work.” (A. B. Magil, review of *The Socialist Party Last Bulwark of Capitalism*, by M. J. Olgin, *Daily Worker*, February 13, 1933)

Now, the “Militant” Thomas makes appeals, according to Magil, against reaction and war:

“Thomas, who was frequently interrupted by applause, stirred the audience with an eloquent appeal for struggle against the forces of fascist reaction and war.” (A. B. Magil, *Daily Worker*, November 23, 1935)

At the Thomas-Browder "debate" deluded workers cheered when the two misleaders of labor shook hands:

"A great ovation greeted the appearance of Browder, Thomas and Krzycki. This was dwarfed, however, by the hurricane of applause that burst forth when Thomas and Browder posed for photographers, shaking hands." (*Daily Worker*, November 28, 1935)

Effervescing with the new hope, the pen-prostitute, Michael Gold, exclaims:

"May 1936 see the birth of a big united front of Socialists and Communists of which Earl Browder and Norman Thomas be the joint leaders!" (*Daily Worker*, January 1, 1936)

To cite more of such passages would be merely repetitive.

The old betrayer of the German workers, the liberal-bourgeois Social Democrat, Rosenfeld, one of the "social-fascists" against whom the Red Referendum was directed, after the "Seventh Congress" gets a friendly headline in Browder's paper, and is utilized to help perpetuate the swindle of the united front:

"Kurt Rosenfeld Views Browder-Thomas Debate as Big Step for Unity.

"Former Social-Democratic Minister of Justice in Prussia Cites German Experience to Impress Urgency of United Front."
(Headlines in the *Daily Worker*, December 13, 1935)

The opportunist Browder is not interested in winning the workers from the opportunist Socialist Party and in exposing the Rosenfelds and Thomases. He likes to see treacherous parties grow—why not! He is helping to build the Socialist Party. Only a couple of years ago Browder said the building of the Socialist Party is the business of the capitalists. The Socialist Party was spoken of as a menace:

"The bourgeoisie is definitely building up the Socialist Party because it knows that in the coming great class struggles in America it is going to need the Socialist Party . . . because the building of the Socialist Party is so directly the business of the capitalists and not of the workers, this is the determining reason why the Socialist Party has such leaders as Norman Thomas. . . . Especially will it grow and become a menace in this country if we Communists are not active and well armed in the struggle against it." (Earl Browder, *Meaning of Social-Fascism*, pp. 40-41)

During the "Third Period," Thomas was a valuable assistant to Roosevelt, and the chief American "social-fascist":

"Mr. Thomas is one of Roosevelt's most valuable assistants in putting across the New Deal." (Earl Browder, Report to the Extraordinary Party Conference, New York City, July 7, 1933)

"Norman Thomas, the leading exponent of social-fascism in America . . ." (Earl Browder, *The Meaning of Social-Fascism*, p. 34)

The petty-bourgeois democrat, Norman Thomas, who shows precisely what he is politically when he states "We desire a peaceful change brought about by constitutional methods . . . we want no revolution" (*The New York Times*, June 7, 1936), is at one time called comrade and portrayed as a proletarian revolutionist, at another called Mister and is depicted as a Fascist.

During the "Third Period," in order to place their "theory" of "social-fascism" upon some sort of a "Leninist" foundation, the Stalinites often levelled *precise* and *incontrovertible* criticism at people who advocated anything approximating the line now laid down by the "Seventh Congress." Such Browders were correctly described as *agents of the bourgeoisie* helping Social Democracy to deceive the workers:

"Throughout the 13 years of existence of the Comintern, whenever the crisis of Social-Democracy became acute, whenever the Communist Parties were confronted with the necessity of a change in tactics to conform to the new stage in the development of the international labor movement, there came forward agents of the bourgeoisie within the Communist Parties, for the purpose of retarding the growth of the revolutionary struggle. Instead of further progress, speedy adjustment to the new conditions, to prepare the working class for the decisive revolutionary class battles, strengthening the independent role of the Communist parties in leadership of them, *sharpening* the struggle against Social-Democracy; opportunist elements within the Communist International openly attempted during these turning points, to drag the Communist Parties *back*. They did this by *adjusting themselves to Social-Democracy*, to its 'left' maneuvers, helping the Social-Democracy, through its 'left' and 'most left' agency, to deceive the working masses (who were deserting them) into believing that Social-Democracy belongs to this side of the barricade; that there is no *fundamental* difference between Communism and Social-Democracy, that the leaders of the 'left' Social-Democracy are moving towards Communism." ("Bolshevist Cannonade Against Opportunism." *The Communist International*, September 1932, p. 531. Emphasis in the original)

The Stalinites have been developing a "broader" united front along the line laid down by the "Seventh Congress":

"What Hearst really fears is the growing united front of Young Socialists, Communists, *Republicans*, *Democrats*, *religious*, *sport*, *social groups*, *etc.*, to prevent the Hearsts, the Liberty Leaguers and the rest of that crowd from doing in this country what Hitler has done in Germany. . . .

"The best answer to his threats is to build a stronger, *broader*, more united movement of the young people of *our country* against war and fascism and in defense of *everything they hold dear*." (*Daily Worker*, November 14, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

Can one imagine Lenin making a united front with Tzarist priests, with the Cadets, the organization of Russian imperialists?

During the "Seventh Congress" Olgin advanced a hypothetical united front of revolutionary workers with—*Herbert Hoover!* Hoover, the exploiter of the Chinese workers, the savior of capitalist Europe after the World War, the tormentor of the Hungarian Soviets through his hunger blockade; Hoover, bitter enemy and plotter against the Soviet Union. Since things have reached a pass where one has to argue to prove that Hoover is an enemy of the workers, let Olgin's boss himself tell of the rôle Hoover played:

"... like Hoover, an international organizer of food and military supplies for counter-revolution." (Earl Browder, *War Against Soviet Union*, p. 8)

"Hoover, at the head of American imperialism, is one of the chief organizers of the war against the Soviet Union." (Earl Browder, speech at the Nominating Convention of the Communist Party, May 28, 1932)

Says Olgin:

"Let us imagine that Herbert Hoover would want to join the united front of protest against Nazi terror. Let us imagine that, in the united front, there would also be war veterans who would remember how Hoover ordered the bonus marchers to be shot. If the veterans should utilize the united front conference to demonstrate against Hoover for his brutal action against the bonus veterans, how would they look? *They would be disrupters*." (M. J. Olgin, *Freiheit*, July 25, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

Only a thoroughly degenerated Menshevik mind can conceive of a united front of the revolutionary proletariat with the brutal

representative of the conservative wing of the most powerful robber imperialism on earth. Olgin tells us that not only is he prepared to lead the workers into such a "united front," but that he is prepared to condemn any worker who will dare to remind the bourgeois exploiters of their brutalities against the workers. His purpose is to blunt and deaden the class-hatred of the proletariat towards its bloodsuckers. The best example he can think of is the brutal action of Hoover against the war veterans, and he teaches the war veterans to forget the destruction by Hoover of their camp Anacostia, to forget the "bloody Thursday" when terror and death was let loose upon the veterans by direct order of Hoover. Through the transparent veil of Olgin's "united front" can be seen the ugly features of the old Olgin of the era of the imperialist war.

While Stalin is a renegade from Communism, Olgin is not even that. He remained, through devious zigzags, under a Red mask, an agent of capitalism. The expression of Stalin's with which Olgin covered his pamphlet *Trotskyism*, "The dog returns to his vomit," can be aptly applied to Olgin. He is back where he was in 1917—a lackey of the American bourgeoisie.

There is another feature of "broadening" the united front, since the "Seventh Congress." In the *Young Worker*, organ of the Young Communist League, in the August 20, 1935 issue, can be seen a picture of *Boy Scouts* and Communist Pioneers marching together, the picture entitled "Real United Front."

The Boy Scouts is a semi-military youth organization of the bourgeoisie of which Roosevelt is honorary president and W. W. Head, former president of the American Bankers Association, president.

A reactionary ulcer is eating at the vitals of the Stalinist Young Communist League; class struggle is rapidly being substituted by class unity. The terms *capitalist* and *bourgeoisie* are avoided when the need arises to soften the sound, and the euphemistic "middle class" is employed:

"In the American Youth Congress we can see a living example of how unity between the proletarian and middle class youth is possible." (Gil Green, National Secretary of the Young Communist League, U.S.A. at the Seventh Congress, *Daily Worker*, September 30, 1935)

The world is approaching another series of wars and revolutions with the proletariat disarmed organizationally and ideo-

logically through the degeneration of the Comintern which is now a force operating for the preservation of capitalism, as is the Second International. Only a few months before the "Seventh Congress," the Comintern still retained some Communist phrases on the question of supporting bourgeois governments in an imperialist war:

"But whatever the exact circumstances in which the hostilities would begin, the French Communist Party would continue to wage its relentless and unceasing struggle against French capitalism and their own imperialists. It would raise Lenin's slogan of turning imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war. *A Soviet France would be the best and only genuine ally of the Soviet Union.* . . . It should be emphasized that *under all circumstances* the main task of the working class is the overthrow of the capitalists of its own country." (*Daily Worker*, April 3, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

To appear as real Leninists, the Stalinist centralists, during the attack on the "Rights" more than once employed correct formulations:

"A characteristic feature of the Chech Rights was a tendency to underrate Checho-Slovakian imperialism and to consider Checho-Slovakia as an oppressed colonial country. This led to a weakening of the struggle against the Chech bourgeoisie and Chech Social-Democracy." (N. Popov, *Outline History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Vol. 2, p. 392)

In the May 16, 1933 issue, the *Daily Worker* attacked the Socialist leaders in an article, "Preparing to Repeat the Betrayal of 1914." Speaking of the approaching war, it asked:

"Will it be a fight for the redivision of the world? Will it be a fight among the imperialist wolves for the redivision of China? Will it, perchance, be a concerted attempt of the capitalist wolves to crush the Workers' Fatherland, the Soviet Union?"

"Not at all, say the Socialist leaders. *It will be a war to defend Bourgeois Democracy against Dictatorship!*" (Emphasis in the original—G.M.)

The *Daily Worker* quoted the *New Leader* of May 13:

"Capitalism is forcing the final conflict and this is taking the form of fascist dictatorship attempting to crush bourgeois democracy."

And the *Daily Worker* correctly declared:

"In these words the Socialist leaders once again are preparing to defend their own capitalist class under the guise of defending democracy. In these words, once again, the Socialist leaders betray the struggle against their own capitalist class by urging the workers to unite with their own capitalist governments against their 'common enemy.' This is exactly the same theory with which the Socialist leaders defended their support of the imperialist world slaughter in 1914."

About a month later, the *Daily Worker* again showed that the Browders had studied Lenin even though they followed Stalin:

"Thomas is opposed to all the past wars. But the coming war? That will be 'different.' That no doubt, will be a war to 'defend democracy' against 'dictatorship.' This is the line with which the Socialist Party already gets ready to repeat the betrayals of 1914-1917. In the next war, the S. P. leaders will surely defend American imperialism 'in the light of Socialist principles.'

"Civil war against 'our own' government, to work for the defeat of American imperialism in the next war, NO MATTER WHETHER IT IS 'DEFENSIVE' or 'OFFENSIVE'—that is the only truly revolutionary policy, in the interests of the working class. The rest is treachery and prostitution to Wall Street imperialism." (*Daily Worker*, "Offensive and 'Defensive' Wars," June 19, 1934. Capitals in the original)

This truly Leninist language has been discarded by the Stalinists. A new language is being spoken, the abysmally putrid language of treachery and prostitution to Wall Street imperialism and international imperialism:

"We have not at hand all the articles that Michael Gold wrote and since you did not give any quotation from his article we cannot tell you what he did write and what he did not. We can tell you, however, that if such a situation did occur, namely that Japan threatened the United States and the Soviet Union with war, and both countries had obligated themselves to help one another in case of an attack on the part of Japan, the duty of the American Communists would naturally be to support the United States in war against Japan, because that would mean support of the Soviet Union against an aggressive Japanese imperialism." (*Freiheit*, May 19, 1936)

"Those of you who read Inprecorr this week will find the resolution on war, and will see that we definitely declared at the Seventh Congress that in a war for national liberation the Communist parties will support in that war their own ruling class in defending the attacked nation. We have Poland and Czechoslovakia in mind." (H. Pollitt, *Labour Monthly*, October 1935, p. 617)

The "Seventh Congress" openly reversed the historical Leninist perspective. The Stalinist choice for the workers now is not freedom against slavery, not extension of the October, dictatorship of the proletariat as against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The choice is capitalist slavery under bourgeois democracy:

"Now the toiling masses in a number of capitalist countries are faced with the necessity of making a *definite* choice, and of making it today, not between proletarian dictatorship and bourgeois democracy, but between bourgeois democracy and fascism." (Dimitroff's report at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, p. 108)

Thus the last essential feature of Leninism, which, on paper, lingered on within the Stalintern, has been eliminated.

Is it any wonder that the extreme Right wing Socialist paper, the Jewish *Forward* of New York, greeted the Stalintern's abandonment of the struggle for Communism and its open support of bourgeois democracy, with the editorial:

"A correct word comes from Moscow at last, an open-hearted declaration that in many countries there cannot now be any talk of Communism any longer, and that there is no such thing there, that there are in these countries only two issues, Democracy and Fascism.

"We sign this declaration with both hands. . . ."

The main issue the American capitalists are facing is to *overcome the crisis*, to put the fifteen million unemployed *back to work*. The danger to capitalism Engels spoke of in his preface to *Capital*—that the unemployed would take matters into their own hands—the American bourgeoisie are striving to overcome.

Browder got permission from the capitalists to speak on a coast-to-coast hook-up. A *Communist* leader would have told the workers that their lot under capitalism is cruel slavery, that the main task is the organization of the proletariat for a *struggle* against its oppressors and despoilers, with a view to marching *forward* toward the abolition of capitalism.

The charlatan Earl Browder, carrying out the line of the "Seventh Congress" and the Stalinist policy of sabotaging the development towards revolution declared to the millions of exploited and unemployed workers that "The main issue of 1936 is how to put America back to work." (*Daily Worker*, March 6, 1936)

Since the "Seventh Congress" the capitalist politicians of liberal hue are doing service to the "American people." Instead of relentless criticism and Bolshevik exposure of the bourgeois liberals and demagogues of the Democratic and the Republican Parties which are the two political organizations representing the Wall Street oligarchy, Browder introduces a Menshevik policy of training the workers' mind to trust their sly enemies. Speaking of the Republican Congressman Marcantonio, the *Daily Worker* says:

"Insofar as Marcantonio contributes to forming that front ["broad peoples' front"] he is doing a distinct service to the American people. . . . So long as he maintains *his excellent record*, he will always have the *warm esteem* not only of the *Daily Worker* but of hundreds of thousands of *liberty-loving American people*." (*Daily Worker*, November 14, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

This is not the place for reviewing Marcantonio's "excellent record." It will suffice to give an extract from his letter endorsing one of the most vicious anti-labor politicians, Hamilton Fish, for delegate to the Republican Convention:

"My colleague, Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr., is a candidate for delegate to the Republican National Convention from the Fifteenth Congressional District. He has served in Congress for sixteen years and has stood for social and industrial justice and a square deal for labor and small business interests." (*The New York Times*, March 26, 1936)

Of course, the *Daily Worker* hastened with hypocritical explanations and "criticism" following which Marcantonio again appeared in the pages of the *Daily Worker* as a friend of Communism.

The present Stalinist policy is the one that was pursued with respect to the Purcells, La Follettes and Chiang Kai-sheks before these representatives of the bourgeoisie assumed the rôle of open hangmen by stabbing the unsuspecting workers in the back at the most critical moments in the class struggle.

Doubtless, after the next major betrayal the hypocritical Piatnitskys will write, "Our sections did not correctly interpret the decisions of the Seventh Congress . . . in our eagerness to root out sectarianism we included in the united front sections of liberal and reactionary political bodies, churches and even Fascists," etc., etc., etc.

An inkling of another piece of treachery Stalin is concocting

for the Red peasant districts of China can be gleaned from the speech of his Chinese lickspittle, Wang Ming. Nothing less is being plotted than the surrender of the Red Army to the treacherous Kuomintang. What divides the armies of the White Terror butcher, Chiang Kai-shek, and the armies fighting for the toiling masses is "certain differences of opinion," say the Stalinites:

"In my opinion and in the opinion of the entire Central Committee of the Communist Party of China our tactics should consist in a joint appeal with the Soviet Government of China to all the people, to *all parties, groups, troops*, mass organizations and to *all prominent political and social leaders* to organize together with us an All-China United People's Government of National Defense and an All-China United Anti-Japanese National Defense Army. . . .

"If the Kuomintang troops will discontinue their offensive against the Red Army and will really begin an armed struggle against Japanese imperialism and its agents, the Red Army will immediately reach them its hand for a joint struggle for the salvation of the fatherland despite the fact that they were and are *divided by certain differences of opinion on internal political questions. . . .*" (Wang Ming, *The Revolutionary Movement in the Colonial Countries*, pp. 20, 22. My emphasis—G.M.)

The swords of Chiang Kai-shek's executioners are still dripping with the blood of thousands of Communist workers, but the Stalinites have already "reduced" the unbridgeable gulf dividing the Chinese exploiters from their victims to "differences of opinion."

A naive Stalinist worker might think: But that does not mean unity with Chiang Kai-shek. The leadership of the Comintern will certainly have no trust in that crafty, bloodthirsty monster, the tool of imperialism, the horrid butcher of the Communist vanguard of China.

As a matter of fact the Stalinites are aiming to unite the Red Army forces of China *precisely* with Chiang Kai-shek!

"If Chiang Kai-shek really means to take up the struggle against Japan, then obviously the Soviet Government will extend to him the hand of friendship on the field of battle against Japan." (Mao Tse Dun, *Daily Worker*, March 30, 1936)

"At the same time, the Red Army issued a call to all troops and their commanders to form a united anti-Japanese army immediately. This call was addressed to Chiang Kai-shek personally, as well. . . . The C.P. and the Chinese Red Army would give him the opportunity of expiating his guilt before the people and China." (Wang Ming,

"Struggle for Anti-Japanese Peoples Front in China," *Communist International*, June 1936)

But hasn't the 1925-1927 experience in China with the "bloc of four classes" against Japanese and other imperialism taught the Stalinists anything? Of course it has! The policy applied proved highly "successful." It is necessary, therefore, to apply that policy all over again.

Are the Stalinists aware that Chiang Kai-shek is a hangman of the toiling masses? Without a doubt!

"In China, the Socialists side with the hangman Chiang Kai-shek." (I. Amter, *The Communist*, April 1931)

Japan threatens the Soviet Union and with it the Stalinist bureaucracy. The Stalinists do not dare to think of allying themselves with a *Communist* China. They angle for the bourgeoisie. But they are quite aware that the hands of Chiang Kai-shek are tied by the existence of Red provinces. No better payment can the Stalinites make to the Chinese ruling classes than by snaring the Reds and turning them over to Chiang Kai-shek. An opportunity would open to draw the Chinese bourgeoisie into an alliance against Japan and prevent a new upsurge of revolution in China. So if Chiang Kai-shek makes a promise to take up the struggle against Japan, the Stalinists are ready to tell the Chinese workers to trust this hangman again.

Trotsky is disposed to believe that Stalin's adroit strategy in China was an "uninterrupted series of blunders which doomed the Chinese revolution of 1925-1927" (*The Third International After Lenin*, p. 255). He declares that the treacherous alliance with Chiang Kai-shek was undertaken by the Stalinists "with the best of intentions" (*What Next*, p. 74). Now, according to Trotsky's way of thinking, the Stalinites are reverting to their false (?!) policies in China. If these organizers of toilers' defeats succeed in surrendering the peasant districts to Chiang Kai-shek, that will be another "stupid error."

It would be shortsightedness to imagine that the bureaucratic distorters of the workers State are not aware of their trampling upon Lenin's teachings. Anticipating that revolutionary critics will make use of Lenin's writings in the struggle against Stalin, the Stalinites caution their duped followers to disregard "idle" criticism from the Left, and advise to take less seriously quotations from Lenin and Marx:

"We have those who want to put forward criticisms supposedly on the Left, those who want to come forward with quotations from Lenin about this, that, and the other. When it is necessary, we can deal also with the discussion of Lenin's position on this war and that war, and Marx's position, etc. The important thing is not that. The important thing is not the question of texts." (Palme Dutt, *Decisive Days Ahead*, p. 6)

In the face of the comprehensive picture of *complete* and *final* abandonment of Leninism by the Stalinists, the Lovestoneites come out with the following misleading poison about these "Communist" agents of the bourgeoisie within the proletarian camp:

"The International is actually in danger of breaking with revolutionary principles. . . . We must not exaggerate the degree to which the Comintern has gotten off the rails. Its motives are those of unswerving loyalty to the proletariat and that is our asset to be counted on in fighting to correct its incipient blunders. . . . But today, now, every revolutionist, every loyal Communist must rally to the Communist Opposition [Lovestoneites—G.M.] for an uncompromising, irreconcilable, hard-hitting struggle against the poison of opportunism before it gets absorbed into the system of the International and destroys it as the organization of revolutionary struggle." (Bertram D. Wolfe, *Workers Age*, August 10, 1935, article "The Comintern in Danger of Degeneration")

Back to 1928! whine the Lovestoneite liars and misleaders of the proletariat. Reunite the divided ranks of Communism! (read: "the various shades of the Stalinist bureaucracy") whimper the Wolfes, Lovestones and Herbergs. Stalin's motives "are those of *unswerving loyalty* to the proletariat." (China! Germany!)

Lovestone supports the Stalinist bureaucracy and their fake theory of Socialism in one country. There is little doubt that had Stalin reinstated Lovestone as his footman, Lovestone would have carried out the "Third Period" ultra-Leftist cover-zigzag. His opposition to dual unions and the theory of "social-fascism" is pure hypocrisy. It is enough to recall that he began to organize dual unions just before his expulsion. As to "social-fascism," the following will show how he "opposed" this Stalinist innovation when he held Browder's job:

"There is a noticeable and rapid fusion of socialist reformism with the capitalist state and increasingly *open collaboration* between socialist reformism and fascism *in all its forms*." (Jay Lovestone, *The Communist*, November 1928, p. 660. My emphasis—G.M.)

Bucharin submitted to the complete bureaucratic centralization. Lovestone would have done likewise, but the Stalin clique mistrusted him, as they for a long while mistrusted Foster.

To appear consistent in the eyes of the workers who succumb to his wiles, Lovestone holds to a "straight" line. Stalin, to preserve his enormous arbitrary power, which by now exceeds that of any living crowned head, and to perpetuate the bureaucratic excrescence, the pillar of his supremacy, must operate through zigzags. Clinging to the "Comintern" much as the remora clings to the belly of a shark, Lovestone "criticises" the "incipient blunders" and points out the "danger" of the Stalinist bureaucracy breaking with revolutionary principles which he, Lovestone, pretends to defend, finding himself a trifle to the Right or slightly to the Left of Browder, depending upon the Stalinern's zigzags.

The Lovestoneites' ideal of "Communist unity" is portrayed by Diego Rivera in his "unity" mural at their New Workers School. All tendencies—opportunist, charlatanish, and Marxist—are "united." Here is Stalin, Marx, Lenin, Engels, Trotsky, Bucharin, Foster, Lovestone, Cannon, Ruthenberg and, of course, Wolfe.

If some workers are still in doubt about the Menshevist character of the Lovestoneites let them look at the following:

"As an *American speaking to Americans*, I do not feel it appropriate here to make suggestions to those south of the Rio Grande. I want rather to say a few words about what *we Americans* should do as a *people* if we wish to promote *better relations* with our neighbors in the South. . . .

"In addition to *our* economic interests *we* have a very vital political interest in Cuba. . . . *We* snatched Cuba from Spain because it fitted into *our* dream of empire." (Bertram D. Wolfe, *Workers Age*, July 15, 1934. My emphasis—G.M.)

No, it is not Roosevelt speaking, not even Norman Thomas. It is Bertram D. Wolfe, a "Communist" leader. Workers who think in terms of classes, will be nauseated after reading that bourgeois-liberal poison.

The Lovestoneites, of course, never miss an opportunity to throw in a little service for the old boss. In reviewing Barbusse's work, *Stalin*, in the *Workers Age*, Wolfe upholds his own criminal past, the erection of Stalinism. He "criticises" Barbusse:

"Not having the political understanding to know wherein *Trotsky was wrong* and *Stalin correct* [My emphasis—G.M.] in their basic differences, Barbusse reduces it to the simple formula that the majority is always right."

And foreseeing the betrayal of the French workers by Stalin, the Lovestoneites already obscure the workers' mind as to who will *actually* be responsible for the new crime:

"Their [the French Fascists'] preparations for civil war have been excellently exposed by the Party. But the proletarian answer to such preparation for counter-revolution is revolutionary civil war. And this answer the Party is not prepared to give and does not give! In order to fully understand this astounding anti-Bolshevism, it is necessary to see the attitude of those *who crack the whip over the French C.P.—Herriot's Radical Socialist Party.*" (*Workers Age*, December 7, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

Not Stalin and his clique of bourgeoisified "Communists" in the Kremlin Palace, but Herriot is cracking the whip over the French Stalinist section!—according to Lovestone.

The exposure of the rottenness and hypocrisy of the Lovestones and Wolfes will proceed parallel with the exposure of the rottenness and duplicity of the Browders, Olgins, Ganneses and Golds.

While the Wolfes do their share in chloroforming the workers, the revolting spectacle of the "Seventh Congress," which has flouted every fundamental Marxist idea sacred to revolutionists, evokes from the bourgeoisie contemptuous comment of this kind:

"The closer that its discussions are studied, however, the less reason does it give even Moscow's inveterate enemies for worry. In contrast to the old Comintern [under Lenin—G.M.] which was forever declaring holy hates against the non-Communist world and exhorting its agents to an unscrupulous offensive, this body seems to be interested solely in defense. The militant missionary spirit is dead. The whole inspiration of present discussion is a panicky fear of Fascist absolutism. Mr. W. Z. Foster would forestall the growth of Fascist spirit in America by tendering an olive sprig, meekly and humbly, to the hitherto contemptible Socialists and 'liberals,' to the end that an anti-Fascist labor front may be formed in America for purely defensive purposes. Mr. William Pieck, the German Communist spokesman, pleads in a keynote speech to the congress for loyal Red support of the 'remnants of democratic freedom.' The great Soviet war machine has this jittery gathering's full authority to go into action abroad (where

the Red Army was never to have been used in alliance with the armed minions of a capitalist regime), in defense of any little capitalist state that fights Fascism, however opaque it may be to the Red light.

"Strange as it may seem, the Soviet Union and its Communist congregations throughout the world have really allowed Fascism to get as much on their nerves as these Comintern discussions indicate. There has probably never been a time since the Brest-Litovsk peace, therefore, when the poor tattered remnants of democracy in these United States have had less to fear from Union Square's conspiracies. The prospects have never been so fair as they are now, indeed, of catching William Z. Foster in the act of leading a choral rendition of 'The Star-Spangled Banner' at a Bowery recruiting station." (*New York Herald Tribune*, editorial, July 29, 1935)

I wonder whether Foster's bourgeois-patriotic record—speech-making and selling Liberty Bonds during the war—is known to the editors of the *Herald Tribune*.

I must remind the honest misled workers in the Stalinist "Party" what one of their own bureaucratic bosses said about Browder and his Fosters:

"Nor can it be regarded as an accident [My emphasis—G.M.] that the *Daily Worker* which is quite vigilant in reporting all cases of the transport of arms and munitions from European countries to Japan, says extraordinary little, and that only on rare occasions, about the fact that war materials are being sent to Japan from the United States. What does this mean? Is not this perhaps opportunism? If the Communist Party of the *United States* is combating the war danger by conducting its struggle only against the Japanese, but not against American imperialism, then, I ask, comrades, who is going to fight against the war preparations in the United States?" (Kuusinen, Report at the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.)

No, it cannot, it *must not* be regarded as an accident that Browder and his swarm of petty-bourgeois opportunists have to be reminded to carry on, at least on paper, a struggle against American imperialism. Not that the Kuusinen do not know their fellow-opportunist, Browder. What they demand is that Browder apply another dab of Red to his face. More anti-Wall Street *words* to conceal Stalinism and the American fake-Bolsheviks themselves. The yellow spots and streaks of opportunism appear too often on their thinly painted skin. More Red paint!

And if any worker is in doubt as to whether Michael Gold will fight for the American bourgeoisie in its war against a

Fascist or a "democratic" imperialist power which during the war establishes, as history shows, a *military* dictatorship, let him read the following:

"We would nevertheless fight for the American capitalist democracy, if it were attacked by Fascism." (Michael Gold, *Daily Worker*, September 17, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

Fascism and capitalist democracy are enemies, declare all the Dimitroffs, Browders and Golds after the "Seventh Congress." What reply can Gold give to a worker's bewildered query: Aren't you advocating that we workers defend capitalist dictatorship which holds us in wage slavery? Aren't you telling us to protect the *mother of Fascism*? Why did Browder only a year or so ago teach us the direct opposite?—

"What are the ideas, the misconceptions, with which the social-fascists confuse and disarm the workers?

"First, is the idea that fascism is the opposite of capitalist democracy, and this democracy is therefore the means of combating and defeating fascism. This false idea serves a double purpose. By means of counterposing 'democracy against dictatorship' it tries to hide the fact that the capitalist '*democracy*' is only a form of the capitalist dictatorship; it tries to identify in the worker's mind the fascist dictatorship with the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, and thus cause the worker to reject the road of revolution. At the same time, this slogan is used to hide the fact that *capitalist democracy is not the enemy, but the mother of fascism; that it is not the destroyer, but the creator of fascism.* [My emphasis—G.M.] It uses the truth that fascism destroys democracy, to propagate the falsehood that democracy will also destroy fascism. Thus does the Socialist Party and trade union officialdom, to the extent that the workers follow them, tie the working class to the chariot wheels of a capitalist democracy, which is being transformed into fascism, paralyze their resistance, deliver them over to fascism bound and helpless." (Earl Browder, Report to the Eighth Convention, *Communism in the United States*, p. 28)

"The Socialist Party puts itself forward as the champion of American democracy, capitalist democracy. . . . But the workers of the United States are learning a great deal about the real meaning of capitalist democracy. They can no longer be fooled, as of old, so easily. . . . They know that in the United States, the boasted democracy is a democracy of money, and a dictatorship against the workers." (*Ibid.*, p. 101)

"Thomas covers up the class character of democracy by contrasting it with fascist dictatorship as if capitalist rule were not the essence

of both. This is the same traitorous hypocrisy [precisely—G.M.] which the German Social Democracy practiced in its policy of the 'lesser evil.' We have seen what this masking of the capitalist dictatorship under the guise of democracy has led to in Germany [and will lead in France, Spain, America and elsewhere, to Fascism—G.M.]. The struggle for the maintenance of capitalism against the rising tide of revolution proceeds under just this guise of a struggle for democracy." (Earl Browder, *The Meaning of Social-Fascism*, p. 16)

These indeed are true words. Today Browder and Michael Gold are defending the capitalist dictatorship *against* the workers "under just this guise of a struggle for democracy." They are working for the maintenance of capitalism by fighting "for the American capitalist democracy."

As everybody can see, Browder *knows* that capitalist democracy is capitalist *dictatorship*. Dishonest to the marrow of their political bones, Browder and Gold are ready to twist and turn the workers' mind in line with the need of their Master.

And didn't the Stalinist twisters and confusers, when it was necessary for them, declare that counter-distinction between bourgeois democracy and Fascism is artificial?

"The XI Plenum of the E.C.C.I. has swept aside the artificially constructed counter-distinction between bourgeois democracy and Fascist dictatorship. By this it has rendered an invaluable service to the Communist Parties in their fight against Social-Fascism." (*Kommunistische Internationale*, No. 10, January 19, 1933, article "The Nature of Fascist Dictatorship")

How long since an entirely different conception of bourgeois democracy than the one now given the workers by the Golds and Browders was taught by the "theoretical" fakers of the Stalinern!

"In our day we need to ascertain the laws of the development which is observable on an international scale, in the conditions of the unequal development of capitalism, determining the fascisation of the bourgeois state, the development of social-democracy into social-fascism, and of *bourgeois democracy into fascism.*" (A. Fogarashi, "The Problems of Fascism and Social-Fascism in the International Communist Press," *The Communist International*, Vol. VII, No. 2-3, p. 102. My emphasis—G.M.)

According to an outstanding paladin of Stalin in the Presidium of the "Executive Committee of the Communist Inter-

national," with all the rest in full agreement with him, Gold is a bourgeois liberal:

"Only a bourgeois liberal can construe a counter-distinction between present-day bourgeois democracy and a Fascist regime." (D. Z. Manuil-sky, report at the Eleventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I., April 1931)

And years ago when fragments of correct formulas still ap-peared in the Stalinist publications, this profound Leninist truth could be read:

"The Communist workers who struggle against the bourgeois repub-lic and bourgeois democracy for proletarian democracy are doing more to bar the path to fascism than all the social-democratic party with its daily declamations about 'democracy.'" (D. Z. Manuil-sky, *Social Democracy—Stepping Stone to Fascism*, p. 46)

Today Gold is telling the workers to fight for capitalist "democracy." Shades of Woodrow Wilson! the agent of Wall Street, who sent the American workers with the blessings and assistance of the Olgins and Fosters—Gold was a mere stripling then—"to fight against autocracy and make the world safe for democracy." Wilson never spoke openly of *capitalist* democracy.

During the entire four years of the war even the most rabid of social-traitors such as Vandervelde, Plekhanov, Sheidemann never dared to speak so brazenly, so openly, as Gold does. And prior to the war they made no distinction between autocratic Russia and bourgeois-democratic France, advocating—on paper, of course—the overthrow of all capitalist governments (Basle Manifesto of the Second International, 1912).

What is the actual meaning of Gold's defense of American capitalist democracy? I think no more concise an answer can be given than the following, written before the "Seventh Congress" by the Stalinites themselves:

"The defense of bourgeois democracy is advanced for the purpose of maintaining the capitalist dictatorship as against the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." (*The Communist*, April 1933)

Revolutionary Marxists do not fight for bourgeois democracy. They fight for democratic gains for the workers and for the *overthrow* of the "democracy," of capitalism, and the establish-ment of their own, *workers* democracy, the dictatorship of the proletariat!

Is Gold familiar with this self-evident Marxist principle? When this Leninist truth was common knowledge among the revolutionary workers, before the foul stream of opportunism had reached the flood stage, even Michael Gold "adhered" to this fundamental of Bolshevism. Here is what this chameleon wrote *less than a year before the "Seventh Congress"*:

"But it is we who defend workers' democratic rights, *not bourgeois democracy* [My emphasis—G.M.], in order that we may better organ-ize the struggle for the seizure of power by the working class." (Michael Gold, *Daily Worker*, December 13, 1934)

Suddenly Gold makes a confession:

"And I am going to take some courses in Marxism at the Workers School; I don't know enough about that; nobody does." (Michael Gold, *Daily Worker*, September 18, 1935)

Very few know and nobody practices Marxism among the Stalinists, that is true. Gold certainly shows it almost every day in the year. For instance:

"And wealth is not created by any individual, however shrewd and talented, but by the community." (Michael Gold, *Daily Worker*, November 29, 1935)

No, wealth is not produced by the community, which in-cludes such "producers" of wealth as bankers, shopkeepers, priests, and the great variety of parasites on the labor movement. *Wealth is created by the toilers' labor-power applied to nature* (Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, pp. 50, 662). A mind that views capital-ist society as Gold views it can never defend the historical inter-ests of the proletariat.

Michael Gold, one of the "spiritual" leaders of the masses, by implication advises the workers to enroll in the Workers School, promising them a Marxist education. The instructors of that institution, in which every room exudes the smelly air of the Stalinist bureaucracy, are engaged in adulterating and pro-faning the teachings of the great leaders of the proletariat. A web of distortion is being spun about the students' minds. Among the outstanding courses is "The Rôle of Stalin in the Struggle Against Deviations from Marxism-Leninism" (*Daily Worker*, March 19, 1936).

My warning to every worker is: Beware of that rattlesnakes!

den! It is the most unlikely place where you will be taught Marxism.

Revolutionary workers will leave the Stalinist camp. Only helpless and hopeless political imbeciles and thoroughly corrupt flunkys will remain to the bitter end. And the bitter end for them will be either the proletarian revolution led by the new Communist Party, or Fascism—if Stalin and his Browders succeed in continuing their hold upon the advanced workers. In any event, the Stalinist refuse will be inevitably cast upon the garbage heap of history amid all other opportunist carrion which obstructed the onward march of the proletariat.

The remarks on the "Seventh Congress" would be incomplete without a word on Wilhelm Pieck, the present head of the "Central Committee of the Communist Party" of Germany, who reported on the activities of the Executive of the "Comintern." Pieck asked, Could the German workers have prevented Fascism? and answered in the affirmative:

"The question of whether the toiling masses of Germany could have averted this catastrophe is one fraught with significance. *There can be no doubt that they could have done so.*" (Wilhelm Pieck, *Freedom, Peace and Bread*, p. 38. My emphasis—G.M.)

This is absolutely correct. The situation for the proletariat was exceptionally favorable. The workers, anxious to fight, gravitated to what they thought was the revolutionary party. Hitler's forces were falling apart. Reports of intense crisis in the ranks of German Fascism appeared virtually in the entire press. The Stalinist leaders could not conceal this fact, and therefore admitted it openly at the Twelfth Plenum, several months before Hitler became chancellor:

"... the fact remains today that disintegration has already set in, in the ranks of the fascist organizations. The Press prints news of a large number of minor revolts in the S. A. (the Nazi storm troops)—cases where the leaders have been thrashed and the fascist flags torn to pieces, cases where small peasants who have hitherto been adherents of the national-socialists, now turn their backs upon them and demonstrate this change in the most stormy fashion." (Kuusinen, *Prepare for Power*, p. 100)

The German capitalists looked on with alarm at the declining Nazi movement, and trembled for their future. An American

bourgeois writer investigating the conditions in Germany in Autumn 1932, described the situation as follows:

"During this period the writer discussed the political situation with industrialists, editors, bankers, political leaders, university professors, labor leaders, economists, and others. Almost without exception they insisted that Hitler had missed the hour." (Calvin B. Hoover, *Germany Enters the Third Reich*, p. 64)

The stage of convulsions within the Nazi camp was carrying Fascism to its dying agonies. The millions of Social-Democratic workers were moving Leftward. The peasantry, too, showed it was turning towards the proletariat, looking to the Stalinists, who masqueraded as Bolsheviks, for leadership. This was seen as early as 1931. Writes Pieck:

"... a group of North German peasant leaders, who had been formerly connected with the fascist movement, in 1931 turned to the Communist Party." (*Freedom, Peace and Bread*, p. 36)

Yes, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the gruesome tragedy in Germany could have been averted. Why, then, did Fascism come into power? The proletariat, Pieck asserts, was betrayed by the Social-Democratic leaders. Quite so; but what about the "Communist" leaders?

Pieck has bits of "self-criticism" scattered through his speech, hypocritically covering up the "Staff of the World Revolution" in Moscow:

"... it was wrong of the Communists to dissociate themselves also from the Social-Democratic workers and to call them 'little Zoergiebels.' While it was right for the Communists in 1928 and 1929 in Germany, France, Great Britain and a number of other countries, in view of the conditions that existed at that time, not to make proposals for a united front to the Social-Democratic leaders, it was wrong to interpret the decisions of the Communist International as meaning that our comrades must not make such proposals to the local organizations of the Social-Democrats and of the reformist trade unions." (*Ibid.*, p. 13)

So! And we thought Olgin and the rest of the "Communist" leaders declared there was no opposition to the united front in the German "Communist" Party! But who did the interpreting of the decisions of the "Comintern"? Not Piatnitsky, not Kuusinen, not Pieck, not Thaelmann? And what were these decisions? Not "united front from below only"?

"In Germany, certain Communists, in face of the fascist offensive, even spoke of the necessity of 'destroying' the reformist trade unions, thereby helping to isolate the Communists from the organized workers." (*Ibid.*, p. 33)

Hypocritical Pieck! Who laid down the line of destruction of the trade unions if not Stalin's lackey Lozovsky, the appointed head of the Red Trade Union International!

Pieck admits that the Stalinists were discovering (to divert the attention of the workers) Fascism where it did not exist:

"On the other hand, a mistake equally as grave as the underestimation of the fascist danger was the fact that fascism was discerned even where it did not exist." (*Ibid.*, p. 33)

If the "Communist" writers were so wrought up about the danger of Fascism, why did they underestimate it where its growth was recognized by all whose eyes were open—in Germany!

"On the other hand, they underrated the Hitler movement, by the assumption that in a country like Germany, where the working class was so highly organized, the Hitlerites could not possibly seize power. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 33)

Pieck admits that not only the proletariat but also the petty-bourgeoisie was not given leadership and was thus driven in despair to the Fascists:

"When in Germany the Danat Bank crashed, with the result that large numbers of petty bourgeoisie lost their deposits, the Communist Party issued no fighting slogans for these strata and allowed a favorable opportunity for gaining greater influence among these strata to go by unutilized. In most of the other countries the petty bourgeoisie did not receive support from the Communists in their resistance to the trusts and to the banks which were draining their life blood. The consequence was that these strata held aloof from the struggle, ultimately followed the fascists and helped them to achieve their victory." (*Ibid.*, p. 37. My emphasis—G.M.)

"These mistakes were due to the absolutely false conception that all bourgeois parties are fascist, that there are 'no two methods of bourgeois rule,' and that it was unseemly for Communists to defend the remnants of bourgeois democracy. . . . Such sectarian views, which have nothing in common either with the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, or with the decisions of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, retarded the growth of the influence of the Communist

Parties and especially hampered the work of winning over the Social-Democratic workers for the joint struggle." (*Ibid.*, pp. 34-35)

Repulsive Tartuffe! First of all, keep Stalin and his Sixth Congress apart from Marx, Engels and Lenin. Second, who originated these absolutely false conceptions if not "the greatest living Marxist," Stalin, with his interpretations that Social Democracy and Fascism are not antipodes but twins? Who spread them among the workers if not you and all the other Browders?

Pieck admits that work in the reformist trade unions was sabotaged for years:

"It was precisely the fact that the strength of the traditions that bind the working class masses to the old trade union organizations was underrated, and that the main stress in our work was laid on strengthening the Red trade unions and on building revolutionary trade unions, that resulted in the Communists for several years neglecting work in the reformist trade unions, although such work was quite feasible." (*Ibid.*, p. 18)

"Strange" shortcomings, Pieck. "Unaccountable" negligence, oversight, inattention, "mistakes." A little "error"—for several years the Lozovskys, Piecks, Browders, Fosters, Pollits, Thorezes and Gottwalds were keeping the small militant vanguard separated in fake "Red unions" from the entire organized proletariat of Germany, England, and other capitalist countries! "The greatest disciple of Lenin" and his picked "Marxists" "underrated" and "overlooked." What reveries were they indulging in? Ah, but they never overlooked "counter-revolutionary Trotskyists" and other "agents of the bourgeoisie" in the Comintern." With eyes of Argus they looked sharp for deviations from their "Bolshevist" line, searching for, investigating and cross-examining skeptics and slinging them out as "enemies of the working class and of the Soviet Union."

Pieck admits that the slogan to defend the trade unions was issued by the "Communists" after Hitler had taken the reins of power—when it was perfectly safe for Stalinism to do so:

"It was with still greater delay—in Germany only even after the advent of Hitler to power—that the Communists issued the clear slogan of defending the Free Trade Unions. . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 33)

A "strange" delay, Pieck—only after the German capitalists established the Fascist dictatorship! The reason for your

transparent duplicity, the lying lengths to which you go, is obvious. Your words on Germany must be delivered in purest whitewash of Stalin and all the Piecks and Browders in the Stalintern. Your job is to screen Stalin's kiss of death on the brow of the world proletariat.

In your admission of "mistakes" you lay the blame for them upon anonymous Communists. The leadership of the German Party you are carefully avoiding to name. All the Piecks, Heckerts and Muenzenbergs, the loyal underlings of Stalin, must not be criticised. The policy of the German Central Committee led by Thaelmann was "correct." And especially the "Executive of the Comintern," all the Piatnitskys, Kuusinsens and Bela Kuns must be shielded. Not a word about the following order of the "Executive of the Comintern" issued at the Eleventh Plenum:

"All the resources of the party must be thrown into the fight against Social Democracy." (*The Communist International*, July 1931, No. 25-26, p. 1154. My emphasis—G.M.)

What resources were there left for the fight against Fascism? Evidently none.

If Pieck had made the revelation that the line laid down for Germany was for the specific purpose of strangling the proletariat and preventing a revolutionary struggle for power, that would have been an approach to *real* self-criticism. If Pieck had admitted that the E.C.C.I. resolution of April 1, 1933, which declared that the line had been correct, was passed to cover up the traces of the hideous crime, that would have been another step to *honest* self-criticism. If Pieck had confessed that the approval of that resolution by the Thirteenth Plenum and the concurrence in this approval by all the Browders and Piecks was done to cover up Stalin and his vile and infamous lieutenants who under his supervision had laid down that deadly line, that would have been *genuine* self-criticism.

The German proletariat was *smashed*, admits Pieck:

"The oldest organizations of the working class formed under the banner of Marxism were smashed by a band of bestial robbers." (*Freedom, Peace and Bread*, p. 38)

To state this fact openly only a couple of years before was "Trotskyism" and "counter-revolution." At that time it was permitted to speak only of a temporary "retreat":

"Our Party says that owing to the treachery of Social Democracy, the German proletariat was forced to retreat temporarily, and that there is now commencing in Germany a new revolutionary upsurge. All the Social Democratic parties attempt as one to distort this perspective, asserting that the German proletariat has been smashed, that in Germany an 'epoch of fascism and reaction' has set in... this counter-revolutionary manoeuvre of the social-fascists and Trotskyists. . . ." (*The Communist International*, No. 23, December 1933, p. 828)

In the quotation above one can detect discomfort, a feeling of embarrassment—if such thing is possible in a Browder or Pieck—and fear of the Communist workers.

During the "Seventh Congress," when everybody saw what a horrible defeat the German workers had suffered, Pieck admitted that—

"The German proletariat has suffered a defeat. . . . The defeat of the proletariat in Germany, one of the most important strategic points of the international class struggle, resulted for a short time [!—G.M.] in retarding the growth of the revolutionary mass movement and in temporarily halting the maturing of the elements of a revolutionary crisis in Poland as well. [Stalin killed more than one Red bird with one stone—G.M.] The defeat in Germany emboldened international reaction, increased the menace of war, intensified the pressure exercised by the bourgeoisie on the working class and multiplied the efforts to establish a fascist regime in other countries too." (*Freedom, Peace and Bread*, p. 41)

So, Pieck, the German working class has suffered a *defeat*? Read, then, the following, written by *you*:

"'We have suffered a tremendous defeat'—howl the Trotskyists and the Brandlerists. The Neumann-Remmele group shrieks about 'the victory of fascism and the defeat of the proletariat.'

"One or two reawakened conciliators add their voices to this counter-revolutionary outcry." (Wilhelm Pieck, *We Are Fighting For A Soviet Germany*, p. 66)

One half of your "fair" methods in protecting the sinister lies of the Stalintern is spewing hatred and venom at those who at any time dare to contradict the official Stalinist "truths." The other half is expulsion with the accompanied brutally mendacious defamation of character, and within the Soviet Union open lynch incitement and a living death in a Stalinist dungeon. At the "Seventh Congress," when the sharp moment of mass arrests and the smashing of proletarian organizations in Germany had

passed into history, the sordid, revealing details remaining generally unknown, you, under the guise of "correcting mistakes," were forced to admit something which could not be concealed.

After "honestly" conceding that reaction has made colossal strides, overwhelmed Germany, swept Austria, wrought a setback in Poland, brought the world to the brink of war, Pieck administers a dose of baleful drug to the workers:

"The international relationship of forces has changed not in favor of capitalism, but in favor of socialism; not in favor of the bourgeoisie, but in favor of the proletariat." (*Freedom, Peace and Bread*, p. 43)

The blinding mists of the "Third Period" have been overlaid by the no less obscuring mists of the "Seventh Congress." The sewage of lies and calumny issuing from the mouths of the Piecks and Browders, will in the end serve as their political grave-diggers. There are numerous passages in Pieck's *Freedom, Peace and Bread*, containing fraudulent statements, too long to copy in full. To cite a few:

"The working class has realized that the split in the ranks of the labor movement led to the victory of fascism in Germany, and that the working class needs unity." (*Ibid.*, p. 44)

This is a threefold lie. First, it is not true that "the split in the ranks of the labor movement led to the victory of fascism in Germany." In August 1917 the Russian workers were split, the majority following the petty-bourgeois parties, yet through a correct application of the tactic of the united front by the Bolsheviks, the masses shattered General Kornilov's attempt to establish a White Guardist dictatorship. Similarly in Germany in 1920 the overwhelming majority of the proletariat followed Social Democracy, yet due to the genuine militancy—not the fake militancy of the "Third Period"—of the then very young Communist Party, both Communist and Socialist workers smashed the Kapp putsch.

Equally false is the intimation that unity of the labor movement can prevent Fascism. The Russian workers in October were divided, but under genuine revolutionary leadership they achieved victory. The Austrian working class was united by Social Democracy, people serving the bourgeoisie. The Austrian masses were led by the Socialist leaders into the Fascist trap. Thirdly, the working class, beset by opportunists and traitors,

so far, has failed to understand precisely what brought Fascism in Germany. That Fascism was brought by split in the labor movement has been "realized" by men specialized in mental drug-dispensing, the Piecks, Browders, Norman Thomases, Ludwig Loes, and the like. The Stalinist and Socialist misleaders cover up the fact that it was their *policies*, springing from specific opportunist interests, that brought Hitler to power.

Complete unity of the proletariat can and will be achieved only *after* the revolution. What the working class needs now is not unity as such, but a new, a Leninist International! Leninism electrified the revolutionary spirit of the toiling masses; Stalinism electrocutes it.

After all his "self-criticism," Pieck, asserting that the relation of class forces in Germany was in favor of the bourgeoisie, declares that he and other leaders of the German Communist Party worked to change that relation:

"The Communists endeavored to bring about this change in the relation of forces in favor of the proletariat *by doing all they could to intensify the fight for the united front*. They set themselves the task of achieving an agreement with the Social-Democratic Party and the General Federation of German Trade Unions (the A.D.G.B.) *at any price*. The purpose of the united front would have been to repulse fascism and defend the remnants of the liberties of bourgeois democracy." (*Ibid.*, pp. 39-40. My emphasis—G.M.)

An agreement with the Social-Democratic Party, Pieck? But that Party was declared to be not only "social-fascist," but actually *Fascist*, playing the rôle of *auxiliary police* of the Nazis! Why, to defend the idea of a united front was to render disruptive and counter-revolutionary lead to the workers:

"Trotsky has come out in defense of a united front between the Communist and social democratic parties against Fascism. No more disruptive and counter-revolutionary class lead could possibly have been given at a time like the present." (London *Daily Worker*, May 26, 1932)

That was eight months before Hitler became chancellor! Now, to hide the facts, Pieck, with pompous hypocrisy declares that he and others in Thaelmann's Central Committee endeavored "by doing all they could" and "at any price" to achieve the united front.

Pieck must do all he can to cover up the atrocious crime. For-

getting in the next minute what he had said a minute before, believing that his speech will be read by workers having implicit faith in him and Stalin, Pieck piles one staggering lie upon another and contradicts himself at each twist and turn. Only a few pages back (*Freedom, Peace and Bread*, p. 34) he said the conception had been that it was unseemly for Communists to fight for the preservation of the remnants of bourgeois democracy!

Sixty "delegates" discussed Pieck's report. Nothing but approval of and full accord with this traitor was voiced by the Stalinist rabble. Complete unity prevailed. Every deception, every skillful whitewash of the Stalin gang was greeted with vociferous applause.

One of the most abominable lies that Pieck deposited at the "Congress" was the following:

"The Communists during this period did everything in their power to mobilize the toiling masses for the revolutionary struggle and to prevent the fascist dictatorship." (*Freedom, Peace and Bread*, p. 40)

This is demagoguery running amuck. After Stalin and his servants did all in their power—and with notable success—to deliver the German workers to Hitler's bloody storm troopers, Pieck billows a dense smoke into the face of the world proletariat to hide the gruesome truth.

In *The Collapse of the Second International*, Lenin exposes the charlatanism of Karl Kautsky who blamed the masses for submitting to military authorities and marching off to war. "The masses," Lenin explained, "could not act in an organized way, for their previously created organizations, incarnated in the handful of Legiens, Kautskys, and Scheidemanns had betrayed them."

In self-justification, Pieck takes a leaf out of Kautsky's notebook:

"... the working class should have established the united front [from below only—G.M.] and destroyed the counter-revolutionary united front of the Social-Democratic and reformist trade union leaders with the bourgeoisie; [what about the Stalinists' united front with the Hitlerites: voting together on the Steering Committee of the Reichstag, etc., etc.—G.M.] it should not have allowed itself to be beguiled by the Social-Democratic theory that the class struggle is impossible in time of crisis... the working class should have assumed the counter-offensive against capital... [with the "Communist" lead-

ership sabotaging all favorable moments for struggle—a fact admitted by more than one Piatnitsky—G.M.] the working class should not have allowed the League of Red Front Fighters [of the C.P.] to be smashed and disarmed, but should have brought about its amalgamation with the Reichsbanner [after the Executive of the Comintern and the Central Committee of the German Party had branded all non-Stalinist organizations as social-fascist!—G.M.]... The working class should not have looked on calmly when the fascists under Hitler's leadership armed themselves, but should have forced the government of the Weimar Republic to disarm the fascist bands, confiscate the property of their organizations and throw their leaders into jail. [Did the Stalinist traitors propose all that? Weren't they shouting before and after Hitler's taking power that the main blow must be directed against Social Democracy? And isn't it clear that they are preparing through their "People's Front" a similar betrayal of the French, American and other workers, after which they will blame the workers themselves for the terrifying nightmare of Fascist dictatorship?—G.M.] The working class should not have permitted the fascists to develop their demagoguery in connection with the yoke of the Versailles Treaty, but should have forced the Weimar Republic to tear up the Versailles Treaty. [Any treaty broken by a workers republic is carrying out the policy of the proletariat, but a treaty broken by Hitler or the Weimar Republic is a policy of German imperialism. Pieck chides the German workers for not having swung behind the German bourgeoisie.—G.M.]

"But this the German working class did not do. Its majority followed the Social-Democratic Party blindly, and paid no heed to the warning voice of the Communists. And so it must now endure the horrors of the fascist hell. The Communists of Germany alone were unable to defend the toiling masses from this catastrophe." (*Ibid.*, pp. 38-39)

The old line of cunningly concealing the *chief* criminal, the Stalinist bureaucracy, behind the treachery of the servile reformist Social Democracy, has been pursued by the Piecks and Dimitroffs. The success of this policy was facilitated by the situation within the Second International. While Stalin was compelled to abandon his ultra-Leftist noise for a number of years, a large part of the leadership of the Second International, in order to retain its hold upon the alarmed and disillusioned workers, let loose a welter of "revolutionary" phrases, at the same time stating that "the failure of the working class can be explained by the fact that the Socialist Parties of the important European countries were not in reality revolutionary parties" (The Draft Program of the Left Wing of the American

Socialist Party, p. 9). The Socialist Left wing, a Centrist current, naturally did not become a Bolshevik current.

As Pieck's speech indicates, the Stalinists have not abandoned their infamous stratagem of unloading the blame for Fascism in Germany upon the German proletariat itself. With an overbearing impudence they are heaping abuse upon the German workers. One recalls that after Hitler had received the reins of power the Stalinist calumniators declared that the German proletariat, the most advanced section of the working class in the entire capitalist world, was *too backward* to prevent the Nazis from seizing control:

"That the German working class was not yet far enough advanced in its development to prevent the *temporary victory of fascism*, is a fact which permits of no concealment." (Bela Kun, *The Second International in Dissolution*, p. 75. Emphasis in the original)

The Russian proletariat was fully grown to seize power in 1917. And yet, the Russian proletariat in its development was behind the proletariat of other countries. "We know full well that the proletariat of Russia is less organized, less prepared, and less class-conscious than the proletariat of other countries," wrote Lenin after the March 1917 revolution. But according to the foul-mouthed Stalinists the German proletariat in the year 1933 was "not yet far enough advanced" to stop the Fascist vermin! The opposite, of course, was true. The German working class was *fully* prepared by history to establish the proletarian dictatorship in Germany. Lenin saw it clearly. In his report at the Seventh Congress of the Bolshevik Party, Lenin indicated that in the problem of saving the October Revolution, he relied, in the main, upon the German proletariat:

"The absolute truth is that without the German Revolution we shall perish." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XV, p. 132. Russian Edition)

It was the "backward" German proletariat that gave the workers the titans of revolution, Marx and Engels and the devoted leaders Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg!

Marx and Engels nearly *ninety years ago* said:

"The Communists turn their attention chiefly to Germany, because that country is on the eve of a bourgeois revolution that is bound to be carried out under more advanced conditions of European civilization, and with a much more developed proletariat than what existed

in England in the seventeenth, and in France in the eighteenth century, and because the bourgeois revolution in Germany will be but the prelude to an immediately following proletarian revolution." (*Communist Manifesto*)

Since Marx, Germany has reached the highest stage of trustified industrial development. Together with monopoly capitalism, there grew up an enormous proletariat, class-conscious in its entirety. After the imperialist war, the German workers went through a whole series of revolutionary struggles. General strikes, the uprising of 1918, street battles in 1919, the March 1921 uprising, Hamburg 1923, Soviets throughout Germany, Soviet republic in Bavaria. The "more advanced conditions" today is the existence of a proletarian State occupying one-sixth of the earth's surface. The truth is that the proletarian revolution in Germany is long and calamitously overdue. But the Stalinist counterfeit Marxists insinuate that the German proletariat was not sufficiently developed to prevent the decomposing Fascist scum from taking power!

Pieck's speech, received with great acclaim by his vitally concerned listeners, is permeated with confidence that the Stalinist conspirators incur no risk of exposure. The generous amount of misinformation and poison had been doing its destructive work, and produced the desired effect. The crimes against the proletariat are buried deep beneath tons of rubbish. Unpardonable ignorance among various shades of "critics," deplorable theoretical apathy temporarily widespread among the workers, clouds of confusion to the creation of which Leon Trotsky, an opponent of world-wide renown, liberally contributed, gave heart and zest to the self-deception of the Stalinist bureaucrats that there would be no unlocking of secrets, that they could go on with impunity.

Out of this smug sense of security comes the piece of audacity to invite the victims themselves to judge who is responsible for their horrible plight:

"Now let the workers of Germany, let the world proletariat judge who bears the blame for the German defeat. Let them learn the bloody lesson of the German events: that this defeat was possible only because the majority of the working class still blindly followed the Social-Democratic Party, allowed the warnings of the Communists to pass unheeded and rejected the struggle." (*Freedom, Peace and Bread*, p. 41)

That the Social-Democratic leaders since 1914 have gone over completely to the bourgeoisie and have been betraying the workers to the enemy has been clear to every true Marxist. The Social-Democratic leaders are dangerous enemies of the proletariat. Lenin always insisted that they be mercilessly exposed and denounced as agents of the bourgeoisie. No sane and sufficiently informed worker expected from them anything but betrayal.

But you, Pieck, carrying out the line of the "Seventh Congress," are introducing a criminal whitewash also of the treacherous Social-Democratic leaders. You have already thrown another hangman's noose around the necks of the Stalinist and the Socialist workers:

"... We must reject sharply all attempts in our ranks to treat the united front as a formal arrangement, as a recruiting device for the Communist Party, as an opportunity to unmask the Social-Democratic leaders." (W. Pieck, *Daily Worker*, January 7, 1936)

Small wonder! There is no basic reason why you shouldn't speak of the Socialist leaders in loving tones. They assisted you, in their own way, in paralyzing the German masses, thus preventing the overthrow of the German bourgeoisie as well as the bureaucratic pyramid in the Soviet Union. They served you as a shield after the consummation of the German crime. They, some of them out of sheer ignorance, confuse you with the genuine Communists of the October Revolution, which confusion you cannot help but appreciate. Had it not been for their saving capitalism in 1919, the bureaucratic centralization of the first workers republic would have probably never taken place. Today they are, as ever, saving capitalism; historically, therefore, they work for you.

Little then is your atrocious injunction to be wondered at. You are a deadly enemy of the working class, Pieck. A prize liar with a dried-up conscience, you are beneath contempt.

Merciless exposure of Stalinism and Social Democracy! that will be the reply to your injunction by every honest revolutionary worker.

Pieck's tissue of shallow lies, his hypocritical "self-criticism" are far more damning than any open confession of guilt.

The international proletariat will finally pierce the tissue of deliberate falsehoods and will know the cold facts. The workers will understand that had there been, instead of the appointed

bludgeon men of Stalin's traitorous set, leaders devoted to the cause of the workers, then today not the foul swastika, but the Red Flag of proletarian dictatorship would wave over Germany. The removal of the Stalinist bureaucracy and the organization of the Soviet Union of Central and Eastern Europe would be the next task. Stalin destroyed that possibility and the record of that destruction is written on the execution block of the Nazi hangmen.

Yes, the international proletariat will judge. You will have to speak, Pieck. Never mind this "self-criticism" about "little Zoergiebel," and other "sectarian mistakes." It is but a subterfuge, a trick to make the unsuspecting victims think: "They are honest enough to admit their errors. I will continue to trust them." Facing the Red Tribunals of the revolutionary proletariat, you will have to tell the whole story, Pieck. And nothing will be forgotten, Pieck. Those hundreds of thousands of nameless victims, the flower of the revolutionary proletariat whom your atrocious gang turned over to the sadistic storm-troopers of Hitler and the beheading swordsmen of Chiang Kai-shek, will be mentioned when the indictment is read. A long indictment, Pieck, a stupendous chain of eloquently damning evidence. The veil of secrecy will at long last be torn down and a lurid light thrown upon all the black crimes of the hideous Stalinist gang. Its crimes will stand out before the awakened proletariat in all their gruesome enormity. Stunned and dazed by the astounding revelations, the workers, with disgust and horror, will hear your nauseating confession. The *subjective* as well as objective counter-revolutionary rôle of Stalinism will not be then a matter of conjecture, as it is with many oppositionists today, but a clearly established fact. It will then be made known to all workers that the destruction of the Chinese proletarian vanguard was conceived by Stalin and all his Gusevs, Piatnitskys and Browders in *cold blood*. You'll tell the truth, and all of it, about the rôle you yourself played in the diabolical crime in Germany. You'll speak, Pieck, and the international proletariat will judge!

Before the victory of Fascism, the German Communist workers were told by the Stalinites that the "theories" that Fascism in Germany would follow the Italian pattern and destroy the cream of the working class were "bloodless abstractions." What

happened following the glib assertions of the treacherous charlatans?

"The utilization of all terrorist forces by the bourgeoisie has from the very first moment inflicted heavy losses on the Communist Party. More than 60,000 functionaries and members have been arrested . . . the lower and middle functionaries found it rather difficult to escape the persecution. . . ." (Wilhelm Pieck, *We Are Fighting for a Soviet Germany*, pp. 73-75)

Dimitroff, showing great "concern" for the German workers whom he helped to deliver to Hitler, tells quite graphically what fate befell them after the deed was accomplished.

"The villainous German fascists beat husbands to a bloody pulp in the presence of their wives, and send the ashes of murdered sons by parcel post to their mothers. Sterilization has been made a method of political warfare. In the torture chambers, captured anti-fascists are given injections of poison, their arms are broken, their eyes gouged out; they are strung up and have water pumped into them; the fascist swastika is carved in their living flesh." (Dimitroff, *The United Front Against Fascism*, p. 13)

The blood of the German workers is on your hands, Pieck. On yours, on Stalin's and on every damned Browder's in your "International." Not only did you destroy, through Hitler, the most advanced and militant section of the German working class, but you saw to it that the Fascist terror found your victims unprepared:

"The majority of the members of the C.P.G. were not prepared for such unheard-of, mass repressions." (O. Piatnitsky, *The World Economic Crisis*, p. 116)

Social-Democratic bloodhound Noske butchered the German workers. He did it openly. What you did, Pieck, is equally abominable, equally monstrous, but infinitely more treacherous because your deed was covered by a Communist mask. You call your thoroughly vile speech *Freedom, Peace and Bread*. What you actually brought to the German workers is Fascism, hunger and feverish preparations for imperialist war. Honest workers can have only intense hatred for you and your Master-Judas. They'll understand fully the meaning of your heading the German Stalinist "Party" today. When Hitler is finally overthrown, you will rush into the breach to save the situation for the Stalinist crowd and the German bourgeoisie.

The Stalinists can no more change their policy of wrecking the revolutionary forces of the proletariat than the tiger can alter its rapacious instinct. And to continue its existence, the bureaucratic distortion of the Soviet State must retain the protective Communist coloration. That despite the apparent change, nothing has fundamentally changed in the Stalinist course, that nothing would or can change, that the bureaucrats regarded that they had nothing to apologize for, that what they had done was considered by them correct, that the policy of betrayal of the proletariat would continue, was clearly indicated at the "Congress." Thorez made it quite unequivocal when in his speech he mentioned his conversation with the Social-Democratic leader, Adler:

"I will tell you quite frankly, Citizen Adler, that this is neither a new line nor a maneuver on a grand scale on Moscow's part. There has not been and there will not be any change in the policy of the Communist International. . . . *We regard what we have done as correct!*" (Maurice Thorez, speech at the Seventh Congress, quoting himself in the negotiations with the Second International, *The People's Front in France*, p. 58. My emphasis—G.M.)

It can also be seen in Pieck's brazen declaration:

"The report of the Executive Committee has met with the full approval of the speakers from all the Communist Parties. Everything described by the comrades who took part in the discussion regarding the experiences gained in their struggles completely corroborates the correctness of the Bolshevik line of the Communist International. . . ." (*Freedom, Peace and Bread*, p. 93. Emphasis in the original)

"The program, strategy and tactics of the Communist International have stood every test." (*Ibid.*, p. 70)

Need more be said?

Having done with the murderous assault upon Leninism and the shrewd casuistry which covered up the real motives underlying its policy, the gathering of renegades, counter-revolutionists and scoundrels adjourned. In the closing scene, amid stormy applause, the Browders, Thorezes and Piecks leaped to their feet, gripped by a genuine feeling of enthusiasm and glowing optimism. They felt safe. That the proletariat had not found out their jealously-guarded black secrets was encouraging. Nowhere was there any danger of the steel drill of Marxism driving through the putrid tissue of Stalinism. Lenin was gone. Trotsky,

who never really grasped the basic motives for Stalin's policies, but yet did some very annoying prodding, finally succumbed to Stalinist hounding and persecution and quite unexpectedly and very opportunely had gone over to the Second International. He thus introduced chaos and confusion into the midst of the workers that leaned toward him, taking the heart out of the Opposition in the Soviet Union. Ineffective before, Trotsky was altogether harmless now; his breakdown facilitated matters for the adroit and persuasive Olgins to make use of him as a traditional and convenient scapegoat with far greater apparent validity than hitherto. And so, looking around, there was really no one to tear the Communist mask from their reactionary faces. They felt safe. The illusion that their system would prevail, even though to preserve it every section of the international proletariat would have to be cast by them into the Fascist inferno, firmly seized hold of their opportunist minds. The Soviet Union, the foundation upon which their power rested, would remain, they believed. And that was sufficient for them.

Facing the Grand Master his minions of deception and crime paid a sincere, magnificent, richly-earned tribute to the founder of the Stalinist Order. Their voices charged with intense feeling, they cheered wildly for the "world revolution," for "Socialism" in the Soviet Union, and for the greatest of all living "Marxists." Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuit Order, could never have boasted of such perfection, size and might of organization, such unswerving loyalty of its captains, such implicit faith in the wisdom and farsightedness of its master. As the final curtain fell, there was the thunderous singing of the *Internationale*.

The "delegates" went their several ways to further serve the "worthy" cause. The immense task ahead was the introduction of the ultra-Rightist line of the People's Front in the bourgeois countries allied or friendly to the Stalinist bureaucracy, and especially in those pregnant with revolution, Spain and France.

THE BETRAYAL OF THE SPANISH TOILING MASSES

IF Stalin and his clique of conspirators had weighty reasons for destroying the possibility of proletarian revolution in 1932, such reasons became a hundred times weightier by 1936. The Stalinist bureaucracy had now much more to conceal, many more privileges to defend. A million lies and distortions and some new ghastly crimes had been added to the old ones. The dread of exposure multiplied a thousandfold.

