

WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL NEWS

VOL.1 NO.8

AUGUST 1938

TWOPENCE

COMRADE KLEMENT KIDNAPPED

PARIS, July 18.—Rudolph Klement, secretary of the Bureau of the Fourth International, has been kidnapped from Paris by the G.P.U.

The missing revolutionist was last seen by his comrades at midnight of Tuesday, July 12, when he left an important meeting at which problems of the international movement were being discussed.

Prior to his retirement for the night, he sent a cablegram to the American section of the International—the Socialist Workers Party—informing it of the discussions that had just taken place.

The next afternoon, he was seen collecting his mail, and from that moment on none of his comrades or friends laid eyes on him again in Paris.

STRANGE LETTER.

Friday evening, July 15, one of the leaders of the International Workers Party, the French Trotskyist organization, received a most peculiar letter, or more accurately, a carbon copy of a letter ostensibly sent by Klement to Leon Trotsky in Mexico.

The letter was postmarked July 15 and had been mailed from Perpignan, a French town on the Spanish frontier.

The communication stated, most unexpectedly for all those acquainted with Klement, that he was breaking with the Fourth International, on the grounds that it was impotent, because of its alleged

“objective collaboration with the fascists,” but declared that the undersigned promised not “to make a public exposure” of the Fourth International. In face of these statements, the letter to “Mr. Trotsky” was couched in surprisingly friendly terms.

All the circumstances surrounding the letter, as well as the letter itself, immediately aroused the suspicion and fears of Klement’s comrades in Paris.

NO PREVIOUS SIGN.

Up to the time of his disappearance, Klement had not given the slightest sign of any differences with the organization which he served in such a prominent and responsible capacity. In fact, less than twenty-four hours before he vanished from Paris, he had, as stated above, sent an important cablegram to New York.

The letter, moreover, was typewritten in German, as was also the signature “Rudolph Klement,” which, in turn, was countersigned in ink with Klement’s pen-name—an entirely unprecedented procedure on his part. In addition, the date-line on the letter was typed off as “July 1938”, leaving the actual day—“14”—to be filled in by hand. His comrades immediately concluded that the letter had been typed out in advance by Klement’s kidnapers, and that the date and signature, if actually, in his handwriting were included by him only afterward and under duress.

G.P.U. EARMARKS.

The contents of the letter are drafted in such a style as could only serve the interests of a G.P.U. frame-up.

The hand of the G.P.U. is seen, furthermore, in the fact that the letter was postmarked from the Franco-Spanish frontier, thus indicating that Klement was in all probability being spirited away to Barcelona, Valencia or Madrid by his captors.

As is known, a group of Spanish Fourth Internationalists was recently arrested and imprisoned in Barcelona, and is now awaiting trial on framed-up charges of treason and of intelligence with the fascists. It is believed in Paris that Klement was kidnapped by the G.P.U. for transportation to Spain, in the hope that he would be subjected to such moral and physical tortures as will cause him to sign one of the notorious Stalinist "confessions" and perhaps appear in the coming trial as a "witness" against the Trotskyist defendants.

LONG KIDNAP TRAIL.

Knowledge of the record of the G.P.U. abroad only fortifies this feeling. It is known, for example, that the Stalinist secret service in Spain kidnapped or murdered such well-known radicals as Marc Rein, son of the prominent Menshevik leader, Rafael Abramovich, and known for his sharp criticism of the Stalinist regime in the Scandinavian social democratic press; Erwin Wolfe, former private secretary to Leon Trotsky, who has not been heard of at all since he was snatched by the G.P.U. in Barcelona; and Hans Freund (Moulin), active and prominent figure in the Trotskyist movement throughout the early months of the civil war in Spain.

In addition, Klement's friends in Paris point out, the G.P.U. has been active for some time in France in trailing, kidnapping and even murdering political opponents. Not only are the cases of Generals Kutepov and Mueller recalled, but also the cases of Navashine, former official in the Soviet embassy in Paris, who was shot down in cold blood in the Bois de Boulogne, because he was too well-informed about Stalinist illegal activities in France; the case of Ignace Reiss, former G.P.U. official who broke with the Stalinists and joined the Fourth International, and was subsequently lured to his death by G.P.U. agents in Switzerland; and the more recent case of Leon Sedov, son of Leon Trotsky, who, it was established by Paris police, had his home under constant surveillance by G.P.U. emissaries, who tried to snare him in a trap laid in Strassburg and who, it is generally believed, perpetrated foul play resulting in his strange death after an operation performed upon him.

PORTFOLIO MISSING.

Further significance is attached to the fact that

two weeks before his mysterious disappearance, Klement reported to his comrades the fact that his portfolio, containing important documents, had been stolen by unknown persons who, by the very nature of Klement's work, could have been none other than operatives of the Stalinist intelligence department.

The stealing of the portfolio indicates that the G.P.U. had been trailing Klement for some time and was aware of his residence and his movements.

Rudolph Klement joined the revolutionary movement while still very young and was one of the most devoted and ablest comrades in the Trotskyist movement, with which he was associated from the very beginning of his activity in Hamburg.

WAS LONG ACTIVE.

While Leon Trotsky was in exile in Turkey, Klement served for some time as his private German secretary, and also as translator of many of Trotsky's writings. The young militant also began to develop an independent political and literary activity for which he became well-known in the movement of the Fourth International.

