high-wage and low-price policy.

fluences safely back into the increasingly conservative folds of the Democratic party. Tho the President confer with Barkley and approve "revision" of the Wagner Act, tho the Administration slash unemployed and work relief, tho the New Deal forces the country on the road to armaments, ignoring and knifing much-needed housing and socially-vital public-works projects, yet it is proposed that labor share this unclean bed.

Labor's political program can only be realized thru increasing political independence, not by an advance promise of complete dependence and surrender. Should Labor's Non-Partisan League take the course which Lewis proposes in such an authoritarian manner, its few slim remaining chances of regaining the confidence of those workers who seek a labor party will be wiped out. It is rather in those new forms which labor itself developed in the last elections and will continue to develop, and in such organizations as the American Labor Party, that the real future of a labor-party movement in America lies.

Rakovsky and Radek

French Marxist Veteran Describes Their Background

By CHARLES RAPPAPORT

(Charles Rappaport is a distinguished Marxist scholar, a veteran of the Russian and French socialist movement. He resigned from the French Communist Party some months ago in protest against the "Moscow trials." Other articles of his have appeared in previous issues of this paper.

—Editor.)

I KNEW Christian Rakovsky and Karl Radek rather intimately, particularly the former. In 1895, more than forty years ago, when I lectured to some hundred Russian students in Montpellier, a university town, Christian Rakovsky was the only student who took the floor to defend Marxism. It was an anti-Marxist lecture on my part since at that time I was a member of the Social-Revolutionaries and had founded the first branches of this party abroad in 1891 or 1892. He was very young and very inexperienced; hence I very easily succeeded in winning the debate, particularly, since the audience was composed of liberal intellectuals, mostly women. My female audience applauded me very enthusiastically and left poor Rakovsky to his own devices. He became my friend later on and I often jokingly pointed out to him that I owed my marital bliss to him, since one of those enthusiastic admirers of mine had become my wife subsequently. I met Rakovsky in Paris when he was associated with George Plekhanov, who introduced Marxism into Russia, and with Jules Guesde, apostle of Marxism in France. He was a very cultured person, very active and a remarkable organizer, thoroly devoted to the cause of labor. He gave up a fortune inherited from his father to pursue his socialist ideas. He became the soul of the socialist movement in Rumania and very nearly its martyr. We often feared for his life when he was in prison. During the war, he remained loyal to the International and, if I am not mistaken, attended the Zimmerwald conefrence in 1915. The Russian revolution in 1917 and the end of the war in 1918 found Rakovsky once more in prison in Rumania, from which he was freed by the victorious Red Army.

In Russia, he threw himself into the Russian revolutionary movement body and soul. Since Lenin appreciated his talent, devotion and knowledge, he entrusted him with the important task of administering the Ukraine, a section of Russia with about 25,000,000 population, one of the hot-beds of the counter-revolution, and at that time still under the influence of Germany. It was to Rakovsky that Lenin entrusted the extremely dangerous Mirbach affair. Mirbach, German ambassador to Russia, had been assassinated by the Left Social-Revolutionaries who were opposed to the Brest-Litovsk peace. This, of course, created a very serious diplomatic situation. Rakovsky gave a brilliant account of himself in settling this affair. He was then sent to London as charge d'affaires or ambassador—a post which was no less delicate; here he succeeded in laying the basis for friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. Then he was sent to Paris where he made headway among the dominant political circles except Poincare, who was the determined foe of the Russian revolution. It was precisely for this reason that the latter found Rakovsky a dangerous man and demanded his removal, which the Soviet government granted. He departed without taking leave in accordance with the custom of the government of which

(*Continued on Page* 5)

Radek and Rakovsky

(*Continued from Page* 3)

he was an accredited representative.

A faithful friend of Leon Trotsky, Rakovsky allied himself with the latter. Rakovsky was in my opinion a better theoretician than Trotsky but did not possess his practical understanding. Rakovsky was not an authoritarian type of person; he was rather human and sentimental. The stupid campaign of persecution initiated by Stalin and his clique as well as Rakovsky's profound knowledge of the international situation drove him towards a firmer alliance with Trotsky.

As is well known, Rakovsky was exiled and, despite his retraction and his obvious desire to remain loyal to the Stalin government, he was forced to admit fantastic "crimes." He was then condemned to twenty years in prison—another counter-revolutionary crime on the conscience of the Stalin clique!

Karl Radek, tho he did not possess the high moral character of Rakovsky, was an unusually capable journalist and an expert on international diplomacy. His brilliant studies on international questions, with which he made his debut in the German social-democratic press in the end attracted the attention of the entire diplomatic world. He always defended the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. His whole spirit was biting, and sarcastic and he did not always know when to hold his tongue. A man like Radek was naturally a thorn in the eyes of narrow-minded Stalin who is lacking in humor and in liveliness of mind. In sacrificing Radek, the Stalin regime deprived the Soviet state of what it most sorely needs, men with real and comprehensive knowledge of Europe.