Had the crisis of power in Spain occurred during the "Third Period," Stalinism naturally would have employed its ultra-Leftist line to bind and shackle the Spanish workers and peasants and deliver them to Fascism. Even in the last quarter of the "Third Period" in 1934 that line was intact. According to Manuilsky, Social Democracy which had already become Fascism before the advent of Hitler, was growing more and more Fascized. "After the shameful capitulation of German social-democracy to fascism, the Second International is going full steam ahead on the way to further fascization." (*The Revolutionary Crisis Is Maturing*, Report to Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, p. 5)

The overthrow of the monarchy in Spain and the establishment of the bourgeois-democratic republic took place during the high tide of the "Third Period" in April 1931.

The crisis of power occurred after the new protective zigzag, formulated by the "Seventh Congress," had been introduced within the international proletariat. And just as the cries "Social Fascism" and "united front from below only" were neither senseless words nor mental aberration, so the "defense of Spanish democracy" and the considerable casting-off of Leninist phrases were neither inadvertent departure from the ultra-Leftist course nor abrupt transformation of Stalinism into out-and-out re-

formism. Both Stalinist methods of chaining the proletarian Prometheus to the rock of capitalism are cold, calculating, artfully applied means to an end—two sides of the same coin. And within the five and a half years of the existence of the Spanish republic with its constantly recurring crisis, Stalinism used now the one, now the other method.

Before showing how the shrewd Stalinists, who covered their maneuvers with the usual deceptive verbalism, operated in Spain, it is necessary to say a word about the Spanish Stalinist section.

The Spanish Communist Party originally had approximately 6,000 members. As every other Party in the Comintern, it underwent the process of Stalinization. A large section which supported the Left Opposition in the Soviet Union was expelled. Another portion of the Party, for siding with the Bucharinites, was sloughed off. Many outstanding leaders, founders of the Party, were thrown out. Later, during the "Third Period," Stalin discovered that the leaders who were of his choice were still not up to the mark, and in March 1932 the entire Central Committee was expelled. As a result of these political massacres, the Party was reduced to a measly group of a few hundred, having only fourteen members in Madrid before the overthrow of the monarchy (*Inprecorr*, April 30, 1931, p. 423). Stalin and his clique in Moscow succeeded, through continual sifting and picking, in selecting puppets who would submit unreservedly to the absolute rule of Stalin (with the exception of Balbontin, who resigned in April, 1934). These agents of Stalin helped him to cover up his falsifications and crimes. Like Browder with his Weinstones and Bedachts, they approved the treacherous policy in Germany, and rejected as Trotskyism the very line they later accepted without a word of criticism or comment:

"When the fight against the fascist danger was being discussed, a delegate proposed an unconditional united front and demanded a revision of the political line of the C.I., as this political line he alleged had proved bankrupt in Germany. The Plenary session calmly listened to these Trotskyist statements and then replied to them by unanimously approving the political line of the C. I. and of the Communist Party of Germany." (Vincent Arroyo, "The Plenary Meeting of the C. C. of the C. P. of Spain." *Inprecorr*, May 19, 1933, p. 495)

Helping Stalin to conceal the ghastly crime in Germany, Jesus Hernandez, a true Stalinist snake, later Minister of Education in Caballero's government, defended the lies of the Stalinern:

"The social democrats, Trotskyists and other renegades from Communism, announce that a new era of fascist terror began with the seizure of power by Hitler, and that the working class movement has suffered a severe defeat. They seek to cause a wave of pessimism and to rob the masses of their confidence in the Communist International which they make responsible for the events in Germany." (Hernandez, Thirteenth Plenum of the ECCI, *Inprecorr*, April 23, 1934, p. 653)

To show what brazen liars the leaders of the Stalinist section in Spain were, how well they fitted into the carefully selected Stalinist leading personnel, one can cite the distortion of the truth about the Chinese Revolution. After the defeat of the October uprising in Spain, the Stalinists issued a manifesto, the contents of which were reported as follows:

"The Manifesto further deals with the monstrous betrayal of the revolution by the anarchist leaders, points out the necessity of continuing the struggle as unitedly in the future as during the last few days, and concludes by stressing that there can be only one Party of the revolution—the Party which bases its activities on the experience gained in *two victorious* revolutions, the Russian *and the Chinese*." (*Inprecorr*, November 3, 1934, p. 1485. My emphasis—G.M.)

Realizing that with the launching of the republic the class struggle in Spain would become accentuated, the Stalinists did not welcome the disturbing news:

"The first Soviet comment on the events in Spain appears in the leading editorial in the newspaper *Pravda* today, but the organ of the Russian Communist Party seems *none too jubilant* over the prospects of the revolutionary struggle which it clearly expects will follow Alfonso's downfall." (Walter Duranty, *The New York Times*, April 17, 1931. My emphasis—G.M.)

"Paradoxically enough, it appears that Moscow is not overdelighted by this circumstance—in fact it may almost be said that if the Spanish revolution 'swings left' as Moscow now expects [he should have said *dreads*—G.M.] Moscow will be more embarrassed than pleased. One would naturally have expected *Pravda* to salute the chance of a Spanish proletariat's struggle for power with loud and glowing enthusiasm and to appeal to the Russian people to support and encourage their Spanish comrades. Instead of that, *Pravda's* first reaction was a dismal editorial, stale as a damp squib." (Walter Duranty, *The New York Times*, April 19, 1931)

Not to be caught napping, the Stalinist agents in Spain quickly and with utmost thoroughness applied the line of the

"Third Period." Upon the Social Democrats, Anarcho-Syndicalists, Trotskyists and other "Social Fascists" they poured vials of their choicest venom. The workers were rejoicing over the defeat of the hated Alfonso, and intoxicated with the illusion that the republic would bring them release from capitalism and feudal oppression. Applying the ultra-Leftist line, the Stalinists declared that since the republic was a bourgeois republic it must be overthrown at once. They rushed into the streets and together with the monarchists, to the bewilderment of the workers, shouted "Down with the Republic!" Piatnitsky relates this in the vein of criticism:

"The Communist Party of Spain had only a few hundred members at the time when the Spanish republic was proclaimed in April, 1931. Its influence in the trade unions was insignificant. In many cities incorrect tactics were employed by the Party organization and by individual Communists. When the masses came out on the streets to celebrate the proclamation of the republic, the Communists shouted 'Down with the republic,' just as did the monarchists." (O. Piatnitsky, *The World Economic Crisis*, p. 63)

Stalin's agents did not stop with this. Avoiding the Leninist line which had been applied in Russia after the overthrow of the Tzar, the Bolshevik policy of explaining to the workers their mistakes in order to win them over in their majority to a position for the capture of power, the handful of Spanish Stalinist leaders and their few duped followers proceeded, all alone, to overthrow the bourgeois-democratic republic. Adventurism ran rampant. They made wild attempts to seize the seat of the Catalonian republican government; and in every way they discredited Leninism and dealt an almost irretrievable blow to the idea of seizure of power by the proletariat. Some of these exploits they admitted themselves:

"Our comrades tried to seize the palace of the Catalonian Government in Barcelona. In Madrid, as well as in Barcelona, and Bilbao, we had armed clashes with the police and the anarchists which resulted in killed and wounded. . . ." ("The Spanish Communist Party and the Revolutionary Situation," *The Communist International*, July 1, 1931, p. 327)

Remote though these tactics and the theory of "Social Fascism" were from Bolshevism, alongside of them, used as a Communist covering, went the adherence to the correct ex-

planation of the historical stage in Spain, accompanied by precise, accurate slogans which served to disguise the disruptive actions:

"In Spain there is a revolution which is growing over from a bourgeois-democratic into a proletarian revolution." (D. Z. Manuilsky, *The Revolutionary Crisis is Maturing*, p. 6)

The above was written when the "Third Period" had already entered the phase of decline. But the slogan of Soviets in Spain was issued early after the fall of the monarchy—*five years before Franco's uprising*:

"In Spain the question of Soviets is on the order of the day." (Gabriel Peri, "Further Sharpening of the Situation in Spain," *Imprecorr*, June 4, 1931, p. 527)

Alongside the ravaging fictionizing of the character of Social Democracy as "Social Fascism" with the never-ending angry reiteration of this distinctive title, the Stalinists, to give this new "theory" a Bolshevik coloration, levelled genuine Leninist criticism against the Socialist leaders, even against those of the "Left" variety. The Socialist leader Largo Caballero, who had occupied during the monarchy an important post in the reactionary government of the dictator Primo de Rivera, was exposed as a tool of the capitalists:

"The secretary of the reformist U.G.T. was Largo Caballero, who was a Privy Councillor under Primo de Rivera and now has the position of Minister for Labour. His role is to prevent strikes with the aid of parity and arbitration committees, and to throttle them if they break out against his will." ("Increasing Activity of the C. P. of Spain," *Imprecorr*, May 7, 1931, p. 442)

"In order to throttle the strike movement Largo Caballero, the social democratic Minister for Labour, has drafted a scandalous Bill for the introduction of compulsory arbitration in labour disputes. . . .

"Naturally these 'Left' social fascist leaders do not differ in any way from their confreres in all other countries. They are the worst enemies of the working class. The bourgeoisie is full aware of this and has full confidence in Besteiro (he was elected President of the Legislative National Assembly by 363 votes against two)." (Michael Hollay, "The Revolutionary Upsurge in Spain," *Imprecorr*, July 30, 1931, p. 741)

"Senor Caballero, the social democratic Minister for Labour, has in the most shameful manner broken his solemnly pledged word and not given even the miners the seven-hour day, not to mention the rest

of the working class." (Z. Spada, "Election Successes of the C. P. in Spain," *Inprecorr*, October 8, 1931, p. 941)

"The socialist party and the trade unions led by it faithfully serve the bourgeoisie and betray the revolution. Of late the social fascists are more and more frequently placing themselves at the head of various movements, but this is due to the revolutionization of the working masses, who are beginning to lose patience. The leadership of these strikes is only a manoeuvre on the part of the social fascists in order to bring the conflicts to an end, without at the same time losing the confidence of the masses." (J. Dornier, "The Revolutionary Wave in Spain," *Inprecorr*, January 12, 1933, pp. 29-30)

The Stalinists' criticism of the Socialists and the talk about Soviets and the proletarian revolution were carried forward into the year 1935:

"For fifteen days during the October, 1934, armed uprising, all of capitalist-feudal Spain trembled with fear at the spectre of a successful proletarian revolution." (Harry Gannes, *Soviets in Spain*, p. 3)

"... the failure of the Socialist leaders to prepare sufficiently for the armed insurrection beforehand, their resistance to the united front until shortly before the armed uprising, their reliance on small bands instead of mass armed attacks, and chiefly their vacillations in putting the question of Soviets as organs of power before the masses. ... Above all, they did not put forward the question of the seizure of the land by the peasants, a slogan which would have had the effect, not only of drawing the peasants into the general uprising, but also of influencing the army, composed mainly of the sons of the peasants." (*Ibid.*, p. 25)

Even during the "Seventh Congress" and immediately following it the Stalinists expressed quite correct condemnations of the Spanish Socialist Party. Manuilsky speaking before "actives" of the Stalinist "Party" in Moscow on September 14, 1935, said:

"The Austrian and Spanish Social-Democratic leaders not only failed to strengthen the fighting capacity of the working class; they actually weakened it in every possible way. The Spanish Socialists, as is well known, joined the coalition government which passed an anti-strike law, restricted the rights of the trade unions, introduced the so-called Protection of Public Order Act under which Social-Democratic workers who took part in the October battles are now being tried; they did everything to lull the vigilance of the workers towards the monarchist and fascist elements... the Socialist leaders stubbornly fought against everything that would help to unite the

forces of the proletariat. They opposed the formation of factory committees. ... They opposed the formation of Soviets, although the Soviets would have been a means of organizing and consolidating the forces of the proletariat and the peasantry against the bourgeoisie and the landlords, against fascist reaction, they would have been organs of struggle for the revolutionary seizure of power. ... The Socialist Party did not strike with all its might against the monarchist and fascist conspirators; it struck its blows at the Left wing of the working class movement. It did not confiscate the land of the big feudal landowners and the Church in order to destroy the economic base of the counter-revolution but actually protected these reactionary forces from the agrarian revolution. It did not dissolve the *Guardia Civil*, which was hated by the people, but strengthened it by forming a "storm Guard" on the fascist model. It did not purge the army of the reactionary officers, but even granted them pensions. This was not the policy of a revolutionary party; it was the policy of a party that was preparing for the victory of the counter-revolution. ... But the party which is afraid of the working class achieving victory, which fears the revolutionary activity of the masses as its own shadow, can never lead the toilers to victory. And it is precisely because the Spanish Social-Democrats were afraid of the victory of the workers' and peasants' revolution in Spain, that, although in the government, they not only failed to insist on the big latifundia being transferred to the peasantry, but on the contrary, they suppressed the peasant movement for the seizure of these lands. That is why the sons of the peasants in the Spanish army did not actively support the Spanish workers in October; that is why the fascist agitation against the Republic carried on by Gil Robles meets with response among the Catholic peasant masses.

"And now about the fourth condition; *vigilance towards fascism, the aiming of well-timed blows against it and the maintenance of the initiative in the struggle against fascism*. It is evident from all that has been said above that there was no vigilance towards fascism in Austria and Spain; there was a systematic lulling of this vigilance by calls upon the workers to remain 'on the legal ground of the Constitution.'" (D. Z. Manuilsky, *The Work of the Seventh Congress*, pp. 46-50)

When the ultra-Leftist zigzag was dropped completely, the language changed:

"... the brave Spanish Socialist Party, and its leader, Premier Caballero." (*Daily Worker*, March 1, 1937)

Up to the introduction of the ultra-Rightist protective zigzag, the "democratic" republic merited only condemnation. Side by side with the course of ignoring the honest illusions of the

masses with respect to the Republic, and the adventurist policy of the substitution of Lenin's "Patiently teach and explain" with ultra-Leftist yells of "Down with the Republic!" coupled with the wild attempts to seize government buildings, went the correct description of the Republic as a feudo-imperialist machine of exploitation and oppression which prevented even the bourgeois-democratic revolution—the granting of land to the peasants:

"But the republican Government that has succeeded the Monarchy differs from the latter only in form. It is maintaining in full force the whole feudal system of landlordism and serfdom and will not give the land to the peasants. It has taken over the entire apparatus of oppression of the national minorities and the colonial peoples and it is carrying out with undiminished brutality the whole imperialist policy of the Monarchy.

"In this task of maintaining the imperialist system the present rulers of Spain are being helped by the Social Democratic leaders. . . ." ("Down with Spanish Imperialism, Resolution of the International Secretariat of the League Against Imperialism," *Inprecorr*, May 7, 1931, p. 443)

Thus, according to the Stalinists themselves, Spain was facing a growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into proletarian revolution. The question of Soviets as organs of power of the toilers was on the order of the day. In order to destroy the mainstay of the monarchists and Fascists it was necessary to confiscate the lands of the big feudal landowners and of the Church. Social Democracy was admittedly a treacherous, anti-workingclass, anti-peasant, pro-capitalist force; and the republic, a feudal-capitalist republic, was not to be upheld and defended, but was to be overthrown by the proletariat and the peasantry.

All these correct positions, employed as a protective Leninist cloak, were discarded by Stalinism together with their "Third Period" when the Spanish revolution entered its sixth year and the question of power *in all reality* broke sharply upon all the classes in Spain.

The masses were defeated in October 1934 but they were not demoralized. The economic and political crisis became more intense as months went by, and despite bloody repressions, a new mass uprising was brewing. The reactionary forces, though victorious, were not sufficiently well organized to abolish what-

ever was left of the bourgeois democracy and establish outright Fascism.

A situation was approaching which may be considered as the pre-October phase. What was lacking was a genuine Communist party. A Leninist Party, even a group, armed with a correct understanding of Stalinism, would have been able to denude this chief disrupting factor within the workers' camp, and growing into a mighty force, would have led the working class to power.

The Stalinist machine for preventing the proletarian revolution in Spain, from the moment of the overthrow of the monarchy, reaped a huge success in attracting the revolutionary workers disillusioned and disgusted with the Socialists and the Anarcho-Syndicalists. Enjoying the distinction of "representing" the first successful proletarian revolution, small though the "Party" was, it was of tremendous weight within the political atmosphere of Spain. Its growth was steady. Workers were flocking to "the Party of Lenin and Stalin." By May 1933 the Stalinists enrolled 20,000 workers into their organization. The Stalinist vote rose from two thousand in April 1931 to 400,000 in November 1935. Knowing absolutely nothing about the true origin of Stalin's "leadership" in the Soviet Union and the "Comintern" and the "leadership" of his puppets, Diaz, Hernandez, Ibarruri and others in Spain, the unsuspecting workers stepped trustfully and enthusiastically into the bureaucratic death-trap.

When the "Third Period" was shelved, the Stalinist machine in Spain continued drawing workers tightly within its powerful dragnet. In June 1936 its membership reached 102,000. After the Fascist uprising, the last reports gave the Stalinists a colossal force of close to 249,000 members with millions of sympathizers and followers. Shrewd Stalin through his deceptive devices captured the Socialist youth organization of Spain which united with the Stalinist youth, forming an organization of 140,000, affiliated to the Stalintern. In Catalonia another "organic unity" operation was performed. The Stalinist "Party" there fused with the Socialist Party, and launched a "new" organization, the Unified Socialist Party of Catalonia which affiliated to the Stalintern. The circulation of the Stalinist press climbed from the smallest to the largest of the Left parties in

Spain. The Stalinist poison won its way into nearly every worker's home.

The reason for the turbulent growth of Stalinist influence, far exceeding in tempo the growth of the influence of all other parties and groups, is obvious. In Spain there was a revolutionary situation, growing tenser every day. Social Democracy was showing itself in action as a counter-revolutionary force. Their exposure was comparatively easy. The "democratic" method of bourgeois power was growing weaker, unable to hold back the revolutionary flood:

"Thanks to their counter-revolutionary governmental activity since 1930, the exposure of the social democrats is relatively easy." (J. Chavarroche, "The Chief Tasks of the Communist Party at the Present Stage of the Revolution in Spain," *Inprecorr*, May 12, 1933, p. 472)

"The revolutionary situation in Spain is becoming more acute every day. The battles between revolution and counter-revolution are every time more fierce and decisive. It is already no longer possible for the bourgeoisie and the big landowners to maintain their hated rule by covering it with the cloak of 'Democracy.' The leaders of the blackest reaction are rapidly concentrating their forces in order to seize power and set up an openly fascist regime." (*Inprecorr*, October 5, 1934, p. 1374)

Bourgeois democracy was bankrupt. Two fuses were set up in Spain by history. One Black, that of Fascism, the other Red, of the proletarian revolution. The machine operating in the interests of the clique of usurpers of power in the first proletarian republic occupied the space where a genuine Communist party should have been. A Bolshevik party would have stamped out the fuse of Fascism by lighting the fuse of proletarian revolution in Spain and in Europe. The agency of the bureaucratic distortion of the Soviet Union, now enjoying a commanding position of influence within the Spanish proletariat, destroyed the Red fuse, leaving the Black one intact to be lighted by Francisco Franco. It did this in masterful manner, through the line laid down at the "Seventh Congress."

Stalin's agents took several momentous steps to effect a change of safety lines. In the Autumn of 1934 they abandoned the tactic of the "united front from below only." They joined the Workers Alliance which had been organized by the Trotskyites, led by Andre Nin, and the "Rights," led by Maurin, and supported by the Socialists. This action by the sly Stalinists was

greeted by all confused minds as a step towards sanity. Even before this step, on July 12, 1934, the Stalinists sent a letter to the Socialist Party, in which, anticipating Pieck's thesis of foregoing the exposure of the Socialists, they proposed united action in the betrayal of the toiling masses of Spain:

"Although we recognize the correctness of our criticism of the Socialist Party, we declare that if this criticism is regarded as an obstacle to the achievement of unity of action, *we are prepared to come to an agreement that each side shall refrain from attacks upon and criticism of the other so long as unity of action of the Socialist and Communist organizations lasts.*" (*Inprecorr*, October 5, 1934, p. 1374)

If such a proposal were accepted, the reactionary Stalinist clique in Moscow stood to lose nothing and to gain much. They could accomplish their purpose with greater ease. What could be safer than to create an atmosphere of "no criticism" which would allow them and the other uncompromising foes of Leninism and the world revolution, the Socialists and Anarcho-Syndicalists, to peddle their counter-revolutionary poison among the aroused masses without the risk of exposure!

With the formation of the Stalinist-concocted "People's Front," the fateful course of events in Spain was guided in all its decisive features primarily by Stalin and his agents. Now, when instead of a few dozen members and sympathizers, the Stalinists had hundreds of thousands, there were no more attempts to capture the seat of the capitalist government. The slogans of the "Third Period," "Soviets!" and "Down with the Republic!" were substituted by "Defend the Spanish Democracy!" Fascism was bulking large and the only correct answer from the proletarian standpoint was the establishment of workers' rule supported by the poor peasantry. But such a culmination Stalin strove with might and main to prevent. The Stalinist "Party," yoked with the Socialist Party in support of the tottering "democratic" rule of the bourgeoisie, was furnishing the Fascist vermin with the necessary and extremely valuable time and freedom to prepare its coup.

The subtle death-trap for the toiling masses, the "People's Front," was made up of outright cold-blooded treason, concealed treachery and hopeless petty-bourgeois confusion. It comprised Left Republicans led by Azana, the Catalan Left Party of Com-

panys, the bourgeois-liberal Republican Union, Stalinists, Socialists and the unified forces of Maurin and Nin, called the Workers Party of Marxist Unification—P.O.U.M.

Only by marshalling all existing facts, by knowing the substance of every political force in the desperate contest of class interests, can one have a real insight into the causes that brought the tragedy to the Spanish toilers, to the toilers of all lands.

Who were Azana and Companys? How Marxist was the P.O.U.M.?

Azana is a man who has served Spanish imperialism all his political life. He is for the continuous enslavement of the Moors, of the peasants and the workers of Spain. He insisted upon retaining the worst reactionaries and military butchers within the army the Republic took over from Alfonso:

"After the monarchy collapsed, some of the Spanish Republicans wanted Franco cashiered. Manuel Azana, then Minister of War, refused.

"'Franco is above all a soldier,' he said. 'We can count on his integrity.'" (*The New York Times Magazine*, November 8, 1936)

As to Companys, when the Ganneses mixed some truth with their poisonous broth of lies, they wrote:

"The struggle for national independence in Catalonia was left to the initiative of the vacillating and treacherous bourgeoisie, such as Companys." (Harry Gannes, *Soviets in Spain*, pp. 26-27)

The P.O.U.M. has never understood the cause of the tragedy of the international proletariat since Lenin's death. It spoke of creating a revolutionary party through the fusion with the Stalinists and the Socialists "if they are able to correct their errors." Later it withdrew from the "People's Front," but it sent its representative, Nin, into the Companys-Stalinist-Socialist coalition government of Catalonia. At best it is a party of abstract "Marxism" and hopeless confusion. Being unable to unmask Stalinism, the P.O.U.M. must either fall in line of support of the Stalinist-Socialist "People's Front" or face annihilation at the hands of the Stalinist-Socialist combination.

The "People's Front" won a sweeping election victory in February 1936. The new government of the Republic, set up by the "People's Front" was of a pinkish-yellow color but of essentially the same capitalist character as the one which preceded it. Backed by all the disruptive elements within the working class,

the government ventured not only to check the advance of the proletariat, but continued the policy of holding back the agrarian revolution.

It maintained the bureaucracy of the monarchy. It maintained the old army with its landlord, monarchist and Fascist generals, including General Franco, the butcher of the Asturian miners. It went so far in its reactionary policy as to maintain even the Spanish Foreign Legion. Let the boosters of the "People's Front" tell what the Foreign Legion is:

"Men, women, and children were slaughtered by the bloodthirsty scum of the Spanish Foreign Legion. This band of hired butchers is universally known to comprise escaped convicts, murderers, mercenaries, the worst dregs of the underworld of every land; White Guard Russians, chased out of other capitalist countries because of their criminal deeds, Riffs, who were paid to kill their own people for Spanish imperialism in Morocco." (Harry Gannes, *Soviets in Spain*, p. 17)

The vaunted Spanish "democracy," run by the government set up by the Left Republican-Stalinist-Socialist "People's Front," employed the Spanish Foreign Legion up to the moment Franco made use of it to destroy the proletarian vanguard of Spain.

The bourgeois liberals, having understood perfectly the meaning of the policies of both the Socialists and the Stalinists, declared:

"The People's Front is the only guarantee for conservatism in Spain." (*El Liberal*, Madrid, April 1, 1936)

But the Republic was unable to cope with the powerful pressure of the toiling millions. The denouement was slowly approaching: either an iron dictatorship of the military Fascist clique, or an iron dictatorship of the proletariat.

What were the Fascists and the republican government occupied with, prior to July 18, the day when Franco commenced the civil war? The Stalinists, who at times indulge in their protective "self-criticism," disclose a few very illuminating features:

"It is necessary to call attention to a serious circumstance. It must be said in the first place that if the republican governments of Azanas and Quiroga had adopted ruthless and drastic measures against the fascist leagues, against the Spanish Phalanx, against the Renovation Espagnole, the National Action of the Youth; if they had really purged

the administrative apparatus and the army, then there is no doubt that it need not have come to a civil war. From the point of view of the interests of the Republic it was a mistake to appoint General Franco, the leader of the conspiracy of February 1936, military governor of the Canary Islands; to appoint General Batet, who bloodily suppressed the October movement in Catalonia, military commander of Burgos. The republican government tolerated the agitation of the fascist officers, and now we see the results." (*Inprecorr*, July 25, 1936, p. 900)

"Meanwhile, reaction is rearming. The "A.B.C." is collecting funds for the employment of non-Marxist workers. They have collected 500,000 pesetas, and everybody knows that this money is being used to hire gangs of armed brigands called 'pistoleros.' The police department, however, takes no action. People everywhere are anxiously asking themselves: what is the government waiting for? With an anxiety that grows from day to day they keep on repeating this question." (*Inprecorr*, July 4, 1936, p. 830)

"The big landlords, the industrialists, the desperadoes of the Phalanx and the 'japistic' gangs of Gil Robles would not be so bold, perhaps, did they not sense the continued existence of the monarchistic forces behind the power and order of the Republic.

"... During the two years rule of Lerroux and Gil Robles a fascist bureaucracy was built up—and it is not dead yet. The Director of the Treasury is none other than Primo de Rivera... the President of the Committee for Culture is still the man who proposed a vote of congratulation to the Civil Guard, after October, upon their 'heroism' in Asturias. The Republican Ministers are surrounded by their old officialdom, which paralyzes their efforts. Within the offices of the administration lurk countless enemies. . . .

"And the question of the Army: almost every officer is either a fascist or (more often) a monarchist." ("Secrets of Spain," *Inprecorr*, July 4, 1936, p. 831)

"Before launching his rebellion, Franco and his fellow-officers took care to remove military medical stocks from Madrid on the pretext of maneuvers in the north. . . ." (Pierre Van Paassen, *Daily Worker*, October 7, 1936)

While the Stalinists and the Socialists inspired the workers with a sense of solidarity with the liberal bourgeoisie, the "democratic" Left government prohibited the circulation of Socialist, Stalinist and Syndicalist papers in the army barracks, allowing Fascist papers to circulate freely. It censored the press of the Left, and many issues of the papers of the constituents of the "People's Front" appeared with whole columns blank. The government allowed the Fascists to use churches as arsenals. It

removed the governor of Oviedo for criticizing the Fascists. It knew that Franco in the War Ministry did selective recruiting for the army making it almost seventy-five per cent Fascist. It knew about the fortifications the Fascist generals had erected in the Guadarrama Mountains, but did nothing about it. These fortifications later proved of enormous importance to the Fascists:

"Thanks to previously constructed fortifications and entrenchments, the Fascists have been able to retain strategic points in the Guadarrama Mountains." (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, August 4, 1936)

The "People's Front" government had received information that the Fascists were about to make an attempt to seize power, but it did nothing about this terrible danger to the workers:

"It appears that the government, *although they had been informed that a big fascist plot was being prepared*, were at first taken by surprise." (*Inprecorr*, July 25, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

"Mr. Azana, his critics charge, failed to take decisive action before or after the civil war broke out and ignored warnings of his advisers." (*The New York Times*, September 1, 1936)

In fact, the "People's Front" government was a transition government in the full sense of the word—*transition to a Fascist coup!* The Spanish landowning aristocracy, the numerically small, outworn, most decrepit class in Europe, and the Spanish bankers and industrialists, unless adequately prepared, would have never ventured to strike for a Fascist rule. The final and quite thorough preparations for the Fascist uprising were made by the generals not before but *after* the installation of the government of the "People's Front." The "friends" of the Spanish proletariat, the Socialists, liberal capitalists, and particularly the Stalinists, were its hidden deadly enemies, who indirectly aided and abetted the open deadly enemy—Spanish Fascism.

To people afflicted with political myopia, Stalinist zigzags and contradictions are an inexplicable medley of imponderables. But all in all, Stalin and his gang, in their game of maintaining their stolen power and hard-won entrenched position, follow a very simple formula. They avoid the Leninist line and success is assured.

In the Spanish situation the Stalinist agents did everything

contrary to Leninism. In 1917, Lenin, arriving in Petrograd, advanced the slogan, "No confidence in the provisional Government!" This was one of the many steps taken by the great leader of the toilers to effectually destroy their trust in the potent enemies, the Mensheviks, S.R.'s and the liberal bourgeoisie—the Russian Azanas and Caballeros. The grave-diggers of the cause of the proletariat, the loyal agents of the arch-Judas, Stalin, did, of course, the opposite. Actively cooperating with the liberals and the Socialists in drugging the proletariat and the peasantry, they made confusion worse confounded and diffused within the deception-laden atmosphere of Spain a sentiment of confidence in and reliance upon the republican government. Here is what Dolores Ibarruri, heart and soul devoted to Stalin, declared with stress in the Spanish Parliament a month before the Fascist uprising:

"Neither the attacks of reaction, nor the more or less masked manoeuvres of the enemies of democracy, will succeed in breaking or weakening the confidence which the workers have in the People's Front and the government representing it." (*Kommunistischesky International*, No. 13, 1936)

The Stalinist organ in Madrid, in an attack upon Maurin, declared categorically:

"... However, we consider that anything tending to break the ranks of the popular masses, to discredit the Government in their eyes, is suicidal." (*Mundo Obrero*, June 17, 1936)

Suicidal for Stalin and international capitalism with all its lackeys!

Unshakeable confidence in the saboteurs! Faith in the Spanish Kerenskys, Blums and Purcells! No criticism! Thus did the mutilators and defilers of Leninism pour corroding acid into the veins of the revolutionary working class of Spain. They made all the provisions to deaden among the workers the urge for freedom from capitalist slavery. They dragged the masses back from the threshold of the new social epoch, to prevent the proletarian revolution from succeeding in Spain and igniting other countries.

When the entire Spanish proletariat followed the Anarcho-Syndicalists and the Socialists, who had the situation well in hand, the Stalinists toyed with Leninist criticism. They wrote openly that the parties supporting a non-proletarian govern-

ment, be that government Fascist or democratic, were parties working against the interests of the masses and helping counter-revolution:

"The present parliament, the former Lerroux-Azana-Caballero government, the present Azana-Caballero government, the future Lerroux-Azana government, or any other similar government and all the parties supporting the government—these are the bulwark of real counter-revolution." (J. Chavaroché, "The Chief Tasks of the Communist Party at the Present Stage of the Revolution in Spain," *Imprecorr*, May 12, 1933, p. 472)

Now the Stalinists have assumed the leadership in "the bulwark of real counter-revolution." A grave danger rose before the Stalinist bureaucracy: the danger of Workers Democracy in Europe, which would jar Workers Democracy in the Soviet Union into an awakening, followed by the inevitable removal of the bureaucratic pyramid and the day of reckoning for the usurper and his accomplices.

Yet, the situation in Spain was revolutionary. Neither the bourgeoisie itself nor its "People's Front" protectors were able to cope with the rising tide. Though rendered politically color-blind the workers were propelled by their class interests to strike at the roots of their enslavement. The Fascists were nervous, demanding that the workers be put down with an iron hand. While blaming the "disorders" upon reaction itself, the Stalinist "Party" harmonized with the demand that they must be brought to an end, although not agreeing with the methods of suppression. Dolores Ibarruri stated that the Stalinists were in full accord with the clerical-Fascist Gil Robles:

"SEÑOR DEPUTIES! Strange and paradoxical as it may seem, this time the Communist fraction agrees with the proposal, although not with the bill, introduced by Gil Robles, which emphasizes the need for putting an end as quickly as possible to the disorder which reigns in our country. . . ." (Dolores Ibarruri, "Against the Enemies of the People," *The Communist International*, No. 9, September 1936, p. 1127)

One need not have been gifted with prophetic insight to clearly discern the approaching sinister charge of Fascism. On July 18, five months after the victory of the "People's Front," the land-owning nobility which officered the Army, and the big capitalists, staged a military uprising throughout most of Spain.

The object of the movement was to throw back the advancing proletarian revolution, shatter all workers' organizations, give the boot to the worthless and impotent, although willing and loyal, flunkey, the government of the "People's Front," and plant in its stead a bloody Fascist dictatorship.

Fundamentally, it is a matter of indifference to the imperialists whether their State is operated along Fascist or "democratic" lines. To the Social Democrats, Anarchists, and trade union bureaucrats only bourgeois democracy offers a golden opportunity to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." "Democracy" provides these agents of capitalism with leadership over the masses, with places of emolument, quite often with government posts. Fascism puts an end to all this from the Right; the proletarian revolution destroys the bureaucratic paradise from the Left. Consequently, the trade union and political labor-lieutenants of the bourgeoisie abhor both, Fascism and proletarian power. Stalinism recognizes, of course, that Fascism is a destructive capitalist force. But, conducting the struggle in the exclusive interests of the Soviet bureaucracy, Stalinism sees Fascism, in the main, as the mailed fist of imperialism threatening the Soviet Union, home of the Soviet bureaucracy. Hence the "most" reactionary Fascism is German Fascism. In reality Fascism aims at the international proletariat as a whole. The degree of its aggression against the Soviet Union is measured by the military might of the given Fascist government, and is governed by geographical, economic and other considerations.

The rôle the labor-lieutenants of the bourgeoisie perform in strikes, parliamentary contests and demonstrations, they continue to perform in civil war, if it finds them in position of leadership over the masses. They send the workers into battle, but unlike the Bolsheviks, who were wholly devoted to the cause of the toilers, they, if the turn of events favors the proletariat, do everything in their power to prevent victory. On the other hand, they arch their backs and spit at Fascism when its long, relentless knife is within the reach of their opportunist throats.

The armed crisis in Spain at once brought into striking relief the vacillating, spiritless, treacherous nature of the liberal petty-bourgeois government representing the "People's Front." The leaders in the government were half-paralyzed with indecision, doubt and fear, hesitant, even unwilling to make a serious effort to put down the Fascist uprising. Fascism would have succeeded

in a few days in seizing the whole of Spain had it not been for the workers. Despite widespread confidence in the government, the workers, remembering Germany and Austria, were for some time oppressed by an awful foreboding of a Fascist storm-to-come. The Stalinist-Socialist reassurances did not succeed in completely devitalizing the proletariat, and the disturbing dark portents kept its vigilance alive. The moment the opening Fascist gun was fired, the epic chapter of the bravery of the intrepid Spanish workers commenced to be recorded in letters of fire and blood. They acted over the head of the sabotaging government and put down the Fascists in many important cities of Spain:

"The key to an understanding of events in Spain is the fact that, in the four great cities of Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia and Malaga, where the rebellion was suppressed, the suppression was accomplished not by government troops or by the Civil Guards, but by armed workers." (Walter Duranty, *The New York Times*, September 17, 1936)

The workers broke into arsenals and seized arms. They captured San Sebastian from the Fascists and occupied Toledo, laying siege to its fortress, the Alcazar. Saragossa, Cordoba, Oviedo and other towns held by Fascists were besieged. The destruction of Fascism and the swift and brilliant victory of the workers was unmistakably in sight.

The "democratic" government, terrified by the rising spectre of proletarian revolution, attempted to save capitalism by sabotaging the struggle against Fascism. A workers government would have immediately armed the toilers to crush the black reaction; President Azana stubbornly fought against the arming of the masses. "He is known to have been strongly opposed to the arming of the populace" (*The New York Times*, September 26, 1936). The blight of the obstructing hand of the "People's Front" government was in all fields of the fight. For instance, when the civil war began, the government air force was immense compared with Franco's, outnumbering it 12 to 1. A proletarian government would have at once employed so effective a weapon. The ferrying of Moors and Foreign Legionnaires from Africa into Spain would have been prevented. Fascist headquarters in Burgos would have been razed to the ground. The few Fascist generals and officers would have been rounded up and given their deserts. But the "People's Front"

government is an instrument of the capitalist class. By its very nature it can act only against the interests of the oppressed. It therefore gave a flimsy pretext for not using the air force: it could not trust its own aviators! And when many foreign fliers volunteered to help fight Fascism, the government rejected their assistance because of "international complications":

**"MADRID SAID TO DISTRUST MEN IN THE AIR FORCE:
FEAR OF DESERTIONS LIMITS ATTACKS BY PLANE**

"Disloyalty of its aviators has become a main obstacle to the Spanish Government in its campaign to crush the Fascist rebellion.

"Harassed by growing Communist cries for 'brutal, violent' action in the civil war, the government fears to send its air armada into the fight, authoritative sources here asserted, because the aviators *might* desert.

"Early in the revolt many pilots sent into battle joined the insurgents, these sources stated. Now the government is sending only one or two planes up at a time.

"Were it not for this lack of confidence, military tacticians point out, whole squadrons of planes could be thrown against enemy strongholds to end the revolt.

"'At present,' one flier at Barajas airport, here, was quoted, 'there are three planes for every flier who would be completely trust-worthy.'

"Many Russians, Polish and Mexican fliers have offered their services, it was said, but the government professes reluctance to employ them because international complications might result." (*The New York Times*, August 18, 1936)

During the civil war in Russia the Bolsheviks used even the Tzarist generals who were placed under the control of armed workers to forestall the least treacherous move. In Spain there were many ways to control the aviators if they really were untrustworthy. That the excuse was a lie out of the whole cloth can be seen from the fact, later revealed, that it was the Fascists who could not trust the Spanish fliers:

"Premier Largo Caballero charged tonight that most of the insurgent airmen bombing Madrid were foreigners. Only they, he said, would be willing to destroy homes within the capital." (*The New York Times*, November 16, 1936)

The thousands of Asturian miners armed with dynamite were held back for some time from attacking the Fascist stronghold in Oviedo (*The New York Times*, August 17, 1936). Premier Giral refused to order the bombardment of the Alcazar be-

cause it was a monument of historical value. Indalicio Prieto, Socialist leader, wholeheartedly supported this tactic. He admitted in an interview that the government forces were not used to full capacity:

"'The government forces,' he continued, 'have not been used up to now to their full efficiency, as would have been done in case of a foreign invasion. I take as a typical example that of Toledo, where a group of rebel officers is entrenched. *It would have been very easy for one of our bombing planes to blow up the Alcazar, but our enemies are Spaniards, as we are, and this palace is one of our most precious art treasures.'*" (*The New York Times*, August 4, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

"Our enemies are Spaniards, as we are"! referring to Franco's cutthroats, declared this Socialist Minister of Air and Marine in the "People's Front" cabinet of Largo Caballero. The Stalinists in their game of driving the workers' minds from pillar to post insisted upon limitless confidence in these "People's Front" Ministers, knowing well the false-heartedness of the Socialist Prieto. To go back no further than a year and a half before the ultra-Rightist zigzag:

"The same social fascist, *Prieto*, who in the name of the socialist minority stated that the declaration of Gil Robles had opened a revolutionary period, that the attempt at a coup de main would call forth a revolution, hastened to explain in the lobbies of Parliament that his words were meant not so much a threat as a warning. He added that the social fascist leaders have made every effort in order to hold back the masses who follow them, but that if the 'Rights' should seize power, they would not be able to hold them back any longer.

"The 'oppositional' role of the social fascists therefore is quite clear. To a government which bows to the wishes of the monarchist fascist 'Right' and to the fascist elements who threaten to seize power, the social fascist leaders utter warning and threatening cries, but not against this fascist danger, but to remind the exploiting classes that this policy can so embitter and exasperate the working masses that they will no longer be able to hold them in check.

"... The most essential tasks of the C. P. of Spain consist in ruthlessly exposing the fresh treachery of the social fascist leaders, inducing the masses to abandon these leaders, and organizing the open fight against fascism, the fight for the revolutionary way out of the crisis." (Vicente Arroyo, "The Lerroux Government, a Preliminary Stage of Fascism," *Inprecorr*, January 5, 1934, p. 7)

All that was before the widespread application of Pieck's thesis of concealing from the workers the reactionary character of the Social-Democratic leaders. With cynical unprincipledness the Stalinists now checked and reprehended sharply any one attempting to question the trustworthiness of the treacherous charlatans heading the "People's Front" government. Some of the Left Socialists outside Spain, to save their face and appear revolutionary, ventured to utter a few gentle opportunist words of "criticism" of Caballero and the Stalinists:

"By accepting office under Azana, Caballero and his associates, including representatives of the Communist Party, have taken over responsibility for administration of the liberal capitalist regime under Azana. They have abandoned 'critical support' of the People's Front. If Caballero is to continue as a revolutionary leader, he must withdraw from office as soon as the emergency of civil war is past, unless a workers' government is set up." (John Newton Thurber, "People's Front Tried and Found Wanting, Spain 1936," *American Socialist Monthly*, October 1936, p. 23)

The Socialist Thurber is not ruthlessly critical; he does not explain that Caballero and the Stalinists, entering into coalition with the capitalists, are traitors to the proletariat and agents of the bourgeoisie. Caballero, the reformist, is painted by Thurber as a revolutionary leader, who may cease to be revolutionary if *after the civil war* he does not withdraw from the government. But the Stalinists resent even this sort of "criticism," for it may arouse some doubts in the minds of the workers about Caballero and the Stalinists. With customary ribaldry, one of the most skilled journalists of the *Daily Worker*, rips and tears at the gentle "Lefts" of the *American Socialist Monthly*:

"They have attacked the Spanish Socialist and Communist leaders, as for example, the latest issue of the *American Socialist Monthly* which directs a venomous stream of phrases against the Socialist premier of the People's Front government." (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, October 31, 1936)

With the valuable assistance rendered by the Stalinist-Azana-Caballero government, "the bulwark of real counter-revolution," the Fascist flames rapidly spread.

Were the "People's Front" government not what it is, a lackey of capitalism, rejected, to be sure, by the big bosses, had it actually and earnestly attempted to break with its ill-smelling

past, and go over to the side of the toilers—a childish illusion!—it could have done so with relative ease. It was and has remained a dismissed capitalist flunkey. A workers government would have decreed the land to the peasants. That would have irresistibly drawn the sixteen million peasants into the civil war on the side of the proletariat. Such a formidable alliance would have destroyed Fascism and its root, the capitalist system, and set Europe afire. It was such an alliance that defeated the White armies and the imperialist intervention in Russia. Precisely because of this revolutionary danger, the "People's Front" government issued no *revolutionary* land decrees. The decrees which have been issued, termed by the Stalinists "drastic and far-reaching" to impress the workers, are decrees "confiscating" the lands of those landlords who support Franco, in other words, landlords almost exclusively within the territory under Fascist control:

"The decrees announced and carried out by Minister Uribe are drastic and far-reaching. The fundamental decree confiscates without compensation the lands of all persons convicted of direct or indirect participation in the rebellion." (Theodore Draper, "Behind the Lines in Spain," *New Masses*, January 26, 1937)

As a result, the Spanish peasantry has remained passive, supporting neither the capitalist-landlord rebellion nor the workers who, it appears, have been defending the rotten Republic which fed the peasantry on fake promises for five long years. A decree granting independence to Spanish Morocco would cripple Franco. But for the "People's Front" government it would mean a break not only with Spanish imperialism, but with British and French imperialism as well. Such a move would cause a rising in French Morocco and other French-African colonies. From the start, Franco has been in complete possession of Spanish Morocco, but all that the "People's Front" government offers the Moors is a *promise* of independence—at some future date:

"Loyalist planes flew over Insurgent lines on the Madrid front today to drop a proclamation *promising* the Moors self-government *after* the government has achieved victory." (*The New York Times*, January 26, 1937. My emphasis—G.M.)

The "People's Front" government, though rejected and repudiated by the Spanish imperialists, remains loyal to Spanish

imperialism, just as Lovestone, though discarded and spat upon by Stalin, remains faithful to his stern Master. The Republican leaders quite often indulge in unmistakably friendly gestures towards the Fascists. For many days after General Franco openly rebelled, his home in Madrid, a virtual arsenal, was not even searched. While the fiendish Fascists were slaughtering workers, news came from the besieged Alcazar that the wife of one of the Fascist officers had given birth. The Republican officials of Toledo sent a priest into the Alcazar to baptize the baby (*New York World Telegram*, September 12, 1936). Fraternalization between workers and Fascist officers was promoted at the front:

"A Fascist captain shouted that he would like to see his aged mother and two little children in Madrid. A Militia captain replied that his enemy might—that he could cross the lines and return to the Fascist trenches after the visit.

"The officer replied that he would not feel safe. The militiamen then proposed that he and two of his men would, simultaneously, cross into the Fascist lines and remain as hostages until the captain returned.

"The exchange will take place shortly after dawn Thursday." (*Daily Worker*, December 24, 1936)

The *Daily Worker* printed the above without a single word of comment.

All the Monarchist officers including Franco and Mola had pledged allegiance to the bourgeois republic. When the Fascist revolt broke out, virtually all the officers in the outlying sections of Spain and the colonies joined Franco. Those who remained in Republican territory and awaited developments, who merely said they were for the Madrid government, were given positions of command in the workers' Militia. And if Franco had remained in the War Ministry instead of being "exiled" to the Canary Islands where he prepared the revolt, would he not have accepted command over the workers? Gladly. And he would have skillfully maneuvered to massacre as many vanguard workers as possible. The "loyalty" of the Republican generals can be judged from the following:

"The government's most secret military plans reach the rebels almost as soon as they are issued." (*New York World Telegram*, October 29, 1936)

The furious class struggle in Spain is *basically* between the toilers on the one hand and the landlords and capitalists on the other. The fundamental historical issue is not whether the "democratic" or Fascist form of rule of Spanish imperialism should prevail. The question which is being settled with all the death-dealing implements of war is: revolution or counter-revolution; back to a stabilized exploitation of the workers, the peasants and the colonies, or forward to a Socialist society. When bourgeois "democracy" is no longer able to check the masses, the bourgeoisie, indirectly assisted by opportunism in the workers' camp, attempts to change the form of its rule.

The Stalinists now bent their efforts to impregnate the consciousness of the proletariat with the false impression that the basic struggle in Spain is between a bourgeois democratic government and Fascism. In many instances they have gone to the extent of eliminating from their language the phrase "class struggle" and "bourgeois democracy" and declaring that the fight is for the preservation of the "...lawfully established Azana government of Spain" (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, August 6, 1936). "... the lawful constitutional and democratic government of Spain" (*Daily Worker*, December 2, 1936).

During the "Third Period" the American section of the Stalinist taught and practiced the theory of "Social Fascism." And now, during their ultra-Rightist zigzag, these "Communists" speak of the "lawfully elected government of the United States" (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, January 13, 1937), and of giving "aid to a brother democratic country" (*Daily Worker*, January 18, 1937). Stalin's menials guardedly avoided the Marxist characterizations of the State, of "democracy." They buzzed about "democracy" *in general*, about "European and world democracy" (*Daily Worker*, December 9, 1936) and "his (Hitler's) war on the Republic—a war aimed at the extermination of all European democracy" (Robert Minor, *Daily Worker*, January 7, 1937), just as any liberal or conservative bourgeois politician, to cover up the class nature of capitalist society, vociferates hypocritically about "democracy" in general. Lenin spoke plain on this question:

"For in none of the civilized capitalist countries does there exist such a thing as 'democracy in general.' There exists only bourgeois democracy.... All Socialists, in explaining the class character of bourgeois democracy, of bourgeois parliamentarism, have proclaimed

the idea, which was expressed with the most scientific precision by Marx and Engels, that the bourgeois democratic republic is nothing but a machine for the oppression of the working class by the bourgeoisie . . . traitors to Socialism present the thing as though the bourgeoisie had presented the workers with 'pure' democracy. . . . Thus the present defense of 'bourgeois democracy' by speeches about 'democracy in general' and the present alarm against the 'dictatorship in general,' are direct treachery to Socialism, actual crossing over into the camp of the bourgeoisie. . . . The defenders of 'pure democracy' show themselves again in reality the defenders of this filthy and prostitute system of the rule of the rich over the means of enlightenment of the masses, as swindlers of the people. . . ." (Lenin, *Bourgeois Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship*, Thesis adopted by the First Congress of the Communist International, March, 1919)

Lenin's teachings on bourgeois "democracy" were a million times analyzed, explained, emphasized by the Comintern. There is not a single Olgin, Browder, Gannes, Bedacht or Foster who does not know *precisely* what bourgeois "democracy" is, and what the attitude of the workers should be towards it. William Z. Foster correctly described the bourgeois-democratic movement in America, Germany, England and France, represented by La Follette, Social Democracy, the Labor Party and the Radical Socialist Left bloc, respectively:

"These four movements, in Germany, England, France and the United States, all differ among themselves in many respects. But all have this in common—they are political coalitions or alliances between the small and middle capitalists, the professional elements, the well-to-do-farmers, certain sections of the labor aristocracy, and the officialdom of the labor movement. Their programs and actions are determined by their social composition. They are inevitably dominated by a capitalist ideology, they base themselves upon the institutions of private property, and *they carry out the imperialistic policies of the capitalist class as a whole*. They are essentially hostile to the aspirations of the working class. They are the last reserves of capitalist 'democracy.'

" 'Democracy' under the capitalist system is a set of forms to mask the dictatorship of the capitalist class. . . .

" . . . But is anything fundamentally changed by all this tinkering with the machinery of capitalist 'democracy'? Not at all. It may happen that temporarily the lower sections of the capitalist class force a bit more recognition for their particular group interests, but whatever power they gain they immediately turn against the workers. The working class never gains anything of consequence for itself, although it really bears the brunt of all such struggles, except the incidental

disillusionment which gradually forces it to begin to organize its own class forces, to mobilize itself as a class, *to formulate its own program*, and to realize the necessity of a break with the petty-bourgeoisie as it broke with the parties of big capital." (*The Workers Monthly*, November 1924, p. 9. My emphasis—G.M.)

Foster wrote this when the chances of the Left Opposition in the Soviet Union were even. Unlike Lovestone, Foster then had been sounding the ground, unable to make up his mind whose side, Stalin's or Trotsky's, it would pay him best to support. To remain "honest" or go crooked, that was the question.

This question was decided finally and irrevocably early in the "Third Period," and Foster, asserting his permanent loyalties, has been rendering unstinted service to the Stalinist Order ever since. He contributed his share in building up and preserving the Stalinist system of organized fakery, betrayal and crime.

In defiance of Lenin's teachings, and in conflict with his own previous writings, he assisted the Stalinist clique in the tremendous enterprise of splitting the world trade union movement during the "Third Period." A member of the Stalintern's Executive, with an ability to win workers' attention and confidence that passes belief, second in this respect perhaps only to Browder, this utterly depraved Stalinist demagogue bent his full aid to the usurper Stalin in betraying the German workers and cooperated with Pieck, Browder and other notables of the Order to conceal the horrible crime. When the "Third Period" with all its deceptive paraphernalia became untenable, he put his opportunist shoulder to the ultra-Rightist wheel. Leafing through Foster's works, one discovers that on almost every fundamental question this double-faced Janus advocates two opposite, mutually excluding, positions, in accordance with the zigzags of Stalinism. Repudiating Lenin's thesis on bourgeois democracy and his own former hypocritical adherence to this thesis, the labor faker Foster now sings lustily of "democracy" in general:

"Tomorrow we Communists march in international solidarity with our heroic brothers in Spain who are giving their lives in defense of democracy. We march in protest, protest against the intervention of Hitler, the madman of Europe, and Mussolini, the despoiler of Ethiopia—the murder twins who would drown the people of Spain in their own blood rather than allow democracy to prevail." (William Z. Foster, *Daily Worker*, November 27, 1936)

The World War marked the ending of one epoch and the beginning of another. The new epoch, Lenin pointed out, is the epoch of imperialist wars and proletarian revolution. Bourgeois "democracy" as a system of capitalist equilibrium has reached the state where all vital functions and ability to resuscitate and perpetuate the wage system and colonial oppression have definitely ceased. Defense of bourgeois democracy means, therefore, one thing, and one thing only—prevention of progress of society, prevention of proletarian revolution. Only a year before the "Seventh Congress" the Stalinist twisters and demagogues quoted Lenin on this very point, and *in words* adhered to his thesis:

"Upon the victory of the October Revolution in Russia, Lenin declared:

"The epoch of bourgeois-democratic parliamentarism has ended. A new chapter of world history, the epoch of proletarian dictatorship, has begun.' . . .

"In Germany, after the betrayal by social-democracy of the proletarian revolution, which had broken out spontaneously, there occurred the establishment of the Weimar republic. Thus, already at that time, social-democracy functioned as a counter-revolutionary party, but it was still impregnated with the 'democratic,' i.e., bourgeois-democratic, ideology, and practiced its counter-revolutionary deeds and intrigues under the slogan of defense of 'democracy.'" (A. Martynov, "The Leninist Slogan of Soviet Power in the Present Situation," *The Communist*, September 1934, p. 903)

Because the bourgeois-democratic parliamentary epoch has ended, and the epoch of Soviets, of workers' rule, has dawned upon mankind, every force arresting the proletarian revolution at the outworn, dead, artificial "democratic" stage, is definitely a counter-revolutionary force, preparing the ground for Fascism. In Lenin's day the main counter-revolutionary force within the working class was Social Democracy. Since Lenin's death it is both Social Democracy and Stalinism, the latter playing the outstanding rôle.

Lenin illuminated the minds of the workers; Stalinism surrounds the whole international vanguard with thick darkness, prevents logical thinking and concentration of correct ideas, and paralyzes the faculties of inference. It gives a false appearance to objective reality of both the Soviet Union and the capitalist world.

In the days of Lenin, the dictatorship of Wall Street im-

perialism was described by the Bolsheviks in unqualified words. The literature of the Third International spoke in no uncertain terms of the brutal oppression of the Filipinos, Puerto Ricans, Negroes and workers in general, by the organized power of American plutocracy. The Leninist Comintern always reminded the workers that it was the "democratic" governments which had sent huge stores of war supplies to the White Armies of Kolchak and Denikin, when the young Soviet Republic was locked in desperate combat with Russian Fascism. And it was "democratic" France, "democratic" America and "democratic" England that had sent troops into Russia to help the Whites in their war to destroy the Soviets and establish a bloody White Guardist dictatorship. The Browders, Fosters and Hathaways know all that. The hypocrisy-soaked hired writers of the *Daily Worker*, who in Lenin's day idled in the intellectual sewers of bourgeois society, today, guided by Browder, are pouring torrents of loathsome deception, impounding and impregnating the workers' view with illusions about bourgeois "democracy."

"Modern America must carry the cause of democracy to the beleaguered people of Madrid!" (*Daily Worker*, editorial, January 29, 1937)

"The United States government is committed to democracy. Let it show that in its stand on Spain." (*Daily Worker*, August 18, 1936)

In Lenin's time, before Stalin appointed the adventurer Pepper to head the agitation and propaganda department of the Comintern, the sections acted as channels for Bolshevik ideology emanating from the genuine revolutionary party of the workers republic. Here is what another Foster wrote in 1922, when Bolshevism was "accepted" by all the Olgins and Weinstones as a convenient Red cover for their personal bureaucratic machinations and plots:

"The dictatorship in Russia is bold and upright class rule, which has as its ultimate object the abolition of all class rule and all dictatorships. Our democracy, on the other hand, is a Pecksniffian Dictatorship, is hypocrisy incarnate, promising all liberty in phrases, but in reality even penalizing free thinking, consistently working only for one object: to perpetuate the rule of the capitalist class, the capitalist dictatorship." (Max Bedacht, Foreword to Trotsky's *Dictatorship vs. Democracy*, pp. V, VI)

But the proletarian dictatorship in Russia is no longer "up-right class rule." It has been warped by the Stalinist bureaucratic distortion which leads the proletarian State founded by Lenin, not towards the abolition of all dictatorships, but towards the reestablishment of bourgeois dictatorship. And due to this fact American capitalist democracy in the mouths of the Bedachts and Michael Golds, the supporters of the bureaucratic distortion, has ceased to be a Pecksniffian Dictatorship, but has become a model for revolutionary workers of Spain and other countries.

In their counter-revolutionary bacchanalia of distortion of Leninism, the Stalinists never fail to wrap their destructive anti-workingclass frauds in Communist phrases and tack Lenin's name to their adroit political forgery:

"To act in the spirit of Lenin today is to rally all possible aid to the cause of Spanish democracy." (*Daily Worker*, January 19, 1937)

"If we would honor the memory of Lenin, then tonight's meeting must be, primarily, the occasion of raising higher the banner of solidarity with the embattled democracy of Spain." (Earl Browder, "The Teachings of Lenin and Problems of Spain," *Daily Worker*, January 21, 1937)

Is there anything so utterly hypocritical and subtly counter-revolutionary as the monstrous anti-Leninist concoctions quoted above! Nothing remotely like this piece of desecration of the great proletarian revolutionist has ever been witnessed.

The bluff of "democracy" naturally does not mislead the bourgeoisie—they play that cunning game themselves. It can mislead and does mislead only the workers; which result is precisely the aim of the Stalinist bureaucrats. The most far-reaching traitors of all times, deeply violating the elementary teachings of Leninism, employ the language of betrayers of Socialism in defense of the "filthy and prostitute system of the rule of the rich." Jesus Hernandez, "Communist" Minister of Education in the Azana-Caballero government, frankly stated the following:

"We are motivated *exclusively* by a desire to defend the democratic republic established on April 14, 1931, and revived last February 16." (*The New York Times*, August 10, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

He told the truth, which is, reactionary Stalinism is fighting against the overthrow of international capitalism. The directors of the organized repudiation of Leninism vent their rancor

against those who, evincing a gleam of intelligence, discern in the Spanish struggle a clash of two systems of society. To speak up is to enlighten the workers, particularly the Spanish workers. It is tantamount to an instruction in their real task. This brings mortal danger to Stalinism, hence the Stalinists' rabid snarling:

"The people of Spain are not fighting to establish Soviets, or the proletarian dictatorship. Only downright scoundrels, or misguided self-styled 'Lefts' declare that they are—and both combine to help the aims of the fascist rebels. The struggle in Spain is for the maintenance of democracy and free constitution. . . ." (Harry Pollitt, *Inprecorr*, August 8, 1936, p. 959)

But a year and a half before the Fascist rebellion, the Stalinists themselves admitted that the powerful urge among the workers of Spain was to go beyond the limits of bourgeois "democracy" and the "free" constitution which protected capitalist private property—a revolutionary urge to march towards Soviets, towards real freedom, Socialism:

"... One of the most striking indications of the revolutionary spirit of the Spanish workers is the slogans which are to be seen all over the country, even on public buildings. In addition to 'Long live Socialism!' 'Long live unity of action!' one mostly sees 'Long live Communism!' and 'Long live the Soviets!' Of course, besides these slogans, to which in most cases the sickle and hammer is added, one reads 'Down with the fascist Lerroux government' and 'Fight against the fascist Catholic Gil Robles!'" (*Inprecorr* No. 57, November 10, 1934, p. 1516)

In fact, so ripe was the situation for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of revolutionary power along the pattern of the Russian October, that—

"... The Congress of the C.G.T.U. raised the concrete question of the struggle for the capture of power by the workers and peasants and welcomed the slogan of the workers' and peasants' government on the basis of the Soviets as the first stage on the path to a socialist, classless society." (J. del Barrio, "On the Way to a Revolutionary Mass Trade Union Movement in Spain," *Inprecorr* No. 37, June 29, 1934, p. 958)

The Spanish workers and peasants, the Stalinists admitted, understood the significance of Soviets as far back as 1934. At that time the formation of Soviets was sabotaged by the Social-Democratic and Anarchist leaders:

"If Soviets have not as yet been formed in Spain, it is not because the Spanish workers and peasants do not need or understand their significance, but mainly owing to the resistance put up to them by social-democracy and the anarchists, who for the time being have the leadership of the majority of the toilers in Spain. If the social-democratic party and its leaders wanted to start immediately, along with the Communists, to form factory committees and Soviets, it is very likely that they would be formed throughout the country in a very short time." ("How the Revolution in Spain Can Be Victorious," *The Communist International*, September 20, 1934, p. 700)

And way back in 1931, five years before the new thesis for a struggle to maintain the rule of the Spanish bourgeoisie, the Stalinists openly stated that the chief task was to lead the toilers to the conquest of power:

"The central question of every revolution is the question of State power," says Lenin. The chief task of the Spanish Party is to lead the workers and peasants in their fight for power." (N. Majorsky, "The Spanish Revolution," *Inprecorr*, May 21, 1931, p. 480)

The Secretary of the British Stalinist section, Harry Pollitt, who shouts that "only downright scoundrels, or misguided self-styled 'Lefts' declare that" the Spanish toilers do—that they *must*—fight for power, is, like Harry Gannes and every other Harry that serves reactionary Stalinism and international imperialism, not a misguided self-styled "Communist." He is a downright lying scoundrel. There is mainly one outstanding reason why today the Spanish workers are not consciously fighting for the establishment of the Spanish Soviet Republic. They are *deliberately* being prevented from doing so by the Pollitts, Hernandezes, Diazes and their allies the Caballeros, who, in this counter-revolutionary sabotage, are aided and abetted by the Anarcho-Syndicalist leaders, and, through their "revolutionary" inadequacy, by the P.O.U.M. and the Trotskyites. In preserving capitalism, the opportunists, led by the Stalinists, are paving the road for Fascism.

To blot out the idea of proletarian struggle for power and divert the workers' thoughts from class lines, the reactionary Stalinists avoid, more and more, using the term proletariat:

"Mrs. Ibarruri was particularly insistent that although she was a Communist and the Reds were dominating the defense of the country, they were fighting for the Spanish people as a whole. When an interpreter translated the word 'pueblo,' which she used, as 'Proletariat,'

she vehemently interrupted: 'No! People, people, not proletariat!'" ("Paris Plea Made by La Passionaria," *The New York Times*, September 3, 1936)

"The defense of Madrid, which is now thrilling *democrats* throughout the world..." (Tim Buck, *Daily Worker*, November 16, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

In many instances the reactionary Stalinists go another step along nationalist lines and, dropping the "respectable" term "Spanish democracy," come out for the defense of "Spain." "Rush aid for Spain... Unite in support of Spain" (*Daily Worker*, November 2, 1936), "Spaniards Driven Out of Spain by Fascists" (*Daily Worker*, September 10, 1936). "Defending Madrid's Homes" (*Daily Worker*, November 18, 1936). "Spaniards defend a land of beauty" (*Daily Worker*, January 27, 1937).

Completely rejecting the class struggle for the liberation of the proletariat, the Stalinist betrayers speak of "Complete unity of the working class with the middle classes" (J. Berlioz, *Inprecorr*, October 17, 1936, p. 1270. Emphasis in the original), of limiting the victory by "the establishment of a strong Republican parliamentary democratic regime" (Dimitroff, *Daily Worker*, January 1, 1937). "Justice" is no longer spoken of as *class* justice, bourgeois or revolutionary-proletarian: "The People's Tribunal is a democratic court. Its basis is the democratic understanding of justice and not the revolutionary conception" (*Inprecorr*, October 17, p. 1278).

Overthrowing the basic tenets of Marxism, the highly talented charlatans go to astounding lengths in darkening the workers' mind with bourgeois ideology:

"... the Spanish women fighting and suffering, hating and tender, protecting her home and dying on the streets *in the name of public interest.*" (*Sunday Worker*, November 22, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

One can fairly choke with disgust reading this subtle anti-proletarian poison. Locked in mortal combat with feudo-capitalist reaction, the workers of Spain, men and women, confused and misled though they are, are imbued with the burning desire to overthrow capitalism. Even the bourgeois writers admit the class character of the anti-Fascist struggle in Spain: "there is a genuine proletarian uprising" (Herbert L. Matthews, "Half Year of War Ends in a Stand-Off in Spain," *The New York Times*,

January 17, 1937). But the vile Stalinists, in their unrestricted duplicity and unbounded perversion and vileness, pursuing the principal aim of preserving capitalism as a means of maintaining and perpetuating the bureaucratic system in the first workers State, put ice over the class fire of the Spanish proletariat. Every conceivable petty-bourgeois poison to pollute the workers' minds and deflect their thinking into a "classless" swamp, is mobilized by the Stalinists, in complete accord with the controlling idea of the "Seventh Congress."

The fact that the Spanish proletariat, *historically*, is fighting capitalism has been grasped not only by a few "misguided self-styled 'Lefts,'" some of whom have been burning with the urge to give the workers conscious guidance, but also by the clear-sighted Fascist leaders. Under the stress of the grave hour, General Franco, while the tramp of his savage cutthroats echoed through the devastated towns and villages of Spain, was forced to resort to subtle demagoguery, thus reflecting the true situation in Spain:

"Do not believe that the army is defending capitalism. It is fighting for the people, including all workers, who will enjoy full rights of citizenship but who must realize that rights also entail duties." (General Franco, *The New York Times*, October 2, 1936)

In Russia after the overthrow of the Tzar, there was established dual authority: the capitalist Provisional government headed by Prince Lvov, and the Petrograd Soviet of Workers and Soldiers Deputies, misdirected and gutted by the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, the Bolsheviks being in the minority. The dual authority was a transition stage which led to the power of the Soviets. Without a Marxist Party, the transition stage would have led to the power of White Guardist dictatorship. The Stalinists, to forestall the organization of Soviets in Spain and the inevitable dual authority resulting from the existence of Soviets, raised the slogan of, and succeeded in creating, a *single* authority—the *bourgeoisie*:

"The Communist slogan of a single authority—the government—has been put into practice by strict loyalty first to the bourgeois democratic cabinet and now to the Largo Caballero government..." (G. Marion, *Daily Worker*, December 10, 1936)

The Browders and Ganneses dispose of the question Why is Fascism so powerful in Spain, by the continuous drumming

about the military assistance Hitler and Mussolini render to Franco. They avoid discussing the political line the proletariat of Spain has been following—*their line*. Doubtless, the question of arms, of aid the bourgeoisie of other lands render the Spanish Fascists is of great, but not of decisive, importance. *The line is decisive*. The records of the experience of the Russian proletariat fully bear this out. The Russian proletariat, upon capturing power, fell heir to an incredibly broken-down country. Industry and transport were paralyzed, the old army was completely decomposed, most of the military equipment had been captured by the Germans. Soviet Russia faced by civil war and foreign intervention, was without an army. The only armed force the young proletarian Republic could rely upon was the sailors and the detachments of factory workers—the Red Guards—who possessed no heavy artillery and no tanks. The international bourgeoisie threw a tight blockade around the Soviet Republic, making it impossible to send to the Russian workers even food and medicines, let alone munitions. Imperialist aid to the White Armies of Kolchak, Denikin, Wrangel and others exceeded a thousand times the aid rendered to Franco by Mussolini and Hitler. "Democratic" England alone gave the White generals guns, tanks, machine guns, rifles and munitions valued at five billion dollars. Other imperialists contributed their share. The whole capitalist world stormed and raved, and yet the Russian workers emerged victorious. They triumphed because they had an *independent* policy, a *proletarian* line, separate and opposed to the political lines of all other classes. It was the Marxist-Leninist line of international proletarian revolution. The sabotaging Russian Azanas and Caballeros, the "Socialist" Keren-skys and Chernovs, had broken their promises of land to the land-hungry peasantry; and the bourgeois-democratic revolution was carried out under the hegemony of the proletariat. Without a day's delay, after "democracy" had been overthrown, the Bolsheviks turned the land over to the peasants. Supported by a mighty ally, the peasantry, the Russian proletariat presented an invincible battle array and stemmed the swirling tide of counter-revolution. The workers and peasants smashed the intervention and the White Armies, capturing and making use of the guns and ammunition with which the imperialists had equipped the enemy.

The political line is decisive.

The correct line—and there can be *only one* correct line—is by no means a guarantee of victory. It only offers the *possibility* of victory. A wrong line—and there can be a dozen or more wrong lines—makes ruin and defeat a *certainty*. No one knows this better than Stalin.