Unable to return to Germany after Hitler seized power, Klement settled in France as a political refugee after Trotsky left Turkey. He then turned his activity to work in the International Secretariat of the Fourth International, devoting all his time and energy to it.

It is not surprising that the G.P.U. turned its sinister attentions to him, knowing the post of importance he occupied in the movement which Stalin is determined to crush even if he must use the foulest methods to accomplish his aim.

PUBLIC WARNED.

Every effort is being made by Klement's comrades in France to ascertain his exact present whereabouts and to delve into the manner in which the kidnapers seized and made off with him.

Meanwhile, the labour public is being warned against the possibility of a frame-up against the Trotskyists in Spain, amalgamated, as is Stalin's custom, with the familiar "fascist elements" and adorned with the usual "confessions." It is known that Stalin needs such a "demonstration trial," not only in Moscow, but right now in Spain, in order to explain away or to cover up the succession of military defeats that have been suffered by the Loyalists as a direct result of the Stalinist policies which now dominate the Valencia-Barcelona government. The numerous Fourth Internationalists, members and leaders of the POUM and of the anarchist movement who are now held in Loyalist dungeons are undoubtedly scheduled to serve as the victim of Stalin's frame-up lust.

The kidnapping of Rudolph Klement can be understood only in the light of this despicable plan.

Learn to Think

by LEON TROTSKY

Certain Professional ultra-left phrase-mongers are attempting at all costs to "correct" the thesis of the Secretariat of the Fourth International on war in accordance with their own ossified prejudices. They especially attack that part of the thesis which states that in all imperialist countries the revolutionary party, while remaining in irreconcilable opposition to its own government in time of war, should, nevertheless, mould its practical politics in each country to the internal situation and to the international groupings, sharply differentiating a workers' state from a bourgeois state, a colonial country from an imperialist country.

The proletariat of a capitalist country which finds itself in an alliance with the U.S.S.R.¹ [states the thesis] must retain fully and completely its irreconcilable *hostility to the imperialist government of its own country*. In this sense its policy will not differ from that of the proletariat in a country fighting against the U.S.S.R. But in the nature of practical actions considerable differences may arise depending on the concrete war situation. (*War and the Fourth International*, p. 21, § 44.)

The ultra-leftists consider this postulate, the correctness of which has been confirmed by the entire course of development, as the starting point of . . . social-patriotism.² Since the attitude toward imperialist governments should be "the same" in all countries, these strategists ban any distinctions beyond the boundaries of their own imperialist country. Theoretically their mistake arises from an attempt to construct fundamentally different bases for war-time and peace-time policies.

¹We can leave aside here the question of the class character of the U.S.S.R. We are interested in the question of policy in relation to a worker's state in general or to a colonial country fighting for its independence. So far as the class nature of the U.S.S.R. is concerned we can incidentally recommend to the ultra-leftists that they gaze upon themselves in the mirror of A. Ciliga's book, *In the Country of the Big Lie*. This ultra-left author, completely lacking any Marxist schooling, pursues his idea to the very end, that is, to liberal-anarchic abstraction.

²Mrs. Simone Weil even writes that our position is the same as Plekhanov's in 1914-1918. Simone Weil, of course, has a right to understand nothing. Yet it is not necessary to abuse this right.

Let us assume that rebellion breaks out to-morrow in the French colony of Algeria under the banner of national independence and that the Italian government, motivated by its own imperialist interests, prepares to send weapons to the rebels? What should the attitude of the Italian workers be in this case? I have purposely taken an example of rebellion against a *democratic* imperialism with intervention on the side of the rebels from a *fascist* imperialism. Should the Italian workers prevent the shipping of arms to the Algerians? Let any ultra-leftists dare answer this question in the affirmative. Every revolutionist, together with the Italian workers and the rebellious Algerians, would spurn such an answer with indignation. Even if a general maritime strike broke out in fascist Italy at the same time, even in this case the strikers should make an exception in favour of those ships carrying aid to the colonial slaves in revolt; otherwise they would be no more than wretched trade unionists—not proletarian revolutionists.

At the same time, the French maritime workers, even though not faced with any strike whatsoever, would be compelled to exert every effort to block the shipment of ammunition intended for use against the rebels. Only such a policy on the part of the Italian and French workers constitutes the policy of revolutionary internationalism.

Does this not signify however, that the Italian workers moderate their struggle in this case against the fascist régime? Not in the slightest. Fascism renders "aid" to the Algerians only in order to weaken its enemy, France, and to lay its rapacious hands on her colonies. The revolutionary Italian workers do not forget this for a single moment. They call upon the Algerians not to trust their treacherous "ally" and at the same time continue their own irreconcilable struggle against fascism, "the main enemy in their own country". Only in this way can they gain the confidence of the rebels, help the rebellion and strengthen their own revolutionary position.

If the above is correct in peace-time, why does it become false in war-time? Everyone knows the postulate of the famous German military theoretician, Clausewitz, that war is the continuation of

politics by other means. This profound thought leads naturally to the conclusion that the struggle against war is but the continuation of the general proletarian struggle during peace-time. Does the proletariat in peace-time reject and sabotage all the acts and measures of the bourgeois government? Even during a strike which embraces an entire city, the workers take measures to insure the delivery of food to their own districts, make sure that they have water, that the hospitals do not suffer, etc. Such measures are dictated not by opportunism in relation to the bourgeoisie but by concern for the interests of the strike itself, by concern for the sympathy of the submerged city masses, etc. These elementary rules of proletarian strategy in peace-time retain full force in time of war as well.

