

THE RED FLAG

ORGAN OF THE MARXIST LEAGUE

No. 3 (New Series).

SEPTEMBER, 1936.

PRICE ONE PENNY

SPAIN AND THE SOVIET TRIAL

Two events of major importance fill our pages this month—the struggle in Spain and the Stalin police drive against critics and oppositionists in the U.S.S.R. These two events are closely related: the extermination of the Bolshevik 'Old Guard' goes alongside the wiping out of all traces of Bolshevik policy in Spain as elsewhere. The volleys of Stalin's firing squads aimed not only at the bodies of old revolutionaries, but at the very heart of the world revolutionary struggle for workers' power.

For while the Republican Government reveals its impotence to resist the onslaught of the Militarist reaction, the Communist International pledges itself and its followers in advance to support a Government which seeks to maintain capitalist property and capitalist exploitation!

"In a country like Spain . . . the working class and all the people have the immediate and urgent task, the only possible task—and all the recent appeals of the Communist Party repeat it and approve it—not to bring about the Socialist Revolution, but to defend, consolidate and develop the bourgeois democratic revolution." So says Andre Marty, French Communist Leader. "The struggle in Spain is for the maintenance of democracy and free constitution . . ." explains Pollitt.

Which Class?

The Communist Parties are entitled to expound this point of view. But it has nothing in common with Bolshevism: indeed, it is the viewpoint of the Spanish Right Socialists. It has appeared before in the Russian Revolution, when the Mensheviks advocated the establishment of democracy and the gradual building within democracy of the Socialist organisations and vote.

Perhaps Pollitt will explain which class is to rule the 'democratic republic,' which class is to carry through the tasks of the democratic revolution, the abolition of feudalism and so on? The class which, in the older capitalist countries, in the days of capitalist expansion, carried through the "bourgeois democratic revolution" and the abolition of feudalism was the rising capitalist and middle classes. In Spain the capitalist class is too weak to rule by itself and to destroy feudal aristocracy. Spanish industry is small; there is considerable foreign capital; the greater part of the industrial class is tied by economic and social threads to the interests of the feudal lords. The tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution can be accomplished in Spain only under the government of the workers and peasants. The carrying out of these tasks will inevitably force the expropriation of the capitalist class as well as the beginnings of Socialist measures.

Power to the Workers and Peasants!

As we see the present struggle, the workers and peasants are fighting reaction side by side with what remains of the Government forces. The defeat of reaction, however, will be complete and final only to the extent to which the workers' army and organisations extend and maintain their control. It is the armed workers who, with unequalled courage and tenacity, have

provided the will and the men to resist the onslaught of reaction. It is the armed workers who are running the industries, transport and the day-to-day life and government in the areas occupied. It can only be the workers and peasants who will carry through the liberation of the Spanish people from the yoke of feudalism and capitalism.

The direction of the war and the life of the country is mainly in the hands of workers' committees, of Soviets. These committees are vitally necessary at the present stage in order to unite for action the various working class sections, the Anarchists, the Socialists and the Communists. It is inevitable that these committees should assume a greater and greater part in the control of the armed forces and of the country. The workers look increasingly to them for direction and away from the weak, impotent Republican Government. In the combination of the workers' organisations, in the creation of workers' and peasants' committees gaining increasing support and confidence from the mass of the people and in the correct carrying through of the struggle against reaction lies the hope not only of the Spanish, but also of the world's workers.

Our duty is clear: to give every aid and support to the Spanish workers in their struggle. Through our trade unions, labour parties and co-operatives we must press for the mobilisation of all the power of the organised workers to send money and foodstuffs, to prevent the sending of equipment and arms to the Militarists by industrial and political action, to expose the press lies, and to secure the sending of every kind of aid to the Spanish workers. The slogan of neutrality must be denounced as a means of covering aid to the Militarists and of preventing assistance being sent to the Spanish workers.

More than this: we must explain to the British workers the issues of the struggle, its vital importance to the world's workers, to the cause of workers' power and expose those who seek to win support, not for the cause of the workers, but for deceptive, lying capitalist-dominated Liberalism which opens the path for the victory of reaction.

"Provocative Slogans."

Which brings us back to the Stalin repressions and misrepresentations. In its virulent abuse of "Trotskyism"—by which the C.P. seems to mean any policy it itself advocates the day before yesterday—the *Daily Worker* has referred to the "provocative" slogans of the Trotskyists in Spain as evidence of the connections between the Trotskyists and the Fascists.