Fully apprised by their agents abroad, Stalin and his gang knew from the start that Mussolini and Hitler were furnishing aid to Franco. A letter dated August 3, 1936, two weeks after the Fascist rebellion broke out, shows that the Italo-German assistance to Franco had already reached tremendous proportions:

“The direct military assistance given by Hitler and Mussolini to the monarchist-fascist rebellion against democratic Spanish republic has reached such proportions and taken on such a form that no one can any longer keep it a secret.” (*Inprecorr*, August 8, 1936)

Naturally, the cunning Usurper in the Kremlin Palace was not at all perturbed. His man Friday made no representation in Geneva or anywhere else in behalf of “Spanish democracy.”

Blum croaked about neutrality, and Stalin hastened to join the “Non-intervention Committee,” in reality a screen behind which Hitler and Mussolini could rush still more effective assistance to Franco. It was the repetition of the Stalino-imperialist farce of sanctions during the rape of Ethiopia by Mussolini. In the present case all that was required, the Stalinists assured the workers, was to get “other powers,” that is Hitler and Mussolini, to promise to uphold neutrality. But if they refused to promise, then it looked as if Blum was going to help the workers of Spain:

“At the same time, it appears that if the other powers do not promise to maintain neutrality, then the Blum government will give full aid to the Spanish Government through airplanes and munitions.” (*Daily Worker*, August 4, 1936)

The “other powers” promised, and, as though to emphasize the Leninist truth that imperialist promises are worthless, are made to fool the workers, Hitler and Mussolini increased substantially their aid to Franco, and factually intervened in the Spanish civil war. And Blum maintained “neutrality.” He organized a blockade against the workers of Spain; and at the same time airplanes from Germany for Franco flew over French territory at night into Spain. French Fascists sent money and sup-

plies to Franco. When the fake of Blum’s “neutrality” became obvious to the workers, the Stalinists spoke of “The great harm which the ‘neutrality’ blockade is doing to the loyalist defense” (*Daily Worker*, September 30, 1936). Hardly an issue of the *Daily Worker* appeared without violent denunciation of the banning of arms to the “lawful, constitutional government of Spain.” But while the Stalinists were fulminating against Blum, they were concealing something about their Master Stalin:

“SOVIET BANS ARMS FOR SPAIN

“The Commissariat of Foreign Trade issued tonight an order prohibiting the shipment of munitions to Spain. The decree forbade the export, re-export or transit to Spain of all kinds of arms, munitions, war materials, airplanes and warships. It was effective as of last Friday.” (*The New York Times*, August 31, 1936)

The fact was that Stalin actively participated in the blockade of the Spanish workers. His embargo, however, was conditional as subsequent events indicated.

Once Stalin’s line, introduced by his Spanish puppets, became dominant within the Spanish proletariat, he assumed the directing influence, as he had in the Chinese Revolution in 1925-1927, and in the German crisis of 1930-1933. As the civil war advanced, a Stalinist stooge, Antonio Mija Garcia, became Commissar of War, and another Stalinist, Francisco Anton, was placed in command of the central front. Stalin’s sway was indubitably established. The fatal gangrene made steady headway within the Spanish working class. After a delay which sufficed for Franco to equip his force with a plethora of arms received from Hitler, Mussolini and the Portuguese Fascist dictator, Salazar, Stalin relaxed his embargo and sent supplies to the “People’s Front” government. He did this: first, to prevent the immediate victory of Fascism; second, to dispel the rising doubts of the Spanish and international working class; third, to becloud the question of policy. Stalin was successful. With the arrival of the Soviet ships in Spain, his popularity spread rapidly among the Spanish workers. Thousands of Socialists and Syndicalists joined the Stalinist “Party.” Some outstanding Socialist leaders, like Margarita Nelken, Deputy of Parliament, left the Socialist Party to join the reactionary Stalinists. Pictures of the sly Usurper graced the walls of Madrid and of other Spanish towns. In workers’ homes portraits of Stalin hung beside those of Marx and Lenin. The front of the Hotel Colon in Barcelona was decorated

with the image of the arch-Judas on the one side and Lenin on the other. "An enormous picture of Stalin decorates the Puerta del Sol, business center of Madrid" (*New York Herald Tribune*, January 27, 1937). The Asturian miners formed a "Stalin Battalion." Foreign volunteers organized a "Thaelmann Battalion" and "The Third International" battalion. Young Spanish workers made up a column "La Passionaria" and women workers a "Maxim Gorky" battalion.

Stabilization of the rule of the Spanish bourgeoisie was the Stalinist task; but this task could be brought to a successful conclusion only through exercising the greatest possible caution, attention to all angles of the situation, vigilance and a high degree of expertness.

Agile Stalin and his men had evolved an appropriate scheme to manage the Spanish situation. Every unscrupulous, conniving bureaucrat in Stalin's "International" was fully mobilized to destroy another possibility for a section of the international proletariat to seize power. There was no danger to the Stalin-Voroshilov-Kaganovich clique that the picked, small-souled, double-faced petty-bourgeois intellectuals, the Browders with their Harry Ganneses, would rake up the memories of Lenin's teachings on Soviets and bourgeois "democracy." Quite the contrary. Their participation in the flagrant violation of Leninist principles and in all the past crimes of the Usurper and their continuous faithful service to the Order, indicated that these people suffered no pangs of conscience, that they had long since forfeited their conscience.

In "Socialist competition" with one another to carry out the bid of the Master and his legates, the Harry Ganneses and the less skilled, tin-horn flunkies of Browder put into execution the well-organized scheme.

The political line was decisive and the ditching of the Spanish revolution could be successfully achieved, but only on condition that the line was masked by feverish activity to "help" the Spanish masses against Fascism. To give a distorted slant, every conceivable petty-bourgeois illusion was hammered into the heads of the workers.

An integral part of the criminal program to deaden the workers' class-consciousness and enfeeble their independent, revolutionary spirit was the persistent, systematic, foul fakery regarding the imperialist-Stalinist League of Nations. When

Caballero's government addressed an appeal to the League of Nations, the Stalinists wrote:

"The Italian and German intervention endangers the peace of the world, and the League should act to forestall such peril to peace. The demand should go up everywhere that the League of Nations accede to Spain's demand for a hearing. A League of Nations Assembly meeting now would be another important obstacle in the path of the fascist war aggressors." (*Daily Worker*, editorial, December 2, 1936)

In other words, the League of Nations has placed so many important obstacles in the path of Fascist war aggressors, which prevented their aggression, that a meeting of the bourgeois diplomats of the Council would be another important obstacle!

Poison! What else is it but deadly ideological capitalist poison the Stalinists are feeding the workers on! The tragedies of Syria, Chaco, Manchuria and Ethiopia, are brazenly ignored. To render assistance to rapacious imperialists to continue their robberies, Stalinism directs the workers to place their hope in the Thieves' Kitchen in Geneva!

The camouflaging of the pernicious policy in Spain proceeded over a wide range. To distort the vision of the workers, a veritable tornado of noise and vigorous "activity," was loosed by the servile flunkies of the Soviet Usurper. Hypersensitive to the origin of their power and position as leaders, the Browders with unbelievable zeal and tireless work were "assisting" the Spanish toilers. To send to Spain a few cupfuls of water to "fight" the raging flames of Fascism, Browder's "Party" staged parades and demonstrations, conducted tag days, sent out trucks with loud-speakers to tour the streets, arranged benefit shows and banquets, organized sewing circles to make clothes for the Spanish fighters. Its speakers delivered spellbinding speeches in which they described the heart-rending tragedy of the Spanish toilers, vividly painted the harrowing scenes of destruction and death, made stirring appeals for funds, and for more funds "to help defeat Fascism," and upbraided the Socialist Party and its leader, Norman Thomas, for not coming around quick enough "to the aid of Spain." But in Spain itself, the treacherous line of the "Seventh Congress" uninterruptedly sprayed opportunist gasoline upon the Fascist flames.

The line is well guarded against criticism. If a member of the "Party" has innocently evinced a "lack of understanding" that in this era of the general decline of capitalism, in the twentieth

year of the existence of a powerful workers State, the choice is not Communism versus Capitalism, but "democracy" or Fascism, he is threatened with bell, book and candle—with fire and brimstone. Anyone who says the workers must fight for a proletarian dictatorship is a "self-styled 'Left'" helping the Fascists. To expose the treacherous "People's Front" government is to side with Fascism. A skeptical air on the part of an advanced worker with regard to the Second and the Third Internationals, hesitancy to support "Spanish democracy" blindly, is open counter-revolution.

The most tragical aspect of the Stalinist-Socialist betrayal of the Spanish toilers is that the Stalinist workers, unacquainted with the post-Leninist changes in the Soviet Union and the Comintern, remote from suspecting the guilty secrets of their leaders, unaware that they are being mesmerized by Stalin and his Svengalis, give their allegiance to the bureaucratic usurpers with devotion, reverence and limitless confidence. During the "Third Period" they stubbornly defended the "theory" of "Social Fascism" and the tactic of the "united front from below only," believing the Piecks and Piatnitskys that the Stalinists really aimed to establish in Germany a Soviet republic (*Prepare for Power, We are Fighting for a Soviet Germany*, and similar titles); now they stand like an iron wall defending the "People's Front" policy and opposing the slogan of "Soviets for Spain." They are far from seeing in the "Third Period" line a trap for the German proletariat and in the "People's Front" line a trap for the Spanish, French, and—who knows—perhaps the British and the American workers.

It must be clearly understood that in this period of the decline of capitalist society and the perpetually recurring revolutionary crisis, Stalin constantly finds himself in collision with two active forces: the Fascist form of bourgeois rule and proletarian revolution. Only dire necessity compels him to choose Fascism as against a new soviet republic. A suitable outcome of the Spanish civil war, for the Stalinist bureaucracy, would be a deadlock, resultant in a sort of "democratized" military dictatorship, in some features resembling the former monarchy, but without a monarch. Under such a regime the revolutionary crisis would be overcome and the workers pacified by some concession on the one hand and machine guns on the other. The Socialist and Anarcho-Syndicalist organizations would retain a legal status

and the bureaucrats would receive their reward from capitalism for holding the workers in check. The Stalinist "Party" would enjoy the opportunity to corral a section of the proletariat to be used by the Soviet bureaucracy as a lever in its international intrigues.

A victory for "democracy" hinges almost exclusively on the ability of the Stalinists and their partners-in-betrayal, the Socialists, to crown the labors of Stalin and his political generals in the Kremlin with complete disembowelment of the class spirit of the proletariat. Only the complete remolding of the workers' ideological outlook, the surrender by the toilers of the deepest issue of the conflict, the abandonment of their strong positions in the factories and in social life and the stifling of their challenge to bourgeois rule, can save bourgeois "democracy." If the workers persist, then, to preserve the bureaucratic pyramid in the distorted workers republic, Fascism will become an unavoidable necessity.

But a rapid, unobstructed triumph of Fascism would have been ruinous for the Stalinist Order. To the workers within and without the Soviet Union, intoxicated by the demagogic speeches of the "Seventh Congress," speeches which assured them that it was the line of the "People's Front," "French Front," "Farmer Labor Party," which would save them from Fascism, this would have been a finale which they had scarcely expected. They would have been seized with a panicky impulse to break out of the Stalinist-Socialist trap and would have given ear to the various critics of the "People's Front" policy. A bare twelve months after the "Seventh Congress," without a prolonged period of artful deception, it would have been utterly impossible for Stalin to discard the ultra-Rightist line and abruptly reintroduce the "mistaken" line of "Social Fascism," "United front from below only," "Red" unions, and the bluff militancy of the "Third Period."

Doubters among the rank-and-file could not be shrugged away as easily and arrogantly as after all the previous betrayals. The workers would tend towards the idea of the Fourth International.

A sweeping victory for Fascism in Spain would have found its repercussion in France. Profiting by the terrible confusion, pain, horror and the burning sense of defeat among the workers, the French Fascists would have seized power and upset Stalin's international alliances and diplomatic machinations. The dark

outlook for the workers of capitalist Europe and of the Soviet Union made darker, the criminal Stalinist clique and its crowd of vultures that pounced upon the first workers State and occupied places of emolument and power, would have faced a sullen, extremely suspicious, threatening proletariat. Seeing the European working class on the Fascist scaffold of torture, sensing the impending final catastrophe, the Russian workers would have searched for the meaning and cause of the long series of terrible defeats of the international proletariat, and the realization of the stubborn truth would have come. Nothing then could have further buttressed the bureaucratic distortion of the workers State.

A dashing victory for the Spanish Fascists would have immensely strengthened Hitler and Mussolini, inspired them with overbearing self-confidence and induced them to plunge into a war upon the Soviet Union.

These clearly obvious angles were heeded by the sharp-minded Usurper in the Kremlin Palace. The course of the civil war had to be made to run in a zigzag fashion, Fascist victories alternating with setbacks and tremendous defeats—Stalin is so skilled in zigzag tactics. Hitler and Mussolini must be given to understand that from now on Fascism meets a furious resistance from the workers of Europe, and the idea of an attack upon the Soviet Union must not be trifled with. In 1927, the workers' anti-Fascist insurrection in Vienna, smothered by the Austrian Socialist leaders, terrified the international bourgeoisie and halted the immediate war upon the Soviet Union contemplated by the British imperialists. In the Spanish civil war, if the petrification of the class ideology of the workers and a victory for "democracy" fail to materialize, then, to prevent a panicky-awakening effect upon the world proletariat, the crafty Usurper Stalin will guide the course toward a logical defeat, in accordance with deductions to be drawn from the circumstances surrounding the conflict. The debacle, in such a case, can never be ascribed by the Stalinist workers to the line of the "Seventh Congress," but rather to a concatenation of inauspicious events and turns. Blum's sabotage, the failure of the "democracies," France, England and the United States, to come to the aid of Spanish "democracy," and above all the direct help to Franco by Mussolini and Hitler—these disadvantages and impediments will be declared by the Stalinist bureaucrats and accepted by the workers as responsible for the defeat of the Spanish masses.

Stalin will be cleared of all suspicion, because the Soviet Union, the workers will sincerely believe, rendered all possible aid to the Spanish masses short of war against Germany and Italy.

From the knowledge of Leninism, Stalin can easily foresee how each political force representing a class or a social group will react to certain situations within a revolutionary crisis. By dint of this understanding, Stalin, to a considerable extent, has been regulating the civil war in Spain. In the initial stage of the Fascist uprising, Stalin, counting quite unerringly on the sure sabotage by the Azana-Caballero government, held aloof and let things run their natural course. The sabotage took effect, and the workers were prevented from crumpling up and knocking into atoms Franco's insignificant force. The Fascists rapidly advanced and the need arose to slow them down, and also to stem within the Spanish and the international proletariat the rising wave of indignation at Stalin's passive attitude of a neutral observer in the face of the tremendous assistance Hitler and Mussolini gave to Franco. Stalin relaxed his embargo and sent supplies to the Madrid government. But not in sufficient quantities to equip a force to overwhelm Franco. Stalin has maneuvered to let Hitler's and Mussolini's assistance to Franco outrace and outbalance the assistance to the "People's Front" government by the Soviet Union and by workers in different capitalist countries. He has managed to be two or three jumps behind Mussolini and Hitler. In this clever way Stalin has been regulating the civil war, and appearing to be doing everything within his power to fight Spanish Fascism.

It should not be imagined that Stalin is so naive and untutored in Leninism as not to understand that the workers of Italy and Germany might assert themselves and attempt to arrest the bloody hands of Mussolini and Hitler. He took care of this end, however, and did what was within his power to paralyze the advanced workers in the chief Fascist countries of Europe. The Spanish crisis demands different tricks for different countries. In "democratic" countries and in the Soviet Union the *Pravdas* and the *Daily Workers* have been spilling a million hypocritical phrases against Mussolini and Hitler; but in Italy and Germany to disarm the workers ideologically and chain them securely to their Fascist jailers and butchers, Stalin's crafty agents, of necessity operating illegally, which fact lends them all the appearance of orthodox Bolsheviks, have circulated literature containing

thinly disguised poison which advocated unity and peace of the proletariat with the Fascists:

"Let us reach our hands to each other, children of the Italian nation, Fascists and Communists, Catholics and Socialists, people of all opinions, and let us march side by side to enforce the right of existence of the citizens of a civilized country, as ours is. We have the same ambition—to make Italy strong, free and happy." ("Reconciliation of the Italian People for the Salvation of Italy," *Imprecorr*, August 22, 1936, p. 1026)

Distribution of a similar protective "Manifesto" and narcotic literature with the line of urging unity with the Nazis, has been effected in shops and factories by the underground poison-disseminating Stalinist machine in Germany:

"You, National Socialist, you, Social Democrat, you, Catholic, you, Communist, you workers, you, Peasant, you, Artisan, and you, Intellectual—haven't we all, children of the German nation, the same ambition to live in freedom, peace and prosperity? . . . Nazi and non-Nazi toilers have heretofore fought bitterly against each other. Nazi Brothers! . . . Let us reach out our hands to each other and unite!" (From the Manifesto of the German Communist Party, *Deutsche Volks-Zeitung*, October 18, 1936)

Is it a wonder that Nazism has grown so powerful in Germany and spread its pernicious influence abroad! Here is another piece of pro-Fascist Stalinist poison:

"The Appeal of the Communist Party of Germany calls upon the German people to keep together, to take the National Socialist leaders at their word, to enforce the realization of those former demands of the national socialist party which are in the interests of the people. . . .

"The vital interests of the German people demand that the non-national-socialists offer a brotherly hand to the national socialist masses in order that, instead of hatred, there shall be confident co-operation in the fight for peace, freedom and well-being." (Walter, "For the Reconciliation of the German People," *Imprecorr*, October 24, 1936, p. 1302. Emphasis in the original)

The atrocious lengths to which the arch-Judas Stalin and his anti-workingclass puppets go, the death-dealing, counter-revolutionary devices to which these subtle poisoners of the masses stoop to gain their insensate bureaucratic objective, stagger the imagination. But there it is, this counter-revolutionary poison, over the signature of members of the Stalinist "Internation-

tion." He is not a revolutionist whose soul does not rise against this revolting Stalinist treachery!

To recapitulate, in order to fix clearly in mind what has actually taken place in Spain.

Basically, both sides, the Fascists and the "People's Front" government, are struggling for the possession of the capitalist State, for the continuation of capitalism; they differ as to the form of bourgeois rule. The working class in its struggle against the attempt of Spanish capitalism to introduce a Fascist regime, is fighting, *historically*, against the domination of the bourgeoisie. The military victory of the armed proletariat, the wage-slave of the capitalist class, would sweep far beyond the confines of the bourgeois-democratic republic with its constitutional safeguard of capitalist private property. The masses in their surge would seize the land, banks and factories, just as the Russian toilers had done nineteen years before. World capitalism and its ally, the Stalinist bureaucracy, have grasped the terrible danger. It is necessary for these reactionary forces, both from entirely different premises pursuing the same aim, to prevent the proletariat from defeating the Spanish bourgeoisie, and to put an end to the revolutionary situation. A section of world imperialism which has already introduced the Fascist form of rule, the weakening of which would mean the early overthrow of this régime, actively seeks to secure victory for Franco. The capitalist "democracies" and Stalinism, the former not particularly desiring, and the latter fearing, Fascism, have made some attempts to terminate the civil war without victory for either Franco or Caballero, to stabilize the capitalist state and thus effect their purpose—bring about the defeat for the proletariat.

Of course, the Stalinist bureaucrats and the imperialists are not endowed with supernatural powers and themselves are only pawns on the chess board of history. A revolt of the toilers in the conscripted Fascist armies and a crushing debacle for Franco followed by a factual attempt at the establishment of workers' power is not excluded. In that event, two factors will perform the needed trick for Stalinism and the international bourgeoisie: Stalin's line embodied in the "People's Front" government, and the absence of a Leninist party. Why were the workers of Russia successful in overthrowing the bourgeoisie? Because Lenin's Party was able to expose and dispose of the opportunists within the proletariat and the peasantry, the Men-

sheviks and Social Revolutionaries. In Spain there is no Leninist party or group to expose the opportunists, particularly the Stalinists who lead in the betrayal. As to the efficacy of the "People's Front" government in counteracting the workers' revolution, Stalin learned something from experience and knew precisely the manner in which this kind of a government acts when the workers threaten to overthrow the capitalist system. Azana or some other Republican leader would repeat the bloody acts of Chiang Kai-shek, who, by the way, was a fraternal member of the Comintern, much further to the "Left" than the Spanish Republicans. "Comrades" Caballero and Prieto would do their "democratic" duty as did their German counterparts, "comrades" Ebert, Noske and Sheidemann, and massacre the revolutionary workers of Spain, to preserve "democracy." Jesus Hernandez, Anton, Garcia or some other agent within the "People's Front" would act as did Tang Ping Shan, "Communist" Minister of the "Left" Kuomintang government of Hankow. He would head a detachment of Civil Guards to suppress—the Stalinist explanation would go—the "agents of Hitler and Mussolini," the "misguided self-styled 'Lefts'" and "down-right scoundrels" who under the pretext of attempting to set up a proletarian dictatorship really aimed at the "destruction of Spanish democracy" and the establishment of Fascism. The persecution of the P.O.U.M. by the Socialist-Stalinist-Liberal "People's Front" government is a fair indication of the introduction of the policy of fire to the Left, against the danger from the masses. Although the P.O.U.M. in essence is far from the correct position and is therefore no real menace to capitalism and the Stalinist bureaucracy, the attack upon it is more than a precautionary measure. A crystallization of a genuinely Marxist current must be prevented and workers must be terrorized against the idea of seizing power. If "democracy" proved victorious the fire to the Left would assume the Noske proportions. Stalin and the Social Democracy will accept "democracy" in preference to Fascism *only* when the "rear" is fully protected against the threat of proletarian revolution. The treacherous "People's Front" government would rob the workers of their victory and would establish a semi-Fascist régime. One recalls that when the workers of Petrograd defeated Kornilov's attempt to establish a White Guardist dictatorship against the workers and peasants, the head of the Socialist-Liberal coalition govern-

ment, Kerensky, began to discard "democracy" and introduce a military dictatorship against the toiling masses. He was interrupted by the proletarian revolution. Moreover, history teaches us that the toilers can be cheated of the fruits of their real, Communist victory (bureaucratic distortion).

The Anarcho-Syndicalist leaders too would do their bit to save capitalism. "Opposed" to all governments, both bourgeois and proletarian, they, like all opportunist leaders of the workers, receive their reward from the capitalist system. They would prefer "democracy" to proletarian dictatorship, as they prefer "democracy" to Fascism. Thus, unless a Leninist party arose in Spain, capitalism and Stalinism, in the final count, would be safe.

Fascism being rooted in capitalism, workers must understand that a genuine struggle to defeat Fascism should never be halted at the "democratic" middle, the bourgeois republic, but must proceed to the overthrow of the capitalist system, the root of Fascism. This is the fulfillment of the great historical task of the proletariat which Marx, Engels and Lenin spoke of. With the present social system in decay, and the beginning of the international proletarian revolution already a reality, bourgeois democracy inevitably gives way either to proletarian power which, if *undistorted*, leads humanity to Communism, or, if the seizure of power by the workers is held back, to the Fascist rule of the bourgeoisie. When the "leaders" of the proletariat do not allow the masses to advance beyond bourgeois democracy, they do not prevent Fascism but merely postpone its arrival. Sooner or later bourgeois democracy collapses. The lessons of Germany—the defeat of the Fascist Kapp Putsch in 1920, the frustration of the Hitler-Ludendorf Beer Putsch in 1923 and retention of "democracy" which finally gave way to Fascism—are highly instructive. It is well to remember that the suppressor of these Fascist rebellions was an officer of the "democratic" Weimar Republic, Colonel-General Von Secht, who later served in the new army organized by the Nazis.

The aim of Stalinism and the bourgeoisie is to keep the international proletariat within the vicious circle of "democracy"—Fascism—"democracy"—Fascism. To get out of this circle of exploitation, horror and death, the workers must have a revolutionary leadership. They must place confidence in only their own class. The proletariat, and not its vacillating, often treacherous

allies, must lead the struggle. The government, to conduct the fight against Fascism, must be not a cowardly, flabby, sabotaging government composed of Left liberals, petty-bourgeois Social Democrats and Stalinist bureaucrats who fear the proletarian revolution more than they fear Fascism, but a Soviet government of the *undistorted* dictatorship of the working class.

Some naive Lovestonite or Trotskyite, believing that the Stalinist bureaucrats are honest blunderers, will ask, Do Stalin and all his Browders and Harry Ganneses know this? Perhaps if they be instructed in Leninism they will set upon the Leninist course? The answer is: Stalin and his Browders know Leninism, and this very fact makes their crimes against the toilers a million times ghastlier. Is it necessary to give further proof that the Stalinists are *conscious* of their own criminality? Here is what an outstanding human rat wrote before the introduction of the line of the "Seventh Congress":

"To be victorious, the revolution in all its forms, must be under the leadership of the proletariat." (Harry Gannes, *Soviets in Spain*, p. 27)

"Today the proletariat knows from its own experience that only under the flag of the Soviets can it conquer." (*Ibid.*, p. 46)

"The agrarian revolution is a central task in the victory over fascism." (*Ibid.*, p. 5)

That there is no distinction *in principle* between the bourgeois-democratic and the Fascist rule of the bourgeoisie, the Stalinists admitted less than a year before the "Seventh Congress." The defeat of Fascism is possible only with the overthrow of the rule of the capitalists, they declared correctly, but of course, hypocritically:

"When social-democracy enters the united front with us, it only aims at defending the bourgeois democratic order against fascism—as a certain degeneration of the present bourgeois state. Social-democracy thus attempts to bring the masses on to this path and to retain them there. Under such conditions the independent and leading role of our Party consists in the following: while in every way defending the democratic rights of the workers, at the same time it must show the masses the incorrectness of making a **DISTINCTION IN PRINCIPLE** [emphasis in the original—G.M.] between fascist dictatorship and the bourgeois—"democratic" dictatorship. Further, we must explain to the masses that the former grows organically out of the latter, and

that the complete defeat of fascism is only possible through the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie in all its forms. We must show that the proletariat can be victorious only when it will pass from the defensive to the offensive, only when the working class will fight for Soviet power." ("For Soviet Power," *The Communist International* No. 22, November 20, 1934, p. 842. London Edition.)

The Stalinists know that the bourgeoisie utilizes two methods in its struggle to retain power to continue its oppression and exploitation of the toilers. One of these methods is "democracy," the other Fascism. Before they had set up the "People's Front" trap, the Stalinists pointed out to the workers these two methods of capitalist dictatorship:

"In order to refute the theory of 'the Lesser evil,' Communists must explain to the masses that the whole system of bourgeois dictatorship is constructed on the utilization in the struggle with the working class of both so-called bourgeois democracy and Fascism. This is clearly stated in the Programme of the Communist International:—

"Adapting itself to the alterations of the political situation, the bourgeoisie employs both the method of Fascism and the method of coalition with Social Democracy... in order to hinder the advancing course of the Revolution."

"It is impossible to separate these two methods of rule from the whole system of bourgeois dictatorship. The presence of these two methods allows the bourgeoisie to manoeuvre during the course of a series of years. Lenin says somewhere:—

"If the tactic of the bourgeoisie is always of one type, or even if it is always of one nature, the working class would quickly learn to answer it with a tactic similarly of one type or one nature. In point of fact, the bourgeoisie in all countries works out two systems of governing, two methods of struggle for its interests and for the perpetuation of its rule, in doing which it replaces from time to time these two methods by one another and sometime it interweaves them in different combinations."

"... The utilization of these two methods allows the bourgeoisie to fasten ever more strongly the fetters of bondage over the masses, speculating on their fear of the 'right' and at the same time assisting Social Democracy to come forward in the character of the champion of 'democracy.' This game is not a new one, it represents the continuation of the traditional policy of the bourgeois dictatorship which in the past, in accordance with concrete conditions, pushed to the fore, now its conservative and now its liberal wing, and thereby drew the masses away from the class struggle." (*The Communist International*, Volume VIII, No. 11-12, July 1, 1931, pp. 346-347)

Until another "Leftist" zigzag, the Stalinists are champions of "democracy," helping the bourgeoisie to continue its traditional game against the proletariat.

Not very long before they began to shunt the international proletarian vanguard upon the ultra-Right defeatist course, the Stalinists caught Vandervelde admitting that the choice for the workers is either dictatorship of the proletariat or Fascism. They emphasised that the one who is opposed to proletarian dictatorship is consciously supporting Fascism:

"Mr. Vandervelde thereby admits that the choice is between the dictatorship of the proletariat or fascist reaction. It follows, therefore, that he who does not decide in favor of the dictatorship of the proletariat *consciously* promotes the cause of fascism.

"It is hardly necessary to say that the whole of Vandervelde's article is devoted to defending the Spanish social democracy, this most bitter enemy of the dictatorship of the proletariat, this stirrup-holder of fascist reaction." (*Inprecorr*, December 15th, 1933, p. 1242)

The Stalinists used to admit that it is impossible to fight Fascism without fighting the deception of "democracy":

"Fascism organically grows out of bourgeois democracy. . . .

"It is impossible to fight Fascism without fighting against all forms of bourgeois dictatorship, against all its reactionary measures which pave the way to the Fascist dictatorship. All this means *firstly* that the fight against Fascism calls for the systematic exposure of the deception of Social-democracy which conceals the counter-revolutionary character of the bourgeois dictatorship with phrases about 'democracy. . . .' (D. Z. Manuilsky, *Inprecorr*, June 10, 1931, pp. 548-549)

And if one is still unconvinced, still does not understand the stubborn reality to which the workers' consciousness must correspond as an essential requirement in the class struggle, still refuses to emerge from his blissful trance, let him read the following, and no truer words than these have ever been written:

"The social revolution can forestall Fascism, as it has done in Russia. But if the social revolution is delayed, then Fascism becomes inevitable.

"Fascism can be fought. Fascism can be fought and defeated. But Fascism can only be fought and defeated if it is fought without illusions and with clear understanding of the issues. The causes of Fascism lie deep-rooted in existing society. Capitalism in its decay breeds Fascism. Capitalist democracy in decay breeds Fascism. The only final guarantee against Fascism, the only final wiping out of the

causes of Fascism, is the victory of the proletarian dictatorship." (R. Palme Dutt, *Fascism and Social Revolution*, p. X)

Yes, the Stalinist renegades and Judases know how to forestall Fascism. They are *consciously* and *deliberately* selling out the international proletariat to bloody capitalist reaction.

The Paris Commune of 1871 was defeated, not only because of the unfavorable situation, but also because its leaders failed to pursue a correct revolutionary policy. But at that time history had not yet provided the proletariat with the needed historical experience of establishing a workers' State. Marx himself was not ready to declare what exact form the dictatorship of the proletariat would take, and much that had been surmised before became clear after the experience of the Commune. Lenin based his line upon the lessons derived from that great historical event.

Stalin and the rest of the degenerated "Bolsheviks" participated in the greatest revolution of all times. They are not the confused idealists and dreamers of the type that headed the Council of the Commune. With the February Revolution in 1917 there unfolded two decades of tremendous revolutionary struggles in which Stalin at first in a positive, then in a negative way, took an active hand. The theory of Marxism-Leninism has been tested in every aspect. Stalin studied not only in books but in living reality. He and his underlings have stored up a considerable amount of knowledge and experience which they could employ in the interests of the international proletariat were it not for the fact that they have given up and gone against this class, in order to capture and perpetuate their personal power.

Stalin and his clique are *consciously* and *remorselessly* leading the international proletariat to ruin. Precisely because they possess some knowledge of Marxism-Leninism are they so efficient in their dastardly work of forestalling not Fascism but the world proletarian revolution.

The grim betrayal of the Spanish workers is as fiendish a crime as the betrayal of their German brothers. But there is a difference in these two Stalin-wrought tragedies.

The German workers were prevented from putting up a struggle against Hitler. Early in 1933 when the entire State machinery of Germany was still in the hands of Social Democ-

racy and liberals, the Nazis, in dissolution, possessed no planes, tanks, armored cars or artillery. They boasted only knives and revolvers. There was in Germany the Stalinist Red Front, the Socialist Iron Front, the Republican organizations, all having arms at their disposal. *But Stalin's line was the decisive line within the German proletariat.* And so irresistible was the "strange" palsy issuing out of the inner sanctums of Stalinism, the Kremlin Palace, and affecting the entire German working class, that no resistance to the Fascists was attempted. The million Communist workers in Berlin, paralyzed by the Stalinist "leaders," did not lift a finger to defend the Karl Liebknecht House, the building housing the Rote Fahne and numerous workers' organizations. All was turned over by the Stalinist leaders to the astounded Hitlerites without a struggle; the Socialist leaders collaborated in the ignoble surrender and delivered to Hitler their organizations.

And with good reason did Stalin and the treacherous Social Democracy prevent a struggle against Fascism. The titanic German proletariat, once aroused, would have inflamed the whole of Europe.

The vicious enemy of the working class, the faker and hypocrite Wilhelm Pieck, loyal watchdog of the reactionary interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy, concealed the true reason for the paralyzing policy in Germany behind dexterously phrased fakes and anti-Marxist apologies:

"There are 'Left' also-revolutionists who come forward and maintain that the Communists should have commenced the struggle, regardless of the fact that such a struggle of the minority of the proletariat would have ended in defeat. These heroes of the pseudo-revolutionary phrase refuse to understand that this would have involved an even greater defeat and the total annihilation of the revolutionary cadres of the German proletariat." (Wilhelm Pieck, *Freedom, Peace and Bread*, p. 41)

It is absolutely improbable that the six million Communist workers would have been left in the lurch by the eight million Socialist workers in the struggle to stop the Fascist blight which threatened not only the Communists but also the Socialists, the trade unions and all other workers' organizations. Also, it is hardly probable that the struggle of the German proletariat would have ended in defeat. And even if the German workers would have been defeated, the Nazis would have paid for their

victory with a sea of their own blood, and the international bourgeoisie would have realized that attempts to spread Fascism was a sure way to transform Europe into ruins and destroy the bourgeoisie itself. Above all, no defeat could have demoralized the German workers as did this inglorious surrender.

In 1871, Marx, who was not a "'Left' also-revolutionist," was aware of the unfavorable position of the workers of Paris; yet he realized that capitulation without a struggle would have left the French workers demoralized for many years to come.

"The decisive unfavorable circumstances must be sought, not in the general conditions of French society, but in the presence of Prussians at the very gates of Paris. This the bourgeois scoundrels of Versailles knew. That is why they put before the Parisians the alternative: either to accept the provoked struggle or to capitulate without a fight. The demoralization of the working class which would ensue as a result of the second instance would be a greater misfortune than the loss of any number of leaders." (Marx, *Letter to Kugelmann*, April 17, 1871)

The workers of Paris, in far less advantageous circumstances than were their German brothers sixty-two years later, fought and went down in defeat. But the French bourgeois, though victorious, remembers the Commune of 1871 and fears the French proletariat. And one of the most glorious pages in the history of the struggle of the oppressed against their oppressors, an outstanding and deeply cherished tradition of the Paris Commune, is the inspiring example of the proletariat of Paris, surrounded by the armies of Thiers and Bismarck, heroically battling the superior forces of counter-revolution.

When the Moscow workers rose against Tzarism in December, 1905, and were defeated, Lenin hailed the heroism of the Russian proletariat, and spoke with contempt of Plekhanov's soulless "They should not have resorted to arms."

The Austrian Socialist workers, whose leaders allowed Fascism to grow and develop and arm itself, electrified the toiling masses everywhere, when, at the last minute, they made a valiant, though hopeless, attempt to stop the Fascists from seizing power.

In the Spanish civil war, the toilers, men and women, have been fighting against a veteran military machine of the Spanish generals. The heroism of the masses has uplifted the revolutionary spirit of the workers of all countries. Capitalism has shown

signs of anxiety and fear. Flashing their mind's eye back to the ignoble surrender of the German masses to Hitler, the Stalinist workers have vaguely surmised that something was wrong with the "Comintern" policies in Germany. The Stalinist leaders have sensed the condemnatory feeling of the workers. With verve and flourish, to prop the shaken confidence, the Stalinist leaders, since the whole truth about Germany has never come out, have ventured to state a tiny bit of truth:

"The tragedy of the working class was, when Hitler succeeded, without any resistance, to annihilate the working-class movement of Germany and establish his bloody regime. The bourgeoisie of the whole world looked at Germany intently, and is seeking to imitate Hitler. And why shouldn't they, if the thing can be accomplished with such ease." (Louis Hyman, *Freiheit*, September 8, 1936)

"This was the great disaster. The failure to put up a fight in Germany represented the very nadir of the working-class movement. At a blow it transformed the world situation and transferred the initiative to the capitalist side." (John Strachey, "The Fascist World Offensive," *New Masses*, December 22, 1936)

Yes, that was the tragedy. And that tragedy, engineered by Stalin to preserve and strengthen his stolen power and to shield his bureaucracy which wolfes the benefits of the October Revolution and in return sustains him in the position of dictator, was a "bloodless" tragedy. The destruction of the vanguard of the German proletariat, of the radical petty-bourgeoisie, of Jewish workers and petty-bourgeoisie, was carried out by the Hitlerites in a silent, "cold" manner, through mass arrests and slow torture in concentration camps and prisons, through the deprivation of the means of livelihood, with resultant hunger, disease and death.

The tragedy of the Spanish worker, on the other hand, is somewhat different. Having been insufficiently paralyzed by their opportunist leaders at the time Franco opened the Fascist offensive, they did not capitulate but, with resolute hearts, fought back bravely. They were, however, blinded ideologically and chained to the capitalist system through the Stalinist "People's Front." Caught between organized treachery directed by Stalin, and organized murder executed by Fascist butcher Franco, the Spanish toilers were slaughtered by tens of thousands, their mangled bodies littering the towns and highways.

The victory of the Russian toilers was due in no small part

to the fact that the Red Army was organized on the basis of universal military service. The resolute, energetic, class-conscious proletarian vanguard, placed in the thick of the backward, somewhat sluggish masses, imbued virtually the entire working class and the impoverished peasantry with the fiery spirit of freedom, made a formidable weapon against the bourgeoisie. The world gaped at the heroic exploits of the invincible Red Army. But in Spain the liberal-Socialist-Stalinist "People's Front" government sabotaged the resistance to the veteran troops of Franco and the army units of Hitler and Mussolini by narrowing the fight down to the basis of volunteer service—"military service is not obligatory" (Robert Minor, Spanish correspondent of the *Daily Worker*, January 7, 1937). Stalin understood the danger of introducing universal military service early in the civil war. To insure against the danger of proletarian power, it was necessary for Stalin to allow Franco to slaughter the picked proletarian vanguard, leaving the backward workers and peasants isolated and leaderless so that they could be handled with care if "democracy" is victorious. Later, when the Stalin-made, treacherous "People's Front" government, under the pressure of embittered workers, introduced a partial mobilization, it saw to it that the advanced workers did not disseminate political enlightenment among the raw recruits. It "forbade political activity on the part of the militiamen" (*The New York Times*, March 8, 1937). The international column, composed largely of class-conscious volunteers from France, and from England, America and other countries who arrived through France, has been bolstering-up the anti-capitalist morale of the militia and stimulating the political thinking of the toilers. But this bolstering-up of the proletarian class-consciousness of the Spanish workers was contrary to the Stalinist sabotaging plans. To deliver a blow to the revolutionary ideology of the Spanish masses, and to prevent the French and international working class from augmenting the stream of revolutionary volunteers who would help the Spanish toilers to destroy capitalism, the Stalinist agents in the Chamber of Deputies bluntly voted to grant the French government power to halt enlistments or transit of volunteers to Spain. The bill was passed "by a unanimous vote of 591" (*The New York Times*, January 16, 1937. My emphasis—G.M.). Everywhere the Stalinists discouraged enlistment of volunteers

for Spain. The petty-bourgeois Socialists in America, criminally concealing the treachery of their Socialist brothers and the Stalinists in Spain, never adopting a genuine Marxist-Leninist position for Soviets and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the only means of defeating Fascism, covered their opportunist line with the call for volunteers. When they were organizing the "Debs Column," the *Daily Worker* and the *New Masses*, meticulously executing secret orders from the Master in the Kremlin Palace, "refused to carry an advertisement for the 'Debs Column,' politely suggesting that other methods be used to organize help to Spain" (C. A. Hathaway, *Daily Worker*, January 22, 1937).

The workers' tragedy in Spain bared to the quaking world the essence of almost every opportunist current within the proletariat, and demonstrated the incontrovertibility of the correctness of Marxist-Leninist theories and principles. The old Marxist truth that Anarchism is a petty-bourgeois plague, proved as sound as ever. The profound accuracy of Lenin's thesis that Social Democracy, both Right and Left, is putrescent to the core, is perfidious and dastardly, serving only capitalism, was again emphatically and bloodily manifested. The baneful character of Trotsky's reactionary utopia of Bolshevizing Social Democracy, the fallaciousness of his fantastic, anti-Leninist view that Social Democracy breaks with the bourgeois State, with capitalism, were established beyond a doubt.

Bourgeois newspapermen and journalists often speak of two brands of Communism, the Stalin brand and the Trotsky brand. The truth is that there is neither a Stalin nor a Trotsky brand of Communism. Misleading also is the notion among workers who with loathing and rage turn away from crime-laden Stalinism, that, because Trotsky headed the opposition to Stalin and has borne the brunt of Stalin's frenzied persecutions, he represents the Leninist current today. The hounding of Trotsky by the Stalinist usurpers will continue under all circumstances. It is but the continuation of the conspiracy of 1923. Whether Trotsky adheres to the Second International or to the Fourth, whether he becomes apolitical, whether he lives or dies, he will be hounded by the Stalinists until the revolutionary proletariat puts an end to this ghastly game. Trotsky has become a visionary rather than remained a Marxist. In the Spanish situation, as previously in the German, Trotsky,

unwittingly, performed an excellent service for Stalin and therefore caused injury to the interests of the working class and to himself.

During the "Third Period" Trotsky's forces in Spain were much stronger than Stalin's. With his blurred outlook, Trotsky disoriented his followers by the policy of unification with the Stalinists, which unification, due to the nature of the political force of the bureaucratic distortion of the Soviet Union, could never be. When the Spanish revolution began, in 1931, Trotsky, instead of mercilessly exposing Stalinist conspirators and distorters, made a plea for the discontinuance of splits, i. e., a plea for halting the process of further centralization of Stalin's power. Laboring under this destructive illusion, Trotsky, with a naivete which is almost incredible, wrote a letter to Stalin and his clique in Moscow:

"The defeat of the Spanish revolution rendered inevitable by the further dismemberment and weakness of the Communists, will lead almost automatically to the establishment in Spain of genuine Fascism. . . . The profound *differences* on a series of questions pertaining to the U.S.S.R. and the world labor movement, should not stand in the way of making an *honest attempt* at a united front in the arena of the Spanish revolution. It is not yet too late! The policy of artificial splits must be stopped in Spain." (L. Trotsky, "A Letter to the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Bolsheviks," *The Militant*, July 4, 1931. My emphasis—G.M.)

Such was Trotsky's singular castle-building with respect to Stalinism. He completely failed to understand that Stalin was pursuing a planned purpose in the systematic, artificial splits, or rather purgings. If some workers sought a different leadership, Trotsky, with immense prestige as an organizer of the first successful proletarian revolution in history, riveted their searching minds on the Stalinist and their hopeful gaze on Stalin. Indicating that he was losing the conception of Bolshevism, Trotsky addressed the gang of usurpers and traitors as "Bolsheviks." Stalin and his bureaucrats, by now rotten to the core, were honored by Trotsky with the title "The Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

Indeed, foxy Stalin and his friends, watching with amazement Trotsky's naive tactics, could only smile. The strangling of Workers Democracy, destruction of Leninism within the Soviet Union and the Comintern, the decimation of the Left Oppo-

sition, the policy of defeat for the world proletariat, hypocrisy, distortions, and crimes were termed "differences" by Trotsky. Heedless of the palpable reality that despite his ceaseless and strenuous efforts to correct Stalinism, it steadily grew more putrid, more brutal, more treacherous and more power-hungry, Trotsky, instead of enlightening the workers to the fact that Stalin and his pirate clique long since forgot what revolutionary honesty is like, urged Stalin and his gang to make an *honest* effort at a united front. Trotsky never bothered to take a good peep behind the curtain of deceptive Stalinist phrases. Believing that the Stalinists are eager to push the world revolution forward and are only prevented from doing so by their inability and ignorance, Trotsky preached sermons to them and spurred them on with the cry "It is not yet too late!" Victim of his own false and delusive belief and persistent error, Trotsky imagined that the victory of the workers of Spain, if they were led by the Stalinists, was *guaranteed*—provided Stalin and his "stupid" underlings in Moscow did not spoil it all by their meddling interference.

"If the proletariat has already 'become conscious of its role of hegemony,' and the peasants have started to build Soviets, and all this is under the leadership of the official Communist Party, then the victory of the Spanish revolution must be considered guaranteed—at any rate, till the time when the Madrid 'executors' are accused by Stalin and Manuilsky of an incorrect application of the general line which, on the pages of *Pravda*, once more appears before us as general ignorance and general light-mindedness. Corrupted to the very marrow by their own policy, these 'leaders' are no longer capable of learning anything." (Leon Trotsky, *The Revolution in Spain*, p. 23)

Reality was bemocking Trotsky's conception of Stalinism.

Considering the knotty problems Stalin has been grappling with, the refashioning of the Comintern and the Soviet Union, the building of the bureaucratic pyramid and the preservation and extension of his personal power in its unbroken development, he has evinced astonishing farsightedness, cleverness and uncommon ability. His loud-mouthed satellites carried out his orders with him looking over their shoulders to see that they were carried out punctiliously. They worked with persistence and earnestness, and under his guidance his system was reaching a marvel of almost mechanical perfection. Making hardly any mistakes, they were learning rapidly and learning well how to protect their

bureaucratic pyramid with circumlocutory speeches, breezy resolutions, solemn orations, and very often with affected ignorance. But Trotsky saw things upside down. Stalin's Bolshevism, which had no existence in fact, lingered in Trotsky's fancy. Stalin's systematic, cautious, realistic and brutally "correct" general line of deflecting the proletarian revolution was to Trotsky "general ignorance and general lightmindedness." Instead of turning the spotlight of exposure into the darkest corners and crevices of the *conscious* and *deliberate* bureaucratic usurpation of power, Trotsky never stopped presenting Stalin's criminal machinations as "mistakes" from which Stalin and his bureaucrats were incapable of learning. "The leaders of the Comintern have learned nothing from their own mistakes." (*The Spanish Revolution in Danger*, p. 6).

Groping through the blinding mists of his own making, paradoxical and tragical though it was, *Trotsky worked for Stalin*. The Trotskyites deplored the fact that in Spain Stalin's influence was trivial:

"Then we learn that 'the workers of Spain are turning in masses to the revolutionary leadership of the Communist Party.' (D.W., 1-23-32). *Unfortunately* [My emphasis—G.M.], this big mouthful is miles distant from the truth." (Max Shachtman, *The Militant*, January 30, 1932)

Just about the time Shachtman wrote the above piece of lament, the German masses, "fortunately" were turning to the Stalinists for leadership. It was only because the German workers were not "mobilized in the united front movement," according to Max Shachtman (*Ten Years*, p. 4), that the Nazis succeeded in seizing hold of the German capitalist State.

The Stalinists dropped their "Third Period" and advanced their ultra-Rightist safety zigzag. The Trotskyites, scarcely pausing to analyze why their iridescent dream of correcting Stalinism never came true, were carried away by the beauty of another reverie and zigzagged to the Second International. Having become the "revolutionary" fig-leaf for the reactionary Social Democracy, particularly for its treacherous Left wing, they shaped their policies accordingly. Spain was driven as if by an irresistible fate towards a major proletarian upheaval. The ubiquitous Stalinists, viewing the developments with concern and alarming anticipation, were making ready to repeat their Ger-

man and Chinese experiences. And the Trotskyites, by spreading their misconceptions, indirectly helped Stalin to set the stage for the betrayal of the Spanish masses. In a book published two months before the Spanish civil war, Max Shachtman, basing his hollow reasoning upon Trotsky's superficial and false interpretations of Stalinist policies, assured the workers that—

"The Stalinists no longer have the slightest belief in the possibility of a socialist revolution breaking out in Europe in their time and coming to the decisive aid of now isolated Russia." (Introduction to Leon Trotsky's *The Third International After Lenin*, p. XII)

This pure hokum misleads those workers who have broken with Stalinism into imagining that the Stalinist bureaucrats are lacking belief in the possibility of revolution and therefore have merely *abandoned* the world revolution, whereas something altogether different and infinitely worse is true. Shachtman's muddle is an impediment in the path of the workers' thinking and prevents them from seeing things as they actually are. It helps the Stalinist bureaucrats to conceal their rôle as active and conscious disrupters of Socialist revolution, in the possibility of which these keen realists have a very strong belief. If they hadn't, capitalist Germany, in all likelihood, would have been transformed in 1932 or thereabouts into a workers' Germany—and so would old feudo-capitalist Spain have been in 1936.

Just about the time the civil war in Spain began, the Trotskyites published Trotsky's book *Whither France*, a conglomeration of "organic unity" fantasies and illusions about Stalinist "mistakes." In it Trotsky, with his mind wandering in an ideological wilderness, shows how remote he is from understanding Stalinism, how great is the distance he has travelled from Leninism, when he seriously speaks about the need of giving the Left Socialists a dose of Bolshevism (p. 109).

A couple of months later, Trotsky's article dealing with the Spanish events appeared in the *Socialist Appeal*, September 1936. In this article, for the first time in his entire political life, Trotsky altogether avoids the question of the political party for the Spanish workers—this in a revolutionary situation! Unbelievable yet true. Thus do proofs multiply that since Lenin's death Trotsky boarded the wrong boat which is carrying him to desert shores. History asks of the organizer of the October Insurrection, What should the Spanish workers do? Should they try once

more his old policy of correcting Stalin? Silence. Perhaps they ought to accept Trotsky's new policy and try to transform Social Democracy into a Bolshevik Party? Trotsky does not say. Or maybe they should proceed with building a new Communist Party of the future Fourth International? No advice from Trotsky. He talks in general about faith in the working class, about an alliance of workers, peasants and soldiers, the coming triumph of social revolution in Spain, but not a word about the concrete instrument of the revolution, a Bolshevik Party. Is it an accident that Trotsky, an old party man, ignores the question of a party for the workers? No, it is rather an indication of his political bankruptcy.

When Trotsky was still on the firm ground of Marxism he wrote clearly on the rôle of the party in proletarian revolution:

"Without the Party, independently of the Party, in an evasion of the Party, through a substitute for the Party the proletarian revolution can never triumph." (Leon Trotsky, *Lessons of October*)

Trotsky gave up correcting Stalinism, and there is already evidence that some day, after he passes the crest of his endeavors, he will abandon Leninizing Social Democracy. He is disgusted with both, the Stalinites and the Socialist leaders, because, as he sees it, not only do they not learn, but they refuse to learn:

"The articles appearing in *Populaire* and *l'Humanite* on the events in Spain fill one with rage and disgust. These people learn nothing. They do not want to learn." (Leon Trotsky, "The Lesson of Spain," *Socialist Appeal*, September 1936)

Strange, isn't it? History furnishes the Stalinist and Socialist leaders with valuable lessons. Trotsky takes upon himself the task of explaining these lessons to them. And the distressing result is that "These people learn nothing. They do not want to learn."

No, these people have learned a great deal! The decrepit, historically doomed Social Democracy and especially the villainous Stalinist bureaucracy have assimilated the lessons of history and learned to perfection the art of blocking and ditching the proletarian revolution.

But if Trotsky is silent on the question of the road to power for the Spanish workers, his hangers-on openly and shamelessly unfurl their opportunist flag. In an article entitled "How the Workers Can Win In Spain," the author, Felix Morrow, asserts:

"Fortunately for the world proletariat, Stalinism in Spain does not command the forces it held in leash in Germany—and precisely because the lessons of Germany have entered the consciousness of the Spanish proletariat." (*Socialist Appeal*, October 1, 1936)

It is an obvious fact that, *unfortunately* for the world proletariat, Stalinism in Spain *does* command the forces it held in leash in Germany. And it is absolutely false to say that the lessons of Germany have entered the consciousness of the Spanish or any other proletariat. *The very opposite is true.* Morrow's deceptive allegation tallies beautifully with Stalinist fakes and helps Stalin and his Piecks to continue concealing their accursed deed in Germany.

"Throughout the world the proletariat has learned from the defeat of the German proletariat." (Wilhelm Pieck, *The Communist*, February 1937)

Morrow does not hesitate to employ cheap sophisms and clumsy lies to rehabilitate the treacherous Socialist leaders before the toiling masses:

"Precisely because they had been so ideologically dependent on the Kautskys and Bauers, the fall of their teachers enabled the Spanish socialists to make an extraordinarily sharp break with their past. . . . With the Socialist Party ready to struggle, the fight against fascism was enormously facilitated, indeed it is not too much to say that only the leftward turn of the Socialist Party made possible, under the existing conditions, the victory over fascism. (This soothing opium was given the workers at the time when the Fascists were sweeping towards Madrid. The date under the introduction is September 22, 1936—G.M.) . . . In their partial struggle against the fascist menace, however, the Socialists acquitted themselves magnificently." (*The Civil War In Spain*, pp. 28, 29, 30)

In their past the Spanish Socialists protected private capitalist property. They systematically trampled upon the teachings of Marx and poured a continuous stream of powerful bourgeois propaganda into the minds of the toilers. There has now taken place, Morrow assures the workers, a deep-going cleavage between their past and their present. Is Morrow reporting the truth or is he peddling a contemptible fraud? Two weeks before Morrow wrote the introduction to his pamphlet, an outstanding Spanish Socialist, Juan Negrin, Finance Minister in the Caballero government, was reported to have declared:

"We are particularly interested in letting the United States know it need have no fear Spain will turn Communist and disregard her obligations.

"I would like to be an American millionaire with money invested in Spain," said the stocky, affable Minister who has visited the United States several times." (*The New York Times*, September 6, 1936)

Morrow displays before the workers the gnat but carefully conceals the camel. Certain it is that the opportunist past and the opportunist present of the Spanish Socialists, like the past and the present of all Socialist leaders since their open betrayal in August 1914, are basically interwoven, fitting solidly one into the other.

In the bitter and tragic situation for the Spanish and the world working class, the Trotskyites indulge in the clownish farce of attempting to invest the stinking corpse with the Marxist robe. Felix Morrow executes his part in a somewhat haphazard manner and without a balanced judgment. On some pages of his pamphlet he extols the Socialist Party as a whole. On other pages, vaguely conscious that his fraudulent argument might be challenged, he speaks exultingly only of the Socialist Left wing and resents the fact that the P.O.U.M. "refused to see the profound significance of the development of the left wing. In fact, in *La Batalla* of May 22nd, it denied that there was any real difference between the left and right wings" (*The Civil War in Spain*, p. 46).

Here is where the superb irony of the "French Turn" enters. No matter how many Red-hot words the Trotskyites mouth about the imaginary Leninist development of the Socialist Left wing, the unvarnished fact, stripped of all the empty trumpeting and ballyhoo is that during the ultra-Rightist turn of the Stalinites, particularly in times of a revolutionary crisis, the Left Socialists in one country after another are developing in a greater or lesser degree into Stalinist stooges. The Left Socialist paper, *Claridad*, Caballero's mouthpiece, which has won so much praise from Morrow (*Ibid.*, pp. 44, 45, 48 and especially 59), immeasurably facilitated the problem of strangling the Spanish proletariat by "recognizing" Stalinism as Leninism. Here is an excerpt from the message the Spanish Left Socialists, upon whom the struggling Trotskyites pin their hopes, sent to Earl Browder:

"We want to take this opportunity of extending revolutionary greetings to the C.P., U.S.A. and of conveying to you our deepest

hopes of soon reaching organic unity in a true Leninist way." (*Daily Worker*, September 16, 1936)

"Organic unity" in a Leninist way! Gone are the days of the genuine Comintern when Social Democracy, Right wing and Left (Two-and-a-half International), sensing its doom, evinced a lofty petty-bourgeois contempt for, and uncompromising hostility to, Bolshevism. Today, with nimble political insight into living reality, the shrewd Caballeros, having shed all doubt as to the counter-revolutionary nature of Stalinism, speak to the "Bolsheviks" with a satin-smooth tongue. Largo Caballero, in his demagogic message to Stalin and the Kremlin gang, virtually admitted that the leader in the betrayal in Spain is Stalinism disguised as Leninism:

"The history of your revolution lives in the minds of the Spanish workers and serves us as a guide in our struggle against Fascism in Spain." (*Daily Worker*, November 9, 1936)

The Trotskyites have rendered an extremely valuable service to Stalin by greatly lightening the task of whitewashing Social Democracy.

The preposterous position of the "French Turners" endlessly piles up for them complications and contradictions. The Trotskyites start out with resounding sophisms but life completely belies their positive assertions with respect to the Left Socialists. It demonstrates that the "Leftest" of the Left Socialists are an integral part of the decaying petty-bourgeois Social Democracy, and that after 1914 anyone holding membership in the Second International and serving it in any manner at all cannot be a true Marxist. When it can no longer be concealed that the Left Socialist Caballero is, in essence, a Stalinist stooge, Morrow takes cognizance of this fact, which lays open his vulgarisms and jugglery. Tearfully he complains that—

"One can no longer distinguish by a little the policy of Caballero from that of the Stalinists; he has fused with them completely." (Felix Morrow, *Socialist Appeal*, January, 1937)

Morrow's downright mockery of truth does not terminate with his cynical distortion of the rôle the Left Socialists are playing within the Second International. It only begins there. Little doubt that Morrow is aware of the fact that the Spanish proletariat is deluded, confused, hoodwinked and misled by the Stal-

inists, Socialists, Anarcho-Syndicalists; that the proletariat is not conscious of this fact. But Morrow, instead of lashing out mercilessly at the misleaders of the working class and helping the Spanish workers to cast off the terrible spell, aids the Stalinists and other ensnarers. He lulls the workers' vigilance with the reassurance that "the proletariat is in no mood to be hoodwinked" (*Socialist Appeal*, October 1, 1936).

Due to the Trotskyites' political position of predicament affording no escape from the realm of absurd fantasies, shallow reasoning, mental tricks and outright deception, Morrow still further thickens the smoke which obscures the Spanish situation by repeating the old Trotskyist harmful illusion with respect to Stalinism:

"The embattled workers' militia will get help from the international workingclass, and from it alone.

"But far from becoming more realistic, about this question, this key to the Spanish situation, the Stalinists *have lost their heads completely*. The false policy pursued by the Stalinists these four months has left them and the Spanish masses more isolated than ever. But the Stalinists *behave like men gone mad with desperation* and seize at non-existing straws." (*Socialist Appeal*, December 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

The above aggregation of empty sounds, superficiality and persistent childish twaddle about Stalinist "false" policies and "stupidity" once more proves to the hilt that, with respect to the task of explaining the essence of Stalinism, to the Trotskyites can be awarded the palm as the greatest confusers of the working class.

To draw a balance sheet:

Within the capitalist camp, from the Pope to the British imperialists, all joined in to assist the Spanish bourgeoisie in one way or another. Amidst plain, honest workers and confused idealists and dreamers who were not familiar with a single Marxist idea and therefore completely incapable of historical prognosis, there lurked treacherous pseudo-Marxists, betrayers of the proletariat. With absorbing energy the Stalinist and the Socialist leaders strove to establish a government capable of maintaining the capitalist order; and the Anarcho-Syndicalists, the P.O.U.M., the Trotskyites, each group and tendency in its own peculiar way, joined in aiding and abetting the Caballeros and Hernandezes.

The infernal Stalinist-Socialist team was directed through the

dominant political line within the Spanish proletariat, the line laid down at the "Seventh Congress" of the Stalintern, by the blackest Judas of all times, the ghoulish monster of treachery and crime, Joseph Stalin.

The tragedy of the German proletariat was not the result of the ultra-Leftist line of the Stalinites, although the Trotskyites and the Lovestoneites say it was. The tragedy of the Spanish toilers was not brought on by the ultra-Rightist line of the "Seventh Congress." The bloody defeats for the Spanish, the German and, earlier, the Chinese revolutions occurred as the logical and inevitable result of the dominant position of Stalinism within the international proletariat, and the complete absence of a genuine Marxist movement.

Over half a million Socialist, Stalinist and Anarcho-Syndicalist workers have been butchered by Franco—a destruction of a large portion of the flower of the Spanish proletariat. The workers sacrificed their vanguard not for the liberation of the toiling masses from capitalist slavery, but for the continuation of this slavery under bourgeois-democratic rule. And little did the women and children torn to pieces by Fascist bombs, trapped in blazing buildings and perishing in smoke and flames, and the workers in the trenches and those herded in bull rings and lined up against the walls of buildings to face Fascist machine-gunners and firing squads—little did all these victims realize before they died in terror and agony that the *real* assassin was thousands of miles away, in the Kremlin Palace, was the ruler of the first proletarian State. They, most of them, had never heard of the "Third Period," and they never understood that they had been caught in a masterly devised trap called the "People's Front."

In ancient Rome, the slaves in the arena were torn to pieces by lions and tigers, but it was the Roman masters who caused this frightful infamy. And in our times of decay of capitalism and the bureaucratic distortion of the first workers State, it is the usurper and traitor Stalin, to preserve the bureaucratic pyramid which sustains him in power, who cast the blinded and chloroformed victims, the workers and peasants of China, Germany, Ethiopia and Spain, to the Fascist tigers, Chiang Kai-shek, Hitler, Mussolini and Franco.

At this writing it is extremely difficult to assert positively what turn events will take in Spain. If a genuine Leninist party develops, then there is a possibility of a successful proletarian

revolution. If not, then Stalin will succeed in dissipating the revolutionary situation either through the "People's Front" after the defeat of Fascism, or through a rotten compromise with Fascism, or through a Fascist victory.

Over the mangled body of the Spanish revolution the Olgins and Harry Ganneses, to cover up their crime, will spill a sea of ink mixed with crocodile tears. Will they declare that their line in Spain was correct, that the line which held back the powerful French working class from rendering genuine assistance to their toiling brothers south of the Pyrenees, was correct? Without doubt. Already during the civil war one could read in their central poisonous sheet the following:

"It takes no microscope to discover the correctness of the position of Communist Parties of France and Spain." (*Daily Worker*, August 10, 1936)

And so, indeed, it was—meticulously *correct for the Stalin bureaucracy*. And the corrupt, usurping clique of vicious turn-coats, to perpetuate itself in power, is *plotting* a similar bestial crime at the next sharp turn of world history.

Is France next?

The line of the "Seventh Congress" has gained the upper hand within the French proletariat. Fascism is preparing to strike. Do the Stalinists know it, or are they unaware of the Fascist preparations?

"Everything indicates that the fascists are preparing for a putch, and are completing the arming of their storm-troops. *It is hoped* [My emphasis—G.M.] that the government will decide to act with all the necessary energy, and that it will not follow the terrible example of weakness shown by the Quiroga government in the months which preceded the uprising of the Spanish generals." (Paul Nizan, "French Fascists Seen Preparing for Putsch," *Daily Worker*, September 24, 1936)

When the counter-revolutionary storm breaks, the Stalinist betrayers will of course feign surprise, as they did in the case of China, Germany and Spain. And they will receive the objective support from all other opportunist currents of mixed motives, including Trotskyism and Lovestoneism. Lovestone has reached another low level in his work of demolishing Leninism. He is not only deceiving his followers with false promises of eventually succeeding in "correcting" incorrigible Stalinism; he has intro-

duced a new (with him) fake—the possibility of bringing the Social Democracy to adopt the Leninist course. When the Fascists invaded the proletarian stronghold, Clichy, a suburb of Paris, and massacred unarmed workers, Lovestone's paper, employing its double deception, misled the workers' minds into the channel of a deadly illusion:

"Clichy! Let it be an alarm, a ghastly warning, and a signal to change the course. Such a change the S.P. as well as the C.P. must make; then the militant united front of labor will be enhanced and a working class victory over Fascism in France will be insured." (*Workers Age*, editorial, March 27, 1937. My emphasis—G.M.)

To forestall betrayals as deadly as the previous ones, to arrest the advance of reaction and the repetition of the holocaust of 1914-1918, the revolutionary workers must act. They must set the proletariat straight with regard to Stalinism, Social Democracy, Trotskyism and other opportunist currents. They must begin organizing the Fourth International, *in a very real sense*. It is imperative to stop the Stalinists in their tracks. Else more and greater catastrophes are a foregone conclusion. To prolong its own life for another dozen years, the Stalinist bureaucracy will continue its gruesome game, which will widen the path of counter-revolutionary devastation. Hundreds of thousands of heroic workers, men, women and children, betrayed by the Thorezes, Cachins and Blums, will be torn to pieces by the Fascist tigers in the streets of Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, Toulon and other towns. Havoc, ruin and death will be stalking through the valleys and over the mountains of blood-drenched Europe. In the Fascist prisons and concentration camps tens of thousands of Stalinist and Socialist rank-and-filers and functionaries and even some high functionaries like Thaelmann will be buried alive; many will have their arms broken, and their eyes gouged out. The Fascist emblem will be carved in their living flesh. A permanent blood bath will be established in France, Germany, Austria, Spain and other capitalist countries, to make the extirpation of the proletarian vanguard thorough and complete.

And far away from the horrible carnage and the screams and agonized groans of the ensnared victims, in the former Palace of the Tzar, the originator of the "Third Period" and the "People's Front" government will be manufacturing plausible ex-

planations of the woeful spectacle and the searing blast of reaction. Experienced and neat-handed, the cold-blooded perpetrator of the most dreadful and outrageous crimes and horrors, renegade and usurper Stalin, through the mouths of his Dimitroffs and Piatnitskys, will console the tortured and bleeding international proletariat with some beautiful yarn about "Socialism has been permanently and irrevocably established in the Soviet Union." Cleverly-worded speeches and resolutions will conceal the fiendish crimes against the toiling masses. Stalin's rubber-stamp "Executive Committee of the Comintern," the set of rogues styling themselves "The Staff of the World Revolution" composed chiefly of "leaders" of the betrayed and decimated sections of the international working class, all the Bela Kuns, Kuusinens and Wilhelm Piecks who, in semi-retirement, are clustered in the Master's Court, will declare that "The line of the Comintern has proven correct."

To continue the work of perpetuating the bureaucratic control of the Soviet Union, new alliances with different imperialist powers will be engineered. And when the ultra-Rightist line of the "People's Front" becomes untenable, an elaborate ultra-Leftist line, a hangman's rope to dispose of the British and the American revolutionary workers, will be handed down to the Harry Pollits and Earl Browders.

TOWARD COMMUNISM OR BACK TO CAPITALISM?

IMPLICIT credulity, a German philosopher once said, is the mark of a feeble mind.

An honest thinking worker will not be misled by the optical illusion that the usurper Stalin and the Soviet Union are synonymous, that the bureaucratic leeches on the proletarian State are Communists. The Stalinites, through sheer necessity of deceiving the world proletariat and exploiting its love for the Soviet Union, and the bourgeois newspapers, out of ignorance or cleverness, foster this illusion.

A Marxist will understand that big harvests, the industrialization, material improvement in the condition of the masses in the Soviet Union are only one-tenth of the story. The other nine-tenths are infinitely more important than the first. In what direction is Stalin leading the Soviet Union, towards Communism or back to capitalism?

A man on a boat sailing down a river may run from starboard to port and back again but the *general direction* in which he is moving is downstream. Stalinist Left and Right zigzags run in one general direction. Stalinism is gradually liquidating the greatest revolution in the history of mankind.

Never mind *words*. Lenin warned repeatedly that one who believes *words* without a thorough and searching inquiry into *deeds* and *facts* is a hopeless idiot. Words are employed to state facts, but are also utilized to conceal the truth. Let one only examine the great historical lesson contained in the decline of the French upheaval in the Eighteenth Century.

Heated disputes took place in Europe and America among the sympathizers of the Revolution as to which way France was going after the revolutionary Jacobins, Robespierre, Couthon, St. Just and other Bolsheviks of those days, had been overthrown

by a wing of their own party. Very few understood. The majority "supported" the Revolution by siding first with the Thermidorian reaction, then with the Directory, afterwards with Napoleon. The restoration of the Bourbon reaction settled all arguments. By then a good many of the ardent "supporters" of the Great Revolution had passed away or grown cold and indifferent.

Each step in the retreat of the French Revolution from the day Robespierre fell was covered up by the degenerated Bolsheviks of the Eighteenth Century with beautiful revolutionary words, with blistering denunciations of reaction. Only years afterward, in retrospect, did it become clear that phrases were mere phrases, masking the opposite reality. One recalls that the revolutionary calendar was in use for *eleven years* after the 9th Thermidor, the starting point of retrogression, and was abolished by Napoleon only at the end of 1805. At some moments reaction gave the impression of going to the Left. The Thermidorians, for example, instituted a national festival commemorating the execution of the King. They crushed the insurrection of the royalist Chouans and Bretons.