An irreconcilable attitude against bourgeois militarism does not signify at all that the proletariat in all cases enters into a struggle against its own "national" army. At least the workers would not interfere with soldiers who are extinguishing a fire or rescuing drowning people during a flood; on the contrary, they would help side by side with the soldiers and fraternize with them. And the question is not exhausted merely by cases of elemental calamities. If the French fascists should make an attempt to-day at a *coup d'état* and the Daladier government found itself forced to move troops against the fascists, the revolutionary workers, while maintaining their complete political independence, would fight against the fascists alongside of these troops. Thus in a number of cases the workers are forced not only to permit and tolerate, but actively to support the practical measures of the bourgeois government.

In ninety cases out of a hundred the workers actually place a minus sign where the bourgeoisie places a plus sign. In ten cases however they are forced to fix the same sign as the bourgeoisie but with their own seal, in which is expressed their mistrust of the bourgeoisie. The policy of the proletariat is not at all automatically derived from the policy of the bourgeoisie, bearing only the opposite sign—this would make every sectarian a master strategist; no, the revolutionary party must each time orient itself *independently* in the internal as well as the external situation, arriving at those decisions which correspond best to the interests of the proletariat. This rule applies just as much to the war period as to the period of peace.

Let us imagine that in the next European war the Belgian proletariat conquers power sooner than the proletariat of France. Undoubtedly Hitler will try to crush proletarian Belgium. In order to cover up its own flank, the French bourgeois government might find itself compelled to help the Belgian workers' government with arms. The Belgian soviets of course reach for these arms with both hands. But actuated by the principle of defeatism,

perhaps the French workers ought to block their bourgeoisie from shipping arms to proletarian Belgium? Only direct traitors or out-and-out idiots can reason thus.

The French bourgeoisie could send arms to proletarian Belgium only out of fear of the greatest military danger and only in expectation of later crushing the proletarian revolution with their own weapons. To the French workers, on the contrary, proletarian Belgium is the greatest support in the struggle against their own bourgeoisie. The outcome of the struggle would be decided, in the final analysis, by the relationship of forces, into which correct policies enter as a very important factor. The revolutionary party's first task is to utilize the contradiction between two imperialist countries, France and Germany, in order to save proletarian Belgium.

Ultra-left scholastics think not in concrete terms but in empty abstractions. They have transformed the idea of defeatism into such a vacuum. They can see vividly neither the process of war nor the process of revolution. They seek a hermetically sealed formula which excludes fresh air. But a formula of this kind can offer no orientation for the proletarian vanguard.

To carry the class struggle to its highest form—civil war—this is the task of defeatism. But this task can be solved only through the revolutionary mobilization of the masses, that is, by widening, deepening, and sharpening those revolutionary methods which constitute the content of class struggle in "peace"-time. The proletarian party does not resort to artificial methods, such as burning warehouses, setting off bombs, wrecking trains, etc., in order to bring about the defeat of its own government. Even if it were successful on this road, the military defeat would not at all lead to revolutionary success, a success which can be assured only by the independent movement of the proletariat. Revolutionary defeatism signifies only that in its class struggle the proletarian party does not stop at any "patriotic" considerations, since defeat of its own imperialist government, brought about, or hastened by the revolutionary movement of the masses is an incomparably *lesser evil* than victory gained at the price of national unity, that is, the political prostration of the proletariat. Therein lies the complete meaning of defeatism and this meaning is entirely sufficient.

The methods of struggle change, of course, when the struggle enters the openly revolutionary phase. Civil war is a war, and in this aspect has its particular laws. In civil war, bombing of warehouses, wrecking of trains and all other forms of military "sabotage" are inevitable. Their appropriateness is decided by purely military considerations—civil war continues revolutionary politics but by other, precisely, military means.

However during an imperialist war there may be cases where a revolutionary party will be forced to resort to military-technical means, though they do not as yet follow directly from the revolutionary movement in their *own* country. Thus, if it is a question of sending arms or troops against a workers' government or a rebellious colony, not only such methods as boycott and strike, but direct military sabotage may become entirely practical and obligatory. Resorting or not resorting to such measures will be a matter of practical possibilities. If the Belgian workers, conquering power in war-time, have their own military agents on German soil, it would be the duty of these agents not to hesitate at any technical means in order to stop Hitler's troops. It is absolutely clear that the revolutionary German workers also are duty-bound (if they are able) to perform this task in the interests of the Belgian revolution, irrespective of the general course of the revolutionary movement in Germany itself.

Defeatist policy, that is, the policy of irreconcilable class struggle in war-time cannot consequently be "the same" in all countries, just as the policy of the proletariat cannot be the same in peace-time.

Only the Comintern of the epigones has established a régime in which the parties of all countries break into march simultaneously with the left foot. In struggle against this bureaucratic cretinism we have attempted more than once to prove that the general principles and tasks must be realised in each country in accordance with its internal and external conditions. This principle retains its complete force for war-time as well.

Those ultra-leftists who do not want to think as Marxists, that is, concretely, will be caught unawares by war. Their policy in time of war will be a fatal crowning of their policy in peace-time. The first artillery shots will either blow the ultra-leftists into political non-existence, or else drive them into the camp of social-patriotism, exactly like the Spanish anarchists, who, absolute "deniers" of the state, found themselves from the same causes bourgeois ministers when war came. In order to carry on a correct policy in war-time one must learn to think correctly in time of peace.