If this reference be to the Party of Marxist Unity (P.O.U.M.) let us first inform the *Daily Worker* that this Party is a coalition, as its name suggests, of Left Socialists, former leading Catalan Communists, and of "Trotskyists." This Party was first in the fray in Barcelona and several of its leading members as well as scores of its rank-and-file have been killed in battle. Its policy differs from that of the Communist Party, in that it is not advocating the retention in power of a Liberal Government which will betray the workers, but the extension of the already considerable workers' power as

a necessary means of finally crushing reaction and liberating the Spanish workers and peasants. To disagree with this is one thing. To attempt to connect these revolutionaries with Fascists is contemptible. It is incredible that Communists should sink to such a level: the regime of Stalin has, indeed, reduced the leaders of the Communist Parties to pitiful toadies.

Neutrality and Russia.

"Neutrality," declares Pollitt, "is treason." But the Soviet Government appears ready and willing to agree to remain neutral. This fact is used by the reactionary Labour leaders to justify their own support of the neutrality swindle. Yet the *Daily Worker* and Harry Pollitt continue their campaign against those who favour neutrality without once attempting to explain their attitude to the neutrality of the U.S.S.R.

In the early stages of the Spanish struggle the Russian workers organised a great solidarity campaign of demonstrations and collections on behalf of the Spanish workers. Did these demonstrations go further than the ruling group in Russia intended and demand that the Soviet Government send aid to the Spanish workers? The "Trial" of the Oppositionists has been in preparation for a long time, but the fact remains that its being staged at this time has given the Stalin clique a justification for driving from the Soviets, from the Party and from the Red Army, not only former oppositionists and critics, but those who were active in campaigning for aid from the Soviet Government to the Spanish workers.

For the work carried out by the British Communist Party rank-and-file on behalf of the Spanish struggle we have nothing but admiration. But we ask them to consider whether the policies and practices of the Comintern are not destroying the meaning and spirit of that work, perverting it to ends far removed from those for which the Spanish workers are dying, and for which the Russian Bolsheviks fought in 1917.

Compel Labour Leaders to Act.

For nearly six weeks the Spanish workers and peasants have worked, fought and died in the cause of world labour. They give their lives gladly for their class. But British Labour has done nothing, beyond raising a pitifully small fund, and sending deputations to fawn on the Foreign Office. This inactivity is shameful, a standing reproach to the whole movement.

Every Trade Union, Co-operative and Socialist worker should join in the effort to compel real solidarity action in support of the Spanish workers: trade union action to prevent supplies to the Rebels and to countries supplying the Rebels, to secure supplies for the Spanish workers and to stop the press lies: Co-operative Society action to send foodstuffs and a nation-wide campaign by all sections to raise money and to arouse the active sympathy and support of the whole working class. To secure such action all sections of the movement can be and should be united.

THE LESSON OF SPAIN

THE OFFICER CORPS: THE ROLE OF THE POPULAR FRONT:
THE WORKERS' REVOLUTION

—BY LEON TROTSKY—

Europe has become a dreadful and terribly harsh school for the proletariat. In one country after another events develop which demand of the workers great sacrifices in blood, but which, up to now, have ended in the victory of the enemies of the proletariat (Italy, Germany, Austria). The policy of the old workers parties demonstrates how **impotent** they are to lead the proletariat, how **impotent** to prepare the victory.

The present civil war in Spain, as these lines are written, is not yet over. The workers of the whole world feverishly await the news of the Spanish proletariat. If that victory, which we firmly hope for, is obtained, it will be necessary to say: the workers have conquered this time in spite of the fact that their leadership has done everything to prepare defeat. All the more honour and glory to the Spanish workers!

Socialists and Communists belong in Spain to the Popular Front, which has already once betrayed the revolution, but thanks to the workers and peasants again obtained, in February, a victory and created a "republican" Government. Six months after that the "republican" army commenced a campaign against the people. It thus appears that the Government of the Popular Front maintained with the money of the people the officer caste, furnished it with authority, with power, with arms, gave it command of the young workers and peasants, and all that in order to make easier for it, the preparation of the crushing of the workers and peasants.

Civil War Tasks.

Yet more: even now at the moment of civil war, the Government of the Popular Front does all it can to make the victory more difficult. A civil war is conducted, as one knows, not only by military, but also by political, methods. In a purely military sense the Spanish revolution is still weaker than the enemy. Its power lies in being able to raise great masses to their feet. It can even draw the army away from the reactionary officers; for that it is only necessary earnestly and boldly to put forward the programme of the socialist revolution.