Also, it would be well to remember that Emperor Napoleon himself had been an ardent sans-culotte. Having become dictator he wielded a bureaucracy composed largely of degenerated Jacobins, former members of Robespierre's party. After Waterloo, corrupted revolutionists eagerly served the restored Bourbons. The infamous arch-intriguer, Joseph Fouché, at one time a fiery revolutionist, a fanatical terrorist, an atheist far to the Left of Robespierre, became a Thermidorian, then police chief under Napoleon, and wound up as a minister of the Bourbon monarchy.

It is instructive to bear in mind that while the Revolution was being liquidated, material conditions improved in France. During the years of the Directory, shops were busy turning out supplies for the army, the bourgeoisie reaped big profits, wages rose. Under Napoleon the bourgeoisie amassed fortunes, the peasantry grew prosperous. The Bonapartist bureaucracy, rapidly swelling in numbers, acquired together with its position of power, immense prestige and considerable wealth.

But grossly in error were those who, allowing themselves to be misled by revolutionary phrases and glowing reports of material progress and astounding military might and glory, over-

looked the *decisive* question of political and social trends. Unconscious of the actual course of history, the ardent sympathizers of the Revolution greeted with utmost hostility anyone who asserted that reaction was overtaking France. So uplifted by the ideals of the Great Revolution were they that they drove away the painful, terrifying idea that a new reactionary tyranny was rising in the land of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity."

Despite the fact that revolutionary France conducted a war against reactionary Europe, the Revolution was being steadily done away with. Amid feudal surroundings it took twenty-one years—from the overthrow of Robespierre, through the Directory, the Consulate and the Empire, to the battle of Waterloo—to restore the rule of the aristocracy and the French tzars. Compared with the French Revolution, the October Revolution is a thousand times deeper and more thorough; it can be completely liquidated, phrases and all—barring a military overthrow—only after a long stretch of years.

One of the most observant bourgeois correspondents in the Soviet Union cannot help observing the striking points of similarity in the decline of both the French and the Bolshevik Revolutions:

"The French Revolution paralleled that of the Bolsheviks in at first being most extreme and in the existence of a desire to extend it to neighboring countries, but gradually, as the physical—that is military—power of France increased, the revolutionary phase became less marked, and finally may almost be said to have vanished when Robespierre was succeeded by the Directory. It is not unreasonable to suppose that a similar evolution has been occurring in Russia as the Bolshevik authority has grown stronger and more stable. The authority has been concerned in keeping and developing what it has had rather than in undertaking new adventures. One might say that Stalin's policies have followed national lines." (Walter Duranty, *The New York Times*, January 12, 1936)

The process leading towards the liquidation of the October Revolution and the abandonment of Marxist internationalism had its starting point under the cover of a million Communist phrases in 1923, marked by the defeat of the course towards Workers Democracy. The liquidation has been gradually gaining momentum. Surrounded by a steadily closing ring of Fascist States, the proletarian dictatorship in Russia will be facing an irrevocable doom if the international proletariat is not snapped

out of its Stalinist and Social-Democratic stupor, if it does not become conscious of the cruel situation.

The chief contradiction in the Soviet Union under Stalin is that along with economic progress there is a systematic political and social retrogression. The Stalinist bureaucrats, silent or "twisty" about the retrogression, shout from every housetop that the Soviet Union is entering, has entered, the state of Socialism. Facts belie their words. The great leaders of the proletariat, Marx (*Criticism of the Gotha Program*) and Lenin (*State and Revolution*), teach us that as society approaches Socialism the State gradually withers away, especially its repressive arm (prisons, G.P.U., etc.). Quite the opposite is taking place in the Soviet Union. As the power, at every new step, at each political convulsion, becomes more and more centralized within the narrow upper circle of the solid, bureaucratic excrescence upon the body of the proletariat, the Stalin clique, seeking provisions for its safety, exerts repeatedly and more vigorously its power of coercion to preserve the false equilibrium. Together with stifling bureaucratic impositions there is an intensification of repression, particularly against those who dare whisper of a policy for world revolution, against those who fail to shout with the flunkies "our greatest, wisest, beloved leader, Comrade Stalin."

To dim the Marxist viewpoint of the Russian proletariat and dull its feeling of internationalism, Stalin promotes a nationalist ideology. Stalinism is gradually stifling the Left writers and is popularizing the Right. Scholochov's reactionary novels have been spread in millions of copies; the book *Peter I* by Alexey Tolstoy, who in the first years of the Soviet republic showed open enmity to the proletarian revolution, is praised to the skies by the Stalinist "critics." The Moscow Theatrical Festival was opened on September 1, 1934, with the old Russian patriotic piece "Prince Igor." The reactionary diary of Mlle. Tiutchev, private lady-in-waiting to the horrible bitch, Empress Maria Alexandrovna, has been published by the Stalinists and is recommended to the workers. After October, in the wake of the struggle against superstition, "Hamlet" was produced without a ghost. Now the ghost has been reintroduced. Left composers are stifled and crushed (Shostakovitch). The monarchist composer, Glinka, whose patriotic opera "Life for the Tzar" in which the hero, a peasant, sacrifices his life for the tzar, and which thrilled the bloody Romanovs and the rabid anti-Semites and hangmen,

the Purishkeviches, Stolypins and Trepovs, is painted as a "different Glinka" and is widely popularized by the reactionary Stalinists ("The Creator of the Russian National Opera M. I. Glinka," *Pravda*, January 15, 1937).

The dark shadow of the orthodox religion grows darker as it lengthens over the Soviet Union. It is being "fought" with fewer and fewer phrases. The powerful Comintern radio station was a nightmare to the international bourgeoisie. It thundered across the border to the toilers and the oppressed to awaken and fight for liberation. Under Stalin, a different message is sent to the workers. On January 2, 1935, it broadcast the Negro spiritual "Steal Away to Jesus." What encouragement to the bourgeoisie! True, the distinct shock throughout the Soviet Union caused the Stalinist bureaucracy to "punish" those who allowed the broadcast. An accelerated tempo of retreat might cause explosions, a danger which the Stalinists perceive too well. Only unobserving minds fail to grasp that the bureaucracy itself assists in the spreading of religious opium. The usual Easter atheistic broadcast and atheistic demonstrations have been forbidden.

Steps backward are taken at brief intervals. For instance. The Young Communist League (Comsomol) adopted a new constitution:

"The original draft of the new constitution pledged the Comsomol to fight religion 'with merciless determination.' At Stalin's suggestion that a merciless fight was no longer needed, this was changed to 'patiently and thoroughly.'" (*The New York Times*, April 22, 1936)

Stalin concealed a purpose behind his suggestion. The retreat from the fight against religion with merciless determination is leading towards dislodgement of Marxist materialism and a vigorous advance of religion and superstition in general. Membership of the Militant Atheist League has declined from 5,000,000 in 1933 to less than 2,000,000 (*Izvestia*, March 10, 1937).

An Associated Press dispatch from Moscow stated:

"The Commissariat of Education recently closed five big anti-religious museums and halted the work of an anti-religious institute that had been instructing 3,000 students. Anti-religious work in thousands of villages has been discontinued.

"Izvestia declared clergymen, taking advantage of the new Constitution, which guarantees freedom of worship, were staging a rapid comeback to the extent of preparing their own candidates for the

forthcoming Russian elections." (*The New York Times*, March 11, 1937)

Young priests are being trained by the church. Easter 1935, reports from Moscow state, saw the churches crowded to overflowing—an unmistakable sign of reaction. They were filled for the greater part with members of the overthrown ruling classes. Something of the sort was observed during the recession of the French Revolution. "The signs of reaction daily became more unmistakable. Worshipers crowded to the churches; the *émigrés* returned by thousands." (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, article on the French Revolution)

How delighted the enemies of the proletarian revolution are can be gathered from the gleeful remark with which *The New York Times*, February 18, 1935, greeted the reversal of Leninist policies by Stalin:

"If in time of crisis Stalin needs the whole Russian people behind him, it is not beyond the agility of a realistic statesman to discover that religion is not an opium, but a cement."

Christmas 1935 marked another long stride towards reaction. The bourgeoisie, quite relieved of the fear of proletarian revolutions, reported the "advance" with ill-concealed joy:

"SOVIET IDEOLOGY TOTTERS! CHRISTMAS TREE RETURNS

"Revival is a Must Everywhere in Russia—Only It's Called New Year Symbol

"The long-standing Bolshevik antipathy to the Christmas tree ceded a point to-day when it was decided to revive the idea, but in the guise of a New Year ornament.

"Thus an exile of more than seventeen years will reappear, complete with trimmings, candies and toys, to delight Russian youngsters.

"Announcement of this notable Soviet concession was made in the newspapers, which called the tree 'the fir tree known before the revolution as the Christmas tree.'

"Managers of theatres, hotels, rooming houses, orphanages and clubs and directors of schools throughout the country were instructed to have trees ready for New Year's Eve.

"The interpretation of the tree as bourgeois was blamed on the Left-wingers by Paul Posticheff, member of the political bureau of the Communist Party, in a published statement. He said it was entirely wrong and that the decorated tree was thoroughly in keeping with Communist beliefs, as long as no religious meaning was given it." (*New York Post*, December 28, 1935)

The Christmas tree has become in keeping with Communist beliefs! Of course the rank-and-file was shocked, and was told to behave. A few days later an item appeared in another capitalist paper, showing "Communist" secretaries spreading superstition among the Communist youth:

"GRANDFATHER FROST TURNS THE TABLES
ON SOVIET REFORMER

"Latter Threatens to Expose Santa to His Party
Chief, Finds Chief is Santa.

"The thwarting of the effort of one earnest young member of the Comsomol (Young Communist League) to persuade a group of children gathered around a fir tree at a New Year's celebration that they were making a 'terrible ideological mistake' was reported today in 'Comsomolskaya Pravda,' official organ of the Young Communists. Just as 'Grandfather Frost' appeared in the window at the party held last night at Comsomol headquarters in one of the districts of Moscow and was explaining that presents were being 'brought by the wind' for all, one young man interrupted the proceedings and began to tell the assembled children the Russian equivalent of 'There isn't any Santa Claus.'

"All this celebration around fir trees, freely indulged in at Moscow last night for the first time since the revolution, meant, he said, that things were becoming 'sunk in the morass of opportunism.' After delivering a serious discourse on how trees were meant for serious uses, such as buildings, he ordered the children to go home. Some, according to 'Comsomolskaya Pravda,' appeared frightened and were about to obey, when the young reformer made a mistake. He turned to 'Grandfather Frost' and threatened to report him to the secretary of the local Comsomol committee. 'Grandfather Frost' jerked off his mask and revealed that he was the secretary.

"Incidentally, the fact that this incident was reported as a humorous feature in the official Comsomol newspaper is an indication both of the liberality with which the Soviet authorities looked on the merrymaking around the fir trees yesterday and of the fact that this reversal of precedent shocked many serious-minded individuals.

"The celebration at the Comsomol headquarters was one of many staged in Moscow last night with government approval. Lighted fir trees graced the parties of many semi-official groups, and it was rumored there was one at the Kremlin." (*New York Herald Tribune*, January 2, 1936)

The rumor that Stalin himself had a lighted Christmas tree in the Kremlin would never have been permitted to circulate if such a rumor had not been based on fact. The blasphemer would have been penalized severely.

Under a veil of "Communist" phrases, religion is receiving protection from the Stalinist clique:

"Soviet rulers of the theater rose up today against a poet, Demyan Bedny, because he ridiculed baptism in Russia in a new comic opera, 'The Titans.' (*New York Herald Tribune*, November 16, 1936)

Bourgeois customs are steadily becoming legalized:

"For the first time since the revolution the Soviet State has begun manufacturing wedding rings. . . . Thus the ancient symbol of bourgeois marriage has emerged like the Christmas tree from the bootleg stage." (*The New York Times*, November 18, 1936)

In their search to strengthen their grip upon the minds of the masses the reactionary Stalinist bureaucrats are developing a new religious opium infinitely more potent than the Christian, Jewish and other crude religions. Lenin, the revolutionist, has been transformed by the Stalinists into a supernatural Messiah. A magazine published in America by Browder's journalists, boasting of the progress "Leninist" education is making in the Soviet Union, describes this monstrous poisoning of the masses as follows:

"A great number of stories and legends of which Lenin is the hero sprang up among the numerous peoples of the Soviet Union . . . in the epic of the Eastern peoples of the Soviet Union he is a prophet, a holy man; a valiant knight (bogaty), who overcomes all kinds of obstacles and defeats various fantastic monsters. In Uzbek legend he appears as a knight who is born of the moon and stars, and whose arms are golden to the elbow. In Kirghiz legends he overpowers Satan with the aid of a magic ring . . . finally there are legends which depict Lenin as the rival of Allah in the creation and organization of the world." (*Soviet Russia Today*, January 1935)

The talented venal pens of the Olgin and Michael Gold variety, all the Michael Rogovs, by carrying this "indirect" subtle poison through the length and breadth of the Soviet Union, plant it stealthily in the heads of the workers and peasants.

In one legend Lenin is about to make a flight on the back of a swan to rouse the masses of the world. As his assistant, he, of course, takes along his "best disciple":

"And my old assistant will fly with me to rouse the working people, the peasant world. I shall take Comrade Stalin with me: his head is clear, his eye steady, and his arm firm and unflinching." (*Ibid.*, p. 5)

That is not exactly what Lenin said about Stalin in his last letter, or Testament, to the Party. But the job of Stalin's writers is not to spread the truth among the masses.

The enthusiastic welcome with a triumphant arch and special banquets accorded by Stalinists in Odessa to Italo Balbo, Mussolini's Minister of Aviation, and Teruce, chief of the Fascist militia, was never reported in the *Daily Worker*.

The New York Times on February 3, 1935, carried a news item: "Evening clothes are gaining amazing popularity in Soviet Russia," and over the Soviet radio, "The announcers urge the Russians to dress for the opera and theatre and give to the Soviet capital the brilliant appearance of other European centers. . . ."

There was never a refutation of this report in the *Daily Worker*. We know what "Russians" are meant in this dispatch. Not the teeming millions of workers and peasants whose modest means do not allow evening clothes and who, despite this reactionary propaganda, abhor the typical uniform of the grand bourgeois. No, it is the fat bureaucratic crust, the high-salaried, pot-bellied, bourgeoisified "Communists." They alone can afford and are developing the new tendency in the workers republic of keeping up with, and in the matter of sumptuous banquets in honor of representatives of capitalist governments, even getting ahead of, the resplendent parasitic Joneses of the bourgeois sections of Paris, London, Berlin and Vienna.

The bureaucracy is developing an appetite for bourgeois tinsel:

"A new jewelry shop was opened in Petrovka Street in Moscow. Ten thousand rubles was taken in the first hour of trading." (*Soviet Russia Today*, April 1936)

There are numerous manifestations to indicate that the bureaucracy headed by Stalin, having usurped the Soviet State, has degenerated beyond hope of recovery, and is crawling back towards capitalism:

"As superficial foreign observers put it, 'Moscow is going bourgeois.' That is to say, there are evident certain phenomena of comfort, or even luxury, which seem inconsistent with the spartan regime of the proletarian revolution.

"Henceforth, for instance, army officers will be no longer addressed as 'comrade commander,' which term was applied universally to all ranks, from lieutenant up to marshal, this last a revived title, now borne by five Soviet military leaders.

"Then, too, there is the resurgence of the idea of patriotism, as exemplified by the word 'rodina,' meaning homeland or birthplace, instead of the phrase 'Socialist Fatherland,' always used before.

"And there are private autos and comfortable apartments and high wage scales for men and women whose services to the State are greater than the average. There are manikin parades and silk stockings, lipsticks and cosmetics and jazz bands. . . ."

"It may be argued that this very differentiation of wages, and by consequence of rewards for service, must lead to new class differentiation in what claims to be a classless society. It looks like that to outsiders. It seems as if there were growing up a new military class of officers, a new class of bureaucrats and directors of state enterprises, a new class of high-paid upper workers, all of whom together will form or are forming a new bourgeoisie." (Walter Duranty, *The New York Times*, December 22, 1935)

And on November 8, 1936, when the thoughts and feelings of true revolutionists were with the embattled workers of Madrid—for this was the week when Franco's cutthroats opened the bombardment on the bleeding city; on the day when the memories of genuine Communists flashed back to November 7, 1917, the day when the workers of Petrograd overthrew the "Socialist" government of Russian imperialism, one could read in *The New York Times* rotogravure section, alongside of a corresponding photograph, the following:

"Soviet Russia takes another step toward the methods of the capitalist nations. Neckties of a gaudiness hitherto unknown in Moscow are displayed for the benefit of the people for 'Necktie Week,' ordered by the People's Commissariat of Home Trade to make Russia 'necktie conscious.'"

Nevertheless in its course towards the restoration of capitalism, the bureaucratic distortion watches its step. It moves neither too fast nor too slow, at a rate of speed sufficient for the masses to reconcile themselves to the measured quantity of reaction introduced at brief intervals. People who dare to make an effort to refuse to go along, especially those who dare whisper of going back to the Leninist days of Workers Democracy, are brutally crushed as "counter-revolutionists," enemies of "Socialism." The reactionary elements, thousands of degenerated Bolsheviks, the former White Guards, Social Revolutionists, Mensheviks, and the pampered thousands from among the millions of workers and peasants, in fine, the elements composing

the Stalinist hierarchy must be in step with, and never attempt to race ahead of, Stalin and his closest associates. Too rapid a tempo of retreat might create immense danger from the Left, with the possibility of the workers rising against the peril of the restoration of capitalism. Infraction of the tempo set by Stalin is punished by expulsion from the "Party," imprisonment, and even execution. But counter-revolution that marches in step with Stalin, that is willing to stride along patiently, is rewarded. It partakes of the immense aggregation of well-paid bureaucratic positions and posts, and is accorded power and privileges.

There are hopeful signs on every side for the counter-revolutionary elements. Under the guidance of the new engineer, Stalin, the Soviet train of history is taking them back to the "dear old spots" from which the old engineer, Lenin, had carried them away. Here are familiar signposts. The return of traditional respect for the bourgeois family, with the formerly stern Stalin becoming a smiling "Papa Stalin," fondling kids. An unmistakable sign of "Socialism," the trend back to bourgeois individualism, is the reintroduction of individual kitchens. The communal kitchens and dining-rooms have suddenly become a "consequence of the Leftist attempt artificially to introduce communal living" (*Pravda*, February 20, 1936).

Abolition of marks of social class distinction used against the children of the former Tzarist aristocracy and Kulaks (Decree by Stalin and Molotov, *The New York Times*, September 5, 1935). Restoration of "the old-fashioned schoolmaster with complete and undisputed authority" (*New York Herald Tribune*, July 6, 1936). Granting rights of private ownership of land to groups of peasants in the collectives. The smothering of the Leninist spirit of self-abnegation; the revival of the Tzarist custom of rewarding loyal subjects with gold watches and autographed portraits of the ruler (*The New York Times*, December 7, 1935). The dissolution of the Society of Old Bolsheviks. "A special concession has been made by which Church buildings are RENT-FREE" ("Religion and the Soviet Union," *The 12th A.D. News*, December 29, 1936. Published by the Communist Party in the 12th Assembly District). The issuance of new silver coins without "For the World Revolution," a slogan repugnant to every Russian nationalist (*The New York Times*, January 27, 1936).

It's a long journey for the counter-revolution, but the direction is unmistakable, and patience will be rewarded. Every mile closer and closer to the materialization of the "great ideal," to "Socialism."

Reaction must entrust the whole thing to Stalin. To "Our great Stalin, our beloved Stalin, our darling Stalin." "His head is clear, his eye steady and his arm firm and unflinching."

There must have been many an eye moist among the octogenarian reactionary cossacks when the cossack uniforms worn under the Tzar were restored by Stalin (*The New York Times*, March 21, 1936). What could they say to one another but, Patience, old-timers, *everything* will be restored!

The rabid monarchist sheet of the Young Russians, *Bodrost* (Firmness of Spirit), observed with barely concealed joy:

"The convalescence of Russia, the first symptoms of which we pointed out years ago, is proceeding apace with every new day. In this convalescence is the pledge of our victory." (*Bodrost*, No. 37)

But the opportunists and hangers-on around the Stalinist clique hide all the painful facts. With their scintillating loquacity they club the masses insensible to the principal points in the tremendous tragedy of post-Leninist reaction. In an article on the Soviet Union, Olgin exclaims ecstatically:

"If Lenin could see these gigantic factories, these colossal plants, these modernized coal mines, these breath-taking combines of mass production units in every corner of the great country, he would have the right to say to himself that the general plan for industrialization was his prime concern. . . . Ah, if Lenin could see." ("If Lenin Could See," *Soviet Russia Today*, January 1936)

It seems that hypocrisy with Olgin is a passion. Olgin read Marx. He read Lenin. He knows full well that Marx analyzed not merely machines, but the correlations of the economic system, class relations, political superstructures, ideology, etc. Steam-driven machinery, railroads, electric telegraph are not the sole characteristics of the capitalist system. Lenin, besides seeing colossal "progress" under imperialism—radio, aviation, etc.—saw murderous exploitation of colonial slaves, a struggle for redivision of the earth—facts covered up by the hypocritical opportunists within the labor movement.

Olgin, himself a particle of the crushing evil, carefully *conceals* the true social, political and economic relations in the

Soviet Union. The cardinal fact of the existence of the Stalinist bureaucratic pyramid is not mentioned in his writings. Like all Stalinist journalists, he completely passed it by. One cannot glean the cruel truth from his speeches and articles, just as one cannot discover in the speeches of Roosevelt that American society is based on wage slavery. Dnieprostroy, the Moscow subway, Avtostroy and Magnitogorsk do not utter a sound about the Soviet bureaucracy, just as the Empire State Building, the George Washington Bridge and Muscle Shoals are mum about the American bourgeoisie.

If a worker asked Olgin, What of the bureaucracy one hears so much about? Olgin, true to his shameful profession, would refer the worker to some of the millions of hypocritical phrases, his own included, about the "Party" under Stalin carrying out a struggle against the "danger" of bureaucratism:

"He [Trotsky] is supposed to be against 'bureaucratism' [Olgin puts quotation marks around the word bureaucratism to make his reader feel that it is rather ridiculous to speak of such a monstrosity existing in a Stalinist organization] in the Party and in the State apparatus—a *danger* which the Party and the Soviet State themselves fight against and mitigate, and which he, Trotsky, *exaggerates a million times.*" (*Trotskyism*, p. 155. My emphasis—G.M.)

The plants are colossal, true enough. The mines are modernized. Production is gaining. But the economic and social relations among the various classes, the proletariat, the peasantry, the former landowners, the former bourgeoisie, the village bourgeoisie (Kulaks), and the privileged bureaucracy, drawn from all these classes, are decisive in the question *Towards Communism or back to capitalism.*

What are these relations today in the Soviet Union? Is there developing a classless society? Or will there crystallize a class—the bourgeoisie—which will garner the fruits of the workers' toil? The form and content of Soviet industry and class relations are transitional. But in what direction is the transition? Has Stalin's decree that workers must not interfere in management been rescinded, or carried out to the fullest extent? What voice have workers in the questions of internal and external policies of the Soviet Union? Why is there such conspicuous absence of differences with Stalin *on any question* among the 173 million Soviet citizens?

Bare figures of industrial expansion do not answer these questions. Olgin is wisely keeping mum. But it is clear why. Because the bureaucratic distortion holds its iron fist ready to shatter the skull of any worker questioning the wisdom and correctness of the chief bureaucrat's policies. Because workers inner-Party and inner-Soviet democracy was eliminated with the crushing of the Left Opposition. Because deception, hypocrisy, compulsory public adulation of the "leader," are raging in the Soviet Union today.

Was it so under Lenin? Just the opposite. Lenin welcomed criticism, because he was anxious to explain, justify, and receive intelligent and honest support in every step he proposed for the proletariat. There was no threat of prison hanging over the head of the man who dared to question the correctness of Lenin's policy or statements.

What is the meaning of the steady displacement of proletarian ideology with bourgeois ideology taking place in the Soviet Union?

The excuse for the Christmas tree by the degenerated Postichiefs and, of course, by the Olgins, is that it is "in keeping with Communist beliefs." Olgin knows, as does everyone who has studied Marxism, that *ideology* does not originate or exist in a vacuum. Ideology is rooted in the method of production and exchange of a given historical period. Capitalist economy gives rise to two ideologies: bourgeois and proletarian (Marxist). Bourgeois ideology rests upon the pillars of private property in industry and exploitation and repression of the proletariat. Marxian ideology bases itself upon the struggle of the proletariat for its emancipation from capitalist slavery, abolition of private ownership in industry, nationalization, and finally, *internationalization* of all the forces of production. The creation of an ideology "combining" these two *irreconcilable* views is, in effect, capitulation to the bourgeoisie. Deviation from Marxist ideology means strengthening bourgeois ideology.

"... the only choice is: Either bourgeois, or Socialist ideology. There is no middle course (for humanity has not created a 'third' ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or above-class ideology). Hence, to belittle Socialist ideology *in any way, to deviate from it in the slightest degree* means strengthening bourgeois ideology." (Lenin, *What's To Be Done*, p. 123. Emphasis in the original)

The capitalist restorationist forces in the Soviet Union operate through a contradictory process, moving backward from the dictatorship of the proletariat and nationalized economy. The bourgeois ideology, which is returning due to the capitulatory line of Stalin in respect to the international bourgeoisie, is somewhat ahead of economic reversion. The propensity to acquire and possess, to imitate the Western bourgeois in more than mere attire and custom, is growing among the bourgeoisified "Communists" in the Soviet Union, hammering at the walls of nationalized economy. The bureaucratic caste has acquired full sway over State property, but has not yet crossed the Rubicon of transforming its top layer into direct private owners of shops and factories. Controlling the source of wealth, it is amassing private property in the form of bonds, bank deposits, jewels, automobiles, houses. But the bourgeoisification of the family in the Soviet Union has an unmistakable meaning. It is the expression of the bureaucrat's craving to hand down his privileges to his offspring. Dreadfully clear is the destination toward which the Soviet bureaucracy is dragging the great workers State. No understanding of the coming occurrences is possible without knowledge of the past. Somber shadows are cast by grave events to come. And if the gloomy dusk of capitalist ideology, traditions and predilections, creeps on, can the black night of bourgeois property relations be many years behind?

"If Lenin could see," says sly Olgin, knowing full well that Lenin cannot see.

If miracles were possible and Lenin brought back to life, he would stare at the strange doings and rub his eyes in dismay and amazement. The resolution on *Workers Democracy*, adopted during his life, has been swept into the limbo of "forgotten" words. The bureaucratic distortion which Lenin sought to smother in its embryo has been elevated to the dignity of a "Marxist" principle. The man whom the comrades were advised to remove from the key position of General Secretary now holds the Soviet State and the Comintern in the hollow of his hand, his iron boot on the throat of the Russian proletariat. Bolshevism is disfigured beyond recognition. The well of Marxism has been dried-up by a horde of pseudo-Marxists. Lenin's banner has been stolen by people disloyal to the cause of the toiling masses. Many of his important writings and virtually all documents pertaining to the organizing of the October uprising have been

suppressed. The annals of the eventful years of the Party are unknown to the growing generation. The Party press and the output of literature are directed, in the main, by former members of the Menshevik, S.R., and even Cadet Parties. A system of organized lying and refined hypocrisy has been established, the masses receiving from their deceivers a daily ration of ideological poison. All voices of criticism have been horribly stifled. The workers republic is tyranny-ridden by repulsive bureaucratic prigs who control all thought and opinion. Most of his old comrades, the heroic figures of October and of the founding years of the Soviet Republic, have been humiliated and defamed, scattered to the winds, ground into dust by the traitor Stalin. Indomitable spirits of the proletarian cause, under Stalin's barbarous persecution, have been transformed into broken outcasts, have been driven to suicide, condemned to slow, horrible deaths in bleak exile in the polar regions. The brutal Stalin, drunk with unlimited personal power, has forced distinguished Marxists into political prostitution, has driven tens of thousands of Bolsheviks, rank-and-file and leaders, to political suicide. Men and women, for their "sin" of having been previously opposed to Stalin's rise to personal power, have been seized in the hush of night, in the darkness of secrecy, and without trial, defamed and dishonored, have been carried off by Stalin's bloodhounds and are now pining in black holes, in penal settlements, their ideal—*Lenin's ideal*—mutilated, hopes blasted. Hounded to their doom, they are succumbing to consumption and other plagues—going down to untimely graves.

Lenin would be amazed to discover that Stalin has been evolved to a cult. There is no end to the number of streets, squares, parks, homes, shops, boats and what-not named after Stalin. During Lenin's life there was not a single town in the Soviet Union bearing the name of the founder of the workers republic. Lenin detested any glorification of his person. Petrograd was named Leningrad after the leader had passed away. Now, under the bureaucratic centralization, there are towns and cities distinguished by the name of Stalin: Stalingrad, Stalinabad, Stalin, Stalinogorsk, Stalino, Stalin-Aoul, and others. Lenin would be amused to learn that the next to the highest mountain in the Soviet Union is now *Mount Lenin*, but the highest is *Mount Stalin*.

Lenin would excavate the buried record of Stalin's history from 1923, the year when, urged on by a satanic lust for power, the apostate launched upon his criminal career. With profound horror Lenin would scrutinize Stalin's dark and bloody counter-revolutionary path strewn with a million corpses of Chinese, Bulgarian, Polish, German and Spanish proletarians, a path of ruin, destruction and death for the world revolutionary movement—Stalin's path to unlimited personal domination.

Better than anyone else Lenin would understand the full meaning of the twist in Stalin's mind, exemplified, among other things, by the burial of the remains of his wife, Alleluva, in the churchyard of the Tzarist aristocracy among the "noble virgins" of the most depraved and bloodthirsty class in old Russia.

Lenin would be treated to the revolting spectacle of the traitor-paramount surrounded by officialdom, legates, ignoble lickspittles, aspirants for fat jobs, ruthless fortune-hunters, bone-hungry dogs, jostling one another with increasing avarice for a better spot at the bureaucratic trough, all in chorus singing hymns of fulsome adulation and flattery to the "comrade" on the pinnacle of the pyramid.

Lenin would witness the development of a social parasite, the idle wives of the leading engineers, directors and executives. Having at their service maids, cooks, butlers, chauffeurs, nurses and other "help," rolling in relative luxury and oppressed by ennui, they are following the example of the idle bourgeois ladies of the capitalist world and to refresh their stale lives are taking to social work (*The New York Times*, May 9, 1936). They even held a conference. Enacting one of the most disgusting scenes since Lenin died, they, in the spirit of "Communism," passed a paper resolution, to cover up this reactionary hideousness, to include wives of the workers in their organization—those wives of the workers "who have time for it," in other words, women of leisure:

"Steps were taken today to expand the volunteer work of wives of industrial executives in improving living conditions and brightening factory communities into a mass movement of all Soviet women who have time for it.

"At the closing session of the first all-union conference of engineers' wives in the Kremlin it was decided not to limit the organization to wives of executives but to include the wives of all workers. An appeal

incorporating this decision was addressed to women generally." (*The New York Times*, May 14, 1936)

The social function of the proletariat is slowly being pushed into the background. The gradually maturing bureaucratic parasitism is assuming more and more the leading role:

"Soviet women, especially the wives of engineers and technicians, are playing a large part in making the Workers' Republic a better place in which to live." (*Daily Worker*, June 5, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

And if Lenin read in Browder's paper the Moscow dispatch evaluating the conference, he would shudder at the impudence of the Stalinist falsifiers:

"Lenin's great idea that 'every cook must learn to govern' was brought to life in the extraordinary significant all-union conference of wives of the leading personnel in heavy industry which closed last night in the Kremlin Palace." (Sender Garlin, *Daily Worker*, May 14, 1936)

The cooks in the Soviet Union have long since abandoned all hope of governing. As to the wives of executives, they have long since abandoned cooking. The great thesis of "control from below" (Lenin, *Soviets at Work*) has long since been suppressed and reversed by the usurping clique (Stalin's decree of non-interference of workers in the management of industry, September 1929). In Lenin's time the proletariat and the peasantry were organizing into a thousand and one organizations while the bureaucracy was dispersed, with no political and economic power, which power since Lenin's death it has usurped and wields exclusively in its own interests. Today the bureaucracy is strongly organizing itself, while hypocritically extending a cordial invitation from above to those working women "who have time for it" to join in.

Lenin in his day was accustomed to meeting distorters of various shades and calibre. Reading Sender Garlin's dispatch Lenin would conclude that for vicious lying, low level of debasement, cynical perversion and black treachery, the journalists of Stalinism are unrivaled.

Lenin would observe another shocking relapse in the land of the greatest social revolution in history.

The Russian working woman under capitalism was a virtual serf. She was oppressed by the double-standard of morals and

tied to innumerable duties and obligations imposed upon her by the ruling classes. Her prime function in the scheme of things was to produce soldiers for the Tzar and wage slaves for the capitalists. In this sphere of her private life she was shackled by limitations, restrictions and coercions. The Tzar and the bourgeoisie demanded that her offspring be born within the "law," besetting her with cruel persecution if she bore an "illegitimate" child; at the same time the "law" prohibited abortions and other preventive means. And what with her pots and dishes and shopping, her mending and washing and scrubbing, her large family, pregnancies and nursing of her infants, this benighted drudge in her hopeless thralldom had no time for study and enlightenment, for social life, for politics.

Came the great October Revolution. With one mighty blow it smashed the age-long fetters that bound the Russian working woman. She was emancipated from the hoops of bourgeois conventionalities and oppression. She became the equal of the man worker, and both stood as the rulers of the new, Soviet Russia.

Throughout the entire world the class-conscious workers of both sexes hailed with enthusiasm the glorious achievement of the proletarian revolution. Fondly hoping for the day of universal liberation, they passionately applauded the rational, humane revolutionary measures, including the removal of the ban on abortions.

Came this dark, forbidding force, the Stalinist reaction. On May 25, 1936 it made public the draft of a new law which prohibits abortions and establishes State premiums for large families.

People who do not probe deep below the surface of all outward manifestations of Stalin's acts, readily accept the absurd idea that the new move is of military purport. Nothing is further from reality. If the population of the Soviet Union were diminishing or becoming stagnant, military considerations would assume a shade of plausibility. The fact is that the population of the Soviet Union has shown tremendous growth in recent years. Despite freedom of abortions, the annual increase has been between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000:

"The population of the Soviet Union is increasing at a faster rate than that of any other great power in the world, and probably than that of any other people. The Soviet population of 173,000,000 is growing at a pace—the net increase of births over deaths is esti-

mated at 4,000,000 for 1935...." (*The New York Times*, August 30, 1936)

To one who sees Stalinism at close range, who is not blinded by its pompous verbiage, who grasps that Stalin's usurpation of power and his policies are phenomena *inseparably* connected with one another, the purpose of this move is plain. The Stalinist clique, to safeguard its brutal overlordship in the Soviet Union, is ever devising ways and means to reduce the proletarian danger, a standing threat to its high-handed régime. The executive committee of the bureaucratic distortion bends its efforts to absorb the workers' mind in everyday routine and tedium, thus drawing them away further and further from political thinking. It is impossible to mistake the intent of the stratagem. It is aimed to steal *time* from the working woman. To burden her with many children. To drive her steadily back to where she was in the pre-October days.

Let her have a baby in her arms, one in her womb, and two tugging at her skirt. That will make her forget such questions as the world revolution. And her hardships will help direct her hopes for relief from the government premiums, and she will bear three or four more kids.

Let her withdraw from the shops and factories. She is quite often more outspoken in criticising the state of affairs than men-workers are. She even dares sometimes to do some "counter-revolutionary" whispering about Comrade Stalin's policies. Let her stay at home and take care of her large family and her kitchen work.

Her husband, too, will be chained by this shrewd device. He will spend his spare hours, after a day's work, rocking the kids to sleep and helping with the mop and the dish towel, instead of attempting to disentangle his mind and find out things for himself. He must have heard years back something about Lenin telling somewhere of the necessity to remove Stalin. Perhaps he is puzzled as to what brought the great and promising labor movement of Germany to such a tragic collapse. He might take it into his head to examine in the light of Lenin's teachings (perish the thought!) the policies laid down for the workers of Spain, France and the rest of the capitalist countries. It is necessary to occupy his mind with other matters.

The intolerable ban is a telling blow to the Russian and the

world proletariat. It will open the way for the return of all the sex horrors of capitalist Russia. Prostitution, celibacy, genital disorders, sex hunger will grow rapidly. But the bureaucratic centralism of the Soviet Union and Stalin's despotic exercise of personal power will become more secure.

Naturally no self-respecting working woman will submit to Stalin's barbarous and oppressive "law." Deprived of the anti-septic facilities of State hospitals and physicians, she will resort to quacks. Although injuries to health and deaths from abortions will rise sharply, the Soviet working woman will not yield to the brutal Stalinists. And the Stalinist clique knows it and provides a punishment:

"Women who undergo the operation *willingly* are *publicly censured*." (*Daily Worker*, May 28, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

Experience has shown that the Stalinist gang gives no quarter. The sharp eyes of its snoopers and informers and the acid tongues of its virulent flunkies will do their work. The proletarian woman of the Soviet Union will be pilloried by the black renegade, Stalin. She will be spat upon and vilified *publicly* by the speakers and editors of the Stalinist Order; she will be ostracized, cast out from all human fellowship. Moreover, the Stalinist reaction brings to bear economic pressure against the violators of its "law" and extorts fines from the working woman, to deprive its victim of her bread if she dares to resort to abortion.

Every degenerate in the Stalinist, every intellectual pervert, from Wilhelm Pieck to Michael Gold, supports the bureaucratic oppression and suppression of the Soviet working woman; every one of them from Stalin down participates in the rape of her soul. "Publicly censured"! How much brutality, ruthlessness, *medievalism* these cold-blooded Stalinist words contain! And, as ever, rhetoric is brought into play to prove that black is Red. The hypocritical *Daily Worker* in the July 3, 1936 issue, assures the reader that "the larger the population the greater will be the well-being of all."

When Stalin's gang of Judases led the masses of Germany towards their Golgotha, every step which aroused the alarm and anxiety of the workers was masked with "criticism." In an identically insidious manner, each jar in the journey back to the bourgeois régime is "criticised" by the Stalinist reaction.

One reads in *Izvestia*, July 11, 1936, about a bureaucrat, Korovatski, member of the Young Communist League (Komsomol) and director of a school, firing the janitress because she gave birth to an "illegitimate" child. "A woman who has an illegitimate child," declared this bureaucratic bloodsucker, "cannot work in a Soviet school." *Izvestia* reports the event in tones of "criticism."

Some simpleton, lending himself to Stalin's wiles and trickery, might imagine that the workers in the Soviet Union are still a privileged section of the population. True, he will say, they are compelled now to rear large families, but they receive prior attention from the State in the form of nurseries, children's camps, rest houses, hospitals, entertainment and so forth. Such a simpleton's mind is clinging to the Leninist bright yesterday, failing to perceive the Stalinist murky today.

"An interesting 'sign of the times' is an inconspicuous notice issued today by the Central Council of Labor Unions stating that the privileges hitherto enjoyed by workers in the price and priority of tickets for holiday visits to rest houses, sanatoria and seaside and country resorts would henceforth be abolished." (*The New York Times*, July 3, 1936)

"Equality" is being established in the Soviet Union. A worker who gets 200 rubles a month is now the "equal" of the bureaucrat who is hogging 2,000. With respect to prices and access to commodities and public institutions, the workers are being given an opportunity (?) "equal" to that of the pampered bureaucrats.

Less than a year after Stalin's oppressive law was put into effect, one could form an idea of its workings:

"Now the birth rate is rising in all urban centers, but the health organizations have failed almost completely in the program to provide beds, doctors and nurses for child-bearing mothers. . . .

"Hundreds of midwives have been sentenced to long terms for illegal operations. Eighteen women got terms of from one to ten years in prison in a single case recently in Kharkof. Bootleg operations continue but at prices far beyond the reach of the *common people*. (My emphasis—G.M.) The bounties and decline in cost of living, promised at the time of the passage of the decree, have not wholly materialized. Instead of declining, the cost of living advanced about 10 per cent in the Soviet Union in 1936." (*The New York Times*, March 7, 1937)

On the one hand the iron fist of punishment. On the other, prevalence of abortions but within the reach of only the wealthy bureaucracy, not of the "socialist" *common people*. And the rising cost of living exposes the hypocrisy of the *Daily Worker* and shows that "the well-being of all" is not a question of the rise or fall of the population, but of a social system under which the people live.

Having warped the workers State out of countenance, the bureaucratic distortion is systematically curtailing the workers' privileges and appropriating them for itself. It is gorging a disproportionate share of milk and eggs and meat and clothing and best apartments and medical care and balmy air and sunshine. Stalin's bureaucratic "Socialism" is creating luxury in the top layers of the officialdom and drudgery in the basic strata of the toilers. Observing the dismal reality, Lenin would conclude that well may the workers in the Soviet Union reverse the words of the *Internationale*, "We have been naught we shall be all" and sing "We have been all we shall be naught."

Lenin would throw a piercing spotlight upon the crimes of that monstrosity which at one time was the powerful engine of the world revolution, now transformed into the direct opposite, still going, however, under the usurped name of the Communist International. He would show how it tramples and crushes everything that a true Marxist holds dear. In his lucid way he would prove even to the most backward workers in the Stalinist "International" that the struggle for the emancipation of the oppressed and enslaved masses has not merely been abandoned—criminal enough—but is actually, with great subtlety and consistency, sabotaged and effectively prevented. And the Stalintern, draped in the stolen traditions of October, backed by the unlimited resources of an immense proletarian State which is misdirected by the Stalinist reaction, is operating as the *chief* disrupting and paralyzing force within the international proletariat—this function being the main reason for its existence. Capitalism, Lenin would indicate, is rotten-ripe for its overthrow, much more so than in 1917. The suffering of the toiling masses and of the oppressed peoples, the Jews, the Negroes, the Chinese, is intense, is tragic. Bourgeois exploitation is growing more brutal. But due *primarily* to Stalinism, the Hitlers, Mussolinis, Roosevelts and Blums have their hands free and are aided by it to preserve the capitalist system through

"democracy" or Fascism. He would point out that Stalinism, guided *only* by its narrow bureaucratic interests, while reeling towards its own grave, is dragging along on an iron chain the Soviet Union and the labor movement of the present epoch into the horrific nightmare of universal Fascism. He would state openly that Stalin's strangulating fingers on the nervous system of the proletariat doom in advance every effort on the part of the workers and the colonial slaves to free themselves from their master and blood-sucker, the imperialist bourgeoisie; and if Stalinism is not removed, then the first proletarian republic will be transformed into a heap of benighted ruins under which will lie buried the most sanguine hopes of the oppressed and exploited masses of the entire world.

But Lenin would not remain standing in bitter contemplation with arms folded, letting the fatal plague of Stalinism clear the road for the atavistic Hitlers and Francos to wash away in a sea of toilers' blood his great ideal. The path-breaker of proletarian dictatorship in Russia would get busy to prevent the overwhelming tragedy. To wrench the Soviet Union from the grip of the bureaucratic distortion, to halt the liquidation of October, redeem the international proletarian vanguard and the name *Communism* from the clutches of renegade and traitor Stalin, to proceed with the extension of the Communist revolution throughout the globe—that would be Lenin's immediate task.

Calling things by their right name, as was Lenin's way, he would expose the counter-revolutionary rôle of Stalin and his Browders. And he would take Trotsky to task for the policy of retreat since the Stalinist conspiracy in 1923; he would severely castigate him for having allowed himself, after his exile from the Soviet Union, to be surrounded by opportunists; and especially would Lenin lash out mercilessly at Trotsky for his capitulation to the Second International, a scandalous surrender which records the Left Opposition's final, panicky rout that did more to strengthen Stalinism and reaction than all the capitulations of the Oppositionists in the Soviet Union put together.

To escape Stalin's gigantic espionage, Lenin would go into hiding among the workers in the colossal industries and modernized coal mines. With his wonted bold initiative, with redoubled ardor, he would start collecting the pathetic fragments

of Bolshevism, gathering around himself, as in the days of old, the best that there is, working for the renaissance of Marxism. Rigidly adhering to the interests of the world proletariat, Lenin would at once proceed to organize a new Bolshevik party for a new revolution which would destroy, *root and branch*, the forest of bureaucratic poison wood, extirpate the evil of anti-Marxian vandalism, unhorse and drive out the Stalinist reaction. The *chief task* confronting the proletariat of the world, the unmasking of the Stalinist impostors who are operating under Lenin's and Marx's colors, would be achieved.

As a result of a flood of damning facts exposing Stalinism, there would ensue a great reawakening accompanied by a feeling of revulsion and a mighty roar of indignation. The proletariat of the Soviet Union and the entire world, called up from the trance, once again led by a truly Marxist leadership, would raise the imperious cry "Remove Stalin and the entire bureaucratic Stalinist incubus! Restore Marxism! Forward to Workers Democracy in the Soviet Union and towards the world Communist revolution!" The Leninist resolution of the Tenth Congress of the Bolshevik Party and Lenin's Testament would at long last be carried into effect. A revolutionary wave of formidable dimensions would sweep the world. All the opportunist vermin which infested the Third International after the collapse of the Second, the Browders, Olgins, Piecks, Lovestones and Cannons would be isolated, deserted by the workers. The Second International would again begin decomposing rapidly. Lenin would organize the Fourth International, an international inflexibly opposed to opportunism, and the world proletariat, hurling defiance at capitalism with its "democracy" and Fascism, would stride in seven league boots towards emancipation.

Yes, If Lenin Could See!

Unfortunately for the proletariat and the colonial slaves, and fortunately for Stalin, his Browders and Olgins, and the imperialist bourgeoisie, *Lenin cannot see.*

Some sincere non-Marxist workers and petty-bourgeois intellectuals arriving from the capitalist countries in the Soviet Union are thrilled by the sight of State-owned shops and factories, the absence of capitalism and the bourgeoisie. They have gone into raptures over the progress industry is making. They feel that what they are beholding is a higher stage of human society. Not familiar with the political and social development since Lenin's

death, and viewing things in a non-dialectic, metaphysical way, chiefly through the perversion-clogged and deception-choked pages of Stalinist publications, they fail to perceive the direction in which the Soviet Union is being drawn by the usurping clique.

Within the scope of realistic vision there can be discerned with respect to the future of the Soviet State, the following variants. One, that the bureaucrats, consumed with an inordinate desire for private gain and accumulation of wealth, growing more bourgeoisified in habit and outlook, more nationalistic, more powerful and more audacious, will, led by Stalin, in another decade or so, reestablish the capitalist system in Russia, with the new bourgeoisie born out of the bureaucracy itself. Second, the extreme reactionary forces may sweep away Stalin, as Napoleon swept away the republic. This second variant is possible, but not probable, since Stalin himself is the leader in the work of abolishing the October Revolution. Third, the organization of an underground Leninist party which will prevent the catastrophe and will regenerate the workers State to make it play the part it played under Lenin—the first proletarian fortress that furthers and helps to bring to completion the international workingclass revolution. A possible eventuality is that the workers State will succumb to the attack of international imperialism. The Stalinists are keenly aware of this danger, which naturally threatens to destroy the base of their existence. Stalin pursues a two-fold policy with respect to the international bourgeoisie. On the one hand, as a result of his policy of frustrating the proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries, he imposes a tremendous burden upon the Soviet Union by a progressive increase in expenditures on armaments—a colossal waste which would have been obviated by the international revolution; on the other hand, he tries to ride the raging seas of international politics by aligning with a section of the imperialist world, by supporting the *status quo* and bourgeois dictatorship, mainly in its "democratic" form, and generally mellowing in his attitude towards capitalism.

The Stalinist bureaucracy, in effect, says to the world imperialists:—

Let us put the lovely maxim *Live and let live* into practice. You may exploit the world proletariat and the colonial slaves; our policies covered up with noisy revolutionary phrases will

insure the failure of every serious attempt of the masses to overthrow your domination. Of course, you must expect a little trouble: demonstrations, occasional hunger marches and other inconveniences, even strikes. Yes. We are awfully sorry, but that can't be helped. If we don't carry on this "activity" and accompany it with blatant loquacity, our game will be exposed, and, besides, we'll be of no value to you. You seem to understand this clearly in the case of the reformist leaders. They, too, are forced, in order to retain their influence with the workers, to conduct strikes. The reformists in England in 1926 called a general strike. Then they betrayed it and saved your system. But if you study the matter more closely you'll discover that it is really *we* who are your true saviors. We helped the Purcells, Smiths and Hickses to retain hold upon the British workers in 1926. We prevented the overthrow of the Chinese bourgeoisie and saved world imperialism. And the greatest service of all we rendered you when we saved Germany for you. Could the toothless Second International have done so thorough a job for you and, of course, for ourselves, as we did in China and in Germany? Never! Do you realize in what terrible danger we both were in those days? Social Democracy alone could not have prevented the proletariat from overthrowing you. More and more you have to depend upon the fact that history brought our paths together, and together we must struggle against the proletarian revolution. We disorient, befuddle and paralyze the proletariat—cooperating with Social Democracy (England, 1926; Spain, France, 1936), without Social Democracy (China, 1927), in feud with Social Democracy (Germany, 1932). One thing you fail to grasp, and that is that the Second International is playing second fiddle now. We are of immeasurably greater value to you than Social Democracy. Just think: did Social Democracy prevent the rise of the genuine Marxist International in 1919? No, it did not and could not. But we can and do prevent the emergence of a real revolutionary movement. By now we are convinced that no one can expose us. Whoever has attempted, failed miserably. Look at Trotsky—we have annihilated him, for we are invincible in the Soviet fortress. So be sensible. We don't mind if you raise a lot of protest against our "Red propaganda." In fact that works out very well for us. It strengthens the illusion among the workers that we are real Leninists. We certainly enjoyed that brusque "protest" Washington sent to our Seventh Congress.

We then made a sharp turn to social-patriotism and kicked the Leninist formula "Proletarian revolution vs. bourgeois slavery" into the garbage can, substituting for it a new formula, "Bourgeois democracy vs. Fascism." The "protest" was quietly dropped by Roosevelt and we remained good friends. Yes, the distortion of the Soviet State creates the most astounding contradictions and anomalies. For example, one can find the undistorted history of the October Revolution, of the Red Army, of the Civil War, only in bourgeois countries, in any sizable library in England, France, the United States—but not in the Soviet Union itself! Yes, life is full of paradoxes. For instance, the rabid diatribes against us by the American Fascist Hearst contribute to the strengthening of the belief that we are real Communists. Hearst in his blind hatred of Communism attacks Marx, Lenin and Stalin together, and in doing so he defends capitalism and also renders us a service. Do you doubt our sincerity? Have you forgotten that when the German workers faced the noose of Fascism we did not make even a gesture of solidarity with them; but we concluded a military pact with the French bourgeoisie and are prepared to send the Red Army across the border to support French imperialism. In return for our friendly policies give us an opportunity to build "Socialism" in Russia, that is, to get our share of the good things in life. And in the name of the angel of peace, let us not have war. And please hold back Fascism. We assure you that capitalism can be continued for years and years through your bourgeois democracy. You remember, Lenin with every fiber of his being hated and fought you and your democracy. He explained, and so did we when we first seized the Comintern, *you know*, that your democracy is hypocrisy incarnate, is a method through which you exercise your dictatorship. As long as he could draw a breath he taught the workers that the most democratic capitalist countries, such democracies as England or France, are nothing but rapacious imperialist exploiters of millions of workers, peasants and colonial slaves. Sharply differentiating between workers democracy and capitalist democracy, both representing class dictatorships, Lenin founded the first workers State as a revolutionary fortress which was to help the enslaved masses outside destroy world imperialism which cloaked its rule with deceptive phrases such as "American democracy," "European democracy." But Comrade Stalin usurped the power in the Soviet Union and reversed Lenin's

policy. And so today the only workers State in existence is a powerful defender of the world capitalist system, a sentinel standing guard over European democracy. We state this openly through the mouths of our most trusted agents.

"The giant land of socialism victorious has become the puissant defender of European democracy." (Wilhelm Pieck, *The Communist*, February 1937, p. 162)

We'll do everything in our power to stop the workers from overthrowing you. Rely upon us to take care of the proletariat. We have developed a zigzag method of preventing the establishment of another Soviet republic. We either incite one section of the proletariat against another, as we did in Germany during our "Third Period," or we chain down the working class to the petty-bourgeoisie, the liberals and Social Democrats, as we did very successfully in England and in China, and as we are doing no less successfully today in Spain and in France. The workers' ideal today, thanks to the line of the Seventh Congress, is a bourgeois democratic republic. Examine our policy, say, in France. Here are proposals to the People's Front made by our agent Thorez:

"People's Front Proposals

"A French Front for the respect of law, which at the present time can only mean the application of the Matignon agreements, the effective dissolution and the disarmament of the leagues, the defense of the Constitution and of all the laws of the Republic." (M. Thorez, *Daily Worker*, September 2, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

What more can you wish for! Some of your people understand us perfectly. For instance: "Mr. Jemmy Schmid recently wrote: 'Except demanding that the Communists should join the Radical Party [a liberal bourgeois party in France—G.M.] I don't see what more one could ask of them.'" (*Inprecorr*, October 31, 1936, p. 1314)

Of course, we must keep up a Communist appearance before the workers, therefore we lie as follows:

"Thorez, the chief strategist of the progressive forces in France, the French proletariat's brilliant and beloved guide in its struggle for liberation from the chains of capitalist tyranny." (*Daily Worker*, September 2, 1936)

You see how clever? We guide the workers' struggle for liberation from wage slavery by defending your Constitution and all

the laws of the bourgeois Republic! So rest assured, no danger is threatening you from the workers. Therefore, hold on to the democratic form of capitalist rule. We will certainly put up a resistance to your attempts to continue spreading Fascism, for Fascism is bent on destroying the Soviet Union and on war in general. War might bring on revolution, you know. Remember 1871, 1905, 1917? Bad for you—bad for us. So the preservation of the *status quo* should be your aim as it is ours.

Reply the imperialists:—

Yes, we understand all this very well, but we are suffocating within the decaying system of capitalism. We must have markets. Each one of us must secure colonies as an outlet for investments and a source of profits. And we have the unemployed. Tens of millions of them. The employed workers also are hard pressed by our wage reductions and other measures. We *must* eventually introduce Fascism, because despite you and the Social Democrats it is very possible that the proletariat and the colonials may get out of hand and run amuck. You and the Social Democracy are doing excellent work in Spain, in France and elsewhere. We have no doubts whatsoever about the reliability of the leaderships of both Internationals. Stalin and Vandervelde and all the Browders and Caballeros have proven to be beyond reproach. But we do not and cannot trust the Communist and Socialist masses. They really want Socialism. And political and economic crises cannot go on perpetually without the danger of the workers beginning to see what aim you and the Social Democracy are pursuing. Time and tide wait for no one. The workers may become unruly and start taking matters into their own hands. Look what happened in Paris right after the Left swing in 1936. They commenced seizing factories. A very serious business. "The occupation, recalling the similar seizure of Italian factories by workers just before the fascist revolution there" (*New York Herald Tribune*, May 27, 1936). Where would the Italian capitalists be today if they had continued depending upon the Socialist leaders? Who knows what might have happened in Germany had we not introduced Fascism? A workers republic as likely as not, and, little doubt, along Lenin's, not Stalin's lines, with real proletarian democracy, spreading the Bolshevik fire throughout the world. So if you really want to save the Stalin system you must allow a certain amount of rights of private property in the Soviet Union and permit foreign investments in

Russia. Open the Russian market by abolishing State monopoly of imports. That will release the terrible tension and prevent both war and revolution.

The Stalinist bureaucracy shyly replies:—

In Germany, we grant, Fascism was necessary and useful. We did not look upon it as an entire evil, as *The New York Times* correctly stated on February 2, 1933. But a further spread of Fascism is a distinct danger to us. However, we hope you don't take our fight against Fascism too seriously. We prefer bourgeois democracy, of course, but we'd rather have Fascism than proletarian revolution, you know. We do not fight Fascism until it organizes its forces and strikes first. We do not decompose your army, and this is a guarantee that your rule is safe. Lenin said that for the proletariat to gain ascendancy it is necessary to decompose the old army; therefore, to prevent proletarian victory, we do the exact opposite and strengthen your army under the guise of working to "win" it for the masses. And Fascism hardly stands a risk of defeat, unless it itself makes a mistake and strikes prematurely, as in Spain in July 1936, before the workers are completely demoralized by our and Socialist policies. But even if Fascism is crushed by the workers, capitalism will continue through bourgeois democracy, because we, "Communists," never aim at your rule as such. *Never!* We work with you. To cite one of numerous cases. Together we are cheerfully piping on that beautiful "instrument of peace," the League of Nations, charming our listeners and making them see dreams, while war is hastily being prepared. You understand, and so do we, that if the masses perceived the terrible danger, they would stir into action. Then revolution. And revolution now would seriously hamper the building of "Socialism" in the Soviet Union. We are friendly with Fascist governments as well as with bourgeois-democratic ones. Take our relations with Mussolini. He planned to gobble up Ethiopia. What did we do? Our Browders on the official stage, in order to hold the confidence of the workers, shouted themselves hoarse cursing Mussolini, crying "boycott Italy!"; while behind the scenes we quietly fed Mussolini's invading armies with Soviet grain and sold him coal, oil and materials for building roads in Ethiopia. (*The New York Times*, September 8, 1935)

Our Comrade Stalin is not averse to taking a leaf on war-profiteering out of Comrade J. P. Morgan's ledger and turning

an honest penny out of the misery and blood of the oppressed peoples. Of course, when old Morg did it we said, and still say it today, *you know*, that that was beastly business. But Comrade Stalin is selling to the Fascists *for cash* and that helps building "Socialism" in the Soviet Union. This should be a consolation to the Ethiopians.

We are even ready to help save Fascism when it is threatened by revolution. Take the case of Japan. You know that Japan, before invading Manchuria, was faced with revolution. We ourselves admitted this through the pens of our experts on international affairs:

"It was not a powerful, growing imperialist power that invaded Manchuria, but a desperate one. Japanese imperialism at the time of the Manchurian invasion was deep in crisis, *facing revolution*." (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, September 6, 1933. My emphasis—G.M.)

So what did we do in this extremely dangerous for all of us situation? It is true, the Japanese imperialists are our enemies, and we very much disliked saving them, but revolution was too close a danger for us to ignore. They needed supplies without which their invasion would have failed and revolution become a reality.

"The Japanese imperialists, bitter enemies of the Soviet Union, bought oil, lumber, manganese, coal and iron from the Soviet Union *during the whole period of the invasion of Manchuria*." (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, September 9, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

Of course, workers are annoyed and ashamed to observe us "Communists" lending important aid to our Fascist enemies. We handle this very shrewdly. The staff of writers we employ, all those Olgins and Michael Golds, are skilled in tricks of illusion and amazing feats of the pen. And they have a knack for forceful Red words.

We have been doing business with Turkey and selling on credit to that despotic, Fascist country (*The New York Times*, April 5, 1936). We have likewise been doing business with Persia. But did we sell supplies to Ethiopia? Did we extend credit to the wretched African people? If we did, this would have been a powerful argument in the hands of our Browders. Yet, our entire press was silent, and the capitalist press had nothing to report on this score either. Who supplies the Red peasant armies in China? Victor Kean wrote from Shanghai to the *New York*

Herald Tribune in July 1932: "Where does the Red Army get its military supplies, etc.? It gets them almost exclusively from the army of the government." And our Piatnitsky corroborates this statement: "Where does the Red Army get its arms and supplies? All of its modern rifles, field and machine-guns, aeroplanes and radio apparatus, *all of this* has been captured from the enemy, from the army of Chiang Kai-shek" (O. Piatnitsky, *The World Economic Crisis*, p. 54).

If the Chinese Red Army depended upon us for supplies it would long since have been wiped out. We would be insane to allow one iota of material assistance to any revolutionary force. In words, you know, we "assist" them abundantly.

And do you think that when we sold supplies to Mussolini we were solely motivated by profits? No, we helped to save Italian Fascism because, like Japan in 1933, it was faced with a crisis pregnant with revolution:

"The slaughter was needed by Fascism for the preservation of the very life of Italian capitalism. It was war or *revolution*." (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, October 6, 1935)

Yes, we prevent revolution, we destroy revolution. In this period of universal breakdown of capitalism, without our interference, the proletariat, the grave-digger of the bourgeoisie, would have destroyed you and your system a dozen times over, and naturally us and our system as well.

What we don't like about Fascism, particularly German Fascism, is that it prepares a war against us. But although we are quite aware of this indubitable fact, we derive certain immediate advantages for "Socialism" through a profitable trade with Hitler. You see, armaments means steel; and the manufacture of hard steel requires manganese. We have the largest output of manganese in the world, virtually a monopoly. According to our customs report for 1935, the shipment of manganese from the Soviet Union to the greatest steel-producing countries was as follows: to England 14,000 tons; to the United States 138,000 tons; to *Hitler* 235,880 tons! We could have put great impediment in Hitler's way, if from the start we had withheld manganese from Germany. But, you know, credits, profits, are not things to be sneezed at. So while our Browders raise a heavy smoke screen of Red words approving boycott of Nazi Germany (*Daily Worker*, October 19, 1935), we carry on trade with

Hitler, ship to him large quantities of manganese and thus facilitate the speedy superarmament of Fascist Germany.

As to the introduction of private property, we must not speak about that above a whisper. But examine our path since Stalin gained full control of everything. Which way is the path running? If you are not confused by our spellbinding noise about Stalin's Socialism, as some poor chumps among the workers are, you will perceive the end. Your impatience shows that you don't realize how lucky you are and how much you owe to Comrade Stalin and his supporters. Had the Left Opposition, after Lenin's death, won the intra-Party struggle, the march of development would have been along the path of unfolding Workers Democracy within the Soviet Union, and proletarian revolution abroad. China had more than an even chance of becoming a Soviet republic; Hitler and his Fascists would never have reached their natural phase of decomposition in 1932, let alone the seat of power—they would have been smashed long before by the iron fist of the then well-organized, powerful German proletariat. The workers of Europe and of the rest of the world would now be removing the remnants of capitalist rule and building up the *genuine* Socialist system which, Marx indicated, must follow capitalism. Comrade Stalin's line has led history in the opposite direction; through bureaucratic centralization of the Soviet Union, towards the strangulation of the proletarian revolution abroad and within the Soviet Union. The line will inevitably bring the reestablishment of capitalism in Russia. Have patience. It is in the interests of both, your system of imperialist exploitation of the world proletariat and the colonies, and of our system of a privileged bureaucratic pyramid resting on the shoulders of our workers and peasants, that the liquidation of the October Revolution proceeds slowly and, therefore, more or less smoothly, otherwise the international proletariat will be seized with alarm; and from alarm it will pass over to investigation, discernment and action. Then both your system and Stalin's system will be swept away. So give us eight, ten years and then it will be safe, for the change will be too far gone for the return to Lenin's original program.

* * *

While the Stalinists very effectively stifle the proletarian revolution, clearing the path for Fascism, they are, of course, unable

to prevent war among the imperialist nations. And their notoriously indulgent attitude towards the international bourgeoisie will not halt an attack upon the Soviet Union. They may over-exert themselves in their ingratiating manner towards their ally, the French bourgeoisie. But by patronizing French steamers and wines, by the friendly gesture of razing the arch of triumph in Moscow which was erected in 1826 to commemorate the defeat of Napoleon by the Russians in 1812, by cringing before the French diplomats at Geneva, they cannot erase the fact that the French bourgeoisie, as well as every other bourgeoisie, is an inveterate and formidable enemy of the Soviet Union, even though the workers State is distorted by a centralized bureaucracy. The world bourgeoisie and Stalinism are brewing the broth of hell for the toiling masses of all countries, the Soviet Union included. *An attack upon the Soviet Union is inevitable.* Due to the dreadful spread of Fascist reaction in the last few years, the danger is daily growing closer, despite the chloroforming assertion of Olgin's that "the probability of such an attack is diminishing with the growth of the U.S.S.R. and of the revolutionary movement in the capitalist world, including the colonies" (*Trotskyism*, p. 34). The "temporary breathing space" won by Lenin during which the Russian proletariat was to bring up reinforcements, the battalions of the international revolution, is coming to a close. Due to the development of Stalinism this breathing spell did not materialize, and *could not materialize* in placing the German, Polish or any other section of the international working class in power. Instead of gaining victories, the world proletariat suffered terrific defeats. The Soviet Union, as a proletarian State, therefore, will face the imperialist assault single-handed. The black clouds gathering over the borders of the first workers republic betoken an early storm.

Japanese imperialism having swallowed Manchuria and other parts of China is rapidly pushing its preparations for war against the Soviet Union. The Nazis, emboldened by their amazingly easy victory over the German workers, are arrogantly rushing ahead with military preparations for the war against the workers State. They are backed by the British and Wall Street imperialists. The worst refuse of feudo-capitalist Europe is being trained for the bloody vortex. At a given signal the frenzied armies of wild cutthroats, soaked in the poison of nationalism, belching a tornado of death, will fall upon the Russian workers and peas-

ants. It is not difficult to picture to one's self what will follow. With the dogs of war unleashed, the bourgeoisie will usher in a reign of extreme White Terror against the masses. The hectoring brutal Fascists will rage through the towns of Germany and of other capitalist countries. Again a tight blockade, as during the years of intervention and civil war of 1918-1921, will be thrown around the Soviet Union. It will be difficult, perhaps impossible, to aid the Russian masses with war materials. The Russian masses in this respect will, in all probability, have to depend exclusively upon themselves. They will run the factories day and night to supply the Red Army with means of defense. The Red soldiers will fight as no men ever fought before. But the Russian workers and the Red Army *alone* will never save the Soviet Union.

Against every Red soldier, imperialism is in a position to marshal five and more. For every rifle, tank and aeroplane the Russian workers will produce, imperialism, with huge arsenals and superior industries at its disposal, will answer tenfold. There is little hope that the Soviet Union can be saved by matching its military might against that of the entire imperialist world. The destruction of the first proletarian State in history can be prevented mainly by direct struggle of the workers in the capitalist countries against their imperialists. And the struggle, to be a *real* struggle, not a deceptive noise and masquerade, must be guided by Marxism-Leninism. Instead of the pro-capitalist line of the "Seventh Congress," bourgeois democracy or Fascism, the workers in *every* capitalist country must adopt Lenin's line, *revolutionary overthrow of capitalism*. If there is any hope for the workers in the present era, it is in this line.

What will Stalin's policy be during an attack upon the Soviet Union?

Lenin pointed out that war is the continuation of the same policy as during peace, only through different means. Stalin's policy of preventing revolution and retaining the bureaucracy's hold upon the Soviet Union will continue. Stalin's orders to his Browders will be without doubt as follows: In countries attacking the Soviet Union, to carry on pacifist propaganda; in countries allied with Stalin, unconditional support of capitalist governments; in all capitalist countries to do their utmost to prevent the utilization of the crisis for the development of proletarian revolution. Stalin's motto "We don't want a single foot of foreign territory. But we shall not give up a single inch of our

own territory either, to anyone" (J. Stalin, *Daily Worker*, September 10, 1933), will be, as long as possible, the guiding policy. Since defeat for international capitalism would spell death for Stalinism, a treacherous compromise at the expense of the toiling masses of the world will be engineered by the Stalinist clique. They will bargain with the imperialists behind the back of the Russian and international proletariat, selling out the remnants of the October Revolution.

What must be the policy of the Russian proletariat, now and when the Soviet Union is attacked by the world bourgeoisie? The proletariat must clearly understand that the Soviet Union is not a capitalist State where the formula "Defeat your own government in the imperialist war" is applied. The Soviet Union is a proletarian State. Therefore, when the armies of the imperialists fall upon the Soviet Union every ounce of strength must be devoted to its defense. But the Soviet Union is a *distorted* proletarian State. And the distortion, if not checked and eradicated, will by a sapping process completely undermine the proletarian State and reintroduce capitalist relations. Consequently, as a part of the struggle to save the proletarian State, to prevent its destruction from within, a fight must be carried on *simultaneously* against the bureaucratic distortion. Lenin said:

"We have, of course, a proletarian dictatorship, but with bureaucratic distortions. And the struggle against bureaucratic distortions can be conducted along two lines: Through the state apparatus and through direct pressure on the part of the workers themselves, whose trade unions protect the interests of their members and thereby combat bureaucracy." (Quoted by Lozovsky, *Lenin and the Trade Union Movement*, p. 28)

Since Lenin wrote these lines Stalinism has bureaucratically distorted the State, the Soviets, the trade unions; and completely destroying the party's Bolshevik content and form has transformed this instrument of struggle against reaction into an engine through which the bureaucracy exercises its reactionary domination. The only force which can lead the combat against the bureaucracy is a new Communist party. This party, a section of the Fourth International which is sure to arise out of the present chaos, confusion and defeat, will naturally operate underground. Like the Party built by Lenin, it will have a program *minimum* and a program *maximum*. Its program *minimum* will consist in the struggle of the workers to regain their lost privileges. De-

mands must be presented to the bureaucracy for an increase in the share of income of the toilers, thus reducing the pot belly of the bureaucrat. Workers will strive to reassert their rights against the impositions and restrictions of Stalinism. A struggle should be developed to reestablish workers control and management of industry, to wrest the power and prerogatives from the bureaucrat. The proletariat must demand the reintroduction of workers political committees in the Red Army. The offensive against the bureaucratic distortion must be assumed along the social, political, economic and cultural fronts, in the direction of *workers* (not general) democracy.