LEON TROTSKY.

Coyoacan, D.F., May 22, 1938.

Wars since the "War to end War"

After making an analysis of 902 wars and 1,615 internal disturbances over a period of 2,500 years, a Harvard professor reports that the war index for the twentieth century reached "a total eight times greater than in all the preceding centuries."

1918-19—Polish Ukrainian War.

1919-22—Inter-Allied Intervention Against Soviet Russia.

1919-20—British military occupation of Ireland.

1919-26—Conquests in Arabia by Ibn Saud.

1920 —Soviet-Polish War.

1920 —Turkish-Armenian War.

1921-22—Greek-Turkish War.

1921-26—Franco-Spanish Wars against Riffs.

1925 —French military expedition to Syria.

1925-27—Civil war and foreign imperialist intervention in China.

1925-35—Gran Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay.

1927 —Occupation of Nicaragua by U.S. Marines.

1931-32—Japaneseseizure of Manchuria.

1932 —Sino-Japanese war at Shanghai.

1935-36—Italo-Ethiopian War.

1936-38—British bombing operations on India's Northwest frontier.

1936-38—Spanish Civil War: Franco aided by Hitler and Mussolini.

1397-38—Sino-Japanese War.

1937-38—British war on Arabs in Palestine.

Palestine the Pawn

Bombing, rioting, sniping, incendiarism have cost hundreds of lives in Palestine since the beginning of this year. In this bloody and violent form the unfinished battles of the Great War are being continued and the secret diplomacy of the war years still produces its harvest of human lives.

In the first months of the Great War secret negotiations were opened between Sir Henry McMahon, High Commissioner in Egypt and Hussein, Sherif and Emir of Mecca and leader of the Palestinian Arabs. With a view to inducing the Arabs to enter the war on Britain's side they were promised the independence of Arab territories including Palestine. The Germans made a similar offer and the Arab nationalists after bargaining finally threw in their lot with the British and in June 1916, the Sherif declared war against the Turks. It was in this way that Palestine was sold to the Arabs.

Simultaneously the British Government entered into negotiations with the Zionists principally with a view to obtaining the sympathy of American Jewry in influencing America to enter the war on Britain's side. The well-known "Balfour Declaration" was the result and in this way Palestine was sold to the Jews.

The German Government for its part also made the attempt to win over the Zionists by offering them the same Palestine that they had been offering the Arabs but before the negotiations could be completed Palestine was in General Allenby's hands. British Imperialism had decidedly come out best in the horse deal. Mr. Lloyd George afterwards stated that the launching of the Balfour Declaration was "due to propagandist reasons". That it was by no means taken seriously by British Imperialism, was startlingly revealed when the Bolsheviks took power in November 1917.

Leon Trotsky became the first Commissar for foreign affairs but as he was still busy at the Smolny with the general work of the revolution he called in Nikolai Markin, a sailor in the Baltic Navy, a gunner and a Bolshevik, to handle the department. "So for a time Markin became an unofficial minister of foreign affairs. He learned the mechanism of the commissariat quickly, carried on the weeding-out of the high-born and thieving diplomats with a firm hand, reorganised the office, confiscated for the benefit of the homeless the contraband which was still coming through from abroad in the valises of

diplomats, extracted the more instructive secret documents from the archives, and published them on his own responsibility and with his own commentaries, in separate pamphlets. Markin had no academic degree, and his writing was not free from grammatical errors. His comments were sometimes quite unexpected. But, on the whole, he drove the diplomatic nails in firmly, and at the very points where they were most needed. Baron von Kühlmann and Count Czernin read Markin's yellow pamphlets at Brest-Litovsk eagerly."

Among the secret treaties published by this ruthless Bolshevik sailor was the Sykes-Picot Agreement in which the relevant clause is as follows:

"... Palestine, with the Holy Places is to be separated from Turkish territory and subjected to a special regime to be determined by agreement between Russia, France and Great Britain." In other words, whatever ideas the Arabs and the Jews might have entertained about the position of Palestine it was clearly understood among the imperialist bandits that the titbit was to be divided up among themselves. By the time the Arabs and the Jews woke up to the fact that their nationalist movements had been dexterously exploited by British Imperialism, America had entered the war and Palestine was in the hands of the British army.

The present position in Palestine is the outcome of the secret diplomacy of those years. Great Britain holding the mandate is now able to play off the one claimant against the other. Under the classic principle of divide and rule, Arab is pitted against Jew in a bitter war of mutual extermination while British Imperialism utilises the deadlock in order that the Iraq pipeline may be guarded and the Suez Canal protected.

And at this very moment negotiations are going on, no doubt, behind the scenes between the Arab nationalist leaders and the ravenous wolves of imperialism. The Arab fellaheen, burdened by primitive methods of agriculture suffering repeated droughts and bad harvests live even in times of prosperity on the verge of starvation. World slump bringing a universal fall of agricultural prices plunges the Arabs into destitution. The nationalist movement sustained by the Arab landowners seeks to exploit peasant discontent for its own ends and its treacherous leaders are just as ready to-day to bargain with rival imperialisms as they were in the war years. And on the other hand the reactionary Jewish nationalist

movement continues to take a hand in the game of power politics. Both Arab and Jewish masses are utilised as pawns and thrown one against the other.