It is necessary to proclaim that the land, the workshops, the factories from now on pass from the capitalists to the people. It is necessary in deeds to pass to the realisation of this programme in the regions where power is in the hands of the workers. The Fascist army would not be able to withstand the influence of such a programme for twenty-four hours: the soldiers would tie their officers hand and foot and turn them over to the nearest headquarters of the workers' militia. But the bourgeois ministers cannot accept such a programme. Holding back the social revolution, they force the workers and peasants to shed ten times more blood in the civil war. To crown all, these

gentlemen hope to disarm the workers again after the victory and to demand from them respect for the sacred laws of private property. Such is the true substance of the policy of the Popular Front. All the rest is phrases and lies.

Many partisans of the Popular Front now shake their heads in a reproachful manner at the governors of Madrid: "How is it they didn't foresee that? Why didn't they bring about the purification of the army in time? Why didn't they take the necessary measures?" There are many such critics, especially in France, where, moreover, the policy of the heads of the Popular Front is in absolutely no way different from the policy of their Spanish colleagues. In spite of the harsh lesson of Spain, one can say in advance that the Government of Leon Blum will undertake no serious purging of the army. Why? Because the workers' organisations find themselves in coalition with the radicals, and consequently, are prisoners of the bourgeoisie.

Alliances.

It is naive to complain that the Spanish republicans or socialists, or communists, not having forseen anything, have allowed certain things to go by. It is not a question of the perspicacity of such and such a leader or minister, but of the general direction of policy. The workers' party which enters into an alliance with the radical bourgeoisie, renounces thereby even the struggle against capitalist militarism.

Bourgeois domination, that is to say the conservation of private property, the methods of production, is inconceivable without the support of the exploiters by the armed forces. The officer corps represents the bodyguard of capital. Without that bodyguard the bourgeoisie would not maintain itself even for a day. The selection of individuals, their development and education, makes of the officers, as a whole, an irreconcilable enemy of socialism. Isolated exceptions alter nothing. The matter presents itself thus in all bourgeois countries. The danger lies, not in military brawlers and demagogues, who appear openly as Fascists; incomparably more menacing is the fact that all the officer corps, at the approach of the proletarian revolution, becomes the executioner of the proletariat. To eliminate 400 or 500 reactionary agitators from the army signifies, at bottom, to leave everything as in the past. The officer corps, in which are concentrated the time-honoured traditions of the enslavement of the people, must be dissolved, broken, shattered in its entirety and without pause. It is necessary to replace the army of the barrack, commanded by the officer caste, by the **popular militia**, that is to say by the democratic organisation of the armed workers and peasants. There is no other solution. But such an army is incompatible with the domination of the exploiters, great and small. Will the republicans be agreeable to

such a measure? Never. The Government of the Popular Front, that is: the government of the coalition of the workers with the bourgeoisie, is by its very essence the government of capitulation to the bureaucracy and the officers. Such is the great lesson of the Spanish events, now paid for in thousands of human lives.

The political alliance of the workers' leaders with the bourgeoisie masks itself in the defence of the "Republic." The experience of Spain shows what that defence is in reality. The word "republican," just as the word "democrat," is a conscious charlatanism, which serves to cloak the class contradictions. The bourgeoisie is republican, so long as the Republic protects private property. And the workers utilise the Republic to overthrow private property. In other words: the Republic loses all value for the bourgeoisie at the moment when it begins to have value in the eyes of the workers. The radicals cannot enter into a *bloc* with the workers' parties, without assuring themselves of a support in the person of the officer corps. It is not for nothing that Daladier is found to be head of the War Ministry in France. The French bourgeoisie has already entrusted that post to him more than once, and he has never betrayed them. Daladier is no more capable of purging the army of Fascists and reactionaries, in other words, of breaking up the officer corps, than persons of the type of Maurice Paz or Marceau Pivert. Yet no one takes them seriously.

The Army and Hitler.

But here an exclamation interrupts us: "How can one dissolve the officer corps? For that signifies to destroy the army and leave the country disarmed in the face of Fascism. Hitler and Mussolini are only waiting for that!" All those arguments have been well known for a long time. Thus argued the Cadets, the Social-Revolutionaries and the Russian Mensheviks in 1917. Thus argued the leaders of the Spanish Popular Front. The Spanish workers half believed these arguments, as long as they were not convinced by experience that the nearest Fascist enemy was to be found in the Spanish army. It is not for nothing that our old friend, Karl Liebknecht, taught: "The principal enemy is in our own country!"