During the war, when hardships are intensified, it is necessary to curb the bureaucratic hog with a view to preventing the starvation of workers' families. Since the bureaucratic distortion, fearing victory no less than defeat, will fight for the restoration of "peace" (there will be arguments not to go too far lest the whole capitalist world rises against the Soviet Union), the proletariat must instill in the Russian workers' minds the greatest distrust for the Stalinist clique. Not a single Stalinist plan, no matter how rosy, not a single explanation, no matter how plausible, not a single promise, no matter how sincere-sounding, will the enlightened workers listen to without the deepest misgiving and suspicion of betrayal which is contained almost invariably in everything Stalinism says and does. One of the chief slogans during the imperialist attack upon the Soviet Union must be: Transform the national war of the Stalinist bureaucracy into a proletarian revolutionary war against world imperialism.

The program *maximum* must be: The removal of the bureaucratic distortion through a mass upheaval of the Russian proletariat assisted by the revolutionary workers in capitalist countries; reestablishment of the Leninist line of Workers Democracy in the Soviet Union, and the extension of the October Revolution throughout the entire world.

THE BLOODY PHASE OF CENTRALIZATION

(The Moscow "Trials")

A HIGH, although not yet the highest, stage of bureaucratic centralization of the workers State was ushered in at the end of 1934 by the Kirov assassination. This new stage was marked by the extirpation of virtually all the leading figures of the Bolshevik Party, men who together with Lenin piloted the Soviet Republic in the first, most critical years of its existence. A sharp light was flashed by history upon the Stalin régime. In these convulsions of centralization of power, like in a sudden close-up, the lurid face of the Stalinist reaction became harshly and ominously vivid. The traitors and deserters of October—Stalin, Voroshilov, Zdanov, Chubar, Andreev and the rest of the mediocrities, who, actuated by a passion for power, banded together and bureaucratically usurped and distorted the proletarian State and are heading the forces negating the revolution, reached a crisis in their ignominious careers. Although they handled the situation with uncommon skill, the Stalinist impostors could not entirely conceal with their outer Leninist vestments their tyranny, and their deep-seated dread and hatred of the international proletariat.

On December 1, 1934, Kirov, one of Stalin's powerful lieutenants, was assassinated. According to the information given out by the Stalinists, this act of terrorism was committed by a petty functionary. At the "Seventeenth Congress" of Stalin's "Party," Kirov described Stalin as "the greatest leader of all times and of all peoples." This assertion aptly reveals the character of the man assassinated in the Smolny Institute. A revolutionist prior to, and for a brief period after, the seizure of power by the Party under the leadership of Lenin, Kirov be-

came a thoroughly depraved idolater of the renegade Stalin, perpetrating the fraud of the "greatest disciple." He was elevated by the clique to a position of a dignitary of the bureaucratic distortion, ranking very high on the honor list of the Stalinist Order. He took his place among the elect in 1926 when, having been appointed Secretary of the Leningrad City and Regional Committee, he smashed the Left Opposition and installed Stalinist supporters in all posts of the Leningrad organization. He had a difficult job of it, for the Leningrad workers were the most advanced section of the Russian proletariat—the shock troops that lighted the torch of the October Revolution and stormed the citadel of power of Russian imperialism. A Stalinist, M. Katz, with barely concealed cynicism, relates how this bureaucratic martinet rushed upon the foes of the bureaucracy and in the approved Stalinist fashion transformed the insignificant Stalinist minority into the ruling majority:

"The task was unusually difficult because the Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition controlled the strongest positions in the Leningrad organization and had there its most energetic representatives with long-established connections among the Leningrad workers. Kirov, however, threw himself into work heart and soul. He promoted dependable rank-and-file members of the Party [i.e., Kirov appointed a leading strata of functionaries, selecting his marionettes from among the unscrupulous and least class-conscious members already supporting Stalin—G.M.], workers from the shop to positions of leadership and responsibility and put the struggle against the Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition on a high level of revolutionary theory and principle [i. e., he employed the O.G.P.U. to arrest and exile the leaders of the opposition, and terrorize the rank-and-file—G.M.]." (*The Assassination of Kirov*, p. 9)

An immense torrent of data flowed across the Kirov crisis. It is exceedingly important to bear in mind, however, that all the evidence, proof, testimony, oral and documentary confessions, clues, information and knowledge of details connected with the terroristic act and the attendant crisis, were and have remained in the exclusive possession of Stalin and his fellow-conspirators and bureaucratic puppets. Only by casting off all colored information, by brushing aside all obvious lies and inconsistencies, by absolute freedom of thought, without fear and apologies, can this stage of Soviet history, its meaning and direction, be determined. The study must be conducted not upon the basis of trust

in the version presented by the Stalinist reaction, but upon the basis of independent investigation and reasoning, to know where to fix one's credulity and also one's mistrust.

From the start the entire Kirov affair was enveloped by the Stalinists with a fog of deepest mystery. Although the assassin was arrested on the spot and his identity became known at once to the Stalinist investigators, his name, his political biography, the motives for his act were for many days cautiously and unaccountably withheld by the Stalinists. Plainly, something was being concocted in the inner chambers of the Kremlin Palace. What design, devised by people far from being incompetent in intricate plots, was to issue out of the ominous silence?

Two and a half weeks after the assassination, on December 17, the Stalinists broke their silence, stating that the assassin, whose name was still withheld, had been an Oppositionist in the Leningrad organization prior to the crushing of the Opposition. True or false, that was the paucity of material information the world received from the Stalinists. It whetted the mind for a more detailed account, but few suspected that this information was the beginning of the unfolding of a terrible Stalinist plot.

The information giving the name of the assassin was issued on December 21:

"On December 1, 1934, Sergei Kirov, a member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was waylaid in Leningrad and shot dead. On December 21 the Soviet Government announced that the assassin, Nikolayev, was a member of the so-called 'Leningrad Center' of counter-revolutionists, a terrorist group bent on assassinating the highest officials of the Soviet." (M. J. Olgin, *Trotskyism*, p. 7)

Between December 1 and 21 the usurpers took several significant steps in preparing to carry into effect their scheme. First, they mobilized their entire mercenary army of journalists, writers, poets, artists—all trained to contort facts and paint infamy as glory, everyone of them, brain and stomach, sold to the Stalinist Order. This army, inimitably subtle, blunting the workers' intellect and completely dimming their mental eye, set off at a spectacular pace. The Stalinists, after the fashion of the Thermidorians, utilize their revolutionary past to cloak their reactionary present. Employing Red phraseology and the garb of the greatest revolution of all times, the ideological mesmerists, whose hands were still hot from the crime against the

German workers, praised Kirov's record to the skies, never forgetting, of course, to make grateful bows to the powerful Master. Inflamed with hatred against the assassins of Kirov, presumably White Guards, they rolled a thunder of denunciation over the entire Soviet Union, and roused the country to a high pitch of excitement, instilling in the workers intense enmity for the White Guards. This campaign early in December surrounded Stalinism with a Red cloud and gave the impression that the bureaucracy was about to turn energetically against reaction.

Four days after the assassination in Smolny, seventy-one names of persons arrested—thirty-nine in Leningrad and thirty-two in Moscow—were printed in the Stalinist press in the Soviet Union. Information told that the arrested were White Guards entering the Soviet Union through Roumania, Poland and other border states. The arrested were tried the same day behind closed doors, and sixty-six of them were executed at once. On December 12, there was a report that twelve White Guards had been arrested in Minsk. They, too, were tried in secret and nine of them shot. Thirty-seven were arrested in Kiev on December 18. They were tried and twenty-eight of them shot, making a total of the summary executions 103 out of 120 arrested, all White Guards.

So far, so good.

Simultaneous with the last executions there was opened in the Stalinist press an attack upon the former Trotsky-Zinoviev Opposition. The attack, steadily growing in virulence, soon rose to flood-like proportions. The Stalinist poison-pens, sprinkling rage and fomenting provocative incitement, wrote that Nikolaiev and the former Opposition were in collusion with the White Guards and the foreign bourgeois powers.

Near the end of December the Stalinists announced that they had arrested fourteen ex-Communist Party members, former Oppositionists, belonging to the secret terrorist organization, the "Leningrad Center." As in the case of the White Guards, the arrested were tried *in secret*. According to the Stalinites, they all confessed, and the next day, together with Nikolaiev, were shot. Whether the "Leningrad Center" really existed, or was a Stalinist invention, whether the confessions to the assassination plot against Kirov and other leading Stalinists were actually made by the executed Oppositionists or were synthetic tales written by Stalin's confidential men remains a secret to this day.

Two weeks afterwards, on January 15, 1935, the leaders of the former Opposition, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Safarov, Yevdokimov, Bakaiev and others, were dragged into Stalin's murky hall of "justice." Here, with doors and windows clamped shut, they remained face to face with their ruthless inquisitors. What took place at this secret "trial" is known only to the Stalinist bureaucrats. All there was for the investigating mind to work on was what the Stalinist usurpers issued from their closed sessions. No bourgeois correspondent was permitted at this secret "trial" of Zinoviev, Kamenev and their companions, therefore no other but the Stalinist source was available. Some days before, and while the "trial" was being conducted, a veritable tempest of poison was raging throughout the land. The sleepless guardians of Stalinism, masters of invective, were swung into frantic action. At thousands of meetings arranged by the huge Stalinist machine, they wreaked their fury—no longer against the White Guards, but against the leaders of the former Opposition whom the Stalinist jackals labeled White Guards! *Pravda* (truth)—which by now should be renamed *Nepravda* (untruth)—and other Stalinist papers, described Zinoviev and Kamenev and the other secretly tried former Oppositionists, and primarily Trotsky, as "provocateurs," "agents of world counter-revolution" and "mad Fascist dogs." The bureaucrats trotted out their foul adjectives with the fury of raving madmen, until the campaign reached a surfeit of anti-Trotsky-Zinoviev vehemence. The Soviet workers, separated from the "court" by a cloud of mystery and skillfully assembled outright lies, in an atmosphere virtually amounting to martial law, voiced approval of the violently-phrased declarations and resolutions presented to them by the bureaucratic bloodhounds who bayed for the blood of the accused. The unanimous cry of the entire Soviet Union, as reflected in the Stalinist press, was: Exterminate the vile dregs of the former Zinoviev-Trotsky Opposition, these White Guard agents of Fascism and counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie!

This swift-moving drama, shrewd and brutal in every detail, was, as had been the Chinese and the German betrayals, naturally, directed by Stalin from his dizzy heights of power. His former opponents, more than at any previous time during his fight for absolute power, were completely in his clutches. How far would the black despotism of the bureaucratic distortion go? Would Stalin instruct his pen-men to announce that Zinoviev,

Kamenev, Yevdokimov, Safarov and others had "confessed" to participation in the plot to assassinate Kirov and other Stalinist leaders, and then drown the volley of the firing squad in a thunderous vituperative burst? Or did he think that the credulity of the workers, inside and especially outside the Soviet Union, would be overstrained?

The felonious gang resolved to slake its thirst for the blood of Zinoviev, Kamenev and others and make more subtle and elaborate preparations for the final act of revenge. The secrecy of the "trial" was in its way. The Stalinist reports said absolutely nothing about the *actual* proceedings behind the closed doors of the Stalinist court. Stalin and his confederates remembered, of course, that at the start of their criminal career the membership of the Party had been equally divided between them and Trotsky, the Left Opposition counting over 300,000 supporters. The usurpers were aware that there still lived hundreds of thousands of revolutionists, veterans of the civil war, old worker-Bolsheviks, some long since awakened after they, off-guard, had been chloroformed by Stalin. Their lips were sealed now, but their eyes were open, hearts bleeding and minds aflame. This advanced section of the Russian working class realized, if vaguely, the terrible significance of Stalin's absolutism which pitilessly plagued the toiling masses. The thinking workers who had read Marx and Lenin witnessed every conceivable violation of Lenin's methods and principles. They were nauseated by the daily panegyrics to the idol of the bureaucracy. They beheld the repugnant, imposed from the top, Stalinist official working his job for all it was worth. In their minds these honest internationalists kept an account of Stalin's victims, of real Leninists, in exile, in prisons, and in graves. To this section of the Russian proletariat the secrecy and mystery with which the bureaucrats surrounded the facts attendant upon the Kirov assassination, and the monstrous onslaught upon the former Oppositionists, spoke volumes. The more advanced workers in the Soviet Union could not but doubt the accuracy of the accounts handed out to the masses from behind the closed doors of the "court" by Jesuitical creatures, whose poisonous breath vitiated the atmosphere in the Soviet Union and within the proletariat abroad. To these revolutionary workers the biting spray of venom and slander thrown against Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev, the charge that these

men had become White Guards working for imperialist intervention, could hardly be convincing.

Resolving to exercise caution and patience, Stalin and his crew eased up a bit on the "Moscow Center," the alleged terrorist organization headed by Zinoviev and Kamenev:

"The investigation had not established facts that would give a basis for presenting the members of the 'Moscow Center' with the direct charge that they gave consent or directives to organize the committed terrorist act against Kirov." (*Pravda*, January 16, 1935)

The Stalinists declared that Zinoviev, Kamenev and others had *admitted* that although they were not connected with the assassination of Kirov, they had carried on "counter-revolutionary" propaganda and activities against the Party and its leadership. The nature of this "counter-revolutionary" propaganda can be gleaned from the following dispatch:

"M. Yevdokimov testified that he, M. Zinoviev and the latter's followers had made counter-revolutionary insinuations against M. Stalin, accusing the party leadership of forsaking the international working-class movement—apparently meaning the world revolution, which has been only lightly touched upon here in recent years." (*The New York Times*, January 16, 1935)

For this "anti-Leninist," "White Guardist," propaganda to which the defendants "confessed," they were thrown by the Stalinist bureaucracy, their sole judge and jailer, into the "isolator," a living grave.

Little credence, however, can be given to the assertion that Zinoviev, Kamenev, Yevdokimov and other ex-leaders of the former Opposition confessed to the charge of carrying on "counter-revolutionary" activity against Stalin. Having abjectly capitulated to the Stalinist clique, they were obedient serfs of the bureaucratic distortion. It is highly improbable that they ventured to open their mouths against the powerful Stalin. But even if they had dared to breathe to one another in private a half-hint that the world revolution was abandoned by the Stalinists, that would have been extremely mild criticism indeed, compared with actuality.

The faithful American footboy of the bureaucratic distorters of the Soviet State, Earl Browder, carrying out the established policy of approving every crime of the leading clique of the Order, approved the imprisonment of the once great leaders of

a once great movement. To make the bureaucratic "justice" appear respectable in the workers' eyes, Browder's sheet called Stalin's secret chamber of inquisition a "workers' court."

"A Just Decision"

"The criminals who inspired the murder of Comrade Sergei Kirov, stalwart leader of the workers in the Soviet Union, have confessed.

"Nineteen of them, headed by Gregory Zinoviev and Leo Kamenev, came before the workers' court and admitted that they carried on counter-revolutionary underground work whose aim was to overthrow the Communist Party leadership. This, they penitently admit, would mean the overthrow of the Soviet government. . . . The sentence of imprisonment meted out by the Soviet court is indeed merciful and mild for this greatest of crimes against the toilers of the whole world." (*Daily Worker*, January 19, 1935)

No matter how clever and experienced the crook, in concealing the traces of his crimes he will leave gaps which sooner or later lead to his exposure. In taking a grisly curve during the Kirov crisis Stalinism failed to close all the gaps on its slippery road. As ever, Stalinism operated through self-expository contradictions which escaped general notice.

Why were the "trials," first of the White Guards, then of the group of former Left Oppositionists who were executed, and then of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Yevdokimov and others, who were given prison sentences, held *in secret*?

Between spasms of lynch-inspiring rantings and howls against the leaders of the former Left Opposition, especially against the man whom they had framed-up in 1923 and hounded ever since, the Stalinist bureaucrats told the workers everywhere that secrecy of examination was dictated by the fact that a foreign power was involved:

"But the enemies of the Soviet Union immediately raised a howl, trying to cast a doubt upon the authenticity of the Nikolaiev confession. It might have been written, they say, by the . . . Cheka (long abolished!). They would be satisfied with nothing less than a *public* trial of the terrorists—they, who know full well that such a thing was not done, in all probability, because it was found that the terrorist plot involves not only Russian White Guardists, but certain foreign governments and their agents." (M. Katz, *The Assassination of Kirov*, p. 15. Emphasis in the original)

A public trial was out of the question, the Stalinist fakers argued. But there were important historical trials in the Soviet

Union before, almost every one of them involving a foreign government, and all the trials, *without a single exception*, were held in *open* court. There was the trial of thirty-two Social Revolutionists in 1922. These people had actually conducted a campaign of assassination of Soviet leaders. It was definitely proven that they were backed by British and French imperialism. The Soviet leaders, headed by Lenin, were not afraid to allow the enemies of the proletariat to come and defend the criminals. There arrived from bourgeois countries the head of the Second International, Emil Vandervelde, Kurt Rosenfeld, A. Wanters, Theodore Liebknecht, Karl Liebknecht's brother, and others. They were permitted to visit the prison where the defendants were confined.

There was the trial of the terrorist Boris Savinkov in August 1924. It was a *public* trial. Savinkov, the organizer of the counter-revolutionary "Union for the Defense of Country and Freedom," was one of the worst anti-workingclass terrorists in Soviet history. His connection with the French and the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie was brought out into the open. This was done with emphasis, to show the masses that the Communists' assertions that the international bourgeoisie is plotting against the Soviet Union are not delirious fancies or a state of nerves, but living reality.

Savinkov was sentenced to death. The sentence was changed to ten years' imprisonment.

There was the trial in 1930, already under Stalin's undivided personal rule, of Ramzin and his fellow-wreckers. One could sit in a cinema in New York and watch the proceedings of the trial, hear the judges, the witnesses and the defendants. In that trial Poincaré's name was mentioned loud enough for all to hear, showing the connection of French imperialism with Ramzin and his associates. The Stalinists wrote quite openly:

"The recent trial of Ramzin and the other wreckers of the 'Industrial Party' fully exposed the interventionist plans of the imperialists, principally French capital and French military circles." (*The Communist*, April 1931, p. 352)

There was the trial of MacDonald of Metropolitan-Vickers. The anti-Soviet machinations of the British bourgeoisie were brought into the open.

That the "foreign government" excuse is but a cynically impudent invention and has no bearing whatsoever upon the real

reason for the secrecy of the ordeal reserved for Zinoviev, Kamenev and other former leaders of the Opposition, is evident. One need not be an astute observer to grasp that the closed "trial" sprang from the fear of something that might embarrass Stalin if the "trial" were conducted openly. Not only foreign correspondents, but even Stalin's own correspondents of the "Comintern" press were not allowed to attend a single session of the 1934-1935 Kirov "trials."

Stalin had prepared the psychological atmosphere for the secret trial of Zinoviev and Kamenev. His press printed a string of fictitious names of "White Guards," supposedly tried and executed in secret. This established the required "precedent." But here, too, the Stalinist reptile brood left some tell-tale gaps. First, whereas in the case of the executed ex-Oppositionists names were accompanied with brief biographical notes, bare names were published in the case of the "White Guards." Secondly, in their haste the Stalinites forgot to invent evidence against Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev ostensibly given by some of these "White Guards." Thirdly, of the 120 "White Guards" said to have been arrested, 103 were shot. What was done with the remaining seventeen? Were they acquitted and released? Are they still held in prison? If so, couldn't they furnish some "evidence" against Trotsky? As a matter of fact, to date not a word has been mentioned in the Stalinist press of the fate of these "White Guards." Why? because these "White Guards" are a myth, and since they never existed, the Stalinites, in the general tumult, forgot to fill this gap and dispose of them in the *Pravda*.

The Stalinites could not, without arousing the gravest suspicions of the international proletariat, carry out a bloody vendetta against the closest co-workers of Lenin on the basis of a "trial" behind closed doors. They could venture upon so horrible an outrage only after an open trial, with Zinoviev and his fellow-victims making a *public* confession to the charge of plotting terrorist acts against Stalin.

The responsibility for the assassination of Kirov was also placed upon the shoulders of Trotsky and his followers:

"Just as Zinoviev in Moscow bears this responsibility, so does Trotsky in Paris bear the full moral and political responsibility for the murder of Comrade Kirov." (*Inprecorr*, January 12, 1935, p. 52)

"The Trotskyists bitterly assail the construction of Socialism in one country, furiously slander the stalwart and brilliant leader of the

Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin, as well as the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. They thereby give heart and encouragement to all capitalist forces willing to use any instrument against the workers' fatherland no matter what spurious banner it gives itself. The main activity of the Trotskyites has been to work up a counter-revolutionary lynch spirit against the proletarian leaders in the Soviet Union." (*Daily Worker*, editorial, December 19, 1934)

The Stalinists succeeded in establishing in the minds of their followers the idea that opposition to or criticism of Stalin means incitement to assassination. Thus has developed another means of shielding the criminal clique.

Although Trotsky's struggle against Stalin's formidable bureaucratic machine, through lack of theoretical clarity, has proven imperfect, still it is some sort of a struggle. But nowhere, in the entire literature of the Trotsky movement, throughout all the documents, both public and internal, is there the slightest intimation, or a shade of an idea, that Stalin's death or the death of any or of all his immediate supporters would open the way for the return of the old Leninist days.

The Tzarist clique, much less entrenched than the Stalinist clique, was removed not by the handful of petty-bourgeois terrorists, but by the toiling masses. The terrorists took a heavy toll of the Tzarist camarilla. They assassinated a Tzar, but Tzarism remained and was rendered more difficult to fight because of the spectacular but reactionary method of the terrorists. These methods, petty-bourgeois in essence, divert the workers into the path of non-reliance upon the mass action of their own class and demoralize the proletariat.

Employment of individual terrorism against Stalinism would inevitably result in strengthening the Stalinites' claim to Marxism, and place a powerful weapon in the hands of the bureaucrats against *any* opposition. The clique made great use of the assassination of one of its leaders. The assassination of Stalin himself would give the reactionary bureaucracy justification for a ruthless military rule and a wholesale and wanton extermination of the politically "unreliable" section of the proletariat. The task of removing the bureaucratic distortion of the first proletarian State would be rendered by individual terrorism a thousand times more difficult, and perhaps impossible. Stalinism has grown into a social and political system; and only a new revolution, only the mass action of the toilers, guided by a Leninist leadership,

can purify and straighten out the workers State and bring to justice the turncoats and their host of toadies and time-servers.

The Stalinists can stretch a fake argument so much and no more. Of course, the credulity of a certain type of people, their inability to think independently, allow the Stalinists a wider range, but even here there is a limit.

In February 1933, an attempt was made on Roosevelt's life. A few months before, during the election campaign, the Socialists, the Stalinists, Trotskyists and others conducted an agitation against Roosevelt. But only a complete imbecile or a tool of reaction would put the moral and political responsibility for Zangara's act upon the above-mentioned people who never for a minute entertained the crazy idea of inciting the assassination of Roosevelt or of any other capitalist official. The one who is ready to declare, as did that vile representative of human species, the editor of the *Daily Worker*, that Trotsky, because of his political opposition to Stalin was responsible for a terrorist act against one of Stalin's bureaucrats, is a thorough scoundrel, and he who believes this is a hopeless dupe.

No sooner had the storm of rage against "the treacherous scum of the former Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition groups, which united hands with the White Guardists for terrorist purposes" (M. Katz, *The Assassination of Kirov*, p. 20) subsided, some former Left Oppositionists executed, others thrown into dungeons, than the White Guardists, Tzarist priests, monarchists of all shades, former generals, kulaks, landlords and slave-drivers, were granted by the Stalinists full citizenship rights. The Stalinist Constitution, which displaced the revolutionary Constitution adopted prior to the tragic degeneration of the proletarian dictatorship, guarantees these sworn enemies of Socialism the right to vote and hold office in the workers State. Is it a wonder, then, that the Stalinist Constitution, at bottom a monstrous fraud serving the Order as another screen behind which preparations are going apace for further attacks upon the workers' rights and interests, is hailed by the gamut of "democratic" upholders of capitalism from Otto Bauer, "the best of social-traitors" (Lenin) to the rabid anti-Communist, Representative Hamilton Fish!

The Stalinist amalgam of the former Left Oppositionists with the White Guards was an improvement upon the Thermidorian amalgams. In the French Revolution Danton was arrested and

executed, and with him was executed Chabot, an agent of the Bourbons. Robespierre and his followers were bunched together with thieves, forgers and spies. But all these people really existed and were seen at the public executions. The Stalinist reactionaries have learned something since their clumsy Wrangel officer, stool-pigeon affair. Drawing upon their own experience and the experience of others, the Stalinists "arrested," "tried in secret" and "executed" trumped-up "White Guards," on *paper*, but in *reality* mowed down with a hail of bullets a group of former Oppositionists.

The amalgam served the Stalinists a triple purpose. First, it aroused the ire of the White Guards abroad, who denounced the executions; and the wrath of the Fascists who assailed Communism and the Soviet Union. This created the impression that the Stalinists were directing their fire against the reactionary classes. Secondly, and *mainly*, it hoodwinked the Stalinist workers in the capitalist countries and still further isolated the Trotskyists. Thirdly, it established in the minds of the gullible followers of the Browders and Thorezes a precedent of former Oppositionists cooperating with White Guardists, and formed a stepping stone for the future, more complicated, monstrous amalgams.

From age-long experience, the skeptical world knows that confessions obtained from prisoners in secret trials are not to be considered authentic. Intelligent workers, free from Stalinist influence, grasped that what had taken place was one of the numerous dark secrets of Stalinism. Stalin and his lieutenants were disappointedly aware that they had missed the bull's eye and the case remained awkwardly suspended in air. Clearly, a public hearing must be brought about; an open confession must be secured from Zinoviev and other former Oppositionists. That would dispel all doubts and push the fight against Trotsky and the leaders of the former Opposition to the next, the *bloody stage*.

Resting on the bones of Workers Democracy, built by means of plots, distortions and lies, cemented with the blood of the revolutionary workers of all countries and the blood of former Left Oppositionists, the bureaucratic distortion of the workers State can be further strengthened and centralized *only* by new and more vicious lies, conspiracies and crimes. The Stalinist bureaucrats, gone murder-wild, thirsted for the blood of Zinoviev

and Kamenev, and above all, of Trotsky. They went ahead to create a setting which would permit them with a measure of safety to pass from dastardly deeds in the dark of night, to bold murder in broad daylight.

The shrewd Stalinites could not help realizing the ludicrousness of their blunt assertion that Trotsky was morally and politically responsible for the assassination of Kirov. Something more drastic must be projected, nothing short of a mortal thrust.

Was the ground prepared for the daring move? Without doubt. The planting started way back in 1929, after Trotsky had been exiled to Turkey. Under Lovestone's direction, gangster raids were conducted against Trotsky's followers because their meetings were "of the same type as monarchist demonstrations" (*Outline for Speakers on Trotskyism*, March 1929). Robert Minor, early in 1929 editor of the *Daily Worker*, wrote an editorial entitled "Trotskyites Take to Armed Counter-Revolution, the Soviet Power Must Destroy Them." And even earlier, on November 28, 1928, when Trotsky was still in the Soviet Union, Dr. Markoff, at a meeting of the Italian fraction of the Stalinist Party in New York, told the members that those who support the Opposition "are Fascists, worse than Mussolini." The January 4, 1930 issue of the *Freiheit*, edited by Olgin, carried a headline, "Trotsky Still Hopes for a Czar in Russia." After Hitler had become master of Germany the workers were told that Trotsky was Hitler's accomplice. Fritz Heckert in his report to the Presidium of the E.C.C.I., which adopted the resolution that the line in Germany had been and was correct, spoke of the "Hitler-Trotsky platform of 'unity' . . . The accomplice of Hitler, Trotsky . . . the social-Hitlerite Trotsky, who has striven to prove that social democracy and fascism are not twins, but antipodes . . . Hitler and Trotsky . . ." (*What is Happening in Germany*, pp. 22-24). At the Eighth Convention of the C.P.U.S.A., held in Cleveland, April 2, 1934, Browder declared that "Too many of our members still do not understand that Trotskyism and the Trotskyites are not a 'branch' of the Communist movement but rather a police agency of the capitalist class" (*Report*, pp. 76-77). Indeed, the minds of the workers directly under the influence of the Piecks, Thorezes and Browders, and to some extent of the workers within the immediate scope of Stalinist influence, were "properly" prepared to receive a seemingly authentic substantiation of all these allegations.

What was required was to concoct a plot, a diabolical plot, infinitely more cunning, intricate and sinister than the device which tricked the Lovestone leadership to Moscow in 1929, or the trap for the Spanish and French workers laid down at the "Seventh Congress."

In the midnight stillness of the Kremlin Palace the uncrowned autocrat with his Voroshilovs and Orjonikidzes, old hands at treacherous conspiracies and partakers in the usurpation of power, put their heads together. They were set upon a dangerous business, and haste and impatience were stifled. The scheme could be a success only if constructed with the greatest attention to details and perfected by painstaking analysis and reasoning. Doubtless it was a difficult job for Stalin and his crew, but it was not the first, and by far not the last one.

The affair was timed for the critical juncture when the trap would begin to close on the Spanish toilers. Stalin naturally harbored no illusions as to the results his policy would bring to the masses of Spain. To prevent the proletarian revolution in that country was only half of the task. The other half consisted in covering up the new crime. A barrage of poison barbs had to be prepared against the inevitable critics, among them Trotsky. Although much confused, Trotsky would point an accusing finger at the culprits. A world-famous figure, he would gain an audience. It was therefore necessary to still further isolate him and any *genuine* Leninist critics that might appear. It was necessary to freeze with ideological terror all faculties of reasoning within the working class.

That Kirov's assassin did the former Left Opposition, and particularly the struggling Leninist thought within the working class, a bad turn, was soon observed in the shocking step the Stalinists took in their drawn-out Dance of Death.

To grasp clearly what took place at the second "trial" of Zinoviev and Kamenev, to understand why Stalin's keen strategy proved highly successful, one must bear in mind certain facts. Having failed to appraise Stalinism accurately, lacking political clarity, Zinoviev and Kamenev were never able to puncture the bloated bag of Stalinist illusions and falsehoods. Instead of combating the malady they abjectly resigned themselves to this historically unknown disease. They capitulated long before the bloodthirsty streak in the bureaucracy became vivid, and time and again they urged other Oppositionists to capitulate to

the bureaucratic plague, arguing that "differences have been practically eliminated."

Oppositionists of much harder mold than Zinoviev and Kamenev were crushed by the bureaucratic avalanche. Rakovsky, under the terrific pressure of spiritual, ideological and physical torment, surrendered to Stalin. And even Trotsky, one of the strong men in history, although outside the physical reach of the formidable engine of Stalinism, is beaten, his movement in a state of decomposition and bankruptcy.

That Stalin succeeded, through the means of a secret "trial," in throwing *Zinoviev*, the former chairman of the Communist International, and *Kamenev*, chairman of the Council of People's Commissars in Lenin's absence, into prison, and got the entire Russian working class, partly through confusion wrought by the depraving passions of the bureaucracy, partly through sheer coercion, to approve the venomous resolutions of the Stalinists, must have had a shattering effect upon the framed Oppositionists. The vastness of Stalin's power and the hopelessness of their situation were brought home to them with a new and crushing significance. Before their eyes, inside of a dozen years, Stalin's personal absolutism had steadily increased to immense proportions. On the other hand, to an equal degree had grown the demoralization and prostration of the former Opposition inside and outside the Soviet Union. The rise of Fascism in Germany and Austria deprived them of any promise of release from Stalin's clutches. Had there been an independent Opposition movement abroad it would have offered a faint glimmer of hope. The liquidation of Trotsky's movement into the Second International intensified the blackness of despair in the extreme. This uninterrupted process etched indelible lines upon their clouded mentality. Their spirit was burned out, faith laid in ashes, and the last tiny spark of self-defense which compelled Stalin to resort to a secret "trial," was now all but extinguished.

The murderers of Leninism, betrayers of the Chinese, the German and the Spanish proletariat, trembling for their material privileges and personal power, were shaping in secrecy their powerful trump card. And what greater trump card could there be in the hands of the bureaucratic distortion in its infamous game against the proletariat than getting Zinoviev, Kamenev and others to state in an *open court* that they, directed by Trotsky, had organized the assassination of Kirov? What surer way of

preventing the confused Stalinist workers from listening to *any* criticism of the murderous line in Spain and France than by proving through the testimony of the former leaders of the Opposition that Trotsky collaborated with Hitler's secret police, that the Trotsky movement is really a variety of Fascism, and so are, by implication, all "similar" shadings. Every falsehood, if not exposed, prevails. Unlike the lines in Germany and Spain, which could be, with greater or lesser difficulty, exposed, an open confession of the former leaders of the Opposition would defy exposure. If any one made bold to run against superficial judgment he would incur the wrath of the duped Stalinist workers. To doubt the genuineness of the open confessions could only mean to side with Trotsky, with Hitler, to cast suspicions upon the leaders of the only land of hope, the Soviet Union.

Workers living in a mental fog, who imagine that Stalinism is Leninism, who know nothing of the Stalinist gangster attacks upon the Left Opposition inside and outside the Soviet Union, know nothing of Stalinism and its methods. Even the followers of the "democratic" bureaucrats, Lovestone and Wolfe, suffer bloody noses and cracked heads at the hands of Browder's gangsters and hooligans. On the day the Stalinites were to open their "trial" in Moscow, a former member of the Trotskyist organization, B. J. Field, speaking at a street meeting, was attacked by Browder's strong-arm men. He suffered a bruised nose and a broken arm (*New York World Telegram*, August 19, 1936). This was done in public, before a workers' audience and numerous passersby. Within the Soviet Union itself, where any Left opposition to Stalin carries a danger to the bureaucracy, the ferociousness of the bureaucratic tigers goes far beyond the limit of broken arms and cracked heads. In deep secrecy, behind the grim walls of the dreadful Lubiankas, the ungloved fist of the G.P.U. makes short work of its victims, particularly those regarded as a menace from the Left.

One can declare with certainty that Zinoviev and the rest of the "cast" scheduled to open the performance on the 19th of August, 1936, underwent medieval tortures in Stalin's dungeons. Stalin's jungle treatment of the former Opposition was, no doubt, applied with double severity to the leaders marked for destruction. The usual torture of political solitary cells with military sentries and absolute prohibition of interviews and visits was supplemented with systematic beatings by the G.P.U. To

the fiery ordeal was added the gnawing torment of the fact that out of 173,000,000 people in the Soviet Union, not a voice was raised in protest. In the vise-like grip of the Stalinist clique, the mind and soul of the old revolutionists, life-long collaborators of Lenin, already savagely mutilated beyond recognition, were being slowly, obdurately transformed by the Stalinist mill of torture into putty—putty in the iron hands of the bureaucratic distortion. The long drawn-out mental and physical torture rasped their nerves to a breaking point, and then—beyond that point.

Throughout the ages there are records of many organized criminal cliques and movements, but Stalinism has no precedent. There have been frame-ups in history, abominable ones, to be sure: Dreyfus, Bailis, Mooney and Billings, Sacco and Vanzetti, the Scottsboro boys, and scores of others. But all of them were crudely staged, clumsy affairs compared with the atrocity masterly engineered by Stalin and his crew who brought into play every infamy which their criminal ingenuity could devise.

Is it very difficult to visualize the ordeal the prisoners were subjected to until they were fully "trained" by Stalin's grinders for the public show?

Zinoviev was brought before some high-placed, well remunerated G.P.U. officials of exceptional baseness and viciousness. Subtly brutal, arrogant and cynical, they expertly worked on the battered creature, moving towards their goal through several successive operations.

"Now, Zinoviev, you know that the line of the Party is correct."

"I'm convinced of it," could be the only reply of the physically exhausted and spiritually destroyed Zinoviev.

"You understand that you are completely isolated from the masses who despise you. In the Soviet Union, as well as in the capitalist countries, the Communist workers are solidly behind our great Comrade Stalin and his able colleagues."

"I realize that. Comrade Stalin is the successor of Lenin. He is Lenin's greatest disciple."

"Now, Zinoviev, if you really are sincere when you say the Party line is correct, if you are not secretly entertaining hopes that capitalism returns to Russia, you will work with the Party, you will assist our great Stalin. You now have the opportunity

to prove your devotion to Socialism, and to the builder of Socialism, Comrade Stalin."

"I'm willing to do anything."

"Are you? Well, this is what you can do. In the closed session you flatly denied any connection with the assassination of Kirov. If you are genuinely interested in doing the proletariat a service, you will come out in an open court and make a confession that you, Kamenev, Yevdokimov and the rest of you organized the murder of our noble Comrade Kirov. You must emphasize that you worked under the direction of the counter-revolutionary renegade Trotsky. The Hitlerite Trotsky, you will say, concocted a Fascist-terrorist plot to assassinate the greatest Leninist of all times, our beloved Comrade Stalin, and his able and devoted associates. This act of yours will conclusively prove that you definitely and irrevocably are siding with the Party, with the Soviet Union, with Comrade Stalin."

A long and painful silence. Although the torture-frayed nerves do not react to the infernal proposal, yet the mind refuses to entertain a project of such revolting nature.

"You realize, Zinoviev, that in our fight against the enemies of Socialism, against the renegade counter-revolutionary Hitlerite Trotsky and his Fascist followers we cannot be over-scrupulous. Means justify the end. Will you do your duty then?"

Silence; then a barely audible whisper:

"No, I cannot do that."

The G.P.U. inquisitors glance at one another askance. Then one of them:

"Comrades, this rat and scoundrel Zinoviev is a confirmed liar and a fraud. He stands there and swears that he is for the Party, for Comrade Stalin, for the Soviet Union. And a minute later he acts to shield one of the worst enemies of the toiling masses and of our Socialist fatherland. He makes an open attempt to protect the Fascist Trotsky."

"Zinoviev, you are a low, contemptible dog. You are a counter-revolutionary Trotskyist."

"No I'm not! I hate Trotsky. He is the leader of the vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. He is the worst enemy of the working class of the entire world, of the Soviet Union and of the truly great Stalin. But how can I come out and say that I organized that horrible murder when I had absolutely nothing to do with it!"

The wonder-working Stalinist tormentors did not, of course, at first wholly succeed in breaking the "obdurate defiance" of their victims. But further intermittent torture, with a terrible threat held over the victims' heads, brought the wretches to their senses. What technique of torture did the Stalinists employ? Only when the scourge is removed by the workers will its dark and bloody secrets be made known to the world. Whether those Oppositionists who flatly refused to help Stalin in his blood-curdling scheme were executed and their corpses shown to the others who wavered; whether wives and children were tortured in the presence of husbands and fathers, the workers outside are not in a position to know. But whether the G.P.U. resorted to the third-degree methods of the American detectives and prison guards, from rubber hose to suspending the prisoners by their thumbs on the cell doors (spread-eagle); whether their jailers put into action the Chinese water torture, cigarette burning or tooth-drilling; whether the pain they chose to inflict upon their victims was the sharp and piercing or the throbbing and grating; whatever instruments were used, the rod, the funnel or the thumbscrew—one thing is beyond a shadow of a doubt. The Stalinist bureaucrats in their own prisons use unlimited, elaborate and far more "persuasive" methods than the "respectable" method of mere nose-bruising and arm-breaking which Browder uses against his political opponents openly in the streets of New York.

Having passed through months of effective "training," Zinoviev knew his role better.

"Zinoviev, you will state openly that the Fascist bandit Trotsky organized a terrorist band composed of you, Kamenev, Bakaiev and others, to assassinate Lenin's great successor, the beloved leader of the world proletariat, Comrade Stalin and the leading comrades of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. You will state that the Hitlerite Trotsky directed the murder of Kirov."

"If that will serve the interests of the Soviet Union, of our Party and its wise and devoted leader, the great Stalin, then I feel I must do that."

"Zinoviev, there is something more you must do."

"I will do whatever you want me to do."

"Very well. It will be established that Trotsky and you received assistance from Hitler's Gestapo. Unless we prove that

Trotsky works with the Fascist secret police, the whole attempt to expose that criminal counter-revolutionist will prove a failure."

A hysterical spasm in Zinoviev's throat; and a prolonged pause. And despite the repeated demand for a concrete reply, an eloquent silence.

After a few more months of intense "training," during which Zinoviev finally was transformed into a thin, haggard hulk, a shadow of his former self, during which, from his shrill, agonized cries the vocal cords in his throat snapped and his voice, famous for its power, was reduced to a squeaky, womanish whisper, he and his fellow-victims knew their roles to perfection. His will, supple before, was now completely destroyed. There were no doubt last minute instructions:

"You, Mrachkovsky, will say that even if you were to succeed in killing Stalin and other leaders, and seize power, you would immediately proceed quarrelling among yourselves for the various posts.

"Kamenev, you must not forget to state that your sole motive was the lust for personal power. You had no program. This is important. It will make the workers throughout the world realize the incontrovertible truth that only our great Stalin, the Lenin of the present epoch, has a program.

"You, Zinoviev, know what to say. What is Fascism?"

"Trotskyism plus terrorism is Fascism."

"Correct. Now everyone must remember that we all work in harmony, except those who were told of their special role, as Smirnov. Don't contradict the prosecutor and the judges. Never for a single moment forget that at this trial we do not direct our fight against the Nazis but against their agent, Trotsky. Denounce yourselves and especially the Fascist bandit Trotsky most vehemently, as the worst enemies of Socialism, deserving to be shot like mad dogs. Don't forget, Reingold, to mention Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsy, and the rest.

"The Russian working class, the international proletariat and its great teacher and leader Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin will recognize the important service you will render to the cause of Communism, to the defense of our great Socialist fatherland, the Soviet Union. The most vicious enemy of the toilers and of humanity as a whole, the Hitlerite counter-revolutionary renegade bandit Trotsky will be completely exposed, and later you

will be treated by our Party, under the leadership of the wise and just Comrade Stalin, in the spirit of growing democracy and freedom guaranteed by the Stalin Constitution. For a while your imprisonment will continue—after such confessions it cannot be otherwise—but at not a very distant day, the Soviet government, directed by our great-hearted Stalin, will amnesty you, without a doubt, in consideration of the penitent tone you took at the trial. Trust Comrade Stalin. You know, you were more than once in opposition to the Party and its leadership, yet you were forgiven and reinstated time and again. Put your entire confidence in our great leader, play fairly and honestly with the Party and you will be dealt with squarely and generously; and you will serve the Soviet Union on future occasions in the struggle against its numerous enemies.

"A few points of warning. Zinoviev and Kamenev, you remember how we, through Comrade Gusev, captured the American section from those contemptible American adventurers and political charlatans, Foster, Browder and Cannon, and handed it over to the equally contemptible adventurer and political charlatan, Lovestone, who at that time, when the Comintern was not yet completely Bolshevized as it is today, supported us against the counter-revolutionary renegade Trotsky. Gusev put an end to the Foster-Lovestone stock-exchange, race-horse speculation on the differences in the Russian Party by creating a Parity Central Committee. But, as you recall, it was not a parity Central Committee. So now we are to have a public trial. But as you will find out for yourselves, it will *not* be a public trial. The proceedings will not be broadcast as was the practice in other important trials. There will be carefully selected people in the court room. There will be our own newspapermen. Foreign bourgeois correspondents will be present whose dispatches, you know, are of an impartial character. Ordinarily we are not severe with the correspondents, but if a single one of them, be it even our friend Duranty, attempts to give a wrong color in his description of the trial, if his dispatches assume an openly hostile tone to the proletariat and its beloved leader, Stalin, we will certainly clamp down on such an unwise correspondent.

"Among your co-defendants will be people who are not known to you. Your 'confessions' will be given to you to memorize before the trial. If any one of you is insane enough

to deny at the trial that he made a 'confession' those people will expose you as liars and hypocrites. You understand who those people are. And you realize what fate awaits you if you fail to carry out the instructions. It will be worse than death, rest assured.

"So keep in mind throughout the trial the following: if any of you ventures some treacherous, perfectly stupid and futile sabotage of this attempt to expose and isolate the counter-revolutionary Hitlerite scoundrel, Trotsky, if you again mislead and double-cross the Party, you may be sure that it will be the last time. The outside world will never hear of your shameful endeavor to shield the Fascist Trotsky; it will learn only of some strange cases of 'suicide' among you. Also, there will be 'suicides' among members of your families. The life of your sons, Kamenev, is in your hands. These are no empty threats, you know. So play fair, trust Comrade Stalin; he will faithfully carry out his promise, he will positively not go back on his word."

Astounding news burst upon the surprised world, rocking it with excitement—news which delighted the malicious heart of many an astute bourgeois statesman, general and banker, bitter enemies of the proletarian revolution. Unmistakably, the Russian Revolution, fortunately for the imperialists, was following the example of the French Revolution.

As at the "Seventh Congress" or at any other elaborate Stalinist show, the roles of the participants in the gruesome and shocking spectacle had been distributed in advance; everybody knew his part, and the curtain went up.

The prosecutor, the judges, the secretary of the "court," all guilty of the most frightful anti-workingclass crimes that can possibly be imagined, were snapping the whip. The bourgeois correspondents, not allowed at the secret "trials" a year and a half before, were almost welcomed now. Most of the defendants were not well known to the foreign correspondents. No doubt all the victims showed the results of the frightful treatments they had received in prison, and the Russian workers, who knew the old Bolsheviks well, would have noticed at once the change wrought. But the workers were not present at the "trial," and the Stalinite bureaucrats took care not to allow press photographers in the room. The wasted figure of Zinoviev, how-

ever, showed unmistakable signs of recent physical torture and mental anguish:

"Zinoviev, however, looked utterly beaten, chagrined and apathetic. Once stout, he is thin, haggard and tired. The shrill voice with which he used to rouse the Comintern meetings has fallen to a womanish whisper." (*The New York Times*, August 20, 1936)

The secretary read the indictment, which really was nothing less than a self-indictment by the Stalinist clique. The whole case was built up not on the basis of some irrefutable evidence presented by the prosecution, as in the genuine cases years before. It was based *exclusively* upon the testimony of the accused themselves.

"At the time of the murder of S. M. Kirov, Zinoviev admitted [from behind closed doors—G.M.] only moral responsibility for that dastardly crime. The state prosecution at that time was not in possession of sufficient evidence to prove more than moral responsibility on the part of Zinoviev and his accomplices. *Today, the defendants have themselves furnished sufficient and convincing proof.*" (*Moscow News*, August 26, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

The indictment is filled with one defendant's testimony being confirmed by another's; with phrases "It now transpires," "The investigation also established" (*Report of Court Proceedings*, p. 10). "The testimonies of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Yevdokimov, Mrachkovsky, Bakayev and a number of other accused in the present case, have established beyond doubt" (p. 12). "Exhaustive evidence on the same point was also given during the examination on July 23, 1936 by the accused Kamenev" (p. 13). "This was confirmed also by the accused Yevdokimov." "Similar evidence was also given by a member of the Moscow terrorist center, I. I. Reingold" (p. 15). "The accused V. A. Ter-Vaganyan confirmed the evidence of the accused Smirnov" (p. 17). "The evidence of Mrachkovsky was fully confirmed by the accused Dreitzer" (p. 22). "This testimony of V. Olberg was fully confirmed by Paul Olberg" (p. 25). "M. Lurye's testimony was fully confirmed by N. Lurye" (p. 28). "The testimony of Mrachkovsky and Dreitzer was also confirmed by the accused Reingold" (p. 36). Etc., etc., etc.

Stalin now switched the amalgam. In the first Kirov "trials," in December 1934 and January 1935, the Stalinist cry was about White Guards, and was directed against Zinoviev, Kamenev and

other former Oppositionists and against Trotsky, who were labeled "White Guards." There were announcements of arrests of scores of White Guards and the execution of 103. But in August 1936 not a single White Guard, nor a former banker, industrialist, nor a professional Russian petty-bourgeois terrorist, the Social Revolutionary—people who are really against Communism—was among the accused. The old amalgam was White Guards-Zinoviev-Kamenev-Trotsky—"foreign governments"; the new one was Zinoviev-Kamenev-Trotsky-Hitler.

The tragedy moved on. The puzzled bourgeois correspondents, who never suspected that they were playing an important part in Stalin's scheme, watched with a skeptical eye an amazing scene which defied credulity. Here were men who, together with Lenin, founded the Bolshevik Party, who for decades worked with him for the proletarian revolution. They often differed with him, as did at one time or another virtually every member of the Party. But much oftener they agreed with him, and followed him. They spent many of their years in the Tzar's prisons, in exile. While Lenin lived they were together with him at the head of the Bolshevik Party, of the Soviet State and of the Communist International. Their entire struggle was directed towards one goal—Socialism. And now when Russia, according to Stalin, has attained the goal and has entered the state of Socialism, these men have plotted to destroy Socialism, to tear down the Soviet State and its leaders, to open the way for imperialist intervention against which they themselves had fought so vigorously during the Civil War, some, like Mrachkovsky, winning medals for bravery and devotion to the cause of the Red Army. Their aim now was to transform Soviet Russia into a capitalist, a *Fascist* country. They were in direct touch with Hitler's Gestapo, according to their own testimony! And in Norway was a man, an exile from the Soviet Union, who, next to Lenin, was the greatest figure of the proletarian revolution in Russia, the man who together with Lenin organized the October Insurrection, organized the Red Army, organized the Soviet victory over the White armies and the imperialist intervention. After Lenin's death he was removed from high posts in the government. In 1927 he was declared by the present leaders a counter-revolutionist, and expelled from the Party; later everybody learned from the papers in the Soviet Union and numerous *Daily Workers* and *Freibeits* in capitalist countries

that he had become a White Guardist. Now he was a Hitlerite.

The presiding judge, Ulrich, announced that the accused declined the services of council for defense. Naturally! Their job was not to deny guilt, but to make "confessions," and a council for defense was out of place here. Their "defense" consisted in vehemently denouncing themselves and particularly Trotsky.

The general understanding throughout the world is that the Nazis are the most aggressive enemies of Communism, of the Soviet Union. One would think that upon the discovery that the Nazi leaders had actively assisted in a plot to assassinate the heads of the Soviet State, these heads would seize upon the evidence to awaken the workers on this clear *Fascism vs. Soviet* leadership issue. But that would interfere with the real purpose of the trial.

"Curiously enough, in view of the prominence given the defendants' alleged link with German fascism, Judge Ulrich twice stopped defendants' attacks on Nazi leaders." (*The New York Times*, August 25, 1936)

The Nazi correspondents and German embassy personnel, to avoid embarrassment, wisely absented themselves from the "trial."

Trotskyite workers knew that their line is to reform Social Democracy, but they found a "refutation" of this in Olberg's testimony:

"I emphasize that my connection with the Gestapo was not at all an exception, of which one could speak as of the fall of an individual Trotskyite. It was the line of the Trotskyites in conformity with the instructions of L. Trotsky given through Sedov. The connection with the Gestapo followed the line of organized terrorism in the U.S.S.R. against the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government." (*Report of Court Proceedings*, p. 25. My emphasis—G.M.)

If any worker read in Trotsky's writings that the Soviet Union, though bureaucracy-ridden, is nevertheless a workers State, they now found out that he was concealing his true opinion, as revealed in the "trial" by the defendant Smirnov:

"Trotsky, who sends directions and instructions on terrorism, and regards our state as a fascist state..." (*Ibid.*, p. 171)

Which Fascist State Trotsky aims to overthrow in order to establish Fascism!

When the treacherous clique—Stalin, Voroshilov, Orjonikidze, Postyshev, Kalinin, Zdanov, Molotov and the rest—was conspiring to usurp power, this sinister aim was, unofficially, attributed to Trotsky. The purpose was to misdirect the workers' vigilance and to divert the finger of suspicion. Now the Stalinist plot to exterminate the ex-leaders of the former Opposition was carried out by presenting the whole thing in the light that the ex-Oppositionists plotted to kill Stalin. The motive that impelled Stalin to actually seize personal power and consciously go over to counter-revolution was now put into the defendants' "confessions."

"Vysbinsky: Consequently, your struggle against the leaders of the Party and the government was guided by motives of a personal base character—by the thirst for personal power?"

"Kamenev: Yes, by the thirst for power of our group."

"Vysbinsky: Don't you think that this has nothing in common with social ideals?"

"Kamenev: It has as much in common as revolution has with counter-revolution."

"Vysbinsky: That is, you are on the side of counter-revolution."

"Kamenev: Yes."

"Vysbinsky: Consequently, you clearly perceive that you are fighting Socialism?"

"Kamenev: We clearly perceive that we are fighting against the leaders of the Party and of the government who are leading the country to Socialism." (*Ibid.*, p. 69)

It is obvious that the Stalinists' position and their entire past course precluded the possibility of having the victims present a policy for Socialism.

If Zinoviev and Kamenev declared they had a different line for the Soviet Union, that would have involved the examination of the conflicting lines, a thorough analysis of Stalin's line. Therefore their aim could be presented only as one against Socialism. These old Bolsheviks had to "confess" that they were for the destruction of the Soviet Union, for capitalism.

"At present the Trotskyite-Zinovievite conspirators, as a reason for their fight against the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government, no longer advance the claim that the Party and the Soviet Government are pursuing an allegedly wrong policy, or that the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government are leading the country to its doom, as they lyingly and slanderously asserted in the past. As their principal motive for

resorting to terrorism they now advance the success of the building of Socialism in the U.S.S.R." (*Ibid.*, pp. 12-13)

The bourgeois correspondents, understanding nothing in the complicated game of the Stalinist reaction, looked on with amazement at this "Fantastic scene in the old club of the Moscow Nobles" (*The New York Times*, August 21, 1936). Not only did the defendants not deny their guilt, but they were actually eager to show they were guilty:

"Today, even more than yesterday, was apparent the incomprehensible desire of the defendants to convict themselves... they supplement their full confession with eager testimony against themselves and against each other. They spring to their feet like bright pupils glad to show how much they know." (*The New York Times*, August 21, 1936)

And as the "trial" proceeded it became obvious that "The accused men are deliberately overacting" (*The New York Times*, August 23, 1936).

But while the bourgeois correspondents were bewildered, and the workers and intellectuals outside the Stalinists skeptical, the duped followers of the Browders and Olgin believed in the authenticity of the "confessions." History was recording a frame-up of the first water, intricate in appearance but simple enough. To safeguard the interests of the bureaucratic pyramid, the prosecutor and the judges lied with fervor of conviction; while in the desperate attempt to win their lives, the defendants lied with even too much emphasis, assisting the prosecution and the judges. The Browders who man the "Comintern," which Stalin converted into a huge pirate ship sailing under the stolen Red Flag, had no difficulty in convincing their followers. Seething with jubilation, all those who live by the crimes of Stalinism trembled with joy. There was no need for them to resort to their stock tricks. All that was done in the headquarters of Stalinism by the Master himself, assisted by the high dignitaries of the Order. What would have been considered a wild phantasy eighteen months ago was an "undisputed fact" today. Zinoviev and Kamenev, by their own admission, were agents of counter-revolution, and so was Trotsky. What more could a Stalinist bureaucrat wish for! Olgin wrote with murderous glee:

"They were brought before an open trial, at which were present representatives of the world press and many foreign visitors. They

were tried in strict accordance with the laws of the U.S.S.R." (*Daily Worker*, September 12, 1936)

The boss press and its correspondents, definitely hostile to the proletariat, to genuine Bolshevism, when it serves Stalin's purposes, are "representatives of the world press." The smug bourgeois idlers and lovers of sensational performances are "foreign visitors." Bureaucratic centralism of the workers State, having distorted the proletarian dictatorship, the government, relations in the shops, history, art, literature—everything—has perverted also the justice and all the laws of the U.S.S.R. to serve Stalin's personal ends and those of his bureaucracy. For the purpose of cloaking Vyshinsky, Ulrich and other criminals with legality and authority, the Olgins honor the place where was staged the grisly spectacle with the name "Soviet Court," and dignify the despicable clique of usurpers and anti-Leninist cutthroats with the title "the heads of the Soviet Government." The bureaucratic distorters acted to defend and perpetuate their power and fat living—*private* possessions and enjoyment of limousines, fair country estates, ever-growing economic security and privileges. Their fear of exposure, which would bring about their overthrow by the impoverished toiling masses, fear which haunts them in their sleep, the lust and ambition and the lure of higher bourgeois luxury, they fused in a murderous frenzy of protective vengeance, veiling it with spurious legality and false dignity.

The ghastly mystery show went on. If the defendants had any doubts with respect to the threats of "suicide" of any one accused by the Stalinites, these doubts were dispelled by Tomsky's death:

"Michael Tomsky died suddenly today at his home near Moscow. Officials said Mr. Tomsky, who was head of the State Publishing House, had committed suicide because 'he became entangled in the conspiracy of counter-revolutionary terrorists.'" (*The New York Times*, August 23, 1936)

Tomsky was one of seven on the highest committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Politburo. Whether he actually committed suicide or was tortured to death upon his categorical refusal to play the gruesome game, is known only to the criminals in the Kremlin.

But the fakery and the purpose of the whole "trial" became

unmistakable when the defendants delivered their valedictory speeches. These men, who according to the indictment and their own "confessions," were actuated by their hatred of Socialism, their hatred of Stalin, counter-revolution having ingrained itself ineradicably into the very core of their hopelessly pro-capitalist minds, spoke of Stalin in suspiciously sanctimonious tones. They voiced their approval of the Stalinist path for the Soviet Union and declared that the Stalinist was the only historically possible leadership. Said Smirnov:

"There is no other path for our country but the one it is now treading, and there is not, nor can there be, any other leadership than that which history has given us." (*Report of Court Proceedings*, p. 171)

Kamenev transmitted a message to his sons:

"I want them to know my last wish—that they shall work, fight and, if need be, die only under Stalin's banner. They shall devote their lives to Stalin's cause." (*The New York Times*, August 24, 1936)

"Moses Lourier, who indicated he felt entitled to some clemency, cried, 'Long live the people of the land and Comrade Stalin.'" (*New York World-Telegram*, August 24, 1936)

"They blessed the name of Stalin." (*The New York Times*, August 25, 1936)

While they blessed the name of Stalin, they cursed Trotsky:

"I want to assure the proletarian Court,' says the accused Fritz David, 'that I curse Trotsky.'" (*Report of Court Proceedings*, p. 173)

Zinoviev explained that "'Trotskyism is a variety of fascism'" (*Ibid.*, p. 171).

Kamenev warned against Trotsky's terroristic activities and expressed his wish that Trotsky be stopped:

"After our deaths, Trotsky will remain as the only person to organize, guide and supervise terroristic activities against Soviet leaders. The sooner his hand is checked the better." (*New York World-Telegram*, August 24, 1936)

Oddly enough, the Stalinists unreservedly accepted "Zinoviev's" definition of Trotskyism:

"As a result of the facts brought out at the trial, Trotskyism today stands exposed not only as an ally of fascism objectively but as a

current in Fascism. *Trotskyism today is fascism.*" (*The Communist*, September 1936, p. 814)

How reminiscent it is of the "Third Period," when Social Democracy was not only Social Fascism, but "IS actual Fascism"! (*The Communist International*, Vol. VII, No. 2-3, p. 101)

One sees now how Hearst became a Trotskyite, "the chief Trotskyite in America, Hearst . . ." (Mike Gold, *Daily Worker*, February 26, 1937)

The "open trial" was prepared less hastily and therefore with far greater skill and caution than the clumsily staged affair a year and a half before. The wide gaps were evaded; but a few unforeseen crevices developed through which truth trickled out.

Zinoviev, Smirnov, Kamenev and the rest were forced by Stalin into a maze of ridiculous contradictions. All their lives they had fought for Socialism. Yet with the Soviet Union becoming Socialist, they became pro-capitalist. When their "plot" was discovered and they suffered imprisonment in a "Socialist" jail, they suddenly saw the light, "confessed" to their "plots," blessed Stalin's name and once more were for Socialism.

Is it difficult to grasp that the "liaison men," Fritz David, the Luryes, Berman-Yurin, and possibly Olberg, were Stalin's G.P.U. agents? Olberg was a star witness, for he was the link, he testified, between Trotsky and Hitler. He arrived in the Soviet Union to carry out the plot.

"Olberg, according to his testimony, came into the country on a false passport arranged by the German Gestapo (secret police). He made all plans but was arrested, for some undisclosed reason, before the fatal day." (*The New York Times*, August 21, 1936)

Yes, why was Olberg arrested? One can peruse *Pravda*, *Izvestia* and other papers, but nowhere is there an explanation as to what led to the arrest of Olberg. When the question is raised, a thousand reasons can be invented. The fact remains that the arrests of Olberg and of Fritz David were left unexplained.

As far as it is possible to ascertain, only two exhibits, outside the "confessions" recorded by the Stalinists, were presented at the "trial." When the Social Revolutionaries were tried in 1922, their secret archives containing various incriminating documents, confiscated by the Soviet Government, weighed over 200 pounds. It had been extremely difficult, virtually impossible, to penetrate the close, conspiratory circle of these petty-bourgeois

terrorists. On the other hand, it was quite easy to enter Trotsky's organization, have access to the homes of its leaders, and if finances permitted, even to visit Trotsky. Yet, only two exhibits were obtained by the Stalinists, both from Olberg. What were they? His Honduran passport and a visiting card of the agent of the German police in Prague, V. P. Tukalevsky.

"In the dossier there is a visiting card of the very same Tukalevsky, which he sent to Olberg at a secret address in Stalinabad, with letters written on it in cipher." (P. Lang, *The Communist*, October 1936, p. 940)

This is extremely interesting. The *Report of Court Proceedings* shows that Olberg visited the U.S.S.R. three times. "The first time Olberg went to the U.S.S.R. was at the end of March 1933. . . . Olberg remained in the Soviet Union up to the end of July 1933. The purpose of the visit was to propose and carry out the assassination of Comrade Stalin. On arriving in the U.S.S.R. Olberg lived secretly in Moscow for six weeks, and then went to Stalinabad" (p. 88). The second and third visits take place two years later. "In March, 1935, Olberg arrived in the Soviet Union for the second time. This visit was also fruitless because he had a tourist *visa*, could not stay long, and had to return to Germany after a few days. There he remained for three months, and again received instructions from Sedov to make another attempt. In July 1935 Olberg again went to the Soviet Union. After remaining in Minsk for a short time, he went to Gorki, and there he established contact with the Trotskyites Yelin and Fedotov. He soon obtained employment in the Gorki Pedagogical Institute, where he remained until his arrest" (p. 90).

So! Olberg was in Stalinabad only in the early Summer of 1933, where according to the Stalinists, he received Tukalevsky's visiting card. But in the *Report* it is clearly shown that Olberg saw Tukalevsky only after 1933 in Prague, Czechoslovakia: "After 1933 I visited Tukalevsky with my younger brother. . . . I learned from my brother that he was an agent of the fascist secret police" (p. 89). But this is not all. Since his second visit, in March 1935, lasted only a few days he could hardly have been in Stalinabad which is about 2,000 miles away from Moscow. The third visit was spent in Minsk and Gorki.

Granting that Olberg did receive the "visiting card" in Stalin-

abad in 1933, two and a half years before his arrest or even during his second visit, in March 1935, if he were what he pretended to be, a terrorist, the most logical thing he would have done upon receiving the message would have been to copy it and immediately destroy the card, the discovery of which by Stalin's G.P.U. would have spelled disaster not only to his plot but to his life as well. But Olberg carried the card with him out of the Soviet Union, in danger of being caught with it by the border police, brought it back to Minsk, later to Gorki. He kept it in a perfectly legible condition to be discovered as evidence by the G.P.U. who arrested him "for some undisclosed reason." Another palpable absurdity the Stalinists expect one to believe in this "visiting card" matter is that the agents of Hitler's secret police are as stupid as the famous cops and detectives in the Mack Sennet comedies. They send visiting cards bearing their names through the mails into the Soviet Union. They send them to people who have entered the Soviet Union on false passports, in fine, people who are at any moment liable to detection. And, in order "not" to attract attention, they write on these cards ciphered messages, two letters "P" and "F," of the "deepest conspiratory character," messages dealing with a plot to assassinate the heads of the State.

Stalin and his Yagodas are master-minds at plotting, but even a master-mind slips. The Stalinists tried to prove two things: one, that "Trotsky's" agent, Olberg, received secret messages; second, that he received them from an agent of the German Gestapo. Hence this clumsy concoction with the visiting card. Another gap. The Olgins now boast about the "open trial." But during the Kirov crisis, the "trials," the Olgins and Katzes explained, had to be conducted secretly, because "a foreign power is involved." But now also a foreign power was involved. Yet no secrecy was required. Clearly, in both, the secret and the "public" "trials" of Zinoviev and Kamenev, it was not a foreign power but something else that was involved.

An additional reason why press photographers, sound-film apparatus, and radio microphones, so prominent in the former trials, were forbidden at this "trial." David and the other G.P.U. agents had, of course, been promised rewards and promotions for their services. To impress them with confidence in Stalin's promises and show that measures were adopted to prevent their recognition at the "trial" and after, no pictures were taken.

Still another important discrepancy. Holtzman testified that "In 1932 he personally received from L. Trotsky instructions regarding preparations for terroristic acts against the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government" (*Report of Court Proceedings*, p. 98). His meeting with Trotsky, Holtzman testified, was arranged by Trotsky's son, Sedov. "I arranged with Sedov to be in Copenhagen within two or three days, to put up at the Hotel Bristol and meet him there. *I went to the hotel straight from the station and in the lounge met Sedov.* About 10 A.M. we went to Trotsky" (*Ibid.*, p. 100. My emphasis—G.M.).

If a New York worker or a Tokyo worker or a Moscow worker read this testimony he could not detect a lie here. It was quite different with a Copenhagen worker. The organ of the Danish Social-Democratic Party, the *Copenhagen Socialdemokraten*, immediately after Holtzman's testimony became known, revealed the fact, which could be verified by anybody, that Hotel Bristol *had been razed in 1917 and was rebuilt only in 1936.* Consequently, in 1932, when the alleged meeting of Holtzman and Sedov took place this hotel did not exist. The *New York Post* made a mention of this in the September 16, 1936 issue. The editors of the *Freiheit* and of the *Daily Worker* read the *Copenhagen Socialdemokraten*. They read the *New York Post*, especially the material that deals with them. Not a word of refutation was uttered by the Olgins and Hathaways, who do much writing and talking, but certainly know when to keep mum.

Days and weeks and *months* went by; the workers were all agog about the Hotel Bristol, but nowhere in the Stalinist press was there even a word to show that the statement that the Hotel Bristol did not exist in 1932 was false.

But Stalin could not let the situation remain unremedied and allow such weighty evidence against him to circulate among the workers. The "Trotskyist" clamor about the Hotel Bristol had to be silenced. The mistake could be very easily rectified, at least in part. Stalin could not, of course, change the trial records or prove that the hotel did exist in 1932. Something different had to be arranged.

On February 11, 1937, almost half a year after the "trial" in which Holtzman had given the testimony about the Hotel Bristol, a dispatch from Copenhagen appeared in the *Daily*

Worker, informing everybody that Martin Nielsen, editor of the Danish Stalinist paper *Arbejderbladet*, refuted the "flimsy arguments" of the "Trotskyites." Hotel Bristol turned out to be "a Viennese cafe, 'Bristol'" situated next to the Hotel Kobenhavn. Holtzman, according to the Stalinist "correction," believed that this was the Hotel Bristol. "The 'Bristol Cafe' is notoriously known in Denmark as a hang-out of Danish and other Trotskyites" (*Daily Worker*, February 12, 1937).

But what is the reason the whole swarm of the Stalinist fact-assassins, which includes Martin Nielsen, was silent about this matter for nearly six months? Are there no Stachels, Amters, Michael Golds and Harry Ganneses in Copenhagen? Galore! Were they not vexatiously stirred by the give-away incongruity in Holtzman's testimony? Didn't they, after the fake about the Hotel Bristol had been laid open, make a thorough investigation and comb the town for everything and anything bearing the name Bristol? Didn't they especially search the area around the railroad stations? And if the story published in the *Daily Worker*, February 11, 1937, were true, why, then, was there for such a long while not a word about the Viennese cafe, Bristol, "located one minute off Copenhagen railroad station!" and "notoriously known" not only in Copenhagen but in entire Denmark!

On March 3, 1937, in support of the story of three weeks before, the *Daily Worker* produced a photograph of the Viennese cafe. One is struck by the size of letters in the sign *Bristol* running over the window of the cafe. Doubtless even a half-blind man, a good many feet away, could not fail to see the sign. But the thousands of Stalinists in Copenhagen, many of whom, without doubt, passed this spot near the main railroad station more than once, failed to notice this sign for a whole half year.