The common enemy, British Imperialism manoeuvring behind the scenes enters into negotiations and yields concessions to the nationalists with a view to

furthering British war aims. Only the publication by a Bolshevik Markin of the Fourth International will reveal the nature of the deals when the secret archives are opened by the revolutionary workers. No doubt they will tell the same story of treachery and cynicism as was revealed in October 1917.

Lenin on Disarmament

On August 1st, twenty-four years ago began the world slaughter which after a period of "peace" is about to be resumed. To-day the "leaders" of that party which Lenin founded have become the recruiting sergeants for the coming blood bath. Now that the hypocritical cry of "Disarmament!" has been raised by the Roosevelts and the Chamberlains it is as well that workers be reminded of Lenin's words on disarmament written in 1916.

Disarmament is a Socialist idea. In a Socialist society there will be no wars, consequently disarmament will be realised. But he is no Socialist alongside of the social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dictatorship is State power relying immediately on *force*, and force in the twentieth century—as generally in the epoch of civilisation—is not a fist or cudgel, but the *army*.

DISARMAMENT NOT MARXIAN

To put "disarmament" as a point in the programme means to say in general: we are against the use of weapons. In this there is not a particle of Marxism, any more than if we said: "We are against the use of force!"

The Kautskyan preaching of "disarmament," addressed directly to the present Governments of the big imperialist powers, is the most vulgar opportunism and bourgeois pacifism, serving *in fact*—in spite of the "good intentions" of the sweet-spoken Kautskyans—to draw the workers away from revolutionary struggle.

For by such preaching the idea is instilled into

the workers that the present bourgeois Governments of the imperialist powers are not enmeshed by thousands of threads of finance capital and by scores or hundreds of corresponding (i.e., robbing, plundering, and preparing imperialist war) *secret treaties* among themselves.

An oppressed class which does not strive to learn to handle weapons, to possess weapons, would only deserve that it should be treated as slaves.

We are living in a class society and there is not and cannot be any way out from that except by class struggle and the overthrow of the power of the ruling class.

In every class society—whether based on slavery, serfdom or, as now, on wage labour the oppressing class is an armed class.

And in the face of such a fact, the proposal is made to revolutionary Social-Democrats that they put forward the "demand" for "disarmament"! This is equivalent to complete surrender of the point of view of class struggle, renunciation of all thought of revolution.

Our slogan must be: arming of the proletariat in order to conquer, to expropriate and to disarm the bourgeoisie. This is the sole possible tactics for a revolutionary class, tactics arising from the whole objective development of capitalist militarism and prescribed by this development.

Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie, can it, without being untrue to its world-historical task, throw on to the scrap heap all

weapons in general, and the proletariat will undoubtedly do this, but only then and by no means earlier.

If the present war evokes among the reactionary Christian Socialists and among the snivelling petty-bourgeoisie only terror and fright, only revulsion against any employment of weapons, against blood, death, etc., then we must say: capitalist society was and always is horror without end.

And if the present most reactionary of all wars is preparing for this society an end to the horror, then we have no cause for despair.

It is the business of the bourgeoisie to develop trusts, to drive women and children into the factories, to torture them there, to demoralise, to condemn to extreme want. We do not "demand" such a development, we dare not "support" it, we fight against it. But *how* do we fight?

THROUGH TRUSTS TO SOCIALISM

We know that trusts and factory labour of women are an advance. We do not want to go back to hand labour, to pre-monopolist capitalism, to domestic labour of women. Forward, through the trusts and the rest, and beyond them to Socialism!

This is, with appropriate alterations, applicable also to the militarisation of the nation. To-day, the imperialist bourgeoisie militarises not only the whole people, but also the youth.

To-morrow it will advance, maybe, to the militarisation of women. We must say on this: so much the better, go ahead quicker! The quicker, the nearer we are to the armed rising against capitalism.

In all the largest countries there have developed two chief varieties of opportunism: firstly, the undisguised, cynical and consequently less dangerous social-imperialism of Messrs. Plekhanov, Scheidemann, Legien, Albert Thomas, Vandervelde, Hyndman, Henderson, etc.; secondly, the disguised Kautskyan type—Kautsky, Hasse and the "Social-Democratic Labour group" in Germany; Longuet, Pressman, etc., in France; Ramsay Macdonald and other leaders of the I.L.P. in Britain; Martov, Chkheidze, etc., in Russia; Trèves and the so-called "Left" reformists in Italy.

Open opportunism is openly and directly against revolution, against the incipient revolutionary movements and outbursts, and in direct union with the Governments, whatever the various forms of this union, extending from participation in ministries to

participation in industrial war committees.

The disguised opportunists, the Kautskyans, are much more pernicious and dangerous for the Labour movement, because they conceal their association with the first with the aid of blessed-sounding quasi-Marxist phrases and pacifist slogans.

STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

The struggle against both these forms of prevailing opportunism must be carried on in all fields of proletarian policy—Parliamentarism, trade unions, strikes, war, etc.

In what consists the chief peculiarity characterising both these forms of prevailing opportunism?

It consists in being silent about, covering up or treating with an eye on police prohibitions, the concrete question of the connection of the present war with revolution and other concrete questions of revolution.

And this happens in spite of the fact that, before the war, attention was drawn on innumerable occasions, both unofficially and officially, to the Bâle manifesto, to the connection precisely between this coming war and the proletarian revolution.

Thus, the chief defect of the demand for disarmament is exactly that it evades all the concrete questions of revolution. Or do the supporters of disarmament stand for a completely new view of an unarmed revolution?