L'Humanite pleads tearfully for the purging of the Fascists from the army. But what a price for that supplication! To vote credits for the maintenance of the officer corps, to enter into an alliance with Daladier, and through him, with finance capital, to entrust the army to Daladier—and at the same time to demand that that thoroughly capitalist army serve the "people" and not capital—signifies either a lapse into complete idiocy, or a conscious deception of the working masses.

"But we cannot remain without an army," repeat the Socialist and Communist leaders, "for we must defend our democracy and, with it, the Soviet Union against Hitler!" After the lesson of Spain, it is not difficult to foresee the consequences of that policy, as much for democracy as for the Soviet Union. Having chosen the opportune moment, the officer corps, hand in hand with the

liquidated Fascist Leagues, will pass to the offensive against the working masses and, if victory is theirs, will crush the miserable remains of bourgeois democracy and offer their hand to Hitler for a common struggle against the U.S.S.R.

It is impossible to read without anger and without deep disgust, the articles in *Peuple* and *L'Humanite* on the Spanish events. These gentry learn nothing. They do not want to learn anything. They consciously close their eyes to facts. For them, the principal lesson is that it is necessary at all costs to maintain the "unity" of the Popular Front, that is to say unity with the bourgeoisie, friendship with Daladier.

Assuredly, Daladier is a great "democrat." But can one even for a moment doubt that, aside from the official work in the Blum Ministry, he carries on considerable unofficial work in the General Staff, among the officer corps. There, there are serious people, who know how to face facts, and don't make themselves drunk with empty rhetoric like Blum. There, they prepare for all surprises. Without doubt, Daladier plans with the military chiefs in regard to the necessary measures in the event of the workers showing a revolutionary activity. The generals, assuredly, willingly go to meet Daladier. And among themselves, the generals say: "We will support Daladier, as long as we have not got the better of the workers, and then we will get a stronger master." Meanwhile, the Socialist and Communist leaders repeat day by day: "Our friend, Daladier." The worker must reply to them: "Tell me who your friend is, and I will tell you who you are!" People who entrust the army to the old agent of capital, Daladier, are unworthy of the workers' confidence.

Certainly, the Spanish proletariat, as the French, do not wish to be disarmed in face of Hitler or Mussolini. But in order to defend themselves against them, it is necessary to crush the enemy in their own country. Impossible to overthrow the bourgeoisie, without smashing the officer corps. Impossible to smash the officer corps without overthrowing the bourgeoisie. In every victorious counter-revolution, the officers have played the decisive rôle. Every victorious revolution, if it has had a profound social character, has destroyed the old officer corps. Thus acted the Great French Revolution at the end of the Eighteenth century. Thus acted the October Revolution in 1917. To determine on such a measure, one must stop falling on one's knees before the Radical bourgeoisie. It is necessary to create the true alliance of the workers and peasants against the bourgeoisie, among them the Radical bourgeoisie. It is necessary to have confidence in the power, the initiative, the courage of the proletariat. They will know how to bring over the soldiers. That will be the true, not the adulterated, alliance of the workers, the peasants and the soldiers. Such an alliance is being created and tempered now in the fire of civil war in Spain. The victory of the people signifies the end of the Popular Front and the beginning of Soviet Spain. For the Fascist executioners of Italy and Germany it will be incomparably more terrible than all the diplomatic pacts and all the military alliances.

July 30th, 1936.

STATEMENT BY LEON TROTSKY IN REPLY TO THE CHARGES MADE AGAINST HIM by the "TASS" AGENCY

(NOTE.—A fuller statement on the Trial and the charges against Leon Trotsky will be published in the October "Red Flag.")

At the moment when I am preparing this statement, I have not had available the original text of the sensational TASS report. I am familiar with it only through a secondary source. But the main features of it, which have been transmitted to me, are sufficient to brand this report immediately as one of the greatest falsifications in the history of politics.

The TASS Agency speaks of a conspiracy of the so-called Trotsky-Zinoviev group. The ruling bureaucracy calls every criticism directed against it a "conspiracy." I assume that criticism is spreading to wider and wider circles in the Soviet Union. This phenomenon I can only greet with joy. It is quite possible that many and quite diverse elements who represent this critical feeling have referred to my name, *i.e.*, to my ideas and my writings. But the TASS report also declares that the charges are concerned with a terrorist plot against the leaders of the regime, and that this conspiracy is directed by me from Norway.