It is obvious, people who manufactured stories about bomb explosions on Broadway, did a little manufacturing with respect to cafe Bristol.

There were several expedients Stalin could resort to in order to fill the gap. He could order a story to be printed cut from the whole cloth. Or he could have his agents in Copenhagen rent a place, preferably an adjunct to some hotel, not far from the railroad station, and set up a "Viennese cafe Bristol" with neon

signs and all else needed to give it prominence. Of course, the stunt would not go over big; it would not entirely eliminate the embarrassing disclosure; but it would certainly for some time cripple the argument of those who sought the truth, and place the burden of explaining upon the defenders of Trotsky. Meanwhile the Olgins and Ganneses would be furnished with a record to which they could now refer whenever the question of the Hotel Bristol was brought up.

However, an eminent Stalinist sympathizer made a public admission of the fact that the hotel in question did not exist. It all happened in the following way. Friedrich Adler, the Secretary of the Second International, wrote a pamphlet on the Moscow "trial." In this work, which is purported to defend Trotsky, Adler, first of all, with malicious satisfaction and gloating irony, settles accounts with Trotsky and Zinoviev for their having followed Lenin's path and fought Social Democracy. Next, Adler, drawing no line of demarcation between Stalinism and Leninism, makes an attempt to defend the frame-up victims against the "Communists" and incidentally defends his old cronies, enemies of the proletariat, the Social Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks.

In the section exposing the Trotsky-Zinoviev frame-up, Adler points out that an English lawyer, D. N. Pritt, in publishing in England an edition of the report of the court proceedings of the Moscow "trial," omitted from Holtzman's "confession" the passage dealing with the Hotel Bristol. This passage *does* appear in the edition published in Moscow.

Pritt has been caught red-handed. Nothing daunted, he makes a reply to Adler in which he, with shamelessly vile effrontery, declares that the fact that the hotel did not exist is hardly of any importance, a mere bag of shells, that the whole thing about the hotel is an "error" which does not at all prove that the "voluntary confessions" are concoctions. Browder's intellectual crooks had Pritt's admission printed in one of their publications:

"... but there remains the fact that Holtzman gave the name of a hotel which did not exist.

"I think most people with any experience of litigation would say without hesitation that one, or two, or three errors of that kind in the course of a number of stories by a number of deponents, relating to many incidents in many places, would excite no suspicion of any kind that their stories were concocted.... A whole series of errors of

this kind would, of course, excite suspicion. . . ." (*Soviet Russia Today*, February 1937, p. 31)

One of the principal implicating points in the "trial" axis was an "error," tacitly admit the editors of *Soviet Russia Today* by printing the above statement without offering a word of comment. And in fact that's exactly what it was—a clumsy error in the Stalinist frame-up.

The sordid bureaucrats have absorbed every vice which is inherent in "revolutionists" that take the pathway of crime against the toiling masses. A world-shaking frame-up is built up with Stalinist-concocted "voluntary confessions." On the basis of these "confessions" hundreds and thousands of old Bolsheviks, worker-revolutionists, are rounded up by Stalin's G.P.U. and thrown into prisons. How many are immediately done away with in the black secrecy of dungeons and prison courtyards, no one knows. On the basis of these "confessions," a beastly man-hunt, unprecedented in all history, accompanied by the wildest bloodthirsty howls, is organized in almost every country on earth. And skillfully though the grim and ghastly frame-up is sewn together, yet, due to some bungling on the part of the perpetrators, it is ripped apart. Those people who have their eyes open recoil with disgust and horror at the sight of the terrible crime which passes before their frozen vision like a horrible nightmare. The Stalinist workers are perturbed and bewildered. Not a few of them are in great doubt. A possibility opens up to bring some order into their chaotic thinking. But the intellectual thugs of Stalinism, perceiving the danger and unable to fill the give-away gap, resort to a protective mind-mangling device which is as reprehensible as the grisly methods by which they manipulate their bureaucratic control over the Soviet Union. While brazenly admitting that the "confessions" have flaws, and anticipating that many more "errors" will be unearthed, they, by way of precaution, assure their followers that even if two or three "errors" in the nature of the "error" with the Hotel Bristol are discovered, the "confessions" must not be regarded as fabrications. The pernicious purpose is to prevent the workers' mind from applying the simplest rules of logic in the process of thinking. What if four or five such "errors" are disclosed? Would that be sufficient proof that the "confessions" are fakes? Can a whole series of such "errors," say,

twenty-five or thirty of them, be considered as sufficient proof that the "trial" is a weird frame-up? Oh, no, says Pritt, who is far from playing a passive or impartial rôle here. No, not at all. A whole series of Stalinist "errors," like the "error" with the Hotel Bristol, can merely excite *suspicion!* And *Soviet Russia Today* feeds this subtle mental hashish to its readers.

Four weeks after the "trial," Yagoda, the old and experienced chief of the G.P.U., was dismissed from his high post. One of the most loyal Stalinites, he hounded the Opposition with dogged persistence and exceptional cruelty. Why was he dismissed? No explanation was given, except a hint at "incompetence." But can one, with a mental note about the practices of Stalinism, doubt for a single second what this "incompetence" consisted in? When you concoct a story to be told by your subordinates to the whole world, a detailed account of some one meeting some one else in a certain hotel, you must put some logic into your story. Avoid errors. A whole series of them will excite suspicion. Make sure that the hotel you are talking about has existence in fact at the time the alleged meeting takes place.

A clumsy oversight which let an enormous cat out of the Stalinist bag of lies, intrigues, plots and murders, could not remain unpunished. Moreover, Yagoda's dismissal was not merely a punishment of an inattentive bureaucrat, but also a sharp warning to others "Do your work right!"

Owing to the total lack of objective evidence (unless one regards Olberg's Honduran passport and "Tukalevsky's" visiting card as material evidence), the prosecution, the judges and the world had before them the defendants' personal confessions as the sole proof of the terrorist plot. The truth or falsity of these confessions could be determined only by means of a fair examination of each statement and its relation to the whole.

In the Leninist court which pursued the aim of establishing the facts, every contradiction and discrepancy in the testimony of a defendant was brought out in bold relief. The bureaucrats carrying out their specific part in the frame-up, did everything to give the impression that the statements of the defendants all tallied with one another. Stalin's men of "justice" simply affected not to have noticed serious discrepancies. For example. According to some "confessions" the Trotskyites and the Zinovievites formed a bloc at the end of 1932:

"Mrachkovsky observed that after receiving the instructions from Trotsky approving the formation of a *bloc* with the Zinovievites, Smirnov instructed Ter-Vaganyan to bring about the formation of this *bloc*. The terroristic bloc of the Trotskyites and the Zinovievites was formed at the END of 1932." (*Report of Court Proceedings*, p. 42. My emphasis—G.M.)

One of the most eminent "confessors," Zinoviev, gave a different date:

"Vysbinsky: When was the united centre organized?

"Zinoviev: In the SUMMER of 1932." (*Ibid.*, p. 44. My emphasis—G.M.)

But the Stalinists were compelled to stick to the story that the "bloc" was organized upon Trotsky's approval through a letter after Holtzman had visited him in November in Copenhagen.

"In the autumn of 1932 a letter was received from Trotsky in which he approved the decision to unite with the Zinovievites." (*Ibid.*, p. 42)

Displaying their customary effrontery to honesty and decency, the Stalinists completely disregarded Zinoviev's divergent reply. With a perfectly brass face they declare in their *Report of the Court Proceedings*:

"These newly revealed circumstances established *without a doubt* (My emphasis—G.M.) that: 1) at the END of 1932 the Trotskyite and Zinovievite groups united and formed a united centre." (p. 11)

The cables told of the conclusion of the "trial." Zinoviev, Kamenev and the rest carried out their end of the bargain. Would Stalin double-cross them? Did they underestimate the treachery of the Stalinist clique?

The death sentences passed upon the S.R.'s who had organized and directed the assassination of the Commissars Uritsky and Volodarsky and the attempts on other Bolshevik leaders, including Lenin, were changed to various prison terms. The life of the arch-terrorist Boris Savinkov was spared. There was the White Guard General Slashev-Krimsky, one of the worst human monstrosities in history. He caused the torture and death of thousands of Communists. He personally, in wild hatred of revolution, tortured and killed many workers. And

upon his repentance he was allowed to return to the Soviet Union and was given work as an instructor in a military school.

The Zinoviev-Kamenev "trial" in certain respects resembled the witchcraft trials of the days of the Inquisition in Europe and demonology atrocities in colonial America.

Absorbing volumes have been written on the subject of witchcraft trials. During colonial days the cruel judges of Salem, Massachusetts, put to death many persons accused of sorcery. In hundreds of instances the witch-hunters, after wringing from their victims public "confessions" which served to prove that belief in the existence of demons was not an aberration but was founded on actuality, set the accused free. But thousands of wretches, especially in Europe, were double-crossed. Having been drilled behind the scenes, broken by the rack, the wheel and the thumbscrew, and impressed by the solemn promise that their lives would be spared if they only made a public "confession," they carried out the instructions of the inquisitors. They solemnly swore that they were in direct communication with evil spirits. They had met the devil himself, yielded to his wiles, attended his Sabbaths, and finally concluded a pact with him. Having gained from the devil supernatural powers, they, by means of sorcery, and in accordance with specific clauses in the pact, caused droughts, floods and epidemics. By their black arts they made people lame and blind, spread anthrax among cattle and sheep, and generally brought all sorts of calamities upon the community. The overwhelming majority of the people believed these "confessions," and no doubt this fact allowed the criminal judges and prosecutors to betray their word to the accused. Such was the case, for example, of the Prioress of the Convent of Unterzell, in Germany in the Eighteenth Century. She "confessed" that she had pledged her soul to the devil, and was burned at the stake by the officers of the Inquisition.

How would Stalin act?

To those whose eyes are open, the thought that Stalin would dare take the lives of the framed men was unendurable. It could not be.

The accused were entitled to three days of grace; but barely twelve hours after the "trial," the cold type in the papers told of a deed that sent a shudder through many a stout heart. The renegades, having gotten from their victims all they wanted,

consumed now with a fierce joy and maddening impatience, hastily carried out their bloody vendetta.

When the victims were led out of their cells to face the firing squad, they must have been shocked into the understanding of this basest act of Stalinist treachery. And if they sent agonized curses to the murderous gang in the Kremlin Palace, there were no foreign correspondents to report to the world these truly last words of the victims.

Lenin lay dead in the mausoleum in the Red Square, with strangled Workers Democracy and Marxism beside him, and not far away in the grim dusk of a prison courtyard, were lined up against the wall his lifelong, broken comrades. A volley from a few dozen rifles, and the bodies, silent, and bleeding, lay on the cobble-stones. Silent forever.

In the sombre dawn the bullet-torn corpses were carted away to the morgue. And in the rosy comfort of the palatial residences of Moscow, Leningrad and other towns the 200,000-ruble-a-year writers and journalists (*The New York Times*, December 23, 1936), the pot-bellied bureaucrats and their wives, the new "social workers," slept a peaceful velvety sleep. A cheery life was ahead. The disturbing factors that held a potential threat of assisting the workers to come into their own, were being eliminated one by one. The future held more than mere abundance of wine and caviar, limousines and estates, sybaritic wantonness, fame and power. A horizon was opening up, guaranteed by the Stalinist Constitution, to hoard up substantial fortunes from the toil of the masses. So far the bureaucrats could only invest their surplus income in government bonds and savings banks and thus exploit the toiling masses, drawing 7 and 8 per cent interest. But some day—who can tell!—maybe they will receive outright shares in the ownership of shops and factories, already under their complete control.

With remarkable ease of utterance, the bureaucrats spread the bed-time story, an opiate to lull the mind of the trusting workers, that they have established Socialism in the Soviet Union. Notwithstanding the parade of Communist phrases, life furnishes conflicting evidence, negating their impudent allegations.

There are not enough shoes and overcoats and shirts to go around for the more than a hundred and fifty million workers and peasants, men, women and children. But shops are set up to make neckties and evening clothes for the bureaucrats. There

is insufficiency of such basic necessities as laundry facilities in Stalin's "Socialist" society (*The New York Times*, January 31, 1937).

Sufficient figures on commodities as a whole are not available—

"But the figures for milk are fuller and more consistent. They show that back in the year 1925 Russian cows turned out nearly seven billion gallons of milk. . . . It is simply a matter of record that today in Soviet Russia there is much less milk than there was ten years ago; and in the year 1925, only a couple of years after a devastating famine, the Russian milk supply was far from bounteous. . . . And her butter, to judge from the fragmentary figures of which the League of Nations complains, is less than half of what it was in 1925." (*The New York Times*, January 14, 1937)

These heartrending facts, taking place in the twentieth year after the revolution, when the Soviet Union has "entered with both feet into Socialism" were never challenged by the *Freiheit* or the *Daily Worker*. With the increase of the population by 30 million in the past ten years, and the production of milk falling two billion gallons below that of 1925, only the children of the privileged bureaucracy which supports its benefactor and god, the usurper Stalin, are well supplied with milk, butter and even ice cream. The vandalic wrecking of limited Workers Democracy and its substitution by absolute bureaucratic control exclusively from above, resulted in enormous bureaucratic material gains, bureaucratic cupidity and bureaucratic waste, on the one hand, and gray poverty for the toiling masses on the other. Had Stalin been defeated in the intra-Party conflict after Lenin's death, and the course upon Workers Democracy, as outlined in the resolution of the Tenth Congress of the Party, had been put into effect, the voracious bureaucratic hog would have been years ago an extinct pest in the Soviet Union. The toiling masses, and the toiling masses *alone* would have been basking in the sunshine of prosperity emanating from the flourishing State industry.

The Stalin-Voroshilov gang, to continue receiving individual, undivided support from the bureaucracy, must artificially regulate the standard of living for the wide toiling masses around the point just above the starvation level, and maintain the reactionary bureaucrats in plenty and even in luxury. It must continue robbing the workers of the gains they made in 1917, and shower upon its bureaucracy more and more benefits, advantages

and favors. Eventually, unless prevented by the international proletariat guided by a Marxist-Leninist leadership, Stalinism must cross the fatal line still dividing the workers State from a capitalist State, and open up a channel for profitable investments of the big accumulated fortunes, by reintroducing private ownership of industry, thus realizing the most fascinating part of the bureaucratic dream. Not a classless, Socialist society is developing in the Soviet Union, but the reestablishment of classes, the division of the people into propertyless toilers and propertied parasites; these last already given full civil rights by the clique of usurpers. "Russia gives civil rights to Owners of Property" (*The New York Times*, March 15, 1937)

The usurpers astride the workers State, the capitalist diplomats, "democratic" and Fascist, with whom the Stalin clique long since has made a united front against the proletarian revolution, scored a great victory. Drawn together by the new Stalinist crime they would at their sumptuous banquets drown in a welter of hypocritical speeches and torrents of champagne the gnawing dread of the world proletarian upheaval.

Stalin played his trump card, which, he was sure, could never be beaten. The poisonous cloud now mushroomed over the mind of the entire world proletariat, including the workers in Spain where the situation for the bureaucratic distortion was fraught with danger. Political criticism of Stalin's line for the Spanish workers would not come from the bourgeoisie into whose hands the line played marvelously. It could come only from either the Trotskyites or the various "shadings of Trotskyism" such as the P.O.U.M. But Trotskyism was now "a variety of Fascism." This conception would help establish a *cordon sanitaire* around all opposition to Stalin's line.

That the frame-up was timed precisely for the psychological moment in Spain is beyond doubt. The ideological poison manufactured in Moscow was at once shipped to Spain, to help the "heroic Spanish people against Fascism and all agencies of Fascism." A Stalinist discovery was made of Trotsky-Fascist assassins in Spain:

"Names of the would-be Spanish assassins, who on the order of the Trotsky-Fascist assassins in the U.S.S.R., sought to kill Francisco Largo Caballero, Socialist Premier; President Azana, and Passionaria, was revealed yesterday in Madrid. First information about this plot

was published in *Mundo Obrero* [Stalinist paper in Spain—G.M.] on August 29." (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, September 17, 1936)

Prior to the "public trial" Zinoviev and Kamenev were declared by the Stalinists to be unmitigated liars who always deceived the Party. In order to save themselves from exile they hypocritically professed to accept the Stalin leadership. They were always found out to be liars and charlatans. They were sinking lower and lower in their practice of false coloring, prevarication and misrepresentation. They could not be trusted; and not a single remark of theirs could be taken seriously. Particularly after the Kirov assassination no one could believe a word these worthless dissemblers and pharisees, tricksters, swindlers and confirmed liars uttered.

"We must not take the word of any former oppositionist. No, not one!" (*Pravda*, December 15, 1936)

Prosecutor Vyshinsky himself, in his concluding speech at the "open trial," made the following admonitory remarks:

"Not the slightest confidence must be placed in these certified and hardened deceivers! They themselves understand that they do not deserve any confidence. While examining Zinoviev I asked him: 'Are you speaking the whole truth now?' and he answered: 'Now I am speaking the whole truth to the very end.' But what proof is there of this? How can we believe them when they have surpassed all conceptions of perfidy, cunning, deceit and treachery?" (*Report of Court Proceedings*, p. 135)

The liberal-bourgeois legal doctrine is, falsehood in one thing is falsehood in everything. The Stalinist doctrine is, falsehood in everything does not necessarily prove falsehood in the thing which, from the angle of the interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy, must be accepted by everybody as truth. The "confessions" were authentic, insisted the Stalinist plotters.

"The inescapable conclusion from an examination of the whole situation is that the confessions were voluntary and genuine." (William Z. Foster, *Daily Worker*, February 23, 1937)

Every word Zinoviev, Kamenev and the others lied about Trotsky was permeated with veracity, sincerity, and plain dealing, declared the Stalinist loud-shouters. And the Stalinists flew into a rage if anyone doubted the absurd and criminal story

about Trotsky told by people who were "certified and hardened deceivers."

But there were doubters. Some, like the leaders of the Second International, mixing up Stalinism and Leninism, spoke of the frame-up as of Bolshevik methods, thus discrediting genuine Bolshevism which, of course, never employed the methods of Stalinism. There were some doubters among the liberals. These were mildly critical. There were many Stalinist workers, doubtful, shocked by the savage slaughter of the founders of Bolshevism. The disturbance in the minds of their followers worried the Browders and their gangsters of the pen. Realizing that their own arguments were not entirely convincing, the Stalinists brought up as ammunition the opinions even of such rabid enemies of proletarian revolution as spokesmen of French finance capital, now allies of counter-revolutionary Stalin:

"Andre Pierre, one of the editors of *Le Temps*, semi-official spokesman of the French Steel Trust . . . his article is an effective answer to such doubters. Pierre's article follows in part: 'There can be no talk of a "judicial comedy" unless one believes that everything was faked, that the confessions were torn from the guilty ones, that they were urged to blacken Trotsky's name by promises of having their lives spared, if one believes that these wretched men were at the last moment the victims of an abominable frameup. I am not forgetting the crimes and the provocations of the Cheka [Harry Gannes mildly calls this "Pierre's prejudices and misconceptions about the role of the Cheka"—G.M.] in the first years of the Revolution, but even at the risk of seeming a simpleton I cannot believe that this trial was a shameful make-believe.'" (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, September 25, 1936)

In their arduous work to cover up the crime, the Stalinists contradict one another. For example. One of them, polemizing against the liberal magazine, *The Nation*, declares that the accused made their confessions with the greatest reluctance:

"But the *Nation* is suspicious because the accused seemed to 'revel in confessions of guilt.' Stuff and nonsense! The record shows the contrary. The prisoners confessed with the greatest reluctance." ("The Nation and Trotsky," *New Masses*, November 10, 1936, p. 12)

And another Stalinist, who, by the way, was present at the "trial," asserts in the same issue of the *New Masses*, the direct opposite, with an explanation which almost touches the truth:

"But why do they admit things so glibly, how can they be so utterly without embarrassment or shame?"

"Disintegration of character! A personality that has experienced justified public disgrace has been undermined. These people have been exposed so repeatedly and so mercilessly that by this time their psychological props have been knocked from under. Hence this gruesome collapse." (Joshua Kunitz, "The End of the Road," p. 17)

Do the well-informed, broad-awake bourgeois leaders see what is behind the persecution of the former Left Opposition? The following observation by one of the shrewdest bourgeois correspondents, a keen observer, quite friendly to Stalinism, is significant:

"From a more practical and materialist standpoint it is not unlikely that the proceedings taken against the Kameneff-Zinovieff group and the subsequent arrest of other ex-Oppositionists had a more or less direct connection with the general international situation . . . there are certain advantages in demonstrating to the world at this juncture that the most persistent advocates of international revolution are regarded by the Soviet State as its bitterest enemies." (Walter Duranty, *The New York Times Magazine*, November 8, 1936, p. 27)

The bureaucratic distortion of the first workers State in the world, wielding the ever-growing, ever-narrowing spiral of centralization of power, has given rise to Byzantine flattery, Byzantine lying, suspicion, mistrust and intrigue. And even within the leading circle of the usurpers there is jealousy, suspicion and spying, because everybody in it is conscious of the fact that the whole structure of Stalinism is resting upon fraud, treachery, betrayal and murder. Not even the highest official feels secure. One recalls the mysterious case of Enukidze. A consummate Stalinist, without a spot of honesty, Enukidze stood on the highest rung of the bureaucratic ladder. He was in Stalin's Central Committee, and during the assassination of Kirov, he, together with Stalin and other chiefs of the Order signed the statement on the assassination. Suddenly something happened. Enukidze was discovered to be a scamp and a cheat, lacking in devotion to the cause of the "proletariat," and was cast to the hounds of the G.P.U.

The Stalinist faction trusts least of all the former Left Oppositionists and the "democratic" bureaucrats, the Bukharinites. With every turn of the centralizing thumbscrew they are being squeezed out of the apparatus of the State. Hardly a better illus-

tration is needed than the case of Radek. On the occasion of the "open trial" of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Mrachkovsky and others Radek dutifully wrote an extremely venomous, rabid denunciation of Trotsky:

"The leader of this gang of fascist murderers, Trotsky... arch-bandit Trotsky, organizer of assassinations of the best people of the world proletariat... even now has not forgotten his natural theatrical clownishness... Nobody in his senses believes that the defendants are slandering both themselves and Trotsky. No one doubts his guilt [!?!—G.M.] before this country, before the ashes of Kirov, before the leaders of our Party whose lives he attempted to take, before mankind whose peace he attacked by organizing his band." (Karl Radek, "The Trotskyite-Zinovievite Fascist Gang and Its Leader, Trotsky," *Daily Worker*, August 24, 1936)

What more could Stalin and his crew desire! But Radek's doom had already been sealed behind the scenes. His name was mentioned in the "trial" and the first act of the newly-appointed head of the Stalinist Inquisition, Yezhov, was to have Radek dragged off to the torture chambers of the G.P.U.

Did Radek's conduct in the past several years give any cause for Stalin's displeasure or suspicion? Not at all. After he had capitulated to Stalin and was returned from exile, Radek devoutly and copiously lied to the working class. He was among the first of Stalin's journalists to raise a blinding smoke-screen concealing the imperialist rôle of the League of Nations. Immediately after the consummation of the German betrayal, when Stalinism lived through a perilous moment, Radek touched the peaks of deception, working in harmony with the Browders and Piecks. When the Stalinists told the workers that what the U.S.S.R. "enjoyed" now was a Socialist system of society, Radek, who had learned to master the Stalinist art of reconciling contradictory phenomena, explained to the underfed Soviet masses that shortage of milk was possible even under Socialism, because "milk is a product of cows, not of Socialism." Radek at the bid of Stalin consciously slandered Leninism, bemocked facts, distorted the history of October, traduced and vilified the former Left Opposition and his former self, and heaped frantic abuse upon Trotsky. Radek falsified the facts about the destruction of the big figures of October and the rise of bureaucratic centralism and its symbol, idol and supreme ruler, the mediocrity, Stalin:

"This was the content of the four years of internal Party struggle that hurled from the leadership, not only Trotsky, alien to the very nature of the Bolshevik Party, but also those members of the old leadership of Lenin's days who nevertheless had neither proper understanding of Leninism, nor the will and audacity to lead vast masses of the workers and peasants into the battle for a newer and higher stage of development of the revolution under Stalin's leadership." (Karl Radek, *Portraits and Pamphlets*, 1935, p. 20)

Radek, knowing well who was the organizer and leader of the Red Army, lied as follows:

"... the leadership of the army was really in the hands of Lenin and his nearest colleague, Stalin... Stalin organized the army on the most dangerous sectors of the front... Stalin did away with partisan methods... The truth of the matter is that Stalin, Voroshilov and their colleagues carried on a ceaseless and inflexible struggle against Trotsky, who flooded the front with former staff officers, and not only did not trouble as to what was their attitude to the revolution, but also neglected to find out as to how they carried out their duties at the front... Stalin represented the proletarian point of view with regard to the employment of professional soldiers... Stalin set himself the task of developing proletarian army leaders... the genius of Stalin as an unsurpassed organizer... Von Clausewitz, in his examination of the attributes of military genius, distinguishes spiritual attributes from what may be called attributes of character... Thus, the profoundest of military theorists has to some extent given us a definition of the fundamental, essential features out of which the military genius of Stalin was formed during the civil war. An unswerving loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism—principles tried in the fire of three revolutions; outstanding intelligence, embracing the totality of class relationships and the direction of their development; an iron will, based upon a profound sense of identity with the working class and a profound belief in their victory; determination in carrying out accepted decisions—such are the essential features which made of Stalin a great proletarian army chief." (Karl Radek, "The Commander-in-Chief of the Proletariat," *Inprecorr*, March 9, 1935, pp. 302-303)

Some people as a result of the violent Stalinist plague, have gone mentally blind. The insidious poison of enormous penetrating power and staying quality, has entered, pervaded and diffused itself through the mind, paralyzing the faculties of independent thinking. A person whose mind is in such a state might suggest that Radek is not lying at all. Perhaps Radek knows that Stalin, not Trotsky, was the real organizer and leader of the Red Army. Perhaps it is true that Trotsky was "alien to the very nature of the Bolshevik Party."

There was a time, not very many years back, when every member of the Communist Party could speak the truth unafraid. Radek wrote then, too, but he wrote differently. In the original—not the Stalinized—*Portraits and Pamphlets*, Radek wrote:

“Old Moltke, creator of the German army, often expressed apprehension that the pens of the diplomats would damage the work of the soldiers’ sabers. Warriors of the whole world, although there were classical writers in their midst, always counterposed the sword to the pen. The history of the proletarian revolution has proven how possible it is to forge pens into swords. Trotsky—one of the best writers of world socialism, yet his literary qualities did not prevent him from being the first leader, first organizer of the first army of the proletariat. The revolution has forged the pen of its best publicist into a sword. . . .

“I don’t know to what extent Comrade Trotsky before the war concerned himself with questions of military theory. I think the first spur to the ingenious comprehension of these questions he received not out of books, but, during the Balkan war, when he as a correspondent was observing this rehearsal of the World War. . . . One of the most remarkable documents of his comprehension of the class structure of the army, comprehension of the soul of the army, is his speech regarding the July offensive of Kerensky. . . . The posing of the question in such a manner by Trotsky is the whole secret of Trotsky’s greatness as the organizer of the Red Army.

“All the great military writers emphasized the tremendous significance, the decisive significance of the moral factor in war. Half of the immortal book of Clausewitz’s is devoted to this question. And our entire victory in the civil war is founded upon the fact that Trotsky was able to apply in practice this science of the significance of the moral factor in war. . . . When in April 1918 in Comrade Podvoysky’s cabinet gathered the best of the former Tzarist officers, those who remained in the army after our victory in order, together with our comrades and with some military representatives of the Allies, to work out a plan for organizing an army—Trotsky—I remember, I splendidly remember that scene—for many days silently listened to their plans. These were plans of people who did not grasp the change that had occurred before their very eyes. . . . Trotsky presented his own; the creation of a voluntary army. The military were reticent, considering this a useless fancy. . . . Not for a moment did Trotsky allow the thought that a voluntary army could save Russia. He built it as an apparatus needed for the creation of a new army. . . . Only Trotsky’s flaming faith in our social might, faith that we would be able to take science from the military specialists and would not permit them to impose their politics upon us. . . . Trotsky not only proved capable, thanks to his energy, to subject to his authority the former

officer cadres—he succeeded in achieving much more than that. He was able to win the confidence of the best elements among the specialists and transform them from enemies of Soviet Russia into its convinced adherents. . . . To be sure, this great victory over the adversary was the result not only of Trotsky’s iron energy which inspired respect in all, not only as a result of profound moral force, great mental, even military authority which this socialist writer and orator, placed by the will of the revolution at the head of the army, was able to establish; this victory required the self-denial of tens of thousands of our comrades in the army, iron discipline within our ranks, consistency with which we marched toward our goal—it required the miracle of the mass which, having fled from the front yesterday, today, under far more difficult conditions, stood up again in defense of the country. It is understood the entire Party was working to create this psychological and political mass influence, but the strongest, the most concentrated and, so to speak, shattering expression it found in the person of Trotsky to whom the Party entrusted the military affairs. Here the Russian revolution acted through the brain, the nervous system and the heart of its great representative. . . . A man was needed who would be the incarnation of the call to struggle, who, completely submitting himself to the need of this struggle would become the tocsin summoning to arms, would become the will demanding of all unconditional resignation to this great sanguinary necessity. Only a man working like Trotsky, only a man capable of talking to the soldier as Trotsky talked—only such a man could become the standard-bearer of the armed toiling people. This unity of a strategist, military organizer and a political is best characterized by the fact that Trotsky, despite all this difficult work, found within himself sufficient insight to grasp the significance in the war of Demian Bedny or the artist Moore. Our army was a peasant army, and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the guidance of this peasant army by the workers and the representatives of the working class, was materialized by the Party through the person of Trotsky and the comrades working with him. And it was materialized primarily in such a way that Trotsky was able, assisted by the entire apparatus of our Party, to instill within the peasant army, fatigued by the war, the profoundest conviction that it fought for its own interests.

“Trotsky worked with the entire Party over the task of creating the Red Army. He would not have performed his role without the Party. But without him the creation of the Red Army and its victories would have exacted many times more sacrifices. If our Party will go down in history as the first proletarian Party which could build up a great army, then this resplendent page of the history of the Russian revolution will forever be connected with the name of Lev Davidovich Trotsky, the man whose labor and deed will be not only the object of love, but also of study to the new generations of the working class,

preparing to conquer the whole world." (Karl Radek, *Portreti i Pamphleti*, 1927, pp. 29-34)

Thus wrote Radek in the days when the workers State had not yet fallen into the clutches of the ruthless bureaucratic monster.

Radek was arrested in October 1936, two months after the Zinoviev-Kamenev "trial." In January 1937 he appeared in the "workers' court" before Vyshinsky and Ulrich. The audience in the "workers' court" was composed of "factory workers" as is plainly seen from the dispatches of the bourgeois correspondents:

"The long, pillared courtroom, ornamented with a frieze of cupids, was crowded with *privileged* observers who were admitted by *special invitation*." (*New York Sun*, January 23, 1937. My emphasis—G.M.)

Comparatively young, energetic Radek showed "no change" in appearance, "no sign" of man-breaking tortures as is clearly indicated in the cablegrams:

"Radek, who had been accepted for a score of years as a Bolshevik oracle, appeared to be an old, broken man." (*New York Sun*, January 23, 1937)

Radek with sixteen others, among whom were such scintillating old Bolsheviks as Piatakov, former Assistant Commissar of Heavy Industry, and Sokolnikov, former Soviet Ambassador to Great Britain, belonged, "it has become established," to a "Parallel Center." Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Mrachkovsky who had made a "full and complete confession" and who dragged in Radek's name as a co-plotter, said absolutely nothing of the "Parallel Center." It is obvious that the "Parallel Center" was invented by the Stalinists after the "trial" of Zinoviev and Kamenev. And as more and more batches of Stalin's victims are haled into "workers' court" there will appear an "Emergency Center" or an "Auxiliary Center" or "The Independent Center" or perhaps "The New Center."

Radek and sixteen co-defendants "confessed" to the most frightful crimes. They revealed that they had wrecked trains, burned factories, blew up mines, maimed and killed hundreds of workers, made preparations for cultivating highly contagious germs to infect the Red Army troop trains. They had plotted under Trotsky's guidance to dismember the Soviet Union, to partition it among the Fascist powers. They had also robbed a

bank of 168,000 rubles. What bank? What is the name of the town in which the bank is located? That was not revealed by the defendants; and "strangely enough" was not asked by the Prosecutor Vyshinsky.

It was all too obvious now that the "foreign government" reason given as the excuse for the secrecy of the first Zinoviev-Kamenev "trial" was a pure fake, a vicious lie. The Stalinists employed this ruse as a protective screen behind which they broke the miserable remnants of the chairman of the Comintern and vice-Chairman of People's Commissars of Lenin's day. Not only Germany, but also Japan was mentioned quite openly now. *Pravda* of February 1, spoke of "Trotsky's 'pact' with the Japanese imperialists."

"Several testified the participation in Trotskyist intrigues to pay Germany and Japan with rich Russian provinces for attacking the Soviet Union and to supplying secret information to Japanese and German agents." (*The New York Times*, February 2, 1937)

The original amalgam, White Guards-Zinoviev-Trotsky-"foreign government," passing through the phase Zinoviev-Trotsky-Hitler, has reached the combination Trotsky-Radek-Hitler-Japan. And what began as the cynical accusation of Trotsky as morally responsible for the assassination of Kirov, has become the truly monstrous charge of Trotsky plotting to parcel out Ukraine and Eastern Siberia to Germany and Japan respectively, and establish Fascism in the remaining territory of the Soviet Union.

The silly emigré White Guards, for whose relief Stalin's man Friday voted in the League Council at Geneva, who in 1934, idiotically believing that Stalin had 103 of their brethren shot, conducted anti-Soviet demonstrations, now understood perfectly on whose side Stalin really stood. In malignant exultation they silently and breathlessly watched Stalin wiping out in blood the old leadership of the real Bolshevik Party of hateful memory.

People who were skeptical about the Zinoviev-Kamenev "confessions" or who stated openly that they were fakes, gave various reasonable and logical explanations for these "confessions." The victims, broken by the most brutal terror, accepted the promise that their lives would be spared and in return performed a priceless service to the Stalinist clique. Stalin, however, double-crossed them. But what caused the second batch, Radek, Sokolni-

kov and fifteen others to "confess," since they could under no circumstances now believe that their lives would be spared! Everybody was puzzled and perplexed, unable to offer some sort of convincing reason. It was a blinding bolt to mentally nearsighted people. There is only one explanation, triumphantly howled Browder and his gang: they are guilty! And the innocent dupes who have been following the Stalinist misleaders down the black road of destruction of the world revolution, were repeating after Browder, "Yes, they are guilty, that's why they confessed!" Many uninformed people accepted the Stalinist verdict. Mauritz Hallgren, former editor of *The Nation*, resigned from the "American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky," and in a letter made the following deduction:

"The men now on trial cannot possibly be under any delusion as to their fate. They must know and they do know that they will be put to death. Despite this they do not hesitate to confess their crimes. Why? The only conceivable answer is that they are guilty. Surely it cannot and will not be argued this time as well that there has been a 'deal,' for men like Radek are obviously not so stupid as to believe that they are going to save their lives in that manner after what happened to Kamenev and Zinoviev." (*Daily Worker*, February 4, 1937)

Radek is not stupid, that is true. And as is now quite obvious, Radek had reasons to believe that his life would be saved, and *it was saved*—temporarily, of course.

Men who are unable to think, those upon whose plastic minds Stalinism easily impresses its pernicious influence, and people who are incurably asinine, never explore the subject with which they grapple, never look behind the official Stalinist stage. Sliding over the surface of things, they save themselves the trouble of tedious research and investigation; they care nothing for a calm, sustained, dispassionate analysis; they know nothing of Stalinism, of the founder of the system of bureaucratic centralism of the first workers State.

Stalin never would have elbowed Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Rakovsky and other big and bigger and biggest figures of the revolutionary period of the Soviet Union out of the way and into the chasm, if he were a plotter and intriguer of the average caliber. He never would have succeeded in fooling a multitude of erudite, cautious and very able thinkers and trap the Chinese, the Spanish and above all the German prole-

tariat—the most intelligent, most class-conscious working class in the entire capitalist world—if he were not a wizard in his new calling. Since he took the plunge, Stalin has been employing every form of deception to advance his own interests and the interests of his Order. A weird mixture of artful contrivance, mind-trancing acute ingenuity and fertility of resource runs through all Stalinist machinations, schemes and crimes. An unusually gifted organizer to begin with, having spent, since 1921, nearly fifteen years in the school of intrigue, Stalin has developed the greatest criminal mind of all times. What may be an extraordinarily elaborate and extremely involved scheme to a sizable crook, is a simple proposition to Stalin. And although he is abnormally vindictive and thirsts quick revenge, he pursues his quarry patiently and as stealthily and with as cautious a step as a murderer in the thick blackness of night entering the house of his intended victim. True, he at times bumps into a chair (Hostel Bristol) and slightly trips over a rug ("Tukalevsky's" visiting card; discrepancy in the dates of the organization of the "Center," excessive praise of Stalin by his framed victims) but these failings only sharpen his vigilance and make keener his faculty of using stratagems.

If Stalin had worked out a scheme of a whole series of "witchcraft trials," and, to start with, had done away with every one of his victims of the first batch, he would have been an utter blockhead. That would have cut his game short, and run contrary to the dictates of the entire scheme. Stalin had to forge a chain, with one link firmly gripping and pulling the next one. A succession of "witchcraft trials" could be organized with greater or lesser ease only on the basis of leaving alive a few of each batch to help extort from the next batch the "voluntary confessions."

It is clear what happened to Radek after he, fainting with agony, a miserable, mangled fragment of manhood, was delivered into the grim Lubyanka prison. Already completely broken politically, morally and spiritually by the "Architect of the Socialist Society" he was at once given a taste of some exceptionally frightful tortures that only ingenious Stalinism, which is so replete with horrible deeds, can invent. In a very short time he was transformed into a physical wreck—"an old, broken man." Accompanied by brain-piercing shrieks of other victims

who were being prepared for the "witchcraft trials," his dead soul sank into the bottomless pit.

For eight years Radek worked for Stalin and his bureaucracy, consciously lying, distorting, poisoning workers' minds, perverting facts, adulterating Leninism, deceiving the masses inside and outside the Soviet Union. He did this work for eight years. Completely transformed by the truculent bureaucratic plague, Radek, with every passing day, was sinking deeper and deeper into the Stalinist man-eating mire. And now his tormentors demanded of him that he continue his services in a somewhat different setting. Radek, as might be expected, declared he would gladly perform any service for Stalin, for he had no compunction with respect to Trotsky or the working class. His only objection was that the "voluntary confession" would be but a brief prelude to his immediate death. The fate of Zinoviev, Kamenev and the rest of the first batch was an instructive lesson to him. His jailers, naturally, assured him that Zinoviev, Kamenev and the rest had been spared, as promised. But Radek, by now a perfect liar himself, would not believe them. Then one day, shortly before the scheduled "trial," the door of Radek's dungeon flew open and there stood before his bewildered stare—Zinoviev, or Kamenev, or Smirnov—people who, he was absolutely certain, had been dead these three months. Such a shock could produce only one result. Radek was convinced. He believed the promise that all he faced was a ten year sentence with a possible amnesty at some future date. And if Radek was still hesitant, the G.P.U. men would step aside and let Zinoviev, or Kamenev do the final persuasion, if more persuasion was needed, that the only hope of release from the excruciating pains and to get a margin of a chance to live, was to submit unconditionally to Stalin.

Thus out of the invisible, gloomy regions of Stalin's "preliminary examination" there issued the funereal procession of battered spirits and crippled lives, hemmed in by bayonets, carrying "voluntary confessions" in their heads to deposit them in the "workers' court" before Vyshinsky and Ulrich, and the selected Stalinist audience, the Pritts, the foreign bourgeois correspondents, some bureaucrats and a knot of Michael Koltzovs and Harry Ganneses. Meanwhile Zinoviev, or Kamenev, or whoever had been left alive of the first batch to perform the necessary

"hooking," was led in the opposite direction and given a dose of hot lead.

Some Stalinists, confronted with the indisputable historical fact that confessions of guiltless men were often obtained through intolerable torture or mere threat of torture (Galileo), are willing to concede a doubtful point. Writes Troyanovsky:

"... one guiltless man might confess; even two or three might confess, but I cannot imagine how it could be possible for seventeen to confess and yet for their stories all to dovetail together." (*The New York Times*, February 3, 1937)

Two or three guiltless men might confess. What about four or five? And why not seventeen?

Stalin's supply of victims is virtually inexhaustible. Thousands and tens of thousands of old Bolsheviks have been for the last ten years in wretched isolation and nerve-wrecking hopelessness, suffering the interminable anguish of a tortured existence. Out of the multitude of wilted outcasts in prisons and Siberian exile, cruel Stalin can pluck two or three hundred of the most pathetic leading figures and order them to be put in shape for "voluntary confessions." The iron despot will, of course, stop at nothing to win his objective. And there can be little doubt that the man who organized such a horrible system as his is, who cast the best sections of mankind, the millions of revolutionary workers, to Fascist tigers, will resort to the most desperate expedients to gain his ends. If the known instruments of torture prove inadequate; if such somewhat antiquated measures as the chaining of his stripped victims to the wall of a dimly lighted underground dungeon filled with rats, lice and other foul vermin will not produce the desired results, then his remarkable ingenuity will create some fiendish device that will.

Stalin, of course, cannot succeed in grinding all the two hundred wretches to confess to deeds they never committed. Some will disappoint him by finding a way to suicide. Others will expire in the process of incessant torture. Still others, crazed by the pain and horrors more than the mind can bear, will be discarded and done away with. But there certainly will remain a dozen or so who, to end the interminable agony, will agree to confess to *anything*. Aware of the fact that never for a single moment are they out of the tyrant's clutches, these obedient tools, impressed by the threat of renewal of the terrible torture,

go through the "trial" without a hairbreadth of deviation from Stalin's instructions, thus becoming helpless tools of the Usurper in his revolting crimes.

Troyanovsky divides the group of seventeen men into two categories. Two or three of them, though guiltless, might make false confessions; but fourteen or fifteen, if guiltless, will not. The point is, that this separation is made by Stalin sometime before the "open trials." The seventeen, as Troyanovsky presents them, are really the two or three hundred "raw" prisoners out of whose midst Stalin has yet to shape his "witchcraft trial" material, discarding nearly nine-tenths of them (Troyanovsky's fourteen) and making use of about one-tenth (Troyanovsky's two or three).

With every new "trial" there will be fewer and fewer flaws. Already in the Radek "trial" Stalin eliminated a few crudities and introduced an improvement or two.

He spared the protagonists in the "trial," Radek and Sokolnikov. And, little doubt, the murder of one or two of those condemned to death was secretly postponed. He omitted the fulsome praise of the "greatest disciple" by the defendants:

"None of the accused beat his breast in self-condemnation or indulged in the fulsome praise of Joseph Stalin that disgusted observers at the previous trial." (Walter Duranty, *The New York Times*, January 30, 1937)

But the attack by the supposedly Trotskyists upon Trotsky, if anything, was intensified. Radek declared:

"Trotsky has become the center of all the counter-revolutionary forces." (*Ibid.*)

The job of dragging in the names of other big figures of Bolshevism Radek performed somewhat clumsily:

"Radek's final speech produced a strange and not wholly pleasant impression. He dragged in somewhat unnecessarily the names of Nikolai Bukharin, former *Izvestia* editor, and General Vitovta K. Putna—both under arrest—as Leon Trotsky's conspirators." (*Ibid.*)

While Radek's "trial" went on, a dread-inspiring wave of arrests among the tattered strands of Bolshevism swept the Soviet Union. Stalin with satanic maliciousness has extended his persecution to the apolitical relatives of his tormented victims,

with the object of intensifying their suffering and increasing the supply of his "witchcraft trial" material. Thus Trotsky's son, who has never taken part in politics, has been imprisoned. Those former Oppositionists and their relatives not yet under arrest, are living under conditions of medieval horror, constantly shadowed by death.

Among the old revolutionists doomed by Stalin was Alexander Beloborodoff, member of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party in Lenin's day (1919), chairman of the Orenburg Soviet, who is known to have participated in the execution of Bloody Nicholas the Second (*The New York Times*, January 27, 1937). What sweet joy must have surged through the old reactionary hearts of the White Guards, Tzarist *chinovniks* and *derjymordas*. Their Stalin was the avenging angel. They could bless his name, kiss his picture in secret and kneel in silent prayer before it, asking their god to grant their Stalin health and long years of reign.

Thus, what began as a "slight" distortion of Trotsky's rôle in the October Revolution, through years of uninterrupted development, reached the point at which he is pictured as partitioning the Soviet Union between Hitler and Japan. And what began on the part of the infirm Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin and other capitulators to Stalin as admission of non-existent errors and "crimes against the Party," and condemnation of Trotsky's struggle against Stalin, in its further evolution assumed the proportions of "witchcraft trials" directed against Trotsky. The seeds germinated, pushed out new shoots, and finally expanded into enormous poison plants.

The direful consequences of Lenin's death, the terrible and unutterably tragic collapse and degeneration of the Russian revolutionists, which now reached unprecedented depth, lead one to conclude that with the single exception of Lenin, not one of them was a *solid* Marxist. The extreme case of debasement and opportunist leprosy is, of course, Stalin's.

Trotsky's inadequacy consists in his quite frequently making peace with opportunism. Before the October Revolution, peace with the Centrists. After Lenin's death, peace with bureaucratic centralism and Stalinist distortions (screening Stalin against the exposure by Max Eastman, etc., etc.). After the betrayal of the German and Austrian workers by Stalinism and Social Democracy, peace with Social Democracy. For over eight years,

since his exile from the Soviet Union, peace and unity with such hypocritical opportunists like Cannon. In essence Cannon has been a millstone on Trotsky's neck and a saboteur in the struggle against reaction. During the Kirov crisis and the secret "trial" of Zinoviev and Kamenev, at the time of fusion of the Trotskyist forces with Muste, the writer and some other members demanded that a vigorous campaign of exposure of Stalinism be opened at once. Proposals were made for a barrage of literature, mass meetings and "Hands Off Zinoviev and Kamenev" demonstrations. The hitherto defensive line "What is Trotskyism?" was proposed to be discarded and the aggressive "What is Stalinism?" brought forward. Cannon, virtual dictator of the party, and Shachtman, his chief lieutenant, in their game of obligingly humoring Budenz, Arnold Johnson, Howe and other opportunists and reactionaries who were averse to struggle against Stalinism, viciously and stubbornly sabotaged every proposal. Thus the Cannon clique rendered another service to the Stalinist reaction. The sympathizers, of course, did not know what was going on within the Workers Party. Only when the interest and excitement among the workers over the crisis in the Soviet Union had subsided, and the sharp moment which might have involved the new party in a life-and-death struggle with the Browder clique "safely" passed, the saboteurs, to save their faces in their tartuffish game with Trotsky and Trotsky sympathizers, perfunctorily arranged a couple of ineffective meetings in the suburbs.

Radek's "trial" intensified the alarm, nervous tension and agitation among the workers, compelling the Stalinist clique to secure every influential voice siding with its cause to help drive the flood of slanderous lies, malice and demagoguery across all the dikes of reason, doubt and investigation and distill the poison in the minds of the workers. One of the most striking contributors to the gushing streams of Stalinist filth and poison was Walter Duranty. An exceptionally keen observer, Duranty cannot help seeing that Stalinism is the bridge that leads towards the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. His articles usually contain a multitude of facts with an admixture of but a few myths, although their tone is always subtly pro-Stalinist. But in this hour of tremendous danger to Stalinism, Duranty threw off his mask of impartiality and did not scruple to juggle facts. He wrote an article which is so well packed with Stalinist

lies, Stalinist distortions and Stalinist perversions, that one is at a loss which falsehood to refute first.

The following is a whole cluster of statements so wide of the truth and so dead against common sense, so bereft of any logic and realism, as to appear ludicrous:

"Trotskyist centers—units of the so-called 'Fourth International'—had been established at various points, notably in Paris, where Trotsky's chief henchman was Jacques Doriot, now definitely a Social-Fascist [even the terminology is Stalinist!—G.M.]; at Barcelona, where the Trotskyists last Summer outnumbered the orthodox Bolsheviks, and at New York, where Jay Lovestone and John Pepper caused *on Trotsky's behalf* a schism in the American Communist party from which it has hardly yet recovered." (*The New York Times*, February 7, 1937. My emphasis—G.M.)

A bourgeois correspondent parading as a neutral observer will tell the truth now and then. But in times of crisis he will strip himself of all his pretensions at impartiality and go over openly and brazenly to the side of reaction against the interests of truth, and therefore against the interests of the proletariat.

In the general mobilization of Stalinist supporters and pen-prostitutes, Browder stirred Michael Gold out of his "constructive repose."

"What a load of awful guilt lies under all Trotsky's too-perfect phrases! To me now he seems a monster, the most horrible Judas of all history. I feel more deeply about this as a Jew; it is the Jew, Trotsky, crazy with egotism, who has made an alliance with Hitler against the land where Jews are at last free." (Mike Gold, "Trotsky—the Most Horrible Judas of all History," *Daily Worker*, February 12, 1937)

The "proletarian writer," Michael Gold, "one of the most beloved figures in the revolutionary movement" (*Daily Worker*, February 11, 1937), at the dawn of his detestable career in the Communist movement was a petty-bourgeois Jewish nationalist with a religious streak. Marxist workers always recognized this fact, evident in many of his works. For example. During the needle workers' strike in Chicago in the Spring of 1924, the bosses employed gangsters to slug the strikers. Michael Gold wrote a poem dealing with the event. Here is a part of that poem:

"Listen, Potash and Perlmutter, Dealers in Cloaks and Suits, the sluggers of Girl Workers.

We will remember what we have seen, gentlemen.
 We will yet redeem the proud race that brought forth Jeremiah,
 the people's prophet,
 Moses, the leader of slaves, Jesus, the rebel, and Marx, Trotsky,
 Liebknecht and Henrich Heine.
 We will go back two thousand years and find the smooth pebble
 and sling of David,
 The sword of Judas Maccabee, and Bar Cochba's martial wisdom,
 We will remember you on that day, we other Jews,
 We will remember all our dear blood brothers, Messrs. Potash
 and Perlmutter!"

(*Daily Worker*, April 5, 1924)

Blinded by his extremely narrow nationalism, Gold viewed the class struggle, which incidentally involves Jewish workers and Jewish bosses, not from the angle of overthrowing capitalism and liberating the *toilers* of all races, but rather from the angle of redeeming the race that brought forth Moses, Jesus, Marx and Trotsky. He did not see the oppressed Negroes, the Chinese, the Hindoos as his "dear blood brothers." But with the years Gold's mind has undergone a certain alteration, as one can detect in his uncommonly abominable article on Trotsky. He has become a *Stalinist* Jewish-nationalist. Gold glories in the fact that under Stalin the Jews are "free," and for the sake of perpetuating, or rather prolonging, the Stalinist system, he is ready to sacrifice the Jews in Germany, Poland and other countries. It is the Stalinist reaction that has opened the flood-gates of excessive ultra-nationalism in Europe and the world. And the steady growth of Russian nationalism in the Soviet Union must needs bring in its wake there too the virus of anti-Semitism. The Jew in the Soviet Union is not permanently released from racial oppression; he is merely enjoying a very brief respite. If nationalist reaction continues advancing, if the tide of history does not turn towards Communist internationalism, towards Workers Democracy in the Soviet Union and the extension of October throughout the entire world, then the Jewish race is doomed. And anyone supporting the Stalinist reaction is, consciously or unconsciously, working not for the emancipation of the Jews but for their ultimate destruction.

Is it an exaggeration to assert that the Stalinist bureaucrats are *conscious* of the fact that in furthering their own interests they fan international anti-Semitism? Would it be wrong to

state that Gold's "Jewishness" is as much a fake and hypocrisy as his revolutionism?

After they led the German toiling masses and the Jews into a horror beyond comprehension, Stalin and his Browders and Michael Golds prevent the struggle against the Nazi cutthroats by a policy of unity with the Fascist "masses" ("For the Reconciliation of the German People," *Inprecorr*, October 24, 1936).

Having prevented the proletarian revolution in Germany, the Stalinist bureaucracy has transformed the steadily developing revolutionary situation in Poland into a counter-revolutionary one. Poland, which was ripe for proletarian revolution seventeen years ago (Lenin), has become reactionary and, next to Germany, the most anti-Semitic country in the world. The bulk of European Jewry is concentrated in Poland. While the Polish generals, landlords and the bourgeoisie brutally oppress the Polish workers and peasants who live in chronic misery, and persecute the Ukrainian and other non-Jewish national minorities who are in a desperate plight, they have set out upon a course of exterminating the Jews physically. The Jewish masses in Poland, amidst intense anti-Jewish terror, are slowly starved to death.

Stalin's "democracy" together with its imperialist ally, the French "democracy," has been wooing the Polish exploiters. And when a representative of the semi-Fascist Poland, General Rydz-Smigly, the savior of capitalism during the Polish-Soviet war, the butcher who staged pogroms in Kiev and other towns, arrived in Paris to solicit funds for Polish armaments, he was greeted by the French Browder:

"Long live Poland! This morning there arrived in Paris the General Rydz-Smigly, General Inspector of the Polish Army and the most important person of his country. General Rydz-Smigly was the disciple and fighting companion of Marshal Pilsudski. . . . The inner regime of Poland is rather distant from a liberal democracy and General Rydz-Smigly at one time occupied Kiev and defended Warsaw against the Red Army. Nevertheless, we are not uneasy in addressing our greetings to France's eminent guest." (Maurice Thorez, *L'Humanite*, August 30, 1936)

"Long live Poland!" Not revolutionary, workers, *Soviet Poland*, but Poland as is, semi-Fascist, anti-Semitic. Hardly a day passes without acts of repression and terror by this Poland. The *Daily Worker* prints reports of persecution ("Poland Arrests 1,000 in Drive on Anti-Fascists," *Daily Worker*, March 22,

1937). And Michael Gold, who champions every Stalinist abomination, supports also Stalin's policy with respect to Poland. For a bit of cheap popularity he is selling out not only the international proletariat but also his own race. He acts, in a sense, like the African Negro chieftains at the dawn of the capitalist era, who, for trinkets, sold members of their own race to the slave-ship captains.

The difference must be pointed out between Radek or Bukharin, on the one hand, and a Michael Gold, an Olgin or a Budenz, or say, a Magil, on the other. This last, for instance, in his excessive zeal to slander Trotsky, hisses that Trotsky during the October days and after, when he occupied high posts in the Party and worked together with Lenin, really concealed his true colors, implying that Trotsky then was an agent of counter-revolution (*Daily Worker*, September 3, 1936). And the following putrid exhalation of Stalinist breath poisons the minds of the workers with the foul fabrication that several months after the October overthrow, Trotsky was ready to sell Soviet Russia to the imperialist Allies—England, France, America and Italy:

“... this rat Trotsky, who was ready to sell Russia to the Allies, who fought Stalin so vigorously on the issues of the Chinese revolution.” (Harry Gannes, *Daily Worker*, February 2, 1937)

Radek, badgered and subjected to savage persecution was broken into submission to the Stalinist clique. He distorted and lied under compulsion, with the threat of prison, exile and even a firing squad ever at his heels. But Olgin, Gannes, Magil, Michael Gold and the rest of the painted “Reds” in Browder's house of ill fame are not forced to sell their conscience. They are liars and distorters by choice. To these moral and intellectual degenerates and perverts, truth is as familiar as their own names. These well-informed people drag into the gutter the great ideal of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Deliberately practicing deception and perjury with a view to winning favors from the higher bureaucrats, they purchase their fame and promotion with lies and slander, eagerly exerting Herculean efforts to diffuse the Stalinist poison fumes among the greatest possible number of unsuspecting workers. The lowest dregs of vice, they consciously violate the most elementary rules of human decency, these voluntary intellectual prostitutes. Their evil conscience is stained

with the blood of the millions of betrayed workers and peasants, with the blood of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Mrachkovsky, and other revolutionary wrecks who have fallen under the hail of Stalin's bullets, with the blood of Joffe and Tomsky, with the blood of Trotsky's daughter, driven by them to suicide, and the blood of thousands of old Bolsheviks who have perished and are perishing in Stalin's grisly dungeons. No more insidious, treacherous and deadly an enemy has ever lodged within the proletariat than these erudite poisoners, eager champions of deception of the masses, the licensed agents of the bureaucratic distortion of the Soviet Union.

In connection with the Zinoviev-Kamenev-Trotsky barefaced frame-up, a mention must be made of the despicable role played in this bitter and monstrous affair by the Lovestone clique. This band of political privateers, who, when inside the Comintern, not only violated the trust and confidence of the membership by withholding the truth about the original anti-Trotsky conspiracy, the plot against Workers Democracy, the planting of the seed of bureaucratic centralism, but who actively participated in this anti-workingclass crime in exchange for position of leadership in the American Party, must continue alongside the usurper Stalin, no matter to what low depths of degradation this unspeakable renegade and bureaucratic Borgia may sink. The old anti-workingclass crimes of Lovestone, Wolfe and Co. are an invisible chain which rivets them to Stalin's blood-bespattered triumphant chariot. They criticise Stalin's zigzags but conceal his general counter-revolutionary course. To confess to their shameful deeds is for them as much out of the question as it is for Browder or Olgin to confess to his. Burning with a sense of grievance, they hate the ungrateful Stalin for having thrown them out of his chariot and given their seats to Browder, Wobbly Weinstone and the double-crossing Stachel. But the invisible chain tugs at their black conscience, and they follow along. Browder and his Olgins and Hathaways, “our official comrades” (Jay Lovestone, “The People's Front Illusion,” p. 30), treat the wretched Lovestoneites with infinite contempt. During the ultra-Leftist zigzags, especially, they sling at Lovestone, Wolfe and Co. the choicest Stalinist mud, they empty upon the heads of the former “Marxian trunk” of the Party pailfuls of slop, they expectorate into the faces of Lovestone and Wolfe, yet the Lovestone leaders dare not break the invisible chain, dare

not expose Stalin and his system. They gallop along, helping "Comrade Browder" to smear Trotsky and other big figures of the Leninist era with Fascist pitch. Say the Lovestoneites:

"We are convinced that there is no adequate reason at hand to doubt the confessions made by the accused." (*Workers Age*, September 5, 1936)

Indignation and disgust wells up in one reading this base and criminal piece of carefully-worded villainy. What words can one use to describe fully the vileness of the Lovestoneites' "position"!

But the Lovestone-Wolfe clique is imbued with the "democratic ideal." The Lovestone leaders have inculcated upon their followers' mentality the illusion of the possibility of reforming Stalin, of erasing the bloody history of bureaucratic centralization of power, and turning the clock back to 1928. Accordingly, they give Stalin a "reform" pill:

"Other and sufficiently adequate punishment could have been meted out without resorting to executions, and thus granting some recognition to the inestimable services once rendered by these erstwhile powerful figures in the ranks of the Bolsheviks. Furthermore, we do not hesitate to say that the bureaucratic regime of Stalin in the C.P.S.U. makes it extremely difficult for healthy, constructive critical opposition forces developing in the Party ranks." (*Ibid.*)

Makes it "extremely difficult"! The Lovestone-Wolfe clique must at all costs prevent its duped followers from realizing that after the virus of treason to the world proletariat has entered Stalin's veins and he with his gang of degenerated "Bolsheviks" have built up a powerful bureaucratic pyramid, the idea of re-deeming this ruthless tyrant and his Litvinoffs, Piatnitskys, Piecks and Browders is a wild, reactionary dream. To conceal its own original sin, the source of its dishonorable conduct and all its crimes against the proletariat, the Lovestone-Wolfe clique consciously deceives its followers. Lovestone, Herberg and Wolfe know their Stalin. But they also know that to say "impossible," instead of "extremely difficult," would involve the question of building the Fourth International. To stop paltering with the truth and admit that the movement founded by Lenin has been destroyed by the renegade Stalin, would make it not "extremely difficult," but indeed *impossible* for the Lovestone clique to continue hiding from its followers its ineffaceable

brand of infamy. A white light thrown upon *all* the black deeds of the Stalinist bureaucracy must needs reveal Lovestone's treacherous role of direct assistant to the usurper Stalin (Anti-Trotsky conspiracy, 1923; Anglo-Russian Committee, 1926; China, 1925-1927), and of an indirect "critical" supporter of every new venomous intrigue, fiendish betrayal and monstrous crime (Germany, 1933; Spain, 1931-1937; Zinoviev-Kamenev-Trotsky bloody frame-up; imprisonment and destruction of thousands of old Bolsheviks).

When Walter Duranty wrote that Lovestone and Pepper split the Communist Party in behalf of Trotsky, Lovestone was incensed by this gratuitous "defilement" of his "moral soundness" and "revolutionary integrity." He then dispatched a vigorous protest to the *Times* editor: "This statement flies in the face of some obvious facts" (*The New York Times*, February 14, 1937).

And in Lovestone's own paper the following was stated:

"As a matter of fact, it was the present leadership of the Communist Party—Earl Browder, Clarence Hathaway and others—who were members of a joint caucus or fraction with the Trotskyites before the expulsion of the latter, separating themselves from them only gradually in subsequent weeks.

"Now, of course, Duranty knows all this as well as the next fellow and, by 'writing as he pleases,' he shows himself to be as brazen and unscrupulous a fabricator as can be found." (*Workers Age*, February 20, 1937)

But what of Duranty's fabrication about Trotsky? Oh, that does not concern "honest" Lovestone. In fact, that part is as it should be. In that respect Lovestone himself goes quite far, a great distance beyond Duranty. There is not an article dealing with Trotsky and the Trotskyites in which Lovestone does not indulge in some fabrication or other. To cut the research short, in this very article where he calls Duranty an unscrupulous fabricator, Lovestone, through habit taught, does a little distorting of facts himself when he writes that "the real Trotskyites (Cannon-Shachtman) broke with the C.P."

As a matter of record, the Trotskyites did not break with the C. P. but were *expelled* from the C.P. by Lovestone; and Lovestone "knows all this as well as the next fellow."

Lovestone really should not be angry with Duranty. First, because it is not Duranty's fault that in the struggle of the

shrewd and unscrupulous Stalin against naive Trotsky and meek Bukharin, Duranty proved to be a better guesser than Lovestone and Cannon, and chose the winner—"I did pick the right horse on which to bet in the Russian race" (Walter Duranty, *I Write As I Please*, p. 200). Secondly, Lovestone and Duranty both, in essence, work for the same cause. And thirdly, Lovestone, after all, also writes as he pleases.

A particularly hypocritical feature in the Lovestoneites' "position," is their pretense at revolutionism and fairness. In a "critical" vein, *after* the executions have been carried out, they declare that Stalin ought not to have murdered the old associates of Lenin. The Lovestoneites hint that Stalin should have thrown the old Bolsheviks into dungeons, "thus granting some recognition to the inestimable services once rendered." Truly, no slimier political sneak has ever infested the proletarian camp, than a Lovestone or a Wolfe.

From the dawn of history, forgery, slander and frame-up, as political weapons have always been employed by unscrupulous opponents, at times with cogency that enabled the perpetrators to perform highly successful operations in protecting their dominant economic and political interests. A social class or a group resorting to such political weapons must of necessity have its scapegoat. The American bourgeoisie established the practice of slandering and framing up labor leaders, radical workers and Negroes. Hitler has for a scapegoat the Jews. The Stalinist clique, Trotsky.

The slandering of Trotsky did not originate with Stalinism. Trotsky has quite often been slandered before. On his way to Russia from New York Trotsky was arrested by the Canadian authorities who accused him of being in the pay of the German government. The agents of the Russian Provisional government and the reactionary Socialists at once gave credence to this slander. Lenin at that time was already in Petrograd. And although Lenin and other Bolsheviks, knowing full well that Trotsky did not adhere to their position, could not foretell which political way Trotsky would go, they rose to his defense:

"Can one even for a minute believe in the reliability of the report which was received by the English government, to the effect that *Trotsky*, former president of the Soviet of Workers Deputies in Petrograd in 1905, revolutionist who has given tens of years of unselfish service to the revolution, that this man had connections

with a plan subsidized 'by the German government'? Why, this is an obvious, unheard-of, most shameless slander of a revolutionist." (*Pravda*, April 16, 1917)

After the above was written, during the next several years, Trotsky's services to the revolution exceeded a thousand times the services he had rendered in all the years gone before. To refresh one's memory: "It is possible to declare with certainty that the swift passing of the garrison to the side of the Soviet, and the skillful direction of the work of the Military Revolutionary Committee, the Party owes principally and first of all to Comrade Trotsky" (Stalin, *Pravda*, November 6, 1918). "Leon Trotsky (Bronstein), People's Commissar for War, and, next to Lenin, the biggest figure of the revolution" (Wm. Z. Foster, *The Russian Revolution*, p. 108). "Comrade Trotsky, the organizer of the Red Army, the organizer of the defense and the victory of the Revolution" (Clara Zetkin, *The Communist International*, No. 24, p. 11).

The maligning and slandering of Trotsky did not terminate with the shameless and vile attempt of the Canadian authorities. Upon his arrival in Petrograd, he, Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders were accused of being German agents in service of the Kaiser. During the July Days Trotsky was arrested; and had it not been for the revolutionary workers who released him from prison, he would have been brought to trial as a German spy. The evidence against him, Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders, was a collection of forgeries known as the "Sisson Documents." Olgin then in the *Forward* upheld these documents as authentic, seeking to prove the existence of the "Bolshevik-Kaiser bloc." In the attempt to discredit Trotsky, the Kerensky government did not limit itself to the Sisson forgeries. Documentary "proof" was fabricated by the "Socialist" Minister of Justice to show that prior to the March revolution Trotsky and Lunacharsky had served in the Tzar's *Ochbrana*, secret police (M. Makotinsky, *Letopis Revolutsii*, No. 1, Part II, pp. 224-225).

A few months after the Stalinist usurpers exiled the eminent revolutionist to Turkey, they spread the slander that his criticism of Stalin was subsidized by the English capitalists whose agent Trotsky now had become:

"For these lies and calumnies the English pay to Trotsky hundreds of thousands of dollars." (Rojkov, *Daily Worker*, June 3, 1929)

It did not take much time and the Stalinists found themselves, as usual, in a contradiction. On the heels of this slander the MacDonald government announced in the House of Commons its decision denying to Trotsky the right of asylum in England. The English reactionaries heartily approved their Socialist lackey's action: "Tories cheer Labor Minister's Announcement in Commons" (*The New York Times*, July 12, 1929)

Few men in the history of humanity have rendered as much service to the enslaved and oppressed as has Trotsky; and his greatest, immortal service consisted in his playing, next to Lenin, the leading role in establishing, stabilizing and solidifying the power of the proletariat in the first workers republic in the world. Throughout the turbulent march of centuries few wrongs have been righted, few tragedies mended. The greatest injustice done to the greatest living figure of the greatest revolution in history will be wiped out by the revolutionary working class.

The Stalinist hyenas hound Trotsky, howling for his blood as the Southern lynch mobs howl for the blood of the Negroes. And they hound him not because he has deviated from Leninism, has capitulated to the putrid Social Democracy, but because with his name is associated the *undistorted* history of October, of the Civil War; because of his former incalculable services to the working class. They traduce and vilify him and hold him up to execration because in 1923 he struck bureaucratic centralization between the eyes, because throughout the years following he attempted to fight Stalinism. They hound him because he is traditionally their scapegoat.

Does it mean, however, that in view of Trotsky's immeasurable services to the revolution and because the bloodthirsty Stalinist pack has organized an international man-hunt for Trotsky, the fight against his present definitely opportunist line is to be relaxed? Criticism of his false position in the struggle against Stalinism to be withheld? Not at all. Trotsky's erroneous conception of Stalinism, his utopian, flabby, naive tactical line with respect to the bureaucratic centralism of the workers State must be shown up in all its helplessness and hopelessness. On the question of reevaluation of the Second International the fight against Trotsky must be *relentless*, because this fight is greater than any man, it is the fight for the revolutionary policy for the proletariat, for Leninism with which Trotsky is

now completely out of tune. But the struggle must be carried on not with the vile methods of the Stalinist reaction; it must be conducted with the clean methods of Lenin, the methods of the revolutionary proletariat. This is the only way to build once again a real Bolshevik organization, and if Trotsky is to be rescued, this is the only way of rescuing him.