P.S.—In the last issue of the English "Socialist Review" (September, 1916), the organ of the opportunist "Independent Labour Party," we observe on page 287 a resolution of the Newcastle Conference of this Party: "Abstention from support of any war whatever, by whatever government it is waged, even if it is 'nominally' a 'defensive' war." And, on page 205, we encounter the following declaration in a leading article:—

We do not approve of the rising of the Sinn-Feiners. [The Irish insurrection of 1916.] We do not approve of any kind of armed rising, just as we do not approve of any form of militarism or war.

Is it necessary to prove that these "anti-militarists," this kind of supporter of disarmament, not in a small, but in a great power, are the most pernicious opportunists? Indeed, theoretically, they are entirely correct when they regard an armed rising as also "one of the forms" of militarism and war.

Where is Erwin Wolf

Following the many protests on behalf of our Comrade Erwin Wolf a much delayed letter from the Minister of Justice of the Catalonian Generality, dated 18th February 1938, has just reached us.

In this letter the Minister of Justice states that he had received from the Ministry of the Interior the assurance that our comrade was released after the inquiries made by the Czechoslovakian Embassy and had furthermore received a telegram of thanks from the Ambassador. He adds that there is the possibility that Wolf may be again in prison but under another name "for it happens quite often that released foreigners fearing expulsion and wishing to stay in this country, give a false name, should they

be arrested by the police again."

It is obvious that the explanation about the possibility of arrest under a different name is out of the question.

It is in this way that the G.P.U. assassins cover their traces and those of their official accomplices. It is in this situation, when the criminal Negrin-Stalin anti-revolutionary repression paves the way for defeat and puts Barcelona at the mercy of Franco, that all workers should insist with us, all the more imperiously, the immediate release of our comrades Wolf, Freund and of all the revolutionaries imprisoned by Stalin the executioner and his accomplices.

After Evian

In Europe, a million Jews suffer persecution while another million face imminent persecution. The world press has been filled for months with reports of the daily intensification of Jew-baiting in Greater Germany—raids on shops, cinemas and cafés; the daubing of the windows of Jewish owned stores by organised bucket-squads; the tearing down of synagogues; the boycott of non-Aryan businesses; the setting aside of special railway carriages for Jews; the enforced registration of Jewish property; dismissal of Jewish employees; deportation of Jews from the big cities and the frontiers; organisation of commercial ghettos; humiliation; plunder and torture of Jews at the hands of hooligans. A Pogrom unprecedented in history rages in central Europe and threatens to envelop southern and central Europe as well.

During the past months, the shortage in Germany of staple foodstuffs, fats, eggs, meat and wheatflour has grown daily more severe, while raw materials for the civil needs of the population are unobtainable. The world slump manifests itself sharply in the decline of German trade, deepening the already intolerable impoverishment of the working masses, who are reaching breaking point. Ominous signs are appearing of discontent in the population, and accounts of army desertions and strikes penetrate the stone wall of totalitarian silence that surrounds Germany. Hitler once more is forced to find a scapegoat for Germany's troubles and the Jews are as usual the chosen race.

The desperate situation of the Jews has at last called forth an international conference of powers. The account of the parleying at Evian bristles with those pious phrases so well loved by delegates who possess the uncomfortable knowledge that nothing is going to be done: "... view with alarm ... agree in principle ... spirit of co-operation ... a beginning has been made ... set up a committee to deal with ..."

And while the bourgeoisie of the "democratic" countries sigh in unison, Switzerland closes her borders; four hundred refugees from the Austrian Burgenland have been drifting about in a barge on the Danube for several weeks, in sight of three frontiers but not permitted to land anywhere; Scotland Yard joins with the Immigration officials to prevent the smuggling of human contraband into Britain; the Australian delegate to Evian makes it plain that Australia is closed to refugees; the "pro-Arab" Lord Winterton is appointed chief British delegate, which means in effect that Palestine will keep its doors locked; the American Legion and reactionary trade union officials rain petitions on Congress to keep refugees out of the United States; for months hundreds of Austrian Jews have been stranded on the Czech-German frontier, starving, penniless, without passports; new legislation prevents even Polish Jews who have been living in Germany from re-entering Poland; more than a thousand Austrian Jews expelled by Nazis and refused admission to France, are roaming along the frontier near Metz,

destitute and in despair. And the United States government, which called the conference, declared through its delegate at Evian that the annual immigration quota would *not* be increased. All over the world, the bourgeoisie cries "Woe, alas!" and with the tears rolling down their cheeks they nail up their doors and windows against the refugees.

Throughout world history, the status of the Jews has been the touchstone of progress and retrogression. From the beginning of the Diaspora, every progressive epoch is marked by toleration of the 'peculiar people', so that in Egypt and Iraq, in Greece and Italy, the earliest emigrant Jews shared the cultural life of their host countries and were ultimately absorbed into the population. When Arab civilisation flourished in North Africa and Spain, they occupied an honoured place in that civilisation. In the days of Arab decline, they were badgered and persecuted. Feudal Europe of the Dark Age crushed and spat upon them, the Inquisition tortured them, medieval reaction imprisoned them in ghettos. The rise of the bourgeoisie in its first progressive phase emancipated the Jews. Cromwell granted them asylum in England; the French Revolution gave them equal rights with other citizens in France, as the American Revolution did in the United States; Napoleon's Republican armies which obliterated feudalism in Europe also smashed down the gates of the ghettos. The treatment accorded to Jews is a sure thermometer of history; in the epoch of progress they are tolerated, in the period of reaction they are hounded, robbed and loaded with humiliation.