I herewith declare that this contention does not contain an iota of truth. To everyone who is acquainted with recent political history, it is indubitable that the report circulated by TASS stands in sharpest contra-

ALL Readers of "The Red Flag" are urged to support the request made by Leon Trotsky for an enquiry by a Committee representative of World Labour into the recent trial of Oppositionists in Moscow and into the charges made against L. Trotsky. Resolutions should be sent to the Norwegian Government protesting against the attempt to intern Trotsky and to deprive him of the means of replying to the slanders and charges now being circulated by the Soviet Government. Resolutions urging the setting up of a Workers' Commission of Enquiry by the Labour Movement should also be sent immediately to the National Executive of the Labour Party and the General Council of the T.U.C.

In our next number we shall deal fully with the recent Trial and the repression of the oppositions in the U.S.S.R.

dition to my ideas, and to my entire activity, which, at the present time, is devoted exclusively to writing.

Ever since my entry into the revolutionary movement in 1897, I

have been, as have all Russian Marxists, an uncompromising opponent of individual terror as a method of struggle, a method which in the final analysis can only serve the interests of absolutism and bonapartism.

I emphatically assert that since I have been in Norway I have had no connections with the Soviet Union—nor have I received a single letter from the Soviet Union, neither have I written a single letter to anybody there either directly or through other persons.

My sole activity in connection with the Soviet Union has been restricted to the writing of articles, which were published in the world press, and to a book which will be

who has had no political connections whatsoever.

Because I am a man without a country and am now utilising the right of asylum in Norway, I believe that the accuracy of the contention that has been advanced that I have directed a terrorist conspiracy from Norway can be best determined by the appointment of a competent Government commission, which would investigate the charges contained in the documents. On my part, I am prepared to furnish such a commission a full accounting of my activities in Norway—day by day, and hour by hour. It is also my opinion that this measure could be made more complete by the nomination of an impartial international commission by the Labour organisations of the entire world, or better still, of its international leaders, to investigate the charges made in the Soviet Union. This commission could make public a report of their investigation. I maintain that their report would expose the charges in all their falsity. I am also prepared to accept any other method of investigation that would give public opinion a better explanation of the principal motives which have prompted the charges against the others and myself. In this matter I have nothing to fear and nothing to hide. As for myself, I am only concerned with establishing the truth.

LEON TROTSKY.

Kristiansand,

August 15th, 1936.

FASCISTS AND STALINISTS HOUND LEON TROTSKY

The working class may not always know who are its friends and who its enemies, but the capitalist class of the entire world recognise, in Leon Trotsky, an irreconcilable foe. As a result of the combined attacks of German and French Fascists, he was expelled from France in June of last year, finding temporary refuge in Norway, where a Labour Govern-

ment was in power. To-day, this same Labour Government, in response to pressure from the Stalinists and the German and Norwegian Fascists, throws Trotsky into prison.

A review of the events leading up to the imprisonment of Leon Trotsky will serve to show how much truth there is in the slanders circulated

against him by the enemies of the workers.

On August 5th, Comrade Trotsky left his place of exile for a short holiday. On the same night the house was raided by Norwegian Fascists, masquerading as police officers; the object of this raid being to steal "incriminating" documents. Owing to the presence of mind of a member of the household the Fascists were frustrated, their identity discovered, and they were arrested. However, instead of the Fascists finding themselves in the dock, an investigation into the activities of Comrade Trotsky was instituted at the instigation of the Fascists, who demanded his expulsion from Norway. The Norwegian Fascists admitted in court that they had been working in close collaboration with the German Gestapo. The bourgeois press of Norway supported the campaign of the Fascists and daily filled their papers with attacks upon Trotsky.

The Norwegian Fascists daily paper, *Fritt Folk*, in the issue of August 14th, defended the Stalinists against the revolutionaries, splashing the following headline: "Trotsky has used Honefoss as a base for large-scale agitation for the overthrow of Stalin." A sub-headline reads: "Dangerous letters from Trotsky are being printed in Russian in Paris and smuggled into the Soviet Union." It is clear that what Fascists regard as "dangerous" is the revolutionary teaching of Marxism.

By a curious coincidence, TASS, the official news agency of the Stalinists, sent out a statement on the night of August 14th, charging Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, etc.,

with undertaking terrorist activities against Stalin. Let every intelligent worker ask himself whence springs this unity of thought between the German and Norwegian Fascists, the Conservative bourgeoisie, and the Stalinists. Who are the terrorists and who the revolutionaries?