No despot ever played so complicated a game to retain power as does the monster Stalin. No voracious social group, in its struggle to protect and further its special group privileges, ever resorted to such weapons as does the bureaucratic distortion. The flagrant technique of the Fascists, the reprehensible system of amalgam employed by the Thermidorian reaction, the darkly mysterious, atrocious procedure conducted by Tomas de Torquemada, Spanish inquisitor general, the trickery and reptile-like coldblooded cruelty of the Oriental despots and the vengeful ferocity of the Romans, Stalinism has rolled into one. And with this diabolic combination, modernized and improved, covered with Bolshevik phrases, the bloodthirsty Stalinist pack swoops down upon the people who at one time or another resisted its advance; and upon the people who threaten, or those who Stalin thinks will threaten, its domination.

The tragic fate of Zinoviev and Kamenev is a cruel handiwork of history: the Frankenstein monster which they themselves assisted in bringing into existence, has in the end destroyed them. Finding themselves perishing in the cold, howling ocean, the raging waves about to close over their heads, these human wrecks clutched frenziedly at the only straw advanced to them by Stalin. But the straws Stalin holds out to his victims invariably turn out to be either execution axes of Chiang Kai-shek and Hitler, or bullets fired by Mussolini's and Franco's soldiers, or Stalin's own firing squads.

Grimed with the blackest treachery against the workers, piling one crime upon another, Stalinism is keeping the Russian masses in poverty and in an ideological fog; and the world oppressed in the chains of capitalist slavery and misery. Ever more centralized is becoming the power of the bureaucratic distortion. And ever greater is the concentration of power in the hands of the personal ruler, the tightening of the Usurper's vise-like grip on the Soviet Union.

At what point will the accentuating process of continuous

centralization of power terminate? What does the bloody phase portend?

The thrill and the sweet and violent sensation produced by the sight and the taste of the blood of the old Bolsheviks who had endeavored to stifle the bureaucratic Monster in its infancy, intoxicated the loathsome Stalinist pack. Having lapped up the warm blood of Zinoviev, Kamenev and other closest co-workers of Lenin, the prowling wolves of Stalinism with fierce passion are silently running down and tearing the throats of more and more victims. Will they spare Bukharin and Rykov? Is Kalinin safe? How long before Litvinov is forced to confess to plotting with Hitler? The bureaucratic distortion has set an official blood-seal upon its power. The bloody stage, now a natural order of things, will roll on! The Stalinist big bureaucrats and favorites are helpless puppets in the power of the appalling system of bureaucratic centralism of the workers State, a system which they themselves brought into life. In the stifling Byzantine atmosphere of careerism, bureaucratic intrigues, dark suspicions and jealousies, will not this mad Dance of Death claim the present close and closest friends of usurper Stalin, one or two of whom, as logical successors, will become rivals for the mantle of the dictator?

The usurpers in their bestial career of treason and murder, must and will drive on relentlessly against all who might be suspected of having adopted a policy of hopefully waiting for a crisis in the upper circles of the bureaucratic regime. The inexorable iron-and-blood logic of the system of uninterrupted centralization of power will lead far beyond the point of the total extermination of the former Opposition. In the months and years to come the entire former Party strata including the Stalinist faction itself, leaders and rank-and-file, will be wiped out. The reestablished private ownership of the means of production and distribution, and the reborn capitalist State will be protected by a bloody Fascist dictator into which the ruling bureaucrat Stalin, or his worthy successor, will be transformed. The profit motive will be in full bloom. The present bureaucracy, which like an immense foul spider, is collectively sucking the blood of the Soviet toiling masses, will be metamorphosed into the new Russian bourgeoisie, each bureaucrat becoming an individual shareholder in some industrial enterprise. Issuing out of the ruins of the undermined workers State,

the Russian Fascist regime will continue infecting the workers' mind with the deadly Stalinist bacteria painted "Red." It must be remembered that the German bourgeoisie only changed the form of its old State, and yet the Nazi regime employs Socialist phrases to a considerable extent; the name of Hitler's Fascist machine is the National Socialist Workers Party.

Having stamped with his brutal boots upon the corpses of the great figures of Lenin's Party and Lenin's Comintern, having waded through oceans of workers' blood spilled at regular intervals, the renegade and usurper Stalin will never swerve from his appalling course. Unless the international proletariat is roused from its lethargy, the bureaucratic centralization of the first workers State will go on. Stalin, by stages, will become transformed into a fabulous despot with immeasurable personal power, and the Soviet Union into a vast, black dungeon for the millions of workers and peasants. That Stalinism will grow in harshness and brutality is evidenced by such decrees as the one making the death penalty for theft applicable not only to adults but—to *children* of the age of twelve! (*Izvestia*, April 8, 1935). On the other hand, for the privileged bureaucracy the process of steady degeneration of the proletarian State will transform the country into a hilarious brothel, a drawn-out Bacchanalia of Stalinism, with noisy, repulsively hypocritical fake Communist phrases to conceal the orgiastic march towards the restoration of capitalism.

Let the ever-growing international Fascist vampire dig its horrible fangs into the quivering, bleeding flesh of the world proletariat. Let the fate of the French, the British, the American workers follow that of the Chinese, the German, the Spanish and other toilers. Stalinism will maneuver with different bourgeois States, meanwhile doing its utmost to increase Soviet Union armaments. The prevalence of Stalinism results in the steady advance of Fascism. The sharpening of imperialist antagonisms results in the steady increase of war preparations of the imperialist world, which preparations in turn necessitate the increase of military preparedness of the Soviet Union.

The arms budget of the Soviet Union for 1931 was one billion three hundred million rubles. The 1936 war expenditures were *double* those of 1935. The 1937 military appropriations have been increased 35 per cent over those of 1936, reaching the staggering sum of *twenty billion one hundred and two million rubles* (*The New York Times*, January 12, 1937). The stupendous

arms budget is bound to swell steadily and drive the standard of living of the masses below the starvation line; and with the opening of a new cycle of wars, untold privation and suffering for the Russian as well as for the world masses is an absolute certainty. The toilers will be deprived not only of milk and butter, but of bread and potatoes. Stalinism, source of unending bloody disasters for the masses, is instrumental in preparing the bloodiest holocaust in mankind's history. This dreadful disease tormenting the proletariat will reap a grim harvest among the toiling masses of the entire world. Stifling the international proletariat, Stalin allows the world bourgeoisie a free hand in its mad race of armaments, which imposes a terrific strain upon the workers and peasants. His agents openly promote the armaments of his *temporary*, extremely unreliable, allies, the French imperialists, Czechoslovak manufacturers and Polish landlords. The international proletariat, including the Russian working class, deprived of the lamp of Marxism-Leninism and therefore unable to see the imperative necessity of removing the Stalinist obstruction to the extension of the October Revolution, is unconsciously submitting to the Stalinist course of pouring an ever greater share of the toilers' labor into armaments, and fatalistically drifting towards the bloody denouement.

And when the supreme test between capitalism and the solitary workers State does come, when the Fascist hurricane of fire, destruction and death, a taste of which was given the workers of Madrid, Malaga and other Spanish towns, bursts loose upon the Soviet Union, the Stalin-Voroshilov clique of usurpers will hurl against the roaring inferno of imperialist cannons ten, twenty, fifty million workers and peasants. The pirates of power, in the futile endeavor to appease the wrath and colonial hunger of the world bourgeoisie, will throw overboard all the remnants of the October Revolution. Faced with the savage impact, they will not hesitate to give up to the imperialists most of the Soviet population and vast portions of Soviet territory if only they can retain for themselves a strip of land and a few million toilers as the basis for a much reduced burocratic pyramid with those at its summit transformed into private magnates of industry.

Some people, permanently blinded by Stalinism, living in a fool's paradise, soothe themselves and others with the lullaby: the German workers will not march against the Soviet Union. Such fatalism is a consequence of lack of a Marxian understand-

ing of the relation of class forces and of the objective and subjective phase of a particular historical conjuncture.

The Russian Revolution in this respect offers a lesson of superlative importance to the working class. In 1918 Trotsky and the Bolshevik delegation at Brest-Litovsk, banking upon the refusal of the German workers to march against proletarian Russia, rejected the robber terms of German imperialism and declared a state of no war and no peace between Soviet Russia and Germany.

Trotsky and the delegation, and for that matter the majority of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party which approved this tactic, proceeded from the premise that the German working class had undergone untold privations and bled for four years, that the German army on the Russian front had ceased fighting and had been fraternizing with the Russian soldiers for months, imbibing Bolshevik ideas. To the German masses, as well as to the masses of the world, the Bolshevik Revolution was the only ray of hope of an early peace out of the black clouds of the never-ending carnage. The tactic of no war and no peace seemed sound, and no one among those who advanced and supported it could make himself believe that the half-Bolshevized German troops would march. And yet Lenin immediately criticised this tactic as a grave blunder. He clearly understood that the German imperialist tiger, though wounded, was still very much alive, while the German proletariat had not yet reached the point at which it would openly defy the master class. Lenin proved right, and the Russian proletariat paid dearly for this blunder. At the command of the Kaiser's generals the German troops opened a withering fire against the Bolshevik soldiers and advanced into Soviet Russia. And only upon the hurried acceptance by the Bolshevik leaders of the harsh terms of peace, did the German generals halt the offensive against the *undistorted* Red Republic.

Today the German proletariat is prostrate ideologically and spiritually. Betrayed by the Stalinist and the Social-Democratic leaders when it was at its height of organization, the German proletariat has been disorganized as a class by the Nazis. The greatest tragedy which broke its power of resistance for some years was that it yielded to Fascism without a semblance of struggle. The millions of Socialist workers vaguely perceive that they have been betrayed not only by their leaders but also by

Stalin. The millions of Stalinist workers dimly grasp that they have been sold out by both Social Democracy and their own leaders. The tens of thousands of the most active and militant German workers, the vanguard of the proletariat, those who were in the Stalinist and the Socialist parties, both rank-and-file and functionaries, have been murdered by the Nazis. It is highly doubtful that another Karl Liebknecht, another Rosa Luxemburg, have by now arisen in Germany, understand the cause of the advent of Fascism, the character of Stalinism, and are organizing a new revolutionary party, the German section of the Fourth International. The German daylight today, for the proletariat, is blacker than the blackest night in the times of the Kaiser; and when the Nazi generals give the command, the German workers, shackled, terrorized and confused, will march. As they fought in the interests of their exploiters in the World War, cutting the throats of their brothers, the French, Russian and other workers, sacrificing their own lives, so will they fight again. Had the Left Opposition, after Lenin's death, been victorious, the European working class led by the German, the French and the Russian sections would be marching today under the Red Flag against the retreating world bourgeoisie, and towards genuine Socialism. Renegade Stalin and his Piecks and Browders, all counter-revolutionary to the core, saved the bourgeoisie and thus prepared the ground for the greatest human hecatomb in all history. The World War was made possible primarily by the treachery of the Social Democracy; and today, as the inevitable consequence of the corroding influence of Stalinism, of Social Democracy and of the rest of the opportunist currents within the international proletariat, world capitalism will succeed in mobilizing huge armies in Germany, Japan, Italy, Poland, Turkey and other bourgeois states and march them against the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union, *unless the Marxian current within the proletariat is revived in time.*

The struggle between the Russian toilers and the imperialist armies will be the most furious in history. But just as in Spain, if the Stalinist clique of opportunists remain intact and together with it the anti-Marxist line, then the defeat of the Russian masses, the transformation of the Soviet Union into the most stupendous shambles, is a *certainty*. The bitterest fruit of Stalinist treachery, the agony of the present epoch, is not very far away. *The line is decisive; and an opportunist line can never*

win a victory for the toiling masses. It brings only defeats and decline for the revolutionary class. The workers State, as in the case of the international proletariat, will stand the catastrophic consequences of the criminal bluster and bombast which supplanted Marxism. The galaxy of internationalists sincerely beloved by the masses, is no more. Those were minds that measured up to the truly Titanic task of saving the first workers republic from the onslaught of the combined forces of exploiters of the toiling humanity. Embodying a mighty revolutionary force and sweep, they were making serious preparations to storm the formidable peaks of world imperialism. Their genuinely proletarian policy aroused the oppressed masses to the highest pitch of enthusiasm, zeal, self-sacrifice and most heroic deeds. Lenin's clear vision, devotion to the cause of *all* toilers, sincerity, tested in the crucible of the class struggle, inspired the masses with unshakable faith in Communism, in the bright future of all humanity and swept them along to victory.

"'Comrade Lenin is leading us to Communism, we shall hold on, however difficult it may be,' declared the Russian workers who, with the vision of an ideal commonwealth for humanity before their eyes, starving and freezing, hurried to the fronts, or, under unspeakable difficulties, worked to reestablish industry. 'Why should we fear that the masters will return and take away our fields? Little father Lenin will save us, and Trotsky with his Red Army.'" (Klara Zetkin, *Reminiscences of Lenin*, p. 8)

Lenin is dead. The rest of the October forest is no more. Trotsky, conspired against and driven out by the disrupters of the world revolution, is slandered and hounded, a firing squad held in readiness to take his life. One by one the old oaks of Bolshevism have been cut down, burned and the ashes scattered to the wind. Zinoviev—Lenin and Zinoviev closely collaborated for over two decades. They were co-founders of the Bolshevik Party. During the black years of the World War they were in Swiss exile, and together wrote the famous series of articles "Against the Current," and the celebrated April Thesis. They were both in hiding in Finland during the July Days. On Lenin's motion Zinoviev was unanimously chosen Chairman of the Communist International. Kamenev, co-founder of the Bolshevik Party, life-long co-worker of Lenin and Lenin's literary executor, vice-chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, Chairman of the Moscow Soviet. Joffe, one of the foremost Bol-

shevik diplomats under Lenin, for siding with the Left Opposition, deprived of medicines and thus deliberately driven to suicide. Head of the Marx-Engels Institute, Riazanov, slandered and persecuted to death. Rykov, Chairman of People's Commissars, framed and immured in a dungeon. Bukharin, one of the great scholars of Marxism, framed and imprisoned. Tomsy, head of the Soviet Trade Unions, murdered or driven to suicide. Medvedev, Secretary of the Leninist Central Committee, a hero of the October uprising in Moscow against Kerensky's troops, is dying in Siberian exile. Sokolnikov, Soviet Ambassador to Britain; Serebriakov, Secretary of the Bolshevik Party; Muralov, leader of the Moscow Bolshevik forces during October days; Smirnov, Radek; well-known Left writers, Tarasov-Radionov, Katayev, and hundreds and thousands, and tens of thousands of the old worker-Bolsheviks, hounded, terrorized, imprisoned, murdered—no trials, no accounts to anyone.

The Marxist-Leninist line of proletarian dictatorship versus capitalist dictatorship is now "counter-revolution" and even "Fascism." The memory of the luminous past has been dimmed, if not obliterated. Proletarian revolutionary traditions have been shattered, zest and spirit smothered in the stale air of the Stalinist reaction.

The place of the October oaks, of the revolutionary captains of the proletariat, has been taken by a horde of bureaucratic climbers, people animated in the main by the lure of acquisition. With the ending of the revolutionary period of the Soviet Union and the change of the tide towards reaction directed by a handful of former Bolsheviks who turned traitors to the cause, there has been a steady infiltration of counter-revolutionary elements into the State machinery. In place of co-workers of Lenin there are now Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries and even White Guards. Menshevik Martynov, who recently died, was Lenin's inveterate enemy. When the tide changed he became a "Bolshevik" and was "elected" a member of the Presidium of the Comintern and the chief editor of the official organ of the Comintern, *The Communist International*. Ustrialov, former minister of the bloody Fascist Dictator Admiral Kolchak, has been building "Socialism." Zaslavsky, who conducted a vicious fight against Lenin and Trotsky, branding them as German agents, of whom Lenin said, "Zaslavsky and similar scoundrels," is now a "revolutionist." Rafes, former minister of the bandit and

pogromist Petlura, has become metamorphosed into a "Communist" theoretician. Serebrovsky, who in 1917 along with the Tzarists and the capitalists accused Lenin of being in the pay of the German Kaiser, has now been "elected" to Stalin's Central Committee. Troyanovsky, enemy of Lenin during the imperialist war and bitter foe of the workers republic, is now Soviet Ambassador to the United States. The present Ambassador to Great Britain, Maisky, was a minister in Admiral Kolchak's domain. Here are some of the proposals Maisky made to the Menshevik Central Committee in 1918:

"Decisive struggle against Bolshevism, preparation and organization of people's uprisings against the Soviet power, active support to Czecho-Slovaks and the Committee of the Constituent Assembly, participation in the building up of a democratic state, continuation of war with Germany in close contact with the Allies." (*Krasnaya Nov*, 1922, Book four, p. 138)

Vyshinsky, today a fiery defender of "Leninism," during the October Revolution and the Civil War was a Right Menshevik; and hundreds and tens of thousands of reactionaries who fought to destroy the proletarian revolution and continue to do so. At the helm of the distorted workers State stands an uncrowned bureaucratic potentate who has deprived the toilers of their rights and privileges which they conquered in the October Revolution and the bloodiest civil war, who placed over them his agents, the brutal bureaucratic bosses, who exercises an insolent sway in every avenue of the workers' daily life. A monstrous Cesare Borgia who has surrounded the workers of the Soviet Union with provocateurs, poisoners and spies. A renegade and traitor who strangled the Chinese, the German, the Spanish revolutions. A hideous fiend who has sold his own conscience for sinister personal power.

And if in the course of the death grapple of the Russian masses with world imperialism the Soviet Union becomes a colossal charred and smoldering wreckage amidst a vast ocean of blood and mountains of corpses? If Stalin's long reign of bureaucratic exploitation of the Russian toilers, the reign which is buttressed by the accompanying orgy of hypocrisy, deception and bloody terror and which is successfully defended against the Russian and international proletariat, falls under the blows of international Fascism? If the invading armies and the White Guards

converge as in 1919 from all directions upon Moscow, and the imperialist iron ring grows narrow and narrower, and, after the total destruction of the Russian working class, with the Fascist occupation of Moscow and the Kremlin, the dastardly Stalin and his underlings who have bartered the great cause of the exploited and oppressed for an opportunist mess of pottage, themselves perish?

Well, wasn't it worth their while! Weren't the stakes worth playing for! How often does history present a group of unscrupulous conspirators with a "golden" opportunity to successfully seize State power? Once in a century!

In return for a brief paradise and glittering glory enjoyed by the privileged Soviet bureaucracy, the vicious Stalinist clique will give the toiling masses many decades, if not centuries, of horrible Fascist hell. But the renegade Stalin and his co-usurpers are not in the least perturbed by this prospect. "After us, the deluge!" Power is the entire premise of their existence. What the Stalinist gang is concerned with today is the acquisition of more power. What this blackest gang of bloodthirsty murderers the equal of which for treachery and crime is unknown in all past history, is fanatically seeking today, is more power. More power for itself, and especially for its idol and Master, the bloodlusty usurper Stalin.

More power! To have everyone tremble with fear and hypocritically distort and lie as loyal Kirov lied—"The greatest leader of all peoples of all times." To terrorize all into blessing the Leader's name. To inflict brutal punishment upon those who fail to exhibit zeal and enthusiasm in carrying out the Leader's orders, who fail to recite the list of cruel blessings the Leader's misrule brought to the masses. To deal severely with those who hesitate to proclaim aloud that the "greatest Leader" follows in the footsteps of Lenin. And as to those who dare breathe a syllable of disapproval, those who dare criticise—to seek them out with the clutching hand of death, to set vicious bloodhounds upon their hot trail and reach out for them everywhere, in the Soviet Union, in Norway, in Mexico, *everywhere*, and bring these "scamps," these "enemies of the Soviet Union," to "justice." In the "workers' court" before the devoted Vyshinskys and Ulrichs, while throughout the world the artful Browders and Olgins, assisted by the wise and careful "unofficial comrades," the Lovestones and Wolfes, lay a heavy Red smoke-screen, to

"try" them "in strict accordance with the laws of the U.S.S.R.," the Usurper's laws of bureaucratic claw and fang, "publicly" if the stage has been set for an "open trial," secretly, if the necessary preparations have not yet been completed.

Indefatigably to round up all those who stood in the way, all those who constitute a potential danger to the regime, all those who, knowing dark and bloody secrets, might venture to disclose them to the workers. To seize these "agents of Hitler who are conspiring to introduce capitalism into the Soviet Union," these "Trotskyists" who are "plotting to divide the Soviet Union among the Fascist powers," and cast them into the Lubiankas, into the torture dens of the G.P.U. To make them grovel in dust, and writhe like worms, beg forgiveness, swear allegiance, to transform them into creatures that will do any hellish enterprise, and finally, when they are reduced to mere living corpses, after no more use can be made of them, riddle their bellies with bullets. To make all thought of criticism hushed as the grave. By the use of a chain of masterly arranged "witchcraft trials" of the Order's Inquisition, each link in the chain firmly gripping the next one, to send an icy, paralyzing horror into every discerning mind. To devise a tremendous steel trap for the toiling masses of the Soviet Union and debase them to the status of docile, voiceless serfs of the Stalinocracy. To protect and uphold the heavy, glistening bureaucratic pyramid not only with frame-ups, ferocious persecution, dungeons and firing squads, but also, should a mass opposition among the toilers arise, with machine guns, artillery and bombing planes.

All semblance of humanity is abandoned. Every instinct of shame and decency is resigned. Everything is given up, cancelled and forgotten: honor, principles, noble aspirations, the precious ideal of universal abolition of the exploitation of man by man, everything *for power*.

More power—to Stalin the Terrible!

BROWDER SERVES STALIN AND WALL STREET

IF in the arduous task of balancing himself on the peak of his pyramid, Stalin must strive for the maintenance of international capitalism, he can accomplish this end *only* through an effective device within each important capitalist country. The combination of these devices, the Stalintern, forms a complex machine of vast proportions, with far-flung belts, shafts and pulleys, well-oiled and expertly managed.

The manipulator of each section of the huge machine must be crafty, cautious, talented; one who has passed Fagin's test.

Operating within the American working class, with the specific aim of preventing the development of a Marxist party and of acquiring great enough influence among the masses to command attention of the American capitalists in their deals with the Stalinist bureaucracy, is a section of the Stalintern headed by Earl Browder. In America Browder is the principal mouthpiece of Stalinism.

This man Browder, at one time, many years before he set out upon his nefarious career, fought against the bourgeoisie. He suffered imprisonment for opposing Wall Street's war. Like Kautsky, Plekhanov and Stalin, he became a renegade. His honest past, which, like Stalin and other turncoats of Bolshevism, he employs to cover up his infamous present, shades off the darker his ignominious fall.

Browder has mastered all the arts of Stalinism to make him a notable of the Order. He can lie without batting an eyelash. He will seize upon every available narcotic to befuddle the proletariat. In an underhand fashion instituted by Stalin, he picks his crew, composed in the main of tag-ends of former factional cliques and augmented as years go by with a motley array of petty-bourgeois deformities. The flunkies are graded and classi-

fied, the least scrupulous and most active in promoting the Order's bureaucratic interests occupying posts next to his in importance and influence. He is utterly callous to the interests of the workers, and is wholly devoted to the Stalinist bureaucracy. Browder's job to ensnare the proletarian vanguard is a difficult one. Since successful swindling could never be possible by merely mixing Stalin with Marx, Engels and Lenin, Browder must "analyze" American conditions, take up national issues (in reality a pure side-play for him and Stalin), and make a show of leading the struggles of the masses. An earnest Stalinist wheel-horse, he performs much back-straining labor. He does things with systematic thoroughness. He writes articles and books, delivers hundreds of speeches, lectures, orations, attends conferences and conventions, gives audience to reporters. He is a recipient of many honors. The *Daily Worker* and other Stalinist publications review his writings, print his pictures and speeches, parrot his words, envelop him with an aura of honesty and humaneness:

"When Browder takes a drink of water during a speech and tells twenty thousand people to relax with him a moment you understand to the bottom of your being how honest and human is the occasion." (*Daily Worker*, June 24, 1936)

"Somehow you believe in that man, Browder, and what he says." (Joe Fields, *Daily Worker*, October 21, 1936)

"You look at him and you know this man is reliable. You can trust him with anything." (M. J. Olgin, *Daily Worker*, October 5, 1936)

The old-timers, particularly the bureaucrats Olgin, Bedacht, Weinstone and others know that statements like those above are pure fakery, a necessary element in the gigantic Stalinist fraud. In the early stage of bureaucratic centralization of the Comintern, when one could, without incurring expulsion, state some facts or express an opinion, even members of the Central Committee did not hesitate to say that Browder is a trickster and a stranger to facts:

"Comrade Browder, you may just as well make up your mind right here and now that we do not let you get away with your sleight of hand tricks." (Max Bedacht, "Browder—A Stranger to Facts," *Daily Worker*, December 23, 1924)

Fanfare and ballyhoo effects are among the favorite devices of the Stalinist bureaucracy. Passions flare when Browder appears on the platform. The stooges, lackeys and cheerleaders, true and constant in allegiance, radiate optimism, confidence and enthusiasm to psychologize the audience for the penetrating downpour of intoxicating demagoguery out of the mouth of "the beloved leader of the American working class, Earl Browder." (*Daily Worker*, June 16, 1936)

The "Party" under his rule operates with almost mechanical exactness, and systematically intensifies its entrapping activity. It must spread out and become a mass "Party" to be as effective as the German "Party" was before the advent of Fascism. The size of the *Daily Worker*, after the German betrayal, was enlarged from four to six and then to eight pages. A Sunday edition of twenty-eight pages with a rotogravure and a magazine section was launched in January 1936. The *New Masses* was changed from a monthly to a weekly. Many new periodicals have been launched; a gutter-tabloid, the *People's Press*. Many pen-pushers, graduated into remarkable manipulators of Communist phrases, have been added to the staffs. Hypocrisy is pouring into the publications in wide and wider torrents. Covering their grisly deeds with a thick layer of pretended anti-capitalist words, they write forceful denunciations of Hearst, Mussolini, Franco and Hitler. The tragedy of the victims of the capitalist class they turn to serve their base bureaucratic ends. The misery of the unemployed, the oppression of the Negro, the suffering of the ex-service men, the plight of the poor student, the persecution of foreign-born workers—all are powerfully etched. Mooney and Billings, the glory of the Paris Commune, workers' anxiety over impending war and the steady growth of Fascism are fully exploited. The Stalinist papers flash headlines hailing Ethiopian resistance, the heroic struggle of the Spanish toiling masses, giving a "victory" tone to the dispatches and articles dealing with the Spanish civil war, the gains of the Chinese Red forces, the passing of the Bonus Bill, a picture of Joe Louis—all this to indicate vital concern with the interests of the oppressed. "Pessimists" who criticize the policies and predict defeat for the workers are savagely berated. Lies are concocted by experts. Cascades of "Bolshevik" diction, not a word of which is meant, roar through the pages. And although the true purpose of the work carried out by Stalin's henchmen is

carefully concealed, even the most solid craftsmen among them inadvertently blurt out here and there significant information for a discerning reader.

Vagueness is one of the characteristics of Stalinism. The bureaucrats create an atmosphere of dignity and hocus-pocus mystery within the "Party" through outpourings of nebulous phrases, very learned-sounding, so that the mortals in the ranks look up to Browder and his Weinstones and Stachels with innocent wonder, profound admiration and honest confidence. Here is an example:

"What was the basis for concretizing and applying the line of the 12th Plenum of the E.C.C.I. to the mass work of the Party? The 12th Plenum of our Party clearly established that the resolution of the 14th Plenum of the Party remains the basic guide for examining the work of the Party in carrying out the line of the 12th Plenum of the E.C.C.I. The 16th Plenum of the Party established that since the 15th Plenum, the Party has begun to understand the line of the 14th Plenum resolution, and established that earnest beginnings have been made to carry it out in life." (*Daily Worker*, editorial, February 13, 1933)

The trusting workers, enveloped by the bureaucrats with a dense Red cloud, are taken through an official hullabaloo of demonstrations, of picketing the Nazi and the Italian consulates, mass meetings, hysterical appeals, of a thousand and one noises. Day in and day out the crafty game goes on. And with no organized Marxist force to oppose it, the Stalinist blight that blasted the vanguard of the proletariat in Germany, China, Spain, is spreading in America.

Browder, of course, blinks the fact that the Stalinist "Party," founded on fraud and riddled with adventurers, is built on the "principle" of *bureaucratic centralism*, with the appointive power pivoted in the Kremlin. With brutal cynicism he lies to the workers, declaring that his is a Bolshevik organization:

"The Communist Party is organized on the principle of *democratic centralism*." (Earl Browder, *What Is Communism*, p. 206. Emphasis in the original)

Someone correctly said, Hypocrisy is the homage vice pays to virtue. As a matter of fact, "democratic" centralism in Browder's "Party" works out in the following manner. The membership enjoys the full "right" of "examining the work of the

Party," the "examination" consisting of seeing that the line laid down by Stalin and his Piatnitskys and Piecks is carried out. This, the membership is told, is democratic centralism. Here it is, Stalinism in the raw:

"How can we start the Ninth Party Convention discussion?

"The question can be best answered by making clear what period in the internal life of the Party a convention period is. It is the time when it is the duty and right of every Party member to examine the work of the Party; it is the time when it is the right and duty of every member of the Party to ask 'how is the Central Committee carrying out the line of the Communist International? How is the District Committee carrying out the line of the Central Committee? How does the Section Committee and Unit Bureau carry out the line of the District Committee?' This is what we call 'democratic centralism' in the Communist Party organization." (Sam Don, *Daily Worker*, January 24, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

The "Communist International" is, of course, Stalin; the Central Committee of Browder's "Party" is Browder. The "pre-convention discussion" in every unit is centered not around the analysis of the correctness or incorrectness, from the Marxist viewpoint, of Browder's line, but around the issue of *how to apply* this line:

"From now until the convention, every unit of the Party shall discuss how to apply the line of the reports of comrade Browder." (*Daily Worker*, June 4, 1936)

In the eyes of Browder and his servile flunkeys, nothing is more heinous than any doubt expressed by a "Communist Party" member with regard to the Stalinist policies.

Those who question the correctness of the line of the "Comintern" are brought by martinets before the Control Commission where the "culprits" are grilled by special inquisitors appointed by the satrap of the "Party." If a member insists that the line is incorrect and dares to offer a different line—say, during the "Third Period," a united front proposal to the Socialist Party, or during the ultra-Right zigzag, a policy against united fronts with religious fakers, and against a permanent entanglement with the liberal bourgeoisie through the "People's Front"—he is driven out of the "Party" with rantings and howls of "Counter-revolutionary Trotskyist!" and "Enemy of the Soviet Union!" "Scientifically," he is described as either a "social-fascist" or

an "ultra-Left sectarian," depending upon whether the ultra-Right or the ultra-Left zigzag is the line at the given moment.

Stalin's administrative arm does not extend across the Atlantic. He cannot inflict upon the "culprit" the savage punishment of the torture chamber. Sinister secrecy in examination and cowardly murder of his victims in obscure courtyards is not applicable. He can only apply, through Browder, the weapon of excommunication. And should the unexpected happen and Browder's brain execute a crazy somersault and tempt him to make a bold push to steal the "Party" from Stalin, he will share the fate of Lovestone and other opportunists who endeavor to beat Stalin at his own game. The membership and the lesser flunkeys would not follow Browder, but would remain with the "Comintern." And some ambitious "hot-air" Weinstein would be only too happy to step into Browder's shoes.

The Bolsheviks in Lenin's day boasted of the genuineness of democratic centralism in their organization. One of the surest proofs that there was full freedom of differences of opinion in the pre-convention period was the *existence* of differences, of ideological groupings. After the discussion closed and the Party adopted a decision, differences were submerged and the minority subordinated itself to the will of the majority. No punishment through dismissal from posts and expulsion from the Party was meted out to those who disagreed with even Lenin himself. The Stalinists, to cover their bureaucratic centralism, transform evil into "virtue" and boast of "a unity that astonishes all who do not know the Communist Party" (Robert Minor, *Daily Worker*, June 29, 1936). The "unity" in the Stalinist "Party" does not astonish anyone who *does know* this destructive instrument of the Stalinist reaction.

With every year the problem of bureaucratic control is simplified with regard to the rank-and-file. The constant turn-over renews the membership of the "Party." But there is no turn-over on the top. The newcomer considers it but natural that experienced people like Browder, Bedacht, or Amter, men who seem to work like beavers for Communism, "comrades" with records of persecution by the bourgeoisie, should occupy the prominent positions in the organization.

The knowledge of the history of the Soviet Union and the Comintern among the members is woefully low. The debilitat-

ing influence of the intellectual riffraff tends to induce dullness instead of alertness in the "Party." Browder's minions, hankering after promotions, speak of Stalin's satrap in America in a reverent voice and train the members to speak in tune with Browder and to become his ecstatic followers. To stun the rank-and-file into submission by demagoguery and to encompass the honest and trusting workers by the dread of expulsion and vilification, is the task of the Stalinist bullies, and they are quite thorough in the observance of this task. An organization soaked in sycophancy, hypocrisy and corruption is deadening the faith and spirit of its members. The destructive function of this masked engine of counter-revolution is keenly felt in the units. The vitiated air the members breathe in the units of the organization is unendurable, and many members quietly slip out of Browder's "Party," never to return. These are tell-tale facts, and the Stalinists themselves cannot help admitting them:

"... many members were lost because of dull, routine, uninspiring and uneducating life in the Party units." (*Daily Worker*, June 15, 1936)

Every fruit has its season. The lotus upon which the Stalinist workers are fed during the Right-swing season is the "Farmer-Labor Party," to keep them politically in a comatose sleep. Although two social *classes* are under consideration, the proletariat and the petty-bourgeoisie (farmers), the Stalinists call it "a *class* Farmer-Labor Party." Browder's eminent columnist writes of the composition-to-be of this *class* "party":

"It will be a class party, in short, a Farmer Labor Party, in which the salaried middle class [?!—G.M.] will find, also, as in England, its natural home.

"It will be a party of the united front, and will include Catholics, Protestants and Jews, Negro and white, Communist, Socialist and liberal, plumber and school teacher, doctor and steel worker, artist and farmer, weavers, mechanics, government employees—the basic American fold, in short, allied against the plutocratic minority that keeps them submerged in the abyss of low wages, high prices, sales taxes and unemployment. . . .

"Signs are not wanting that the vision of this great and beautiful movement of the hungry American nation [!—G.M.] has appeared in many places." (Michael Gold, *Daily Worker*, December 16, 1935)

"We will try to bring middle-class workers into this party." (Michael Gold, *Daily Worker*, January 4, 1936)

The inventiveness of a Stalinist mind in giving existence to social groups within capitalist society, groups of which Marx, Engels and Lenin never knew, is to be marvelled at.

But that is not all. Browder's new all-inclusive *class* anti-Fascist Farmer-Labor Party will also include the *Fascists*:

"The new mass party of toilers should also strive to include sections of the sprouting fascist or partly fascist organizations and tendencies; such as company unions, American Legion posts, and groups of the Coughlin and Long movements, etc." (William Z. Foster, *The Communist*, October 1935)

Years back Foster exposed the opportunism of Pepper, Lovestone and other leaders of the "Marxian Trunk" caucus:

"Certainly no one would discover much Marxism in their advocacy of a 'class' farmer-labor party." (William Z. Foster, "As to the 'Marxian Trunk' of the Party," *Daily Worker*, December 30, 1924)

Foster set off the word "class" with quotation marks, to show how ridiculous and un-Marxian it is to speak of a "class" party for two distinct classes. Today this subtle labor faker is advocating the inclusion of sprouting Fascist movements into his "mass party of toilers"!

During a Leftist zigzag every party is "social-fascist," the Stalinist "Party" being the only true weapon of the proletariat. The ultra-Right swing adds to the *only weapon* another *only weapon*, a "Labor," or a "Farmer-Labor Party," which is the *people's own*:

"While fighting for more relief, for higher wages and lower prices, the people must organize *their own* Farmer-Labor Party as *the only trustworthy weapon* against the predatory interests." (*Daily Worker*, November 23, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

"Toward a Labor Party

"The workers must have a political party of *their own*. A Labor Party. . . ." (William Weinstone, *Daily Worker*, March 18, 1937. My emphasis—G.M.)

"Such a Party could be neither Socialist nor Communist, but it also could be neither anti-Socialist nor anti-Communist; it could be a genuine anti-capitalist Party." (Earl Browder, *What Is Communism*, p. 106)

Something unheard of in Lenin's time: not a Communist and yet a *genuine anti-capitalist party*!

But is this vile rubbish something new with the petty-bourgeois adventurer Browder and his coadjutors? Not at all. The same sort of rot was handed out to the workers about a dozen years back by the Pepper-Lovestone-Weinstone and the Foster-Cannon-Browder gangs:

"Towards a Labor Party

"... A Labor Party defending the interests of the wage workers and appealing to the impoverished farmers is the *only political power* that can challenge the cynical tyranny of Wall Street." (*Daily Worker*, editorial, May 27, 1924)

"There is but one way to end the visible and invisible capitalist tyranny and that is for the workers and farmers to send both capitalist parties to the scrap heap, organize *their own* farmer-labor party on a *class* basis, fight for the establishment of a workers' and farmers' republic, and set up a proletarian dictatorship to take over the industries and natural resources." (*Daily Worker*, April 4, 1924)

The same paltry hodge-podge, almost identical hit-or-miss phrases calculated to lead the workers into an intricate ideological labyrinth, a will-o'-the-wisp to keep the workers' mental eye busy. In practice this policy makes the proletariat a tail-end to the petty-bourgeoisie.

Then, as now, some friends and a few foes of the "Communist" charlatans saw in these serio-comic vulgarities signs of liquidation of the Stalin-controlled outfit in America.

During the "Third Period," despite the frenzied cramming of all opponents into one pot labeled "social-fascism," the Stalinites gave a far more sensible evaluation of a Farmer-Labor Party:

"... the danger exists that the Party, under the elemental pressure of the petty-bourgeois masses, especially the masses of farmers, will be switched to the wrong track, in the direction of a Farmer-Labor Party." (*Open Letter to All Members of the Communist Party*, July 1933, p. 17)

No conciliation with the idea of a Labor Party was possible:

"We can make no peace with the Labor Party idea..." (Earl Browder, *The Communist*, August 1933)

The workers were told that a labor party would only be another capitalist party:

"Does the Trade Union Unity League support proposals for a labor party? No, it rejects social fascist proposals for launching a labor party, which would be only another capitalist party." (*Labor Unity*, December 1933)

Presto changeo, and the *only* salvation for the workers is a Farmer-Labor Party.

Through the Rightest safety-zigzag, the "People's Front" (Spain), or "French Front," or "Bloc of Four Classes" (China), or "Anglo-Russian Committee," or its equivalent in America, the "Farmer-Labor Party," Stalinism pursues one definite aim: to rob the only revolutionary class in society, the proletariat, of organizational, political and fighting *independence*.

Browder is obligated to carry out the line of the "Seventh Congress." To remain in the Order's best graces, he *must* bind the proletariat to the liberals and petty-bourgeoisie. He does not work for a *temporary* united front of the proletariat with the petty-bourgeoisie, liberals and other extremely unstable, characteristically unreliable and often very treacherous "allies." To prevent the proletarian revolution which is placed on the agenda of history by the deepening crisis of world capitalism, including American capitalism, Browder strives to entice the revolutionary proletariat into a *permanent* alliance with other classes which historically are not revolutionary, to tie the proletariat with sections of the bourgeoisie. With this policy Browder, if not prevented by a genuine Leninist party, will force the proletariat to abandon its own historical aim and *permanently* subordinate itself to the bourgeois-liberal line of the all-inclusive political bloc. That Browder means precisely that, precisely what Lenin, who worked for proletarian revolution, *always fought against* and *always successfully avoided*, is seen from Browder's own words:

"... a *permanent* alliance, a coalition of the organized workers, farmers, and progressive people generally, in the form of a new political party—what we mean when we speak of the Farmer-Labor Party." (Earl Browder, *Daily Worker*, October 29, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

The noose successfully employed by Stalinism in China in 1925-1927, firmly attaching the Communist Party of China to the Kuomintang and subordinating the Chinese proletariat to the policy of the bourgeoisie, the noose the Stalinites have

fixed securely about the necks of the proletariat of France and of Spain, in a permanent coalition with the liberal bourgeoisie—this strangulating noose Browder will do his utmost to fasten around the neck of the American working class.

Consequently, there is some ground for the supposition that, unless a Leftist zigzag becomes suddenly once more the order of the day, Browder will reenact the farces of July 4, 1923 in Chicago and June 17, 1924 in St. Paul, the launching by the Pepper and Foster forces of a fake Federated Farmer-Labor Party and fake Farmer-Labor Party, respectively.

The shameful masquerade at St. Paul ended with the labor-faker Mahoney turning against the whole affair when La Follette spurned Foster-Pepper support. "Mahoney joins in drive on Communists" (*Daily Worker*, December 4, 1924). A faker and poisoner of the masses was presented to the workers by Gold as an honest friend of the proletariat: "Kindly and earnest labor editor William Mahoney" (Michael Gold, *Daily Worker*, June 25, 1924). The policy of instilling in the workers a feeling of confidence in their enemies, the Purcells, Hickses, Chiang Kai-sheks, and Azanas, the policy of spreading disastrous illusions was practiced then as it is practiced today.

Of course, in the 1924 to 1929 Right zigzag the Stalinists preserved some sort of a "decent" face. They never dared broaden their opportunist performances to include the churches into the work of building the "Farmer-Labor Party" and the opportunist "united front." With the "Seventh Congress" the swing to the Right is much wider:

"The Communist Party, in its manifesto, urged all unions, clubs, veterans, fraternal and *church* organizations to go on record and *unite* to build a Cleveland Labor Party to represent the interests of the *majority* of the population." (*Daily Worker*, November 4, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

"We are printing below, as an excellent example of a united front appeal, a leaflet issued by a Communist Party unit of Springfield. TO ALL CATHOLICS: Brothers and Sisters." ("Party Life," *Daily Worker*, October 26, 1935)

Not that the "poor innocent" Stalinists don't know any better. They know very well whose interests the church represents:

"The Church, by means of religious preachings, terrors of hell, promises of the hereafter, etc., are keeping the soul, the mind of

the worker chained down to the present system. The 'methods' of the church are, therefore, somewhat different from the methods of the policeman, judge, or governor. But they pursue the same aim. They serve the same master, namely, the wealthy, the rich, the capitalists, the exploiters." (Alex Bittelman, *Revolutionary Struggle Against War*, p. 11)

The growth of reactionary ideology in the Soviet Union strengthens tenfold that ideology in the capitalist world. Just as Stalin spreads religion among the Russian workers, Browder carries out his Master's policy among the American proletarians, helping to make the decline of Marxist ideology general and terrific.

"We communists are quite ready to work with churches." (Earl Browder, in Thomas-Browder debate, *Daily Worker*, December 14, 1935)

Browder's methods are of course somewhat different from those of the church, the policeman, judge or governor. But they pursue the same aim. "Religion is the opium of the people" (Marx). Therefore, Browder gives this opium to the workers, but in a more subtle way than do the churches, of course. He does it "indirectly," so to speak, and in a "Marxist-Leninist" way.

"Christ must be rescued from the charlatans who rob his teachings of all social significance, just as Lenin rescued Marx from the opportunists." ("Letters From Our Readers," *Daily Worker*, November 23, 1935)

"In my opinion, Communism is the only movement which will bring into reality the ideals of Christianity. I feel ethically compelled to support the Communists." ("Letters From Our Readers," *Daily Worker*, August 29, 1935)

Browder introduces something which is a novelty even for Stalinism—an open address to the Pope. Pointing out that Ireland is loyal to the Pope, I. Amter, Browder's raving henchman, chides the Catholic Church for having refused the sacraments to the Irish soldiers:

"We saw Ireland, a small nation noted for the loyalty it has to Rome, rise in revolt, against the British Empire. We saw *with amazement* [My emphasis—G.M.] the Catholic priests refuse the Irish

fighting men the sacraments. Nothing can explain this away." (I. Amter, "Letter to Pope Pius XI," *Daily Worker*, June 5, 1936)

Amter refuses to be duped by any possible attempt on the part of the Pope to "explain away" this clear dereliction of Christian duty.

The Stalinites help the bourgeoisie to poison the workers with religious opium in their own skillful way. The religious holidays of capitalism are veiled to become palatable.

"For many people Christmas has lost its religious association; it is no longer exclusively the holiday of those who affirm belief in Christianity. In long years of changing custom, it has come out of its sectarian halo; it has become a humanitarian symbol: an expression of good cheer and good will, of warm, brotherly interest.

"We of the working class who are seeking a closer bond in comradeship with our fellow-men welcome the spirit of Christmas." (Helen Schneider, *Daily Worker*, November 17, 1936)

And when the Pope "marred" the Stalinist spirit of Christmas by a most venomous attack against Communism and the Soviet Union, the Stalinists pointed out very respectfully:

"Pope Pius XI chose Christmas Day as the occasion for a world attack on Communism. The Pope was *ill-advised* in the utterance which he made." (*Daily Worker*, December 25, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

If the bourgeoisie in this epoch of decay of capitalism, with the crude forms of religion losing power over the workers, were to introduce a more subtle form of religious opium, create a "revolutionary God," Browder would hail this as a distinct step of progress in the *direction of emancipation of the masses from religion!* The question put to Browder and his answer are as follows:

"What objections would you have to a group of ministers going out and working with the people in their congregations, proclaiming that God is a revolutionary God, that God is definitely working for the establishment here on earth of a Communist cooperative society?"

"We would consider such a move a distinct social advance over the ordinary type of preaching. It would represent one step in the emancipation from religion." (Browder's discussion with theological students, Earl Browder, *Communism in the United States*, p. 339)

The churches perform specific functions in capitalist society. When finance capital makes feverish preparations for war, these preparations must have the cover of pacifism. The churches

fulfill this task very efficiently and effectively. When the bourgeoisie substitute the policy of temporary peace with the policy of war, the church overnight becomes a powerful engine for mobilizing the masses in support of war. Before they sank to the present level of degeneration, corruption and bourgeoisification, Browder and all his Bittelmans spoke true words about the church:

"But it is a sinister sort of peace that the Church preaches... It is obvious that the 'pacifism' of the Church is just a fake and a swindle. Its so-called opposition to war and advocacy of 'disarmament' is of the same hypocritical nature as the official pacifist manoeuvres of the imperialist governments. The Church helps the governments to *hide* the preparations for war and military intervention.

"This is in no way contradicted by the fact that the Church is actively engaged in various movements for peace and international good-will. On the contrary. The more the Church talks peace the more 'safely' can the imperialist governments prepare for war." (Alex Bittelman, *Revolutionary Struggle Against War*, pp. 12-13)

Today, Browder, helping American imperialism, covers up the real function of the church. He and his sell-out artists are doping the minds of the workers, of the youth, leading these victims into the opium den of capitalism. At the Third World Lutheran Congress in Paris, Dr. Trexler, an ingenious religious watchdog of the imperialist robbers and murderers, a man experienced in using stratagems to tangle the workers' mind in the capitalist net, urged "unity" of the church masses with the revolutionary youth (who are being fed pacifist morphine by the Social Democrats and Stalinists). Here is how the dangerous, anti-workingclass paper, the *Daily Worker*, "warns" the youth against Dr. Trexler's subtle trap which he clearly sets for them in preparation for transforming them into cannon fodder of the bourgeoisie:

"We hope Dr. Trexler's eloquent plea for *unity* of Christian and revolutionary youth will echo into every parish, every synagogue, every congregation, every school and Bible class in the country.

"Not only do we welcome Dr. Trexler's appeal, for we know that in his words he is making articulate the deepest yearnings of the church masses for *unity against war and for peace.*" (*Daily Worker*, October 23, 1935. My emphasis—G.M.)

"Pacifism in times of peace becomes transformed into chauvinism during war." (Lenin.) Church pacifists become rabid war jingoes. Wrote Bittelman:

"What did the Church do in the imperialist slaughter of 1914-1918? Everyone old enough to remember will recall that the Church of *all denominations and religions* gave its blessing to the war, doing its bit to win the war for its respective capitalist class." (Alex Bittelman, *Revolutionary Struggle Against War*, p. 15. Emphasis in the original)

Another pacifist agency of the bourgeoisie is Social Democracy. And Browder helps to spread Social-Democratic poison among the masses.

The list of Stalinist publications which are being distributed by the Browder-controlled Central Distribution Agency contains the name of a publication which is not Stalinist—the *Socialist Call!* The Stalinists are selling the *Socialist Call* in their bookshop, as admitted by Browder in the *Sunday Worker*, February 23, 1936. And the "Bolshevik" *Daily Worker*, which is supposed to win the workers from Menshevism bemoans the "unfortunate" fact that the Left Socialists do not put out their fakes and illusions in a daily:

"The Left Socialists unfortunately have no daily of their own—only the lively weekly *Socialist Call*." (*Daily Worker*, editorial, December 13, 1935)

Are the Stalinites aware of the petty-bourgeois character of the Left Socialists, or "Militants," as they are sometimes called; of the rôle they play within the Social Democracy? Without a doubt:

"The 'Militants' are the essential cover for the rotten capitalist character of the Socialist Party." (I. Amter, "Mr. Fish Endorses the Socialist Party," *The Communist*, April 1931, p. 312)

One might argue that this was the erroneous view held in 1931; that things have been adjusted since. Then let him read about the Left Socialists in Browder's book, an edition of which was printed *after* the "Seventh Congress":

"In this crisis the social-fascist leadership finds it necessary to invent new means to keep the workers fooled and under their control. For this purpose, they are beginning, wherever the situation gets too hot for them, to establish a division of labor—one part of them becomes the 'right wing,' which carries through the dirty work of the direct sell-out; the other part becomes a 'left wing' which mildly deplores the necessity of submitting to the sell-out, and which con-

soles the workers with an ineffective opposition and a sugar coating of radical and even revolutionary and Communist phrases." (Earl Browder, *Communism in the United States*, p. 62)

Barring the Stalinist invention of "social-fascism," the statement about the Left and Right Socialist leaders is correct.

Lenin called Gompers and other opportunist leaders of trade unions "agents of the bourgeoisie in the labor movement." War or peace, these trade union leaders work for capitalism. There are few agencies of monopoly capitalism as powerful and effective as the conservative trade union bureaucracy. "The struggle against Gompers, Jouhaux, Henderson, Merrheim, Legien and Co. in Western Europe is much more difficult than the fight with our Mensheviks, who represent a thoroughly homogeneous social and political type. This struggle must be mercilessly conducted. . . ." (Lenin, "*Left Wing*" *Communism*). Browder and his vice-ring of obscuring demagogues, injecting the poison of class peace into the blood of the proletarian vanguard, maiming and emasculating Lenin's teachings, depict the faithful agent of the coal trust and other labor lackeys of finance bourgeoisie as people interested in fighting monopolies and urge them to bring pressure to bear upon the head of the executive committee of American imperialism:

"It's about time John L. Lewis and the other labor leaders who are supporting Roosevelt told him to cut out the shadow-boxing and fight the monopolies with something more than words." (*Daily Worker*, editorial, June 18, 1936)

According to Browder's anti-Leninist sheet, the A. F. of L. leaders are delivering "blows at Fascism" and indulge in "noble gestures":

"BLOWS AT FASCISM"

"Following its condemnation of Mussolini's war against the Ethiopian people, the convention of the American Federation of Labor has struck again at fascism in a resolution assailing the bloody Nazi dictatorship and calling for the boycott of German goods, non-participation in the Olympics and support of the labor chest for the victims of Fascism. . . ."

"Labor has spoken. Now Labor must act. To support League of Nations sanctions against Italian fascism and to fail to take concrete measures to carry out sanctions in this country by stopping all trade with Italy [what about Stalin's trade with Italy during the Ethiopian

invasion?—G.M.] is to indulge in little more than a noble gesture." (*Daily Worker*, editorial, October 19, 1935)

During the "Third Period" the American Federation of Labor was not considered even reformist, but was declared to be *largely fascist and open fascist*:

"The American Federation of Labor (a reactionary, largely fascist, trade union organization)..." (O. Piatnitsky, *World Communists in Action*, p. 12)

"It has been a mistake on our part that we did not sooner clearly analyze and characterize the open fascism of the A. F. of L." (*Thesis and Resolutions*, Seventh National Convention, Communist Party of the U.S.A., April 1930)

Out of three clear lines, two are pursued by Stalinism: the ultra-Left and the ultra-Right. To keep the Stalinist bureaucracy in flower the *Leninist line* is uncompromisingly avoided. The other two lines, alternate, introducing Leftist fakes and Rightist fakes to make the workers believe what is utterly false.

Besides lending aid to the imperialist bourgeoisie by holding up the screen of pacifism of all kinds and cultivating confidence among workers towards the agents of capitalism within and without the labor movement, Browder is assisting the spreading of—*Fascism!* The commandant of the Stalinist outpost in America is pushing the social forces, stirred by the crisis, into the direction of the Fascist solution if bourgeois democracy fails.

Browder fights for freedom of speech for the American Hitlers. When the Chicago Park Board refused Coughlin the use of Soldiers Field Stadium where he was to pour out his wanted demagoguery, Browder's agent, Benjamin Meyers, intervened in behalf of the priest. The open servants of the bourgeoisie make a gesture at curbing Fascist propaganda, and meet resistance not only from the Coughlins but also from the "Communists," who insist the Fascist be given the right to speak to the masses.

The League of American Writers, a Browder-controlled organization, is supposedly fighting Fascism on the cultural front. Luigi Pirandello, a staunch supporter of the black Fascist tyrant Mussolini, on his arrival in New York was interviewed by a reporter of the *New York Post*. Here are a few words from the *Post*, July 20, 1935 which tell the whole story of Pirandello:

"There was a bright Fascist badge in his lapel. 'I'm a Fascist,' he explained, 'because I am an Italian.'"

Twelve days later, on August 1, the following notice appeared in the *Daily Worker*:

"Mike Gold, just returned from the recent International Congress of Writers in Paris, will give a report of the Congress at 8 o'clock tonight in the Labor Temple, 242 East Fourteenth Street. The meeting is sponsored by the League of American Writers.

"Signor Luigi Pirandello, who tries to divorce his artistic conscience from his politics, *has been invited to speak.*" (My emphasis—G.M.)

A bourgeois separation of art from the class-struggle, and a white-wash for the agent of Mussolini. No demonstration against this avowed Fascist was held by Browder's "party." Instead, an invitation to swirl some of the subtle Fascist poison-phrases to the workers was extended to this open enemy of the proletariat.

Michael Gold, in his work of tearing down Leninist conceptions, with a stroke of his pen discards Lenin's definition of imperialism being the last stage of capitalism by substituting the new Stalinist conception "Fascism is the last stage of capitalism, as has been said a thousand times" (*Daily Worker*, October 15, 1935). Quite aware that they are opening the door to Fascism in all capitalist countries, Gold's elders in the E.C.C.I. are inculcating upon the workers' mind the idea of the inevitability of capitalism going through Fascism, with Gold, of course, echoing them:

"The capitalist world is heading for revolution but *before* succumbing it goes through the phase of Fascism. Fascism is going to be the last stage of capitalism *before* the world revolution." (D. Z. Manuilsky, speech at the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.)

What an inspiration to the Fascists in America, to the Fascists everywhere! The "Marxists," the "Leninists," themselves say that Fascism must overtake the capitalist world. With wild joy they can shout to the German, Austrian, Spanish and other workers already in the Gehenna of Fascism: This is an epoch of Fascism—all capitalist states must go through it, France, England and America are not excluded. Even if some sort of Communism does come, it will be, according to the "Communists" themselves, *after* the Fascist phase of capitalism. Hitler's estimate of the duration of Fascism in Germany is a thousand years. Truly, history can add but little to the Stalinists' infamy.

The October Revolution took place in imperialist Russia, with that country having never gone through the Stalinist "last" stage. And if the revolutionary workers succeed in isolating their vicious internal enemy, Browder and his vile perverters of Leninism, and organize a revolutionary party in America, United States imperialism will never reach the "last" stage of capitalism.

Perversion of Marxism-Leninism is assuming monstrous proportions in the Stalinist "Party." The very heart of Marxism, Marx's teachings on the subject of the State, of paramount, of decisive importance in this period of history, is ripped out and trampled into mud by the heavy bureaucratic boot. In the preface to the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels declared:

"Especially did the Commune demonstrate that 'the working class cannot [My emphasis—G.M.] simply seize the available ready machinery of the State and set it going for its own ends.'"

What must the working class do, according to Marx?

"What Marx says is that the working class must *break up, shatter* the 'available ready machinery of the State,' and not confine itself merely to taking possession of it." (Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, chapter III. Emphasis in the original)

The Stalinist distorters, whose temerity and subtlety in adulterating Marxism transcend these qualities in any other set of contemporary swindlers and opportunists, make a "slight" change in this classic observation of the founders of Scientific Socialism:

"... that essential lesson of the Commune of Paris—which was commemorated on May 24 by a vast demonstration—that *it is not enough* [My emphasis—G.M.] that the working class capture the State in order to make it serve its own ends." (J. Berlioz, *Daily Worker*, May 30, 1936)

The distortion, when this Stalinist interpretation of the lesson furnished by the Paris Commune of 1871 is compared with the historical statement by Marx and Engels, is apparent. In addition to the reactionary mirage, the "transition government," the Browders are holding up to view another reactionary mirage, the possibility of *capturing* the capitalist State and making it serve the proletariat, instead of the revolutionary task of break-

ing up the bourgeois State and erecting in its place a workers' State. The real motive for the organized, systematic distortion of Marxism-Leninism, the imperative and ineluctable necessity for Stalinism to preserve the capitalist society is daily coming more and more into the open despite the extreme cautiousness of the bureaucrats; Earl Browder's local problem being the safeguarding of the rule of American imperialism, preferably along "democratic" lines. It is no accident that Browder's 1936 election pamphlet bears the title *Democracy or Fascism*, and the issue which this "Communist" now chews on is the one between "democracy" and Fascism.

"Earl Browder, Communist candidate for President, makes opening speech in Denver, Col., stressing issue between democracy and fascism." (*Daily Worker*, August 10, 1936)

That Stalinism is against the proletarian class struggle is seen also from the following counter-revolutionary holiday greeting to the *Daily Worker*, printed without a single word of criticism or comment:

"From Dorothy Day, editor of the Catholic Worker.

"The Catholic Worker joins in an appeal for democracy and peace and therefore asks you to join in a protest against all dictatorships—Fascist and Bolshevik; against all suppression of civil liberty—fascist and Bolshevik. That includes freedom of religious propaganda, education and organization—against all war, whether imperialist, civil, or class. Merry Christmas." (*Daily Worker*, December 25, 1936)

There is no doubt that this capitalist opium was solicited by Browder—otherwise one cannot see why on earth any Christmas greeting, and especially *such* a greeting, should be sent by reactionaries to a supposedly Bolshevik paper.

There are thousands of workers who believe that the Stalinists are Communists. The Stalinist bureaucrats, of course, are vitally interested in keeping this illusion alive. But at times, unwittingly, they make slips. The *Daily Worker* prints a letter from a reader who writes:

"Before I heard Browder's speeches, I thought that the Communists were a bunch of people always starting revolutions and trying to overthrow governments. But now I know different." (*Daily Worker*, September 29, 1936)

The bureaucrats realize that the average "Party" member, unskilled in verbal acrobatics, is unable to stand his ground against

critics who are familiar with the history of the "Comintern" and with the teachings of Marx and Lenin. The honest member's mind must be daily filled with a quantity of ideological mustard gas, with distortions and fabrications. There is no more powerful thought-guiding instrument in Browder's hands than the *Daily Worker*. Therefore, he periodically launches drives to make every one of his victims read his "People's Champion of Liberty, Progress, Peace and Prosperity."

"Speakers declared that it was hopeless for Party members to try to get along without the official organ of the Party. Jack Johnstone, Central Committee member, explained why so many Communist Party members have difficulties answering the Trotskyites. It is because they depend on what they read in the capitalist press and occasional Party lectures. If they read the *Daily Worker*, this whole problem would be clear and simple for them. . . ." ("Every C.P. Member a *Daily Worker* Reader, Chicago Slogan," *Daily Worker*, March 5, 1937)

In passing, if the Trotskyites are what Browder and his Michael Golds declare they are, Fascists, if, according to the "voluntary confessions" of Zinoviev, Radek and others, they are cooperating with Hitler's Gestapo and are plotting to divide parts of the Soviet Union between Germany and Japan, why is it that "so many Communist Party members have difficulties answering the Trotskyites"? Why is it that Browder is compelled, in the final count, to resort to his tough squad to answer the arguments of the Trotskyites and of other critics?

The oppressed Negro is an important reservoir of revolution in America. Those who aim at destroying the revolutionary potentialities in the United States, pay particular attention to the Negro masses and help spread religious, pacifist and Fascist poisons amongst them. This is the real meaning of Browder's united front with Father Divine.

In the 1935 May Day united front parade of the misled workers of Browder and of "god" Divine, the "angels of god" distributed back copies of *The Spoken Word* along the entire line of march. The copy that fell into my hands was dated "Saturday, January 19th, 1935, A.D.F.D. [Anno Domini Father Divine], No. 14." There was an explanation about Hitlerism in this issue, in the spirit of an "*honest fight against Fascism*" :

"WHAT'S HAPPENING IN GERMANY"

"From information obtained from a national magazine, it is possible to gather a brief picture of what is happening, industrially and socially, in Germany.

"The picture of Germany today presents a *vast national trade union*. Under a system, not exactly, although similar, to Communism, there exists what is known as a *Socialist Workers Government*. Under this arrangement an *industrial revolution* has been achieved by *wiping out all class privileges and class distinctions*. The economic foundation has been left virtually intact, private capital and property rights being undisturbed, *for the time*. In the course of a year *Hitler has won the support* of that group which is threatening all governments — *the organized working class*.

"*In the new workers world in Germany*, all emphasis and stress has been placed upon the *social status of the workers alone*. *The old lines, dividing capital and labor, have been swept aside* and the matter of wage fixing has not been a paramount issue." (My emphasis—G.M.)

Some one with a naive, childish outlook might hazard that Divine innocently repeats what the bourgeois press generally writes about Germany. Nonsense. Even a yellow tabloid says quite openly what happened and what is in Germany:

"German business men, big and little, saved by Hitler in 1933 from Red peril. . . Fascism is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie." (*Daily News*, December 26, 1935)

No, the purveyor of religious and pacifist opium for the exploited Negroes, Father Divine, knows better. He is an agent of Fascism!

It was curious to see what sort of sophistry and trickery Browder's fertile brain could produce in justification of his policy of working with Divine and the "angels."

There were, no doubt, many protests and inquiries sent to the "Communist" charlatans, for soon there appeared an official defense of Browder's policy. "At first such a united front seems grotesque. Surely none of us believes in this strange cult," wrote Michael Gold in the *Daily Worker*, May 10, 1935. "The Communists will make a united front with any group that is honestly fighting war and fascism."

Browder and his intellectual flunkies read Divine's poisonous sheet. They know what it contains. And in his habitually shameless fashion Browder declares:

"We have no apologies for working with the followers of Father Divine, working with his church organization." (Earl Browder, the Thomas-Browder debate, *Daily Worker*, December 14, 1935)

Browder's poison labelled "Communism" is by long odds the most potent of all opiates fed to the proletariat, for Browder derives his authority from the "Comintern"; he is backed by the "Bolshevik" leaders of the workers State. Workers are placing confidence in Browder's sleeping potion. The cumulative evil effects of the Stalinist chicanery, wily devices, traps, doors, spell disaster for the proletariat. The Stalinist purpose, carried out by Browder, is to head the proletarian vanguard in order to behead it as in China, Spain and Germany.

Many people believe that the Stalinists obliquely supported Roosevelt against Landon. That is not entirely correct. They support *capitalism*, and in one form or another, *all* the capitalist parties. They distinguish between a bad Fascist and a "good" Fascist "who tries to divorce his artistic conscience from his politics"; between a reactionary Republican, like Hamilton Fish, and a "progressive" Republican, Vito Marcantonio, who endorses Fish. In some places they support Socialists, in other, Democrats, in still other, even Republicans, against whom they appear to be all up in arms.

"A petition for a swimming pool to be built in St. Mary's Park, which has been distributed by the Republican candidate from the 22nd Congressional District, is being supported by the Communist Party in the First A. S., Bronx." (*Daily Worker*, September 9, 1936)

"The Daily Worker urges the people of the 20th Congressional District, New York, to vote for Congressman Vito Marcantonio." (*Daily Worker*, November 3, 1936)

To blunt the workers' sense of vigilance, to disarm them before the enemy, the most vicious bourgeois organizations noted for their hostility to the working class are presented in a "favorable" light.

"The American Legion has taken an important step toward becoming what it should be: a bulwark of American democracy." (*Daily Worker*, November 7, 1936)

Imperialist war, an attack upon the Soviet Union, are drawing closer. A *real* fight against capitalist war, a *genuine* defense of the Soviet Union can be carried on *only* through the Leninist

struggle for the overthrow of capitalism, for a Communist revolution.

The bourgeoisie learned its lesson in 1917. While supplying the Fascist armies with death-dealing weapons, the bourgeoisie will let loose a flood of propaganda against Communism. This propaganda of utmost subtlety, holding out to the destitute masses attractive illusions, will be pouring through a million channels, through books, magazines, newspapers, movies, radios, and will beat against the minds of the workers. To drive back this flood of nationalist, religious and every other kind of opium and to steel the workers with clarity, the proletariat must have weapons of Marxian enlightenment. There is no plethora of such weapons in the possession of the workers. In fact there is felt a keen shortage of ideological means of counter-acting Fascism, while the atmosphere is being vitiated more and more by the Coughlins, Hearsts and Liberty Leaguers. And in this situation, Earl Browder, Foster, Olgin, Trachtenberg, Joseph Freeman, Weinstone and the other Stalinist bureaucrats, corrupt and breeding corruption, these accursed ASSASSINS of the workers' cause, *consciously* and *deliberately* render a service to Morgan and the Fascists. They are suppressing Communism and at the same time, under the guise of anti-capitalist phrases, are spreading Social-Democratic and their own poison, and are liberally assisting the Marcantonios, the Pirandellos and the Divines to spread theirs. The Stalinites are the fountainhead of reaction within the proletarian vanguard.

Wrapping themselves in the Red Flag of the Soviet Union, exploiting to the fullest extent the workers' love for the first proletarian republic, this band of artful charlatans, intensely conscious and watchful of their special bureaucratic clique interests, high-handed and unscrupulous, rotten with hypocrisy and remarkable in their capacious dexterity to poison and pervert the masses, feel safe in their refuge. This is their powerful means of defense. You see, if you dare to expose these repulsive, venomous, anti-workingclass reptiles, you are "attacking" the Soviet Union! Workers who are honestly attempting to defend Leninism against these defilers and distorters are called by them what they themselves are—degenerates, renegades, counter-revolutionary scoundrels and, *historically*, tools of Fascism.

Trotsky quite correctly points out that "People who have neither honor nor conscience cannot be trustworthy revolution-

ists. In the moment of difficulty they will inevitably betray the proletariat."

Browder, who betrayed the proletariat yesterday, is betraying it today, will inevitably betray it tomorrow. When in China, Browder served Stalin and the Chinese bourgeoisie. When in America, Browder serves Stalin and Wall Street.

There can be not a modicum of doubt that in a revolutionary situation similar to that in Germany in 1923 or 1932, with a *Leninist party leading the masses*, Browder and his Hathaways, Fosters and Golds will side *openly* with the capitalists, as did the Mensheviks in Russia, and will serve as the spearhead of counter-revolution in the midst of the proletariat.

Incidentally, there is a "slight" inconsistency in Trotsky's attitude towards hypocrites and opportunists. His warning *fully* applies to Cannon, Shachtman and Co. "In the moment of difficulty they will inevitably betray the proletariat."

THE TASK OF THE HOUR

ONE of the outstanding features contributing to the failure of more than one revolt of the slaves of remote antiquity, and of the serfs in the Middle Ages, was that deeply-trusted leaders, having got a taste of power, degenerated, surrounded themselves with splendor, began within their own domain to reintroduce slavery, the very institution they had risen against. Those among the slaves who attempted to rectify the situation were thrown into dungeons, were tortured to death. The traitors' vision narrowed by their selfish interests, the entire movement would finally go down under the blows of the *historical social class upholding slavery*.

The modern period, the era of wage-slavery, is replete with instances of outstanding followers of Marx lapsing under the terrific pressure of the ruling class. Plekhanov, Kautsky and Guesde whose revolutionary character was sapped by the situation history brought them into, are cases in point. And these men never had the taste of power.

The irrepressible enchantment of power during a special historical conjuncture brought Stalin and his satellites, third-rate "Marxists" all, into the fetid cloaca of degeneration and treason to the toiling masses.

Capitalism is rotten ripe to give place to Socialism. It is not the strength of reaction that preserves capitalism. It is the Stalinist sabotage that prevents the proletariat from rising to its full height and sweeping away the obsolete bourgeois society.