To-day the decay of capitalism is far advanced, and the outworn system plunges headlong into the abyss. Millions of workless men, enormous piles of arms, hunger and war—these are the products of capitalist decay. But even if these signs were ignored, the status of the Jews to-day all over the world would be enough. A wave of anti-Semitism sweeps the world, threatening particularly the nine million Jews who are imprisoned in Central and Eastern Europe.

The connection between anti-Semitism and the economic difficulties of the ruling class is no more strikingly demonstrated than in Italy, where the Jews form an insignificant minority, numbering at the last census 47,825 in a population of forty-five millions.

On February 7th of this year, the world press announced that in view of the possibility of a poor harvest, the Italian Government had ordered the admixture of maize, rice and potatoes in the wheat used for the baking of bread. The next day the *London Times* reported that measures against Jews were being enforced in Italy.

One week later it was announced that Italian fears of a corn failure were now allayed by favourable weather. This statement was followed three days after with a declaration by the Italian Foreign Office that only Jews hostile to Fascism would be affected by the repressive measures. Anti-Semitism waxes and wanes in step with the prospect of more or less bread.

During the past month even the muzzled Fascist press had guardedly admitted popular dissatisfaction with the adulteration of bread. Leaflets have been distributed in North Italy agitating against the intervention in Spain as the cause of the "mixed" bread. In the towns, bread-riots have broken out, followed by the announcement that a vigorous campaign was to be undertaken to safeguard the "Italian race" from "non-Aryan" infiltration. Fascism, incapable of providing bread for the workers, offers as a substitute, theories of race.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 struck a death blow at Czarism and as part of its progressive mission liberated the Jews from Czarist pogroms. Since the death of Lenin the resurrection of anti-Semitism in itself stigmatises Stalin's regime as retrogressive.

It is consistent with Stalinism that Soviet Russia demanded as the price for taking part in the Evian Conference that "no refugee dealt with under any new arrangement will indulge in political activities." (*Yorkshire Observer*, 11/5/38). Having murdered the communist refugees who, fleeing from fascism, found asylum in the Soviet Union, Stalin seeks to shut the gates of the Soviet Union against a second invasion of revolutionary refugees. Bolshevism, in its first progressive phase following the October Revolution abolished anti-Semitism and opened the gates of Russia for the persecuted politicals of other lands; Stalinism systematically, though not openly exploited anti-Semitic prejudices to further its ends. To-day Stalin slaughters revolutionary refugees who were already within Soviet borders and excludes those who seek to enter.

The Conference at Evian has been a piece of hypocrisy outstanding in a world which is to-day suffused with hypocrisy. Germany was not asked to attend and Italy returned a blunt "No!" to the invitation. All the participants were concerned not so much that Hitler expels the Jews, but that he plunders them before he drives them out. As for the worker Jew who possesses nothing and can therefore not be robbed—it is on him that the full brunt of persecution falls, and for him even more so than for the bourgeois Jew there is no hope of assistance from the capitalist authorities. Only world revolution can guarantee for the Jew the right to work and live and be the equal of his fellow-man.

Stalin Murders

Communist Refugees

The recent imprisonment in Moscow of the head of the Hungarian Communist Party, Bela Kun, lifted a small corner of the curtain behind which hundreds of Hungarian, German, Polish, Greek, Rumanian, Esthonian, Latvian and other communists sojourning in Russia, have been murdered or imprisoned by the G.P.U., without even the semblance of a trial.

We print below a sensational list of some of the leaders of the German and Polish communist parties who have been shot or jailed by Stalin in recent times. The article, by comrade "X," is translated from the May-June, 1938, issue of the "Bulletin of the Opposition," organ of the Russian Bolshevik-Leninists abroad.—Ed.

I—POLAND.

Arrests and shootings of Polish communists began in the year 1933, after many Ukrainian and White Russian communists had already been arrested and executed. Even prior to the mass arrests, in 1929, the Comintern, with the assistance of the G.P.U., "adjudged" the controversy between the Right grouping in the Central Committee of the Polish C.P. (Varsky, Kostrzeva and others) and the Left grouping (of Lensky) by sending the majority of the Rights into exile. Lensky's group—the partisans of the general line—remained in leadership up to the end of 1937.

In 1933 arrests among the Rights began, and in 1938 they made arrests among Lensky's group.

THE RIGHTS ACCUSED

The Rights were accused of assisting agents of Pilsudski to worm their way into the leadership of the party, and of maintaining contacts with the nationalist elements in Polish Ukraine and White Russia, and of having supported Trotsky in 1923-24.

A beginning was made with the execution of Zharsky and his wife, Matseyevskaya. Zharsky was a member of the party from 1920 on (prior to that time he was a member of the left wing of the Polish

Socialist Party); he participated in the party leadership and was elected by the Communist Party to the Sejm. Both of them "confessed" that in 1919 they had wormed their way into the party on the instructions of the Polish counter-espionage system and the P.O.V. (Pilsudski's Polish military organisation). Together with them, Sokhatsky (Bratkovsky—Communist deputy in the Sejm—and Voyevudsky—leader of the revolutionary peasant movement in Poland (organizer of the Independent Peasant Party, N.P.K.)—had joined the party. All of them also confessed that they gave false information to the Polish C.P. concerning internal relations within Pilsudski's camp, as a consequence of which the Polish C.P. supported Pilsudski's uprising in 1926. (It is not amiss to point out that comrade Trotsky was an uncompromising opponent of this tactic.)