The attitude of the reactionary press of this country to the "Moscow Trials" clearly demonstrates the hatred of the bourgeoisie for those "old Bolsheviks" who played such a great part in carrying through the Revolution of 1917, and shows also that the capitalist class rightly see in these events a retreat from Bolshevism. They will not rest content until Leon Trotsky falls to the assassin's bullet or a firing squad of the Fascists or Stalinists. It is necessary to understand once and for all that Leon Trotsky and the "Trotskyists," slandered and reviled alike by the capitalist class and the Stalinists, stand for the overthrow of capitalism and the rule of the workers throughout the world. It is the duty of every worker to rally to the defence of Leon Trotsky.

H. DEWAR.

THANKS!

The attempted frame-up of Leon Trotsky has brought us a number of new donors. Stewart Purkis posted us £1 on August 25th and to date we have received the following:

H.W. .. 2/6	'Dave' 12/-
T.F. .. 10/-	C.P.'er £1
'Tom' .. 2/6	F.W. .. 10/-
W.N. .. 10/-	S.D. .. £1
I.March 10/-	J.W. .. £1
H.D. .. 2/6	

Total to August 25th, £6-19-6



"Serves you right, you dirty counter-revolutionist!"

(With apologies to "Americana")

Notes on the History of Bolshevism.

3.—A Betrayed Revolution.

Under the aegis of the October Revolution, a revolutionary movement developed in Finland on a vast scale. The movement was supported, in both a political and military sense, by the Bolsheviks. On the 18th December, 1917, the Soviet Council of People's Commissars—in its resolution recognising the Independence of Finland, and the full separation of the Finnish Republic from Russia—gave an unexampled lesson to the world of the right of subject nationalities to self-determination.

Despite the enormous revolutionary asset represented in this proletarian solution of the national question, despite direct military assistance, the Finnish proletariat was defeated. In the early days of the Communist International, that defeated revolution served the young Communist parties as an object lesson against trusting the leadership of revolution to a vacillating left social democracy steeped in democratic prejudices.

This estimate of the defeat of the Finnish proletariat has, in recent years, been subjected to drastic revision. Taking the 1924 afterthoughts of Kusenin as his cue, Ralph Fox writes:—

"In Finland, a counter-revolution started, the Germans sent a couple of divisions to support it, and Finland was lost, its Workers' Government constitutionally elected, drowned in blood. It was the price of Trotsky's policy."

If these words mean anything, they mean that the Finnish revolution was sacrificed under the terms of Brest Litovsk. This slander is not new. It was hurled at Lenin in February and March, 1918, by Mensheviks and Social-revolutionaries. But it is new that Communists should be ready to repeat their lies. Lenin, speaking on March 7th, 1918, for the ratification of the peace terms, said:—

"The Treaty orders us to withdraw the troops from Finland—incidentally, these troops are good for nothing—but we are not forbidden to export arms to Finland. The talk that we have betrayed Finland is the most childish phrase. We did not betray either Finland or Ukraine. We help them in whatever way we can. In this not a single class-conscious worker will blame us. We have not withdrawn and will not withdraw a single good soldier from amongst our troops."

An Expert's Evidence on the Defeated Revolution.

Kusenin—who has distinguished himself by his retention of a seat in the Presidium of the C.I. since 1923—in his pamphlet "The Finnish Revolution" (it is borne in mind that this was written in 1919) related the stages through which the movement in Finland passed. Describing the November movement—which was the apex of the revolution—he wrote:—

"The general strike spread throughout the country. Our Central Revolutionary Council discussed the question of going further. We . . . did not wish to do so . . . Our social democratic point of view was: one peaceful continuous but not revolutionary class war . . . We did not believe in revolution; we did not trust it, nor did we call for it . . . In November, however, we determined to avoid the revolutionary struggle, partly in order to protect our democratic conquests, partly because we hoped to weather the storm by parliamentary means . . . We prevented the formation of those eddies by countermanding the general strike at the end of the week and by referring back a decision as to revolution to the Party Congress. This caused discontent and even exasperation amongst the working masses . . . Confidence in the Party leaders was, to a great extent, lost."

The root cause of this conservatism in the leadership is explained as follows:—

"The relative feebleness of the Finnish bourgeoisie, its inability to carry on a parliamentary struggle, and the fact that it had no armed forces, were so many factors which we social democrats were predestined to suffer from democratic illusion; inasmuch as we wished to reach Socialism by means of a struggle in the Diet and by democratic representation of the people."