Removal of Stalinism or defeat—this is the alternative the international proletariat is faced with today. If the proletariat takes the correct road, then, decades hence, posterity looking back out of the sunny world of Communism, will learn how the class-conscious workers through a supreme, truly Bolshevik effort, cleansed the body of the international proletariat of the

dreadful disease, and led the giant in a victorious struggle against its decaying antagonist, the international bourgeoisie. If the proletariat proves unable to eject the pernicious poison from its system, then posterity, dragging a wretched existence in a military-Fascist phase of imperialism, will never know the cause for the collapse of the Soviet Union and the present labor movement. The huge bonfires of the scientific works of the great teachers and leaders of the proletariat, Marx, Engels and Lenin, will envelop the toiling masses with impenetrable darkness; and it will take decades, perhaps centuries, for the proletariat once more to find its way to Marxism.

Delusions once formed are instinctively and persistently clung to, but their powerful effect upon the mind is counteracted by the bitter fruit they invariably bring. If not abandoned, they finally lead to destruction. Class-conscious workers must be guided only by the historical interests of their class. If they delay and hesitate to break with the agonizing delusions of Stalinism and Social Democracy, history will mercilessly take a negative course for the proletariat. Failure to proceed promptly will be followed by more bloody disasters, with the final catastrophe closing the present era. The vision of building up a complete Socialist system of society under the direction of the corrupt Stalinist bureaucracy, this rosy dream implanted in the minds of millions by Stalin, will inevitably be transformed by the infuriated international bourgeoisie on the one hand and Stalin with his Browders on the other, into a black nightmare of a hundred or more years of agony for the oppressed masses of the world.

The Austrian Social-Democratic leaders were "building Socialism" in "Red" Vienna, within the capitalist State. The rosy soap-bubble burst under the murderous fire of Fascist artillery. This Socialist fakery cost the workers thousands of victims and brought them Fascist dictatorship. But "Socialism" in Vienna can hardly compare with the gigantic swindle of Stalin's "Socialism" in a single workers State surrounded by a ring of Fascist countries which are armed to the teeth, and are bent upon rounding out capitalist slavery throughout the entire planet.

The international proletariat has paid with much suffering and much blood for Social-Democratic and Stalinist treacheries and betrayals.

The Second International took the lead in helping the bour-

geoisie organize the imperialist butchery of 1914-1918. During the revolution in Germany in 1918, the Socialist leaders held the masses back from overthrowing the capitalist rule thus making the coming of Fascism a possibility. Noske and other Socialists saved capitalism by drowning in blood the workers' attempt in 1919 to establish a proletarian dictatorship. They murdered Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. They formed a coalition government with the capitalists and bit by bit surrendered all the economic and political gains the workers had made in 1918. They allowed the Nazi forces to grow and arm. They led the millions of Socialist workers to the polls to vote for the worst enemy of the masses, the monarchist mass butcher in the imperialist war, Field Marshal von Hindenburg, who immediately upon his reelection put Fascism in power.

In their work of chloroforming the German workers the German Socialist leaders received active assistance from the Socialist leaders in other countries. "Nevertheless Hindenburg has at least been honest and loyal to the republic," Norman Thomas wrote in the *New Leader*, March 19, 1932.

Forty-eight out of sixty-five Socialist deputies present at the last gasp of the Reichstag voted *confidence in Hitler!* Almost the entire leadership of the Socialist Party of Germany advocated submission to Fascism.

In Hungary the Social Democrats betrayed the Soviets. The Italian workers who seized the factories in 1921 and were about to rise against the bourgeoisie, were paralyzed by the Italian Socialist leaders who insisted upon "democratic" methods, upon gradual and peaceful overthrow of capitalist slavery. This Social-Democratic policy of cowardice and treachery threw the door wide open for the bloody Mussolini. Having held power in Austria the Socialist leaders allowed the steady growth and the arming of Fascism, and thus prepared the bloody debacle for the Austrian workers. The same paralyzing work was done by the Social-Democratic leaders in Spain. Today the Social Democracy is doing its share in betraying the masses in France, Belgium, England, America—everywhere!

Social Democracy during revolutionary upsurge acts as a Left wing of the bourgeoisie, preserving and strengthening the bourgeois State which crushes the proletariat. In times of reaction Social Democracy acts as the paralyzing Right wing of the proletariat. In both instances it serves capitalism.

Lenin's astute sense of political direction steered the proletariat's advance along the correct path. Realizing that not a trace of revolutionary Marxism remained within the old organization, that no reformist party had ever been or ever could be reformed, that the imperative need is to break with opportunists and unite the revolutionists, Lenin insisted upon:

"... a systematic effort towards the creation of a Party of a *new* type, which must *by no means* resemble those of the Second International."

Resolutely he declared:

"*Never again* along the lines of the Second International! *Never again* with Kautsky!" (*Letters to Kollontai*. Emphasis Lenin's)

The story of Stalinism, this hideous caricature of Bolshevism which has now ripened into an incurable gangrene, is tragically recorded in Bulgaria and Esthonia 1924, in England 1926, China 1927, Germany 1923 and 1933, Spain 1936-1937. Today the Stalinist "Party" in France is growing. With the German and Spanish lessons in mind, one can clearly perceive that the hour of the delivery of the French workers to the Fascists, perhaps through the medium of a belated bloody resistance on the part of honest unsuspecting proletarians, is growing close.

These two grave-diggers of the proletarian revolution, the Socialist and the Stalinist bureaucracies, have been drawing the Red out of the blood of the international working class. It is time to call a halt! It must be pounded home to the workers that their hopes and lives are planted on quicksands. The toiling masses of the entire world are teetering precariously on the very brink of a dark, yawning abyss. Step by step the opportunist "clairvoyants" and "prophets" of both the Stalintern and the Social Democracy, the false pretenders to the leadership of the oppressed masses, have brought the toiling humanity to this intolerable pass. In the event the proletariat is again caught off-guard it will be plunged by the Fascist avalanche into the unfathomable chasm. Marxism, having declined in the last decade to an alarming degree, will be reduced to the vanishing point. And no power will exist to collect the floating debris of the stupendous wreckage hopelessly adrift in the swelling stream of reaction.

The warning finger of history points inexorably to the task at

hand. Not to clutch fatalistically at all sorts of imaginary straws like the Stalinist ensnaring "healing of the wounds," but to repair the breach in Marxism made by the Stalinist reaction, as Lenin repaired the breach caused by the degeneration of the Second International. To do what Lenin would under the present circumstances. Not to fall victim to Trotsky's desolate fantasy that the destiny of the proletariat depends upon the decaying Social Democracy transforming itself—this utterly preposterous, misleading, *suicidal* theory born of isolation, confusion and political despair, but to adopt Lenin's thesis, incontrovertible two decades ago, deeply correct today: a *new* type of proletarian party, built from the bottom up, brick by brick, *by no means* resembling those of the Second International and of the Stalintern, a party similar to the one that propelled the October Revolution, free from opportunism and bureaucratic control, organized on the Leninist principle of *democratic centralism*, practicing genuine inner-Party democracy combined with iron Bolshevik discipline. Only such an international instrument of proletarian revolution can lead the toiling masses on the road to power in this era of the decline of capitalism and the steady drift towards Fascism, imperialist war and attack upon the Soviet Union. Everything else is reactionary utopia. Everything else is rejection of Leninism, and, conscious or unconscious, graceful or disgraceful, capitulation to the rule of capital.

Stalinism, Social Democracy, with all their shadings, the post-Leninist Trotskyism—all have been tested by results, all brought unspeakable ideological chaos within the proletariat; and Stalinism and Social Democracy are directly responsible for the bloodiest defeats of the masses in the entire history of capitalism, and for uninterrupted retreat. As against these opportunist currents within the working class stands out the Marxist current defended by Lenin. This current has also been tested by results; it has brought to the toilers the most glorious achievement of all ages, the victorious proletarian revolution. Opportunism in all its forms must be buried by the workers. And with opportunism must be buried all the delusive assumptions, unfounded hopes, beguiling emotions, pessimism and lack of faith in the might of the working class. The current of Marxism-Leninism must be revived. A new revolutionary weapon must be forged.

Only a new Communist International can cure the body of

the world proletariat of the opportunist plagues. Only a new Communist International can prevent the most horrible of all catastrophes, the imperialist or Stalinist destruction of the Soviet Union. Only a new Communist International can extend and complete the great October Revolution.

Within the working class today there are several opportunist tendencies that speak in terms of creating the Fourth or a "new" International.

First, the International Communist League (Trotskyites). This organization is "building" the Fourth International within the "all-inclusive" Second International. The American section of this tendency, formerly the Communist League of America, later the Workers Party of the United States, is now the Left Wing of the Socialist Party. The leaders are Cannon, Shachtman, Swaback, West, Morrow.

Next, the London-Amsterdam Buro, or the I.A.G. (International Buro of Revolutionary Socialist Unity), a loose federation composed of social-patriotic and centrist parties: the Norwegian Labor Party, now the government party of Norway; the Socialist Workers Party of Germany which is a Left split-off from German Social Democracy combined with a split-off from the Love-stone-Brandlerites; the Independent Labor Party of England; until recently the Doriot group of France, and others. The I.A.G., a sort of a revived Two-and-a-half International which Lenin called "an International of traitors," is a shamefaced edition of the Second International, formed as a result of the too black a record of its parent body. It does not speak openly for the formation of the Fourth International, but for some ambiguous "New" International. The Field group, which accepts both terms, the "New" and the "Fourth," represents the I.A.G. tendency in the United States. Field's conception of Stalinism is that of Trotsky's.

Third, the Weisbord group. This group formerly adhering to Trotsky is dangerously confused on the central question facing the proletariat today—that of Stalinism and the Soviet Union. It declares that the Stalinist bureaucracy rules, within certain limits, *for the benefit of the workers!* The definitely anti-Leninist nature of the Weisbord group is expressed in its position on the *class* character of the State in the Soviet Union. According to Weisbord the proletarian dictatorship has been *destroyed* instead of *distorted*:

"Today, what we have in Russia is not the dictatorship of the proletariat but the dictatorship of the bureaucracy over the proletariat (still, however, within certain limits, for the benefit of the proletariat). The dictatorship of the proletariat has been destroyed." (Albert Weisbord, *For a New Communist International*, p. 26)

Weisbord's explanation allows only one conclusion: today, in the Soviet Union, there is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie—since no middle-of-the-way power is possible under capitalism. Such conclusion, it is obvious, is an utter monstrosity.

Weisbord hasn't the slightest conception of what the Stalinites are, and he is confused in general:

"As the Stalinists have turned into filthy Liberal-Socialists, it is after all the Anarchists who are behaving like genuine Communists." (*Class Struggle*, October 1936, "Long Live the Spanish Socialist Republic," p. 3)

Led by Oehler and Stamm the Left-wingers in the Workers Party, after their internal struggle against Trotsky's capitulation to the Social Democracy, have, through expulsions, and some through sheer disgust, found themselves outside the Workers Party. They formed the Revolutionary Workers League of some 100 members throughout the country.

Since the fight in the Workers Party revolved around the "French Turn," the basic political line of Oehler-Stamm was obscured. It came into bold relief only after the separation from Trotsky. The fundamental questions that confronted the new organization were theoretical foundation and orientation in the class-struggle. Two sharply opposed lines on the evaluation of and attitude towards Stalinism were presented to the membership of the Revolutionary Workers League, one by the Political Committee headed by Oehler and Stamm, the other by the writer—"Marlen's line." The Oehler-Stamm leadership as well as the majority of the R.W.L., although breaking with the International Communist League (Trotskyites), carried over with them, as was done by virtually every group which separated from Trotsky, his theoretical characterization of Stalinism as "bureaucratic centrism." Marlen and a few other comrades disagreed with this formulation.

Lenin defined the three historical currents within the international labor movement: Reformism, Centrism and Marxism. Reformism is a tendency representing the labor aristocracy which

is objectively bribed by the bourgeoisie, and which assists its own bourgeoisie to squeeze profits out of the basic section of the proletariat and the colonial slaves. Marxism is the revolutionary current within the proletariat. Centrists "historically and economically speaking, do not represent any special layer." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIV, p. 54, Russian Edition). The Centrist tendency vacillates between Reformism and Marxism, and under the pressure of an acute crisis the bulk of the Centrist leadership usually goes over openly to its own bourgeoisie, while the rank-and-file unites with the forces of proletarian revolution.

It is clear that without the precise estimation of *all* social forces and political trends there can be no Marxist viewpoint. Without a correct understanding of Stalinism a serious struggle against it is out of the question. Is Stalinism Marxism, the revolutionary tendency within the world proletariat? Obviously not. Is it Reformism, securing crumbs from its own bourgeoisie? Obviously not. What is it, then?

Is there any special social *layer*, historically and economically speaking, whose interests Stalinism represents? Unquestionably there is—the million-headed bureaucracy. This bureaucracy is a privileged crust drawn from all classes and highly centralized; a new experience visited upon the proletariat, a unique development possible *only* on the soil of a workers State. A formulation serving the purpose would be: Stalinism is *bureaucratic centralism of the workers State*.

All the intolerance and bigotry of the Stalinites, all the lies, including the one of building a Socialist society within the Soviet Union, all the hypocrisy, treachery, betrayals, crimes, outrages, and horrors committed in the name of Communism are a consequence of Stalinism's defense of the *material* and *political* interests of the bureaucracy and not as a result of the "theory" of Socialism in one country, of "stupidity," "vacillation," "errors" and "impotence," as Trotsky imagined. Ignoring the fundamental difference between classic Centrism which *does not* represent any special historical economic and political layer, and the Stalinist reaction which *does*, Trotsky confuses these totally alien to each other currents. He overlooks the fact that Centrism, which veers between Marxism and Reformism, is a tendency within the labor movement in the *capitalist* countries, while Stalinism, which is reactionary in its uninterrupted development,

is a poison weed on the soil of a *workers State* and is misdirecting that State. His unreal analysis of Stalinism, Trotsky has based on superficial phenomena. Unwittingly underestimating the fact that deception plays an important rôle in history—Stalinist deception especially—Trotsky has been misled by the phrases that clothed Stalin's zigzags, particularly by the decorative blustering "Left" passions of the "Third Period." At the time when the Stalinist bureaucracy was going through the higher stage of centralization and consolidation in the Soviet Union and the Comintern, when a flood of jobs for toadies and flunkies was released by the Stalin clique, when, to prevent its own removal, Stalinism was strangling the proletarian vanguard of Germany in order to send it to Hitler's torture rack and execution block, Trotsky wrote:

"The errors of the leadership of the Comintern and consequently, the errors of the German Communist Party pertain, in the familiar terminology of Lenin, to the category of 'ultra-Left stupidities.'" (Leon Trotsky, *What Next*, p. 114)

Trotsky never asked himself, Isn't there a certain method in the Stalinists' "madness"?

It was Trotsky's failure to clearly understand this new historical tendency rising on the firm foundation of the proletarian State, which led him to believe that the Piecks and Browders are *misled revolutionists*:

"The social democratic leaders represent the agencies of the class enemy within the proletariat. The Communist leaders, though confused, poor, and incapable, are revolutionists or semi-revolutionists that have been led from the right track. That is not one and the same thing. The social democracy must be destroyed. The Communist Party must be corrected." (*Ibid.*, p. 113)

Failing to recognize in Stalinism a fourth tendency, Trotsky places it within the old division existing in the capitalist countries: although Russian Reformism and Centrism (Right and Left Mensheviks who have not gone over to Stalin) as well as Marxism are suppressed in the Soviet Union. He evaluates Stalinism as *bureaucratic* Centrism, giving the wrong impression that there is also *democratic* Centrism.

Instead of viewing the "C.I." as it really is—a well-constructed, powerful engine for preventing proletarian revolution, a machine which the Stalinist gang will strengthen and improve

as long as Marxism does not assert itself—Trotsky, blinding himself and blinding others, fancies the Comintern to be what it is not:

“*Bureaucratic centrism* brought the Comintern to collapse. . . . Fundamentally the Stalinist ruling group has given up the C.I. a long time ago. . . . the Kremlin has reconciled itself to the C.I. as a nonentity. . . . The hopes based on the world proletarian revolution it has swapped for hopes in the League of Nations.” (Leon Trotsky, *The Kirov Assassination*, p. 19)

Every sentence cited above contains a false and misleading idea. The Stalinist usurpers have never given up the Comintern; they have *transformed* it to serve their own ends. They do not consider it a nonentity but something of great value and immense power of influence. They never based their hopes on the world proletarian revolution but rather upon its defeat, and they are far from being so stupid as to place any hopes in the League of Nations. Like the imperialist members of the League, the Stalinites base their hopes upon the armed forces of the Soviet Union.

Trotsky’s formulation offers no understanding and no warning to the proletariat as to what it must fight today, what to guard against when another workers republic is set up. To reject the theory of Socialism in one country is not sufficient. Bureaucratic centralism sank its roots in the Soviet Union *before* the introduction of this anti-Leninist quackery.

Trotsky’s mistakes in the analysis of the German situation can be traced to the same source from which all his post-Leninist errors flow. In his first article after Hitler was appointed chancellor, Trotsky wrote:

“There is no way of getting around without the Nazis. But it is likewise *impossible to give over to them the actual power*; today, the threat on the part of the proletariat is not so acute that the higher-ups should consciously provoke a *civil war with problematic outcome*.” (“Trotsky Analyzes German Situation,” *The Militant*, February 24, 1933. My emphasis—G.M.)

A civil war with a problematic outcome!—expecting the Stalinist bureaucracy to allow a successful struggle on the part of the workers, which would seal its own doom.

Trotsky’s entire struggle against Stalinism was paralyzed by his loyalty to the official “Party,” in reality loyalty to the growing bureaucratic centralism of the Soviet State:

“Under the perfidious blows of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the Left Opposition maintained to the very end its fidelity to the official party.” (Leon Trotsky, *The Militant*, April 8, 1933)

Instead of furnishing the proletariat with a fog-horn, Trotsky intensified the fog. Loyalty to the “Party.” Its leaders are “misled revolutionists.” They are epigones. They are frightened bureaucrats. Stalin is a Centrist. He is stupid. His policies are erroneous. The guidance of the Chinese Revolution, of the German proletariat, “was undertaken with the best of intentions.” “Change the course of the Party.” “Reform the Party regime.” “The about-face of the Stalinists is inevitable.” “The first positions have been won by us.” Such were the clouds of self-deception and confusion through which Trotsky marched down to and tumbled over the precipice of the “French Turn.” The policy that resulted from such misconceptions could only play and did play very effectively into the hands of Stalin. The aim of the Trotskyites in America, for instance, was to strengthen Browder’s outfit. This aim was based upon the illusion that the Stalinist machine could be regenerated and cleansed:

“Our aim is to strengthen the Communist party, to regenerate it, to help cleanse it of the evils that corrode it, to help it to prepare and consolidate its victories.” (*The Militant*, July 25, 1931)

In his article “The New Constitution of the U.S.S.R.,” in the section headed: “The Whip Against the Bureaucracy,” Trotsky quotes Stalin from the Stalin-Howard interview:

“‘Secret suffrage in the U.S.S.R. will be a whip in the hands of the population against the organs of government which work badly.’”

And Trotsky arrives at the following, utterly false, misleading analysis and conclusions:

“Stalin’s autocratic rule has erected nepotism, self-will, profligacy, pillage and bribery into a system of administration. The decay of the apparatus, cropping out at every step, has begun to threaten the very existence of the State as the source of power, income and privileges of the ruling stratum. *A reform became necessary. Taking fright* at their own handiwork the Summits of the Kremlin *turn to the population* with a plea to help it *cleanse and straighten* out the apparatus of administration.” (*New Militant*, May 9, 1936. My emphasis—G.M.)

It is obvious, Trotsky carries his total lack of understanding of Stalinism to pretty ridiculous ends. No wonder a Trotskyite worker once expressed to me his belief that Stalin, horrified by the havoc his "mistakes" brought about, would finally commit suicide. Trotsky's "bureaucratic centrism" is responsible for such childish views. To still more strongly entrench the bureaucracy, shrewd Stalin introduces a powerful deceptive device (employed even by Hitler), the plebiscitary secret balloting to be conducted in an atmosphere of terror—a system of appointment and dictatorial rule through "elections." He takes a monstrous step towards disorganizing the proletariat as a class, doing the direct opposite from what Marx and Engels taught the Communists to do ("Organization of the proletariat as a class"). And Trotsky discovers in this reactionary move a "plea" to the population. Seeing Stalinism as "Centrism veering between classes," Trotsky imagines a Leftward move. He deals guilelessly with Stalin's *words*, heedless of the fact that they are designed to conceal Stalin's true intentions and actions. Will the ruling gang restore workers' control and management of production and distribution of wealth? Will democratic centralism be restored in the so-called Party? Will the resolution on Workers Democracy adopted at the Tenth Congress of the Party and later reiterated, be put into effect? Will one have the right, under the new "Constitution" which so boastfully guarantees freedom of speech and of the press, to print and criticise Stalin's statement that Social Democracy and Fascism are twins? Will one be allowed, without risking a firing squad, to print Lenin's Testament, or Stalin's speech which appeared in the November 17, 1927 *Inprecorr*? Will the workers be given freedom of *research*—access to the files of at least one publication, the *Pravda*, beginning with 1917 and up to, say, 1925 or 1926, and thus allowed to discover the peculiar infrequency, almost total absence, of the mention of Stalin's name, and the obvious, overwhelming prominence of the names of Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin and other big figures of the revolution, and from this discovery to proceed to figure out the secret of Stalin's steady rise to personal power?

Stalinist bureaucratic centralism is enveloping its monstrous rule with an elaborate smoke screen of fake freedoms; it arms itself with a new whip against the masses and the former Oppo-

sitionists, but Trotsky sees a "reform" "to cleanse and straighten out the apparatus," a "whip against the bureaucracy."

Trotsky's approach to the study of Stalinism has been idealist, not materialist. It has been, therefore, utterly un-Marxist. He attacks Stalin's decoy, "Socialism in one country," ignoring the material ground from which this "theory" springs. His view of Stalin's protective zigzags is metaphysical, not dialectical. He has failed to notice that the ultra-Leftist line supplements the ultra-Rightist one, and he has taken both to be two distinct entities, terming the first "ultra-Left stupidities" and the second "Right-Centrism." In his self-blinding misanalysis, Trotsky has failed to rightly interpret the savage persecution of the revolutionary workers devoted to their class.

The following, written on the eve of the "Third Period," and published in 1936, gives a vivid glimpse of Trotsky's ideological chaos with respect to Stalinism:

"... the strategy of the E.C.C.I., especially since the year 1926, was a strategy of imaginary sums, false calculations, illusions with regard to the enemy, and persecution of the most reliable and unwavering militants. In a word, it was the rotten strategy of Right-Centrism." (*The Third International After Lenin*, p. 135)

In truth, it is nothing of an exaggeration to declare categorically that the root of the unspeakable confusion among the workers regarding Stalinism is traceable primarily, if not exclusively, to Trotsky. The pen is mightier than the sword, has been said times out of number. And Trotsky's pen was mighty during the Russian Revolution and some years after, delivering powerful thrusts against the bourgeoisie and its loyal agency, the Social Democracy. But Trotsky's pen became impotent in the face of the Stalinist reaction because there was no clarity behind his pen, because back of it stood the unfortunate, flatly opposed to manifest reality, inconsistent with the plain dictates of objective facts, meaningless and harmful theory of "Bureaucratic Centrism."

Should the international proletariat fail to create a new Marxist organization, posterity will endeavor to trace the causes for the destruction of the present revolutionary movement, so that the new movement can be built upon a correct theoretical foundation. In that case, too, Trotsky's formulation will serve to confuse, rather than clarify the workers. If they accept his ex-

planation of Stalinism, they, having overthrown the bourgeoisie in some country, will guard against the nebulous "burocratic centrism" instead of against the *concrete* burocratic centralism of the workers State. They will be on a sharp lookout against the "theory" of Socialism in one country. But in repeating the tragedy of the Russian Revolution, the burocratic distortion of another proletarian State need not introduce this theory to establish itself in force. It may advance a thousand other issues to involve the supporters of Workers Democracy and cover up the central, vital question. Stalinism is a new form of opportunism that sacrifices the *historical* interests of the proletariat for the *temporary* interests of a centralized aristocratic labor burocracy of a proletarian republic. Stalinism is conditioned to a certain course which it can never abandon or alter without facing annihilation. The course is toward greater and greater unity with the world bourgeoisie. Stalinism is a corroding acid that is eating away the foundation of the Soviet State and the world labor movement. But Trotsky views it as a pendulum swinging Right and Left between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. It is Trotsky's fatal error of considering this new opportunist development as a variety of Centrism, and not his organizational methods, as some people think, that led Trotsky to adopt wrong policies in fighting Stalinism, that led him to the "French orientation." The "French orientation" was not a bolt out of the blue. Trotsky had been proceeding from blunder to blunder. Instead of a stormy onset upon the burocratic distortion, an uninterrupted retreat. Pursuing the course of capitulation by stages, Trotsky sustained his supporters on the Right from outright capitulation and checked those on the Left who were straining at the chain to unfold a powerful offensive against Stalin. Stalin's policies were bringing to the world proletariat one terrific defeat after another, but Trotsky, rejecting the idea of utilizing the bloody lessons to arouse the workers in the Soviet Union and throughout the Comintern against the burocratic clique, poured cold water upon the aggressive elements within the Opposition:

"During the first days after the *coup d'etat* by Chiang Kai-shek, I was obliged to pour many a bucket of cold water over the hot heads of my young friends—and over some not so young. I tried to show them that the opposition could not rise on the *defeat* of the Chinese revolution." (Leon Trotsky, *My Life*, p. 530)

This amazing reasoning, in line with Trotsky's appraisal of Stalinism as Centrism conducting erroneous policies, is false and defeatist throughout. Had Trotsky understood that he was dealing with *burocratic centralism of the workers State* he would have eventually opened with this key the secret of Stalin's policies and realized that to expect anywhere in the world a victory for the proletariat while Stalin holds the reins of control within the international vanguard, is fatal. Every reverse of the proletariat, especially a major disaster as in China, would then have been utilized by the Opposition to the fullest extent to expose and remove Stalinism.

If after his expulsion, hoping to break by persuasion Stalin's cast-iron system he clung to the Comintern—"The Opposition needs no other soil than that of the Communist International. No one will succeed in tearing us away from it" (*The Strategy of the World Revolution*, p. 86)—then, after the "French Turn," he pinned his hopes of achieving this task through the "revolutionary" wing of the Social Democracy—"The growth of the revolutionary wing in the S.F.I.O. will inevitably open a breach in the deadly burocratic discipline of the Stalinists" (*The New International*, May 1935, p. 99). Despairing, Trotsky begins to advise the Centrists to turn their backs upon the Stalinists (*The New International*, February 1936, p. 7).

While Trotsky dropped the correct evaluation of Social Democracy, he has never abandoned his wrong estimation of Stalinism.

It is owing to his false estimation of Stalinism that Trotsky pursued a utopian policy in Germany and Spain.

At different historical moments different problems come to the fore and until they are solved, the proletariat cannot move forward towards its historical goal. The central issue today between Marxism-Leninism and opportunism, between capitalism and Communism, is Workers Democracy vs. Burocratic Distortion of the first proletarian State. Trotsky's line was correct in 1923, when he made the struggle against Stalin and his fellow-usurpers revolve around this pivotal issue. By shifting the main fight to the question of "Socialism in one country vs. international Socialism, or permanent revolution," Trotsky made a fundamental error. The proletariat lost sight of the fact that Workers Democracy was being eliminated in the Soviet Union and in the Comintern. The wrong impression was created that

Stalin and his crew were also for Socialism; and since the world revolution had not yet materialized, there was a feeling among the workers that the Stalinists were correct in proceeding with the building of Socialism in the country where the bourgeoisie had already been overthrown. It goes without saying, the non-Marxian character of the "theory" of Socialism in one country had to be exposed, and Trotsky did expose it in a masterly fashion. But only on condition that the basic organizational feature of the Bolshevik Party—democratic centralism—was intact, could the whole question of theory be considered as the central one. Otherwise, of necessity, the dispute on theory became a blind which screened the ever-growing bureaucratic centralization of Stalin's power. It was necessary to point out that Stalinism used this "theory" merely as a fig-leaf to cover the hideous distortion of the workers State. Trotsky was fighting a phantom. The power-crazed Stalin never really intended to build Socialism in the Soviet Union. Due to Trotsky's error, the focus of universal attention was diverted from the essential, basic feature of Stalinism, its pillar, the shattering of which would cause the whole fabric of fraud and blood to crash to the ground.

Until the central problem facing the revolutionary workers is solved, the proletariat will continue retreating, the reaction advancing.

Never was the inaccuracy of Trotsky's estimation of Stalinism and the harm of the "French orientation," flowing from this estimation, so obvious as at the time of the monstrous double-crossing of Zinoviev and Kamenev, and the infamous framing of Trotsky himself. These acts of Stalin and his confederates and helpmates were not "errors of Centrism" but a bloody orgy of a *consciously* and dexterously organized legal murder by the bureaucratic centralism of the Soviet State. The Trotskyites, having entered the Socialist Party, liquidated their independent press, and when speech was imperative, were impotently silent in the face of the Stalinist and bourgeois barrage of slander directed against Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev. But they did something infinitely worse than merely maintaining official silence. The tragedy of the "French Turn" was strikingly brought home to the honest rank-and-file of the Trotskyist group when, while Cannon, Shachtman and other opportunist leeches on Trotsky's back were campaigning for Thomas for President, Thomas rendered an extremely valuable and important assist-

ance to the Stalinists; and utilizing the fatal moment, attacked Communism as a whole. This is what Thomas wrote about Stalin's witchcraft trial which lacked every sign of authenticity:

"It was an amazing, fantastic, incredible affair. Here were illustrious men, close associates of Lenin, who have broken, by their own confessions, every standard of loyalty and decency. They plotted individual terrorism, which Socialists and communists have always repudiated. They were willing to accept—they even sought—Nazi aid. They had not even the honor among thieves, for they planned, once in power, to use the OGPU to put out of the way the actual assassins by whose work they had hoped to come to power. Neither their former services nor the alleged eloquence of their final speeches can win them forgiveness. That leaders of a great movement could do such a thing is to cast doubt upon the standards of the entire movement [i.e. Lenin, October and all—G.M.]." (*Socialist Call*, August 29, 1936)

The Trotskyites, as loyal and disciplined members of the Socialist Party, have been pushing the sale of the *Socialist Call* among the workers.

After Radek's "trial," at the awful moment when Browder and his gang, whipping themselves into a frenzy, were raging like maniacs against Trotsky, running out of epithets and completely exhausting their vocabulary of venomous words, when the muddy Stalinist poison-flood was beating against confused and bewildered minds with irresistible force, and Trotsky, virtually gagged, was going through an overwhelming ordeal, Thomas, under the guise of defending Trotsky, bore down upon the hounded man with this pro-Stalinist dose of sugar of lead:

"Emphatically Trotsky is entitled to the hearing for which he asks. I personally do not think he helped himself in his demand for justice by the extreme vehemence of his attack upon absolutely everything in the Soviet government which he helped to set up." (*New York World Telegram*, February 15, 1937)

Of course, Cannon and his fellow-hypocrites maintained absolute silence in the face of this pro-Stalinist attack on Trotsky by their comrade, Thomas. Thus history has demonstrated beyond cavil that in this, Stalinist, era, no matter how well grounded people are in the fundamentals of Marxism (Trotsky), confusion with regard to Stalinism inevitably leads them, instead of upon the wide revolutionary highway at the head of

the masses marching against capitalism, to some dangerous quagmire.

In the pre-convention discussion of the Revolutionary Workers League, Marlen pointed out the following:

In Lenin's time the Third International, in spite of all the lying assertions and furious opposition of the opportunists, led the whole proletariat and the oppressed peoples—the *entire humanity*—whether the backward masses knew of the fact or not, whether or not they ever heard of Lenin and the Comintern, forward toward the abolition of capitalism, toward Communism. Owing to the desperate resistance of reactionary forces and the immaturity of the Communist Parties there were setbacks and temporary defeats, but the general direction was indubitable. The bureaucratic distortion of the first workers State warped and reversed the Comintern and the direction. Not merely one section of the international proletariat, the Russian, is in the toils of the tyrannous Stalinist bureaucracy; all sections are affected. The millions of workers in the Socialist Parties and trade unions, the vast mass of the unorganized, the peasantry, the colonial slaves and oppressed nationalities, although they are not aware of it, and especially because the proletarian vanguard is not conscious of the fact, are drawn by Stalinism into the abyss of reaction. Alongside of planned bureaucratized economy and the systematic abolition of October within the Soviet Union, there is planned and highly successful disruption of proletarian revolution without. The working class is helpless to prevent the Stalinist line from succeeding because Marxism is dispersed and silenced, and the opportunist currents cannot and will not halt Stalinism. During the "Third Period" it was the Stalinist line of "social-fascism" and "united front from below only" that prevailed within the international proletariat; today it is the Stalinist line of the permanent "People's Front" that hand-cuffs the world proletariat politically and organizationally and robs it of independent thinking and action. Whether one recognizes the fact or not, in the work of entombing labor within capitalism, of taking precautions that the iron lid is fastened and bolted securely, of barring Marxism from coming to the rescue, Stalinism gives the lead.

Marlen contended that nothing can prevent the eventual establishment of world Fascism if Stalinism is not unmasked in time, if the international proletarian vanguard is not released

from the tentacles of this horrible monster. The existence of Stalinism within the working class is a guarantee of the victory of Fascism. In America, Marlen insisted, all those who are sincere in their allegiance to the workers' cause must fight the Stalinist scourge with their might and main. This, of course, does not mean that the struggle against the Lovestoneites, Social Democrats, Trotskyites, A. F. of L. reactionaries and other opportunists, is to be relented one iota. But it is only through the political and organizational destruction of the vicious Browder clique and the rescuing of the thousands of honest workers from the Stalinist charnel house that the way can be cleared for the Leftward-moving workers in the Socialist and other parties and groups towards the establishment of the Leninist party and towards the revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie.

The line of the Political Committee of the Revolutionary Workers League is summed-up in the following: independent activity among the masses, "to fight not only on a clear cut program against capitalism *but also* against the *false* [My emphasis—G.M.] line of the Second and Third Internationals, against the London-Amsterdam Buro, and against the new orientation of the I.C.L."

Stalinism, which by virtue of the salient fact that it is in control of a powerful workers State occupying one-sixth of the earth's land surface and embracing eight and one-half per cent of the world's population, and which holds a position of *commanding* influence within the international proletariat, was placed by the Political Committee of the R.W.L. on the same level of importance as other opportunist movements! Lenin would certainly laugh such "Leninism" out of court. Marlen pointed out that in life the position of the Political Committee meant nothing else than the shirking of the fight against the *main* obstacle to proletarian revolution and the *worst* plague ravaging the working class.

In drawing up the agenda for the convention of the R.W.L. the leaders "forgot" the Soviet Union. They subsequently "corrected" their "mistake"; but in the same issue of *The Fighting Worker*, in which the "correction" appears, is printed the agenda for the convention of the Young Workers League which is completely under the control of the adult section, with the Soviet Union conspicuously omitted.

In the R.W.L. convention Marlen's position was crushingly

defeated. In their growing confusion, the Oehler-Stamm leadership went Trotsky one better and divided Stalinism into two tendencies, Centrist and Reformist: "Stalinist policies within the Soviet Union continue to be centrist (though more and more definitely right centrist), while in the capitalist countries they have already become reformist."

This thesis had never been presented to the membership of the R.W.L. in the pre-convention discussion. In the last minute before leaving for the convention the "democratic" centralist leaders rushed it through in the National Committee, thus depriving Marlen and a few others opposed to this harmful absurdity of an opportunity to criticise it before the rank-and-file. The wrong line is, of course, reflected in the R.W.L. literature:

"Browder makes several fundamental *errors*. . . Browder the *reformist* . . . fundamental *error* which runs through the whole works of Stalinism . . . the People's Front *error* and the Farmer-Labor Party *error*. . ." (*The Fourth International*, Vol. 2, No. 3. My emphasis—G.M.)

The deadly trap Stalin *consciously* set up at his "Seventh Congress" is an error, declares the R.W.L. This misleading interpretation is not one iota different from Lovestone's (vide *The People's Front Illusion*), although the reasons, of course, are not the same. With Lovestone it is the old game of covering up the kernel of Stalinism by "criticising" its safety surface zigzags, meanwhile protecting his own political hide; with the R.W.L. it is the old Trotskyist muddle-headedness.

To spread the illusion that Browder is a reformist, that the policy of the "People's Front" is an error, is to assist the Stalinist fakers to continue their hold upon their victims' minds. The Stalinist worker will forgive his leaders any error. With his mind's eye temporarily shut, he will accept as sincere even "self-criticism" *a la* Pieck. It is only when he learns the cruel truth that all the Stalinist "errors," including the "theory" of Socialism in one country, are not errors at all but *conscious* anti-workingclass policies to preserve and strengthen the bureaucratic distortion of the Soviet State, that he will break with Stalinism and fight to weed it out of the working class.

On the question of independence from all opportunist organizations, the convention of the R.W.L. adopted the position that affiliation to the social-patriotic I.A.G. (London-Amsterdam

Buro) is not a principled, but a tactical question, leaving the door wide open for affiliation. Marlen's contention that the leadership of the R.W.L. lacked confidence in itself to defeat Stalinism with its Lovestone purifiers, and Social Democracy with its Trotskyist resuscitators, was fully confirmed when the convention passed a decision to move the national headquarters of the R.W.L. to Chicago and build the organization primarily in the Great Lakes area. The question of forming the center in Chicago is not a principled one. Very probable that when the movement takes on the proportions of a mass party, it will be advisable, even necessary, to establish the revolutionary center in the industrial heart of America. But to plan and act as a mass party would, now, when the serious and sober problem is to start from scratch, to build up a Marxist skeleton organization of several hundred leading workers, is ridiculous, speaking politely. Instead of a resolute struggle to win the existing, historically developed vanguard from the opportunists, as Lenin won the vanguard and then the majority of the proletariat from the Mensheviks and S.R.'s (for the way to the masses is through the advanced workers), the R.W.L. set out to create a vanguard. This opportunist chase after a phantom was induced, Marlen insisted, by the panicky fear of Stalinism. No sooner did the R.W.L. emerge from the shell of the Workers Party into the wide world than it sneaked out of the difficulty of fighting opponents more serious than Cannon and Muste.

New York, the seat of American imperialism, the chief political battlefield of the country today, and within a radius of a hundred miles one of the most industrialized areas in the world, with its million unemployed, its quarter of a million class-conscious workers a considerable number of whom are organized; New York, where is concentrated a third of Browder's victims (15,000 out of 45,000 members in the entire country), and the bulk of Stalinist publications, the center of Social Democracy and other opportunist organizations, including the R.W.L. itself which was born in New York, suddenly became too small for the headquarters of the R.W.L.

New York is the main link with Europe, Africa, and to a considerable extent with Latin America. With the toilers of the Soviet Union and the French and the Spanish and other workers threatened by the dreadful danger of bourgeois and Stalinist reaction, in need of advice and assistance, the shabby orientation

of the R.W.L. at the present phase of development has a distinct non-internationalist implication.

But with its own mind in the dark, this organization can furnish no light to others anyway.

In truth, it is spreading confusion, falsehoods and misleading information. For instance. During the civil war in Spain, the Stalinists, in a desperate need to close every channel of enlightenment and understanding, brought into play all their ingenuity in manipulating their safeguards. Before, a Soviet worker could, in a whisper, criticize Stalin's régime. Under the drive of the blood-bath against the former Oppositionists even an awe-struck mutter was stifled within the Soviet working class. "Even whispers against the régime are silenced" (*The New York Times*, September 28, 1936). Effectively muffled, the Russian masses now knew only implicit obedience to the bureaucracy. The fierce denunciation flung against the former Trotskyites and Bukharinites the Stalinist bureaucracy supplemented with a hypocritical show of solidarity with the Spanish toilers. It organized factory meetings throughout the Soviet Union and deducted from the workers' pay a portion for food to the Spanish masses. Soviet workers were obliged to sign collection blanks, as is plainly shown even in the *Daily Worker*, September 30, 1936. Although among the Soviet masses there was, of course, genuine feeling of solidarity with the Spanish toilers, the Stalinists in their press did not disclose that it was the bureaucracy that organized and supervised the drive, but rather sought to create the impression that the Russian workers acted on their own initiative. "The workers of the Soviet Union," wrote the *Daily Worker*, October 3, 1936, "have now rallied to the aid of their Spanish workers to the sum of 14,061,162 rubles (about \$2,812,000) with collections still going full blast."

Smashing as was the blow against the former Oppositionists, and powerful though was the preventative ideological wave against all possible criticism, the treachery in Spain caused the claws of doubt dig deep into the mind of many a Stalinist worker. Indeed, it was a crucial moment for the Stalinist bureaucrats. But the leaders of the R.W.L., instead of effectively destroying the illusions in the minds of the workers duped by Browder and Co., helped to perpetuate them:

"But the magnificent struggle of the Spanish workers raised new hope in the Russian workers. They reacted spontaneously holding fac-

tory meetings and raising funds for their class brothers in Spain.

"The frightened Stalinist bureaucrats put themselves at the head of the movement to keep it from getting out of bounds and misled it into supporting the capitalist government of Azana." (*The Fighting Worker*, October 1, 1936)

This outrageous misinformation bears a resemblance to Stalinist fakes and fabrications. In the most irresponsible manner the leaders of the R.W.L. distort the picture of reality in the Soviet Union. They are obscuring the horrible fact that the entire Russian working class is pining in the bureaucratic strait-jacket and is exposed to the caprices, whims, misrule and misleadership of the Stalinist bureaucracy. As a result of such poisonous fairy tales as told by *The Fighting Worker*, those of Browder's victims who, shaken by the defeats, are struggling to break through the Stalinist trance, are prevented from doing so by the R.W.L. to the extent of its influence. In the lines quoted above, the workers in capitalist countries find confirmation of the Stalinists' assertions that Workers Democracy in the Soviet Union is intact. The R.W.L., moreover, conveys the impression, false and deceptive through and through, that if there had ever been the utterly non-Bolshevik, Draconian discipline imposed by Stalin upon the Russian workers, the cords of this discipline suddenly were relaxed. The Russian workers "spontaneously holding factory meetings," started a "movement" which the "frightened" bureaucrats must "keep from getting out of bounds," and which apparently was going in a correct direction but for the bureaucrats who misled it. This fantastic and criminal story arouses false hopes among the workers in capitalist countries and dims their mental eye.

The same article in *The Fighting Worker*, after a few words on the frame-up and executions, asserts:

"This infamous business did not frighten the Russian workers. The latest reports show that money is still being collected for the Spanish workers and that food and clothes are being sent to them."

Instead of exposing the Stalinists, removing their Red mask, the R.W.L. paints a few camouflaging streaks upon the mask. Even *The New York Times* on October 12, 1936, speaks of "food purchased with funds raised by levies on workers throughout the Soviet Union." To present the shrewd move the Stalinists made in collecting a compulsory tax from the Soviet workers

for the hypocritical gesture of assistance to the Spanish masses, as a *conscious, independent* policy of the Russian workers, to offer the continuance of the collection as proof that the Russian workers are not terrorized by the nightmarish persecution of the Opposition, that this collecting of money is in conflict with the policy of Stalin, is to show either hopeless confusion or utter stupidity, or to be guilty of practicing downright criminal deception.

Thus without a theoretical Marxian compass, its political chart heavily marked with opportunist lines, the R.W.L. launched upon its sterile, sectarian, miserable existence.

After the convention, Marlen presented a statement to the R.W.L. to the effect that since it was now illegal to advocate his line either inside or outside the R.W.L., and in order to present this line to the workers, he was forced to leave the organization. Thereupon the National Committee promptly expelled Marlen as an "ultra-Left sectarian" who found himself in a "hopeless contradiction."

In its statement to the membership, the National Committee declared: "Marlen rejects the Leninist thesis of the three basic tendencies in the labor movement (reformism, Centrism, Marxism) claiming that 'burocratic centralism' (Stalinism) is a fourth such tendency." The above sentence contains a deliberate distortion. First, Marlen does not reject Lenin's thesis of the three tendencies in the labor movement; second, Marlen declared that Stalinism is burocratic centralism of the *workers State*, not merely burocratic centralism which exists to a certain degree in *any* opportunist organization. Marlen repeatedly corrected Stamm, who, reporting on the convention, persistently omitted in his criticism of Marlen's formulation, this basic feature of Stalinism.

Opportunism and distortion are bedfellows.

Whatever political criticism against opponent organizations the leaders of the R.W.L. attempt, they throw the weight of it primarily at Trotsky and Social Democracy, employing stock-phrases about the Second International being a stinking corpse and an agency of imperialism. And the criticism they level against Trotsky's present line is timid, half-hearted and un-Leninist:

"True it is that Trotsky's political line is *opportunist* today. He advances the slogan of the Fourth International and dissolves the

groups of his followers into the Second International. His followers betray Marxism, make principled concessions to Stalinism and the Socialists. But Trotsky's line is not anti-working class, not pro-capitalist." (*Stalinism Betrays the Spanish Revolution*, p. 3)

Trotsky's line is admitted to be opportunist, yet it is declared not to be anti-workingclass! It is "neutral," suspended somewhere in the intra-stellar space, not operating within the proletariat! Fearing to think out an idea to its logical conclusion, the R.W.L. timidly shuns the fact that *objectively* Trotsky's line is *definitely anti-workingclass*, definitely playing into the hands of the Stalinist reaction, decaying Social Democracy, and the international bourgeoisie.

The indubitable fact that the R.W.L. is much closer to the Leninist position than Field and Weisbord does not change the other, no less certain, fact that it is miles from the correct course. The acts of all these pseudo-Bolsheviks who fundamentally differ but little from one another, are all of a piece. In concert they rail at the bankrupt Trotskyites, confound their followers with much pother and noise about Marx and Lenin, thus appearing as genuine Communists, each group, in essence, striving to capture Trotsky's dearly-prized following. The opportunist pots call the opportunist kettle black, and they broaden the scope to include a pretense of exposing Stalinism. In reality these "revolutionary" outfits serve Stalinism as a lightning rod to deflect some thinking workers' attempts at a correct understanding of the post-Leninist era. Although they employ pretty tall gibber about the masses, strikes and world revolution, and engage in all sorts of self-activities, these sterile, sectarian groups, objectively, are nothing else but sabotaging agencies in the historically imperative struggle to remove the main obstacle in the path to the overthrow of capitalism.

Perhaps with greater determination and energy than any of its rivals does the R.W.L. discharge this function. An example. During the siege of Madrid, when Stalinist influence, outweighing that of all other elements and tendencies, hung heavy over the Spanish vanguard, the R.W.L. devoted a whole issue of its theoretical organ to the Spanish situation. Not only is there no sharp attack against the Stalinist machine, no warning to the workers against it, but there is not a single paragraph, not even a sentence containing anything remotely resembling an exposure of Stalinism. There is an extensive castigation of the P.O.U.M.,

a considerable amount of proof that the various kettles, Blum, Morrow, Field, Cannon and others, are black; and a particularly sinister conclusion:

"The worst enemy of the Spanish Revolution at the moment, the Spanish Kautsky, Caballero. . ." ("The Civil War and the Imperialist Conflicts in Spain," *The Fourth International*, Volume 2, No. 8, p. 16)

The murderous rôle of Stalinism in Spain is disregarded, is not revealed. Alongside of this criminal shielding of the worst enemy within the Spanish and every other section of the international proletariat, the R.W.L., by diverting the workers' attention to the secondary evil, the Social Democracy, gives outright support to the Stalinist trick of unloading the main share of the crimes against the workers upon the shoulders of the Social Democracy.

Although *in words* the R.W.L. stands for the creation of the Fourth International, yet, owing to its hopelessly tangled position, its failure to correctly estimate Stalinism and the resultant utter impotence in the face of this plague, its indifference to the Stalinist debauch of the only existing proletarian State, its puerility and paltry romanticism and finally its cowardly, opportunist, pie-in-the-sky orientation, this burlesque "Bolshevik" outfit is an encumbrance on the proletarian road to the Fourth International. The R.W.L. must be eliminated by winning away from it the best elements to a real Leninist organization. The same applies to the other wretched imitations of Bolshevism, the Weisbord and the Field groups.

Some time after leaving the R.W.L., Marlen and a few comrades formed a small group, the Lenin Circle. Its aim is to establish similar circles throughout the country and transform them into a cornerstone of the new Communist party. A similar development will take place in all countries, laying the groundwork for the Fourth International.

* * *

History is hastening along towards a climax. Is there a possibility that the working class might find itself in an irretrievably disastrous situation? Is it too late to forge the new instrument for the proletarian revolution? No, it is not yet too late. History has allowed the workers enough time, but every day is valuable and must not be wasted but should be devoted

to this work. Workers who take this view seriously will follow up their conviction with concrete steps. They will not give to plaintive sighing that so many political tendencies exist within the proletariat. There are no seven ways to the overthrow of capitalist slavery: there is only one, the Leninist way. The opportunist lines which shackle the toiling masses within a thick fog of illusions, and the revolutionary line which dispels the fog and leads the masses to their emancipation, are *irreconcilable*. Every piece of opportunism is a deadly pitfall for the proletariat, and every opportunist road leads to Rome (Fascism). Workers who have grasped this truth will connect themselves ideologically and organizationally with that force which is leading in the construction of a new Communist party.

The degenerated Stalinist bureaucrats—these political bandits, racketeers and gangsters, whose hands are dripping with the blood of their victims, declassed anaemics, gutter lecturers and journalists, conscienceless careerists, toadies, half-baked "revolutionists" of the *New Masses*, all these repulsively rotten Magils and Ganneses and Michael Golds—will fight like mad to save their Jesuit system. Led by the hate-crazed Browder this vile chorus of intellectual adventurers and defamers will raise a lynch howl. No lie is too filthy, no slander too foul, no fraud too repulsive, no device too low to serve them in their fight against Marxists, against the proletarian revolution. Sheathed in their stolen armor, they appear invincible, these fraudulent "leaders" loathed and despised by Communists worthy of the name. But the maniacal rage of these master-technicians of slander and crime will not avail them. To a thinking worker the fierce yelping of the raging hounds of the Stalinist reaction, the hideous shrieks of denunciation, the vile pogrom and assassination incitement will only help to disclose what these detestable crucifiers of the great cause are anxious to conceal. In every one of their shrieks and curses there beats the terrible fear of the revolutionary proletariat.

Browder with his pirate crew, and the other bureaucratic cliques, his "oppositions," the Cannons and Shachtmans, Lovestones and Wolfes and, of course, all the Thomases and Zams, will do their vicious sniping. They will all be felled by the blows of Marxist truth and swept aside by the rising wave of enlightenment, honesty and devotion to the proletarian revolution.

Although Marx and Engels were men of gigantic intellect, they erroneously expected that the overthrow of capitalism would be accomplished yet in the Nineteenth Century. One of their important "mistakes" was that they never foresaw a complete and thorough degeneration of the leadership of the proletariat. Lenin was the equal of Marx and Engels. Lenin's "error" in predicting that the world revolution would very soon sweep away the traitorous leaders of the Second International is due to the fact that he never expected that on the very soil of the Soviet State there would arise a counter-revolutionary monster which would save capitalism, Second International and all, and slowly strangle the October Revolution itself. Certainly Marx and Engels did not and could not foresee the development of a bureaucratic distortion of the first proletarian State. Lenin witnessed the beginnings of the distortion and to his dying days fought to clear out "the wild grass of burocratism."

In these momentous historical days we must recall Marx's weighty observation that class-struggles in the past "ended, either in the revolutionary reconstruction of society at large, or in common ruin of the contending classes" (*Communist Manifesto*). The revolutionary proletariat does not intend to go down in common ruin with the bourgeoisie, into a state of perpetual war, chaos and barbarism. Its historical mission is to overthrow capitalism and lead human society towards Communism. To adopt a fatalistic attitude, however, that the proletarian victory is inevitable is suicidal. Unless the workers, disillusioned with Stalinism and the Social Democracy, throw off their spell of passivity and "watchful waiting" and begin to think and act along Leninist lines, begin energetically to awaken and organize the vanguard of the proletariat, not victory, *but ruin, is inevitable*.

In the most difficult, least promising days for the proletarian cause, Lenin was never seized by panic or despair. When in 1914 he witnessed the collapse of the vanguard organization of the proletariat which had been built with the active participation of Friedrich Engels, when he saw the Socialist leaders, big and small, in every capitalist country, going over to the side of the bourgeoisie, he did not sink into a black pool of despondency. Virtually alone, he lifted high the banner of Marxism and issued the clarion call for the building of a new revolutionary organization. There was not a bright spot to relieve the gloom, but Lenin

understood the great Marxian truth, that a tiny grouplet, a spark, if it correctly expresses the historical interests of the proletariat, inevitably grows into a flame, then into a conflagration.

Zinoviev, who fully shared Lenin's position during the grilling years of general hypocrisy and treason, wrote in the central organ of the Bolshevik Party, edited by Lenin and himself, "The darker the night, the brighter the stars." History is being repeated. Prior to and during the World War the bulk of the proletarian vanguard was in the hands of opportunists and traitors. After Lenin's death the vanguard once again fell into the hands of opportunists and traitors. The roaring Niagara of Marxism, let loose by the October Revolution, has been dried up, owing to the degeneration of the Comintern, to a barely visible mere trickle, as in 1914; its voice has fallen to a murmur. But the brightest stars in the long and dark and painful night of reaction are those of handfuls of people clinging with unflinching faith, devotion and loyalty to the cause of the proletariat, bravely carrying on the great struggle for the liberation of the toiling masses.

To the class-conscious workers I say: break with the false leaders. Let us expose and drive out of our midst the political racketeers and swindlers, vultures and leeches that by the trainload have entered the proletarian camp! They are benumbing the brain of the proletariat and are paralyzing its revolutionary muscles. And just as a cancer systematically eats at the vitals of its victim and finally goes down together with him into the grave, they relentlessly drag the proletariat towards a horrible catastrophe and the destruction of the basis of their own existence.

Part with the cold-blooded traffickers in treason and betrayal! Widen the political, ideological and organizational breach with the putrid Second International, the abominable Stalintern, the bankrupt Trotskyites and all the rest of the opportunist outfits and cliques! Sound the rallying cry to the toiling masses! Let us raise the old banner of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and let us build anew—to carry forward the great ideal of the founders of Communism, of the founder of the Soviet Republic, the ideal of the abolition of exploitation of man by man!

Dedicating their lives to the proletariat, Marx and Lenin have given the revolutionists an inspiring example of inconceivable

labor, of endurance and fortitude unmatched in the annals of the revolutionary movement. In their struggle to lead the enslaved masses to emancipation, both encountered a fierce pack of opportunist hounds, and Lenin faced this pack when it was at its fiercest. Marx and Lenin were never beaten. The terrible antagonism they were confronted with whetted their will and persistence. Their immortal shades forever inspire the revolutionary proletariat to weather gales of reaction; in the cold and empty breasts of the exploiters they strike the dread of Communist revolution. The profound teachings and intrepid spirit of these great proletarian revolutionists, the experience and traditions of the Paris Commune and the glorious October are a priceless heritage. This heritage is the beacon light that will guide the workers out of defeat and collapse, to new ardor and new victories.

"The First International laid the basis of the international struggle of the proletariat for Socialism.

"The Second International marked a period of preparation, a period in which the soil was tilled with a view to the widest possible propagation of the movement in many of the countries.

"The Third International has garnered the fruit of the labors of the Second International, casting off the refuse of its opportunist, social-chauvinist, bourgeois and lower middle class tendencies and has set out to achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVI, p. 182, Russian Edition)

There exists today no *Communist party* in any land. There is no Marxist International to complete the work that was carried on by Marx, Engels and Lenin. The goal to be accomplished is still ahead, but the proletariat is bereft of light and leadership. It is without an independent political organization, and as is well known to every Marxist, "Working class without an independent political party is like a body without a head" (Second Congress of the Third International, 1920).

When, through the temporary coincidence of the interests of the German capitalists and the Stalinist bureaucracy, Hitler found himself in the seat of power, he boasted that he had annihilated Marxism in Germany. That was an empty brag. The destruction of Marxism in Germany, as well as elsewhere, had been effected sometime before the rise of Hitlerism. Hitler faced a working class that had been deprived of its sure weapon by Stalin and the Social Democracy. Today the entire international

proletariat, Russian included, confronts its deadly enemy, the bourgeoisie, politically totally disarmed.

In the camp of the enemy, among the Fascists, liberals, conservatives, there is no betrayal, no treason; the leaders of various bourgeois tendencies, differing only as to the method of rule, are eagerly and aggressively fighting against the toiling masses to preserve, extend and fortify capitalist domination and exploitation. Within the camp of the proletariat there is a lethal epidemic of opportunism; the leaderships of the two major organizations, in their iron determination to prevent a death-blow to capitalism, are practicing hypocrisy, double-dealing and high treason. The chieftains of the lesser opportunist outfits among the workers, in one way or another, are working for the bourgeoisie. And all in harmony are splintering the revolutionary spine of the most revolutionary class in history.

The sincere, clear-sighted, true internationalists, men and women who are self-effacedly devoted to the cause of the oppressed and exploited, who should really be directing and guiding the army of the proletariat onto the path leading to emancipation, are without voice and influence. They are dispersed individuals branded as foes of the working class by the bureaucratic impostors, the vicious enemies of the toilers.

The impotence of these unattached revolutionists in the face of the organized might of opportunism lies in their dispersedness. There is little doubt that there are many of them. They may even outnumber the revolutionists, who, with no hope whatsoever, hang on to the Stalinist, Social-Democratic and other organizations. The unaffiliated revolutionists and those within various parties and groups must find one another, reintegrate, and, summoning the will and energy, must create the political and organizational head for the working class. The great danger in this period is for an isolated revolutionary worker to cling to the paralyzing illusion of the need to wait for a great man, a Marxist "Messiah," who can lead the toiling masses out of the present straits. *The "great" men have gone bankrupt!* The workers must rely upon themselves to forge a new leadership. But the great work of ideological, political and organizational reconstruction of Marxism-Leninism must be started at once, lest Stalinism, with no Bolshevik counterblast against it, utterly reckless of consequences, to prolong its own, temporary existence, wrecks the proletarian movement in its totality upon the

rocks of reaction. After the French proletariat, too, is delivered to Fascism, it may be too late. No extraordinary penetration is required to realize that. The situation, then, indeed, may become hopeless.

Not since the crash of the Second International during the World War and the trying days in the Autumn of 1919 when the Russian Soviet Republic, bleeding from a thousand wounds, reduced to a small area by the White armies and British and French troops, was preparing to make what appeared to be the last stand before Moscow and Petrograd, has there been a more critical period for the proletariat than is the present period. The crucial hour is drawing near. With the entire future of the Marxist cause at stake, certainly the revolutionary workers will not stand idly by and gaze with unruffled placidity as the first toilers' State in the history of mankind, the material, ideological and organizational achievements of the world labor movement, won in bitter struggles of fifteen decades, the great contributions of the First, the Second and the Third Internationals, are being devoured by the flames of the raging capitalist inferno. The horrible lessons of the sell-out of the Chinese, the German and the Spanish masses will burn themselves as with a flame of fire deep into the mind of every honest class-conscious worker. The undying memory of the revolutionary workers whose mutilated bodies littered the streets of Shanghai, Canton and Madrid, the silent, nameless graves of the hundreds of thousands of victims betrayed to the enemy by Stalinism and the Social Democracy, the cries of anguish from the revolutionists languishing in the grisly dungeons of China, Germany, Poland, Spain and other capitalist countries, and within the Soviet Union itself, call true revolutionists to action. With firm resolve they will prevent the traitor and renegade Stalin and his vile Browders and Piecks, who are indirectly aided by all other "revolutionary" opportunists, from leading the toiling and oppressed masses of the world into the blackest hell of slavery in which the vanguard of the proletariat would be bloodily extirpated, the employed transformed into military-industrial serfs of rapacious imperialism, and the unemployed reduced to a passively rotting layer in the horrid pit of the benighted Fascist-ridden capitalist society—a hell with no prospect, no promise, no hope—for decades and decades.

Let there be no mistake about the seriousness and proximity

of the threat of the blood-thirsty Fascist serpent belting the entire globe. Let there be no doubt that with the Fascist-military form of bourgeois rule becoming general, unbridled horror, a thousand times more intense than that of Nazi Germany and Fascist Spain, will be loosed upon the toiling masses and the oppressed nationalities, the Negro, the Jew, the Chinese, and the others. Not the Dark, but the Black and Bloody ages will engulf the world.

And let there be no confusion, uncertainty or hesitation regarding the *central* and *primary* task the revolutionary workers face today. The task is to frustrate the new crimes against the toiling masses of *all* countries daily concocted in the sheltering recesses of the Kremlin Palace. The treacherous Stalinist bureaucracy, night and day dogged by its nightmare of proletarian revolution, is translating its fear into the reality of ghastly acts. Draped in Lenin's cloak, its fearful eyes gleaming ominously through the Red mask, gripping tight in its practiced hand the dependable dagger, the "Comintern," the Stalinist monster is keeping a sharp watch upon the international proletariat, like a lynx stalking its prey, ready to spring at a critical moment and plunge the fatal steel to the gory hilt into the back of its blindfolded victim. The task is **TO STOP STALINISM**; to remove Lenin's cloak from its misshapen, hideous carcass and tear the Red mask off its face of death; to shatter its treacherous bloodstained weapon into atoms; to hurl it aside, clearing the road for *genuine Bolshevism*; to remove the heavy bandage from the eyes of the tormented toiling masses and lead them to scale the ramparts of crumbling capitalism in the final assault upon the bourgeoisie.

A fatal error, however, would be to imagine that *only* Stalinism must be exposed and rooted out of the proletarian camp. *All* the pseudo-Marxists must be exposed for what they are, and their followers won over to a correct political and organizational policy.

In 1917, under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky, the proletarian revolution in Russia was waking the world toiling masses:

"And on the morning of October 31, after the defeat of Kerensky's Cossack army, Lenin and Trotsky sent through me to the revolutionary proletariat of the world this message: 'Comrades! Greetings from the first proletarian republic of the world. We call you to arms

of the R.W.L. at the present phase of development has a distinct non-internationalist implication.

But with its own mind in the dark, this organization can furnish no light to others anyway.

In truth, it is spreading confusion, falsehoods and misleading information. For instance. During the civil war in Spain, the Stalinists, in a desperate need to close every channel of enlightenment and understanding, brought into play all their ingenuity in manipulating their safeguards. Before, a Soviet worker could, in a whisper, criticize Stalin's régime. Under the drive of the blood-bath against the former Oppositionists even an awe-struck mutter was stifled within the Soviet working class. "Even whispers against the régime are silenced" (*The New York Times*, September 28, 1936). Effectively muffled, the Russian masses now knew only implicit obedience to the bureaucracy. The fierce denunciation flung against the former Trotskyites and Bukharinites the Stalinist bureaucracy supplemented with a hypocritical show of solidarity with the Spanish toilers. It organized factory meetings throughout the Soviet Union and deducted from the workers' pay a portion for food to the Spanish masses. Soviet workers were obliged to sign collection blanks, as is plainly shown even in the *Daily Worker*, September 30, 1936. Although among the Soviet masses there was, of course, genuine feeling of solidarity with the Spanish toilers, the Stalinists in their press did not disclose that it was the bureaucracy that organized and supervised the drive, but rather sought to create the impression that the Russian workers acted on their own initiative. "The workers of the Soviet Union," wrote the *Daily Worker*, October 3, 1936, "have now rallied to the aid of their Spanish workers to the sum of 14,061,162 rubles (about \$2,812,000) with collections still going full blast."

Smashing as was the blow against the former Oppositionists, and powerful though was the preventative ideological wave against all possible criticism, the treachery in Spain caused the claws of doubt dig deep into the mind of many a Stalinist worker. Indeed, it was a crucial moment for the Stalinist bureaucrats. But the leaders of the R.W.L., instead of effectively destroying the illusions in the minds of the workers duped by Browder and Co., helped to perpetuate them:

"But the magnificent struggle of the Spanish workers raised new hope in the Russian workers. They reacted spontaneously holding fac-

tory meetings and raising funds for their class brothers in Spain.

"The frightened Stalinist bureaucrats put themselves at the head of the movement to keep it from getting out of bounds and misled it into supporting the capitalist government of Azana." (*The Fighting Worker*, October 1, 1936)

This outrageous misinformation bears a resemblance to Stalinist fakes and fabrications. In the most irresponsible manner the leaders of the R.W.L. distort the picture of reality in the Soviet Union. They are obscuring the horrible fact that the entire Russian working class is pining in the bureaucratic strait-jacket and is exposed to the caprices, whims, misrule and misleadership of the Stalinist bureaucracy. As a result of such poisonous fairy tales as told by *The Fighting Worker*, those of Browder's victims who, shaken by the defeats, are struggling to break through the Stalinist trance, are prevented from doing so by the R.W.L. to the extent of its influence. In the lines quoted above, the workers in capitalist countries find confirmation of the Stalinists' assertions that Workers Democracy in the Soviet Union is intact. The R.W.L., moreover, conveys the impression, false and deceptive through and through, that if there had ever been the utterly non-Bolshevik, Draconian discipline imposed by Stalin upon the Russian workers, the cords of this discipline suddenly were relaxed. The Russian workers "spontaneously holding factory meetings," started a "movement" which the "frightened" bureaucrats must "keep from getting out of bounds," and which apparently was going in a correct direction but for the bureaucrats who misled it. This fantastic and criminal story arouses false hopes among the workers in capitalist countries and dims their mental eye.

The same article in *The Fighting Worker*, after a few words on the frame-up and executions, asserts:

"This infamous business did not frighten the Russian workers. The latest reports show that money is still being collected for the Spanish workers and that food and clothes are being sent to them."

Instead of exposing the Stalinists, removing their Red mask, the R.W.L. paints a few camouflaging streaks upon the mask. Even *The New York Times* on October 12, 1936, speaks of "food purchased with funds raised by levies on workers throughout the Soviet Union." To present the shrewd move the Stalinists made in collecting a compulsory tax from the Soviet workers

for the international social revolution.'” (John Reed, *The Liberator*, March 1918, p. 21)

This message of two decades ago, temporarily stifled by the bureaucratic distortion of the first proletarian republic, will once more reverberate throughout the downtrodden capitalist society. Leninism is not dead! Thousands, yes, millions will rouse from lethargy and heed its clear, living call, summoning the toilers to the greatest and final class combat in mankind's history. And who knows, Trotsky in time may reject and repudiate his present wretchedly opportunist, anti-workingclass position, stop playing into the hands of the Stalinist reaction, sever his connection with the contemptible demagogues and swindlers, the Cannons, Shachtmans and Felix Morrows, to become again one of the leaders in the preparation for the World October.

The luring mirages created by the opportunists will dissipate. The trappings of deception, inevitable in a class society torn by conflicting political and economic interests, will be ripped away. The workers will overcome the temporary confusion and torpor. Undaunted by the hardships history has imposed upon them, while sorrowing for the terrific losses of the recent and the distant past, they will bestir themselves and unflinchingly face the task of the hour. Their revolutionary spirit evoked, clearly and firmly grasping the gravity of the moment, they will act to determine the course of history.

These are gloomy days for the international proletariat, for all the exploited and oppressed. But different days are coming. Those will not be the days of wholesale Fascist butcheries, Stalin's plots, treacheries and firing squads, and petty-bourgeois impotent gibberish about “democracy” and “peace.” Those will be the days of the rebirth of revolutionary Marxism.

Under the pressure of events and relentless exposure by true followers of Marx and Lenin, the dark flood of the Stalinist reaction will recede. The skies will brighten. A new era will dawn upon the world and will regenerate hope, courage and enthusiasm in the hearts of the misled and betrayed masses. The skies will brighten and in the blaze of revolutionary glory, the great historical class, freed from the trammels of opportunism, guided once more by Marxism-Leninism, will resume the interrupted onward march. The volcanic revolutionary energies within the capitalist society will inevitably surge forth again. As in the days of Marx, as in the days of Lenin, the ruling classes

will tremble at the prospect of a Communist Revolution. Today, as ever, the toilers have nothing to lose but their chains. Out of the fire of Marxist understanding of objective reality will burst the mighty Red conflagration which will forever destroy oppression, exploitation and misery. Tomorrow's sun belongs to the working class. The Fourth International will yet lead the armies of the proletariat and all the oppressed in a fight to an end against the international bourgeoisie, against all open and concealed agents of capitalist slavery—towards the establishment of the *undistorted* world dictatorship of the proletariat, towards the Communist Society.

LONG LIVE THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL!

THE ROAD

By **GEORGE MARLEN**

*A Mighty Blow Against
International Imperialism*

*A Powerful Weapon in the
Defence of the Soviet Union*

623 pp. \$1.

Order from
P. O. BOX 67 STATION D,
NEW YORK