SHOT FOR "ESPIONAGE"

Simultaneously with the arrest of Sokhatsky and Voyevudsky came the arrest of the following members of the Central Committee: Klonovich, Khrostel, Yulski-Bukshorn. They were all shot in 1934.

In the same year they shot Vandursky—poet, proponent of proletarian art in Poland, and former head of the Polish theatre in Kiev—and Teshner (Anton Werner), member of the C.C. of the Polish Y.C.L. Both of them were shot in connection with the Sokhatsky case—for espionage.

They were all "exposed" by Lensky and his group. After their execution the Polish party press was filled with articles about the "exposed provocateurs" and about the radiant plans for the future now that the "atmosphere has been purified." Stalin, however, did not rest content with these victims. Additional ones became necessary—and it was now the turn of Lensky and his group.

LENSKY GROUP PURGED

It began with the arrest (and execution?) of the well-known writer Bruno Jascensky, author of the novels "I Set Fire to Paris" and "The Man Who Changed His Skin," which created a sensation. He was accused of ties with Yagoda's tool, Auerbach, and the "Polish spy" Domsy, former member of

the C.C. of the Polish C.P. who was already in exile for many years. Later, the following were arrested (and shot?): Lensky ("the Polish Stalin"), general secretary of the Polish C.C., Albert Henrikowsky, a well-known member of the Profintern, and Bronkowsky.

Of the former collaborators of Varsky and Kostrzeva, the following were arrested during the recent purges: Valetsky (Horowitz), Lapinsky, a prominent member of the Berlin embassy, later the head of the foreign department of Izvestia, and Unschlicht.

II—GERMANY

After the seizure of power by the Nazis many prominent German Communists fled to the U.S.S.R., where a worse fate awaited them than in Hitler's Germany. In 1934 began arrests and executions among the German emigres in the U.S.S.R. We give a list, far from complete, of the victims of Stalinist terror.

GERMAN EMIGRES SHOT

Herman Kupferstein and his wife departed from Paris for Moscow in 1935. He was a prominent member of the League of Red Front Fighters (R.F.B.). In 1932, he had shot two officers on Buelowplatz in Berlin. In Paris he was one of the leaders of the German communist emigres. He was shot in Moscow as an agent of the Gestapo. After his death, the G.P.U. spread rumours to the effect that 2,000 English Pounds had been found in his possession during the raid.

Ernst Ottwald—in 1927 he left the ranks of the Nazis to join the C.P.G. He played a prominent role in the League of Revolutionary Proletarian Writers. Author of a series of novels exposing national socialism (Nazism). After Hitler's assumption of power, he lived in Prague. In 1936, he left for the U.S.S.R. together with his wife, and there they both were arrested as agents of the Gestapo.

Gunther—another well-known member of the League of Revolutionary Proletarian Writers. Arrested in Moscow on the Charge of espionage.

EXECUTED AS SPIES

The following former members of the Central Committee of the German Communist Party have been arrested and shot as spies: Heinz Neumann, Hermann Remmele, and Schubert, a deputy in the Landtag.

Werner Hirsch—a bourgeois journalist, joined the C.P.G. in 1924 and from that time has been the closest henchman of Thaelmann. After Hitler's

assumption of power, Hirsch was arrested but shortly set free. During one of his conspiratorial meetings with Thaelmann, they were both arrested. Hirsch was sent to a concentration camp. Owing to his mother's influential connections, he was set free in 1935, and fled to the U.S.S.R. where he was arrested as an agent of the Gestapo and the organizer of Thaelmann's arrest. In 1937 he was shot. His wife was in the employ of the Paris-office of the T.A.S.S. In 1936 she was fired. At present she is living together with her child in great want in southern France.

In 1937, the following were shot: Ziskind, former editor of the *Rote Fahne* in Berlin; Nikolaus Birkenhauer, former editor of the *Ruhr Echo*, in 1933-1934 secretary of the Political Bureau of the C.P.G. in Paris, and later, after the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern, head of the Paris Committee for the defence of Thaelmann.

VICTIMS PILE UP

In the summer of 1937 Kurt Sauerland, the former editor of *Roter Aufbau* in Berlin, was arrested in Moscow.

Since 1936 the following have been incarcerated: the Austrian physician Gerber, former collaborator in the central theoretical organ of the C.P.G., *Die Internationale*; Boross, the former editor of the *Internationale Presse Korrespondenz*, and later editor of the *Rundschau*, who was famous for his dispatches concerning the U.S.S.R. and his paeans of praise to Stalin; and Professor Halle, a prominent member of the C.P.G.

At the end of May 1937 they shot in Moscow Rudolph Haus (Hausschild), a specialist in military questions in the C.P.G. whose articles appeared in *Pravda* and *Izvestia*. He "confessed" to espionage for the Reichwehr.

By LEON TROTSKY.

The Lesson of Spain

The Last Warning.

3d. Post free.

Send orders to:

WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL PRESS
14a Chichester Road, London, W.2.

Printed and Published by J. R. Strachan, 14a, Chichester Road, London, W.2.
SET BY TRADE UNION LABOUR.

PRINTED BY VOLUNTARY LABOUR.