Of the January struggle—which came at the ebb of the movement, when the Finnish bourgeoisie provoked the workers into an open struggle for class supremacy—Kusenin says:—

"The Finnish working class party did its duty by going into battle; it drew up its forces for the struggle but it was for a defensive struggle not for a definite

CONTINUED AT FOOT OF NEXT COLUMN.

TESTAMENT OF LENIN—"REMOVE STALIN"

Editor's Note: For the light it throws on Lenin's attitude to Stalin as well as for its historical interest we republish the letter, known as "Lenin's Testament," written by Lenin on the eve of his last illness. It belongs to a period in which Lenin was engaged in preparing to wage open struggle against the bureaucratic and reactionary tendencies increasingly shown by Stalin. The Lenin letters and documents of this period will not be found in the C.P.G.B.'s "collected works of Lenin."

"By the stability of the Central Committee, of which I spoke before, I mean measures to prevent a split, so far as such measures can be taken. For, of course, the White Guard in *Russkaya Mysl* (I think it was S. E. Oldenburgh) was right when, in the first place, in his play against Soviet Russia he banked on the hope of a split in our party, and when, in the second place, he banked for that split on serious disagreements in our party.

"Our party rests upon two classes, and for that reason its instability is possible, and if there cannot exist an agreement between those classes, its fall is inevitable. In such an event it would be useless to take any measures or in general to discuss the stability of our Central Committee. In such an event, no measures would prove capable of preventing a split. But I trust that is too remote a future, and too improbable an event, to talk about.

"I have in mind, stability as a guarantee against a split in the near future, and I intend to examine here a series of considerations of a purely personal character.

"I think that the fundamental factor in the matter of stability—from this point of view—is such members of the Central Committee as Stalin and Trotsky. The relation between them constitutes, in my opinion, a big half of the danger of that split, which might be avoided, and the avoidance of which might be promoted, in my opinion, by raising the number of members of the Central Committee to fifty or one hundred.

"Comrade Stalin, having become General Secretary, has concentrated an enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure that he always knows how to use that power with sufficient caution. On the other hand, Comrade Trotsky, as was proved by his struggle against the Central Committee in connection with the People Commissariat of Ways of Communication, is distinguished, not only by his exceptional abilities—personally he is, to be sure, the most able man in the

CONTINUED FROM COLUMN 1.

revolutionary fight . . . We talked at the same time of democracy and the democratic State, which meant, if anything, that revolution was perforce the very thing to be avoided. Thus in reality, the standard of the Revolution was raised—so that Revolution might be avoided."

This account of the Finnish Revolution was withdrawn from circulation when the campaign against Trotsky opened in 1924. Then Kusenin—citing as his new evidence some odd memoirs of the German Generals—decided to recast his analysis of the causes for the defeat of the Finnish proletariat, henceforth, for him, the main cause of the defeat was the entry of the two divisions of German soldiers into Finland in March. In this connection it is worthy of notice at this same time the German Army entered the Ukraine. There is in Junker memoirs, no little evidence to the fact that the German troops learnt their political A.B.C. in Ukraine, and carried the "contagion of Bolshevism" throughout the organism of the German Army. But it is also to be noted that in Ukraine, a revolutionary party was at work, with leaders whose efforts were directed, not to the desperate curbing of the initiative of the masses, but to unleashing the forces of revolution.

HARRY WICKS.

THE DEPORTATION OF MRS. MUHSAM.

In the *Manchester Guardian*, July 20th, a letter appeared over the signature of Gore Graham, protesting at the publication by the Editor of some previous correspondence. "Sir,"—said Mr. Graham—"I am sorry to notice in your columns letters by opponents of the Soviet Union, containing innuendoes, sinister suggestions, and stories based on material from unspecified sources. I refer particularly to the recent letters (on the alleged arrest of the widow of Erich Muhsam in the Soviet Union) . . ."

As Mr. Graham has been associated with the C.P.G.B. for some years, and as his articles appear frequently in the press of the Third International, the above passages in his letter would naturally lead one to suppose that he was fully informed of the facts of the case of the widow Muhsam. More especially when he goes on to say that "Facts can be answered by facts." Unfortunately, he adds the word "sometimes" for some obscure reason. But why he should say "Facts can be answered by facts sometimes," will become more apparent later.

The real problem to Mr. Graham, however, is not the facts . . . but how to deal with dark insinuations is difficult to determine. Quite true. At this stage one naturally expects that Mr. Graham will furnish the real details of the case, but strangely enough, he then passes on to another case. So all that Mr. Graham has done in the matter in the relevant points quoted above is to make the innuendo, by means of a sinister suggestion in the use of the word "alleged," that it is a dark insinuation to speak of the arrest of the widow of Erich Muhsam, and that the story has no basis in any material of a specified source.

Poor Comrade Graham! On the very day his letter appeared in the *Manchester Guardian*, i.e. July 20th, a short article likewise appeared in the *Daily Worker*, straight from Moscow, mark you, from "Our own Correspondent" too, explaining that "the Soviet Authorities, in duty bound, arrested Mrs. Muhsam in order to prevent harm to the Soviet State"!

So now we know why Gore Graham used the expression "Facts can be answered by facts sometimes"! Let it pass.

However, now that the *Daily Worker* makes its violent attack upon this woman, Gore Graham's letter is fully exposed as a wretched piece of lying.

Erich Muhsam was murdered by Fascists in Germany, his widow sought the asylum of the Soviet Union. Now it appears that she has not only been arrested, but has been deported from the territory of the U.S.S.R. "because the right of asylum in the Socialist State was misused by her."

What was her crime? Well, it is not clear. "The fact is that Mrs. Muhsam's stay in the Soviet Union was used by the Soviet's enemies, hiding behind her and using her for the purpose of making connections in the interest of counter-revolutionary Trotskyist elements." That is the explanation given by the *Daily Worker*. Not very convincing is it? At the most it would seem to suggest that she handled some correspondence. For this, then, she has had to undergo arrest and deportation. So "she was expelled as plotters' catspaw."

If one protests against this, it will prove you "hate the Socialist State," because "the whole world knows that the people who tried," only "tried" notice, "tried to use Mrs. Muhsam are the worst enemies of Socialism." The whole world knows, mark you!

"Hypocritical cries," says the *Daily Worker*, "about apparent injustice to a woman who, on the basis of the tragic fate of her husband, has the right to special sympathy, will have little influence on those who understand that the Socialist State must protect itself from the demagogic intrigues of its enemies."

It is incredible that such arguments can appear in an "alleged" Communist daily. Surely if the present government of the Soviet Union is so scared of one poor little widow, it must be in a sorry plight. How big is the Socialist State? They tell us one-sixth of the earth's surface. Yet they have had to turn out Erich Muhsam's widow as a dangerous counter-revolutionary. There's "revolutionary élan" for you!

HENRY SARA.

present Central Committee; but also by his too far-reaching self-confidence and a disposition to be too much attracted by the purely administrative side of affairs.

"These two qualities of the two most able leaders of the present Central Committee might, quite innocently, lead to a split; if our party does not take measures to prevent it, a split might arise unexpectedly.

"I will not further characterise the other members of the Central Committee as to their personal qualities. I will only remind you that the October episode of Zinoviev and Kamenev was not, of course, accidental, but that it ought as little to be used against them personally as the non-Bolshevism of Trotsky.

"Of the younger members of the Central Committee, I want to say a few words about Bukharin and Piatakov. They are, in my opinion, the most able forces (amongst the youngest), and in regard to them it is necessary to bear in mind the following: Bukharin is not only the most valuable and biggest theoretician of the party, but also may legitimately be considered the favourite of the whole party; but his theoretical views can only with the very greatest doubt be regarded as fully Marxist, for there is something scholastic in him (he has never learned, and I think never has fully understood, the dialectic).

"And then Piatakov—a man undoubtedly distinguished in will and ability, but too much given over to administration and the administrative side of things to be relied on in a serious political question.

"Of course, both these remarks are made by me merely with a view to the present time, or supposing that these two able and loyal workers may not find an occasion to supplement their knowledge and correct their one-sidedness.

"December 25th, 1922.

"Postscript: Stalin is too rude, and this fault, entirely supportable in relations among us Communists, becomes insupportable in the office of General Secretary. Therefore, I propose to the comrades to find a way to remove Stalin from that position and appoint to it another man who, in all respects, differs from Stalin only in superiority—namely, more patient, more loyal, more polite and more attentive to comrades, less capricious, etc. This circumstance may seem an insignificant trifle, but I think that from the point of view of preventing a split and from the point of view of relation between Stalin and Trotsky which I discussed above, it is not a trifle, or it is such a trifle as may acquire a decisive significance.

"LENIN.

"January 4th, 1923."

A few Copies left of
TROTSKY'S ARTICLE on
"THE STALIN-ROY HOWARD
INTERVIEW"
Post free 2d.