

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE

# FIGHT

FOR THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL  
ORGAN OF THE MARXIST GROUP (TROTSKYISTS)

Subscription 2/6 a year, post free. Vol. I. No. 10. September, 1937.

Price 2d. monthly.

## CONTENTS

|                                   |    |  |    |
|-----------------------------------|----|--|----|
| China Fights — For Whom? .....    | 1  | "It Can Be Done" .....                   | 12 |
| News From Spain .....             | 4  | Letter to a Comrade .....                | 14 |
| Terrorism .....                   | 6  | by Leon Trotsky.                         |    |
| The 1937 T.U. Congress .....      | 9  | The A.E.U. To-day .....                  | 15 |
| Imperialism in South Africa ..... | 11 | The Labour Party's "Immediate Fraud" ... | 16 |

## EDITORIAL

### CHINA FIGHTS—FOR WHOM

A CARTOON in the Soviet newspaper "*Ivestia*" shows a little Japanese officer trying to ride a Chinese coolie and getting an unexpected knock on the nose. From this it would appear that the Chinese coolies are bestirring themselves, that the great liberation war against foreign Imperialism has started. Eulogies of the great leader Chiang-Kai-Shek appear in the bourgeois press. We read about his oriental serenity, his romantic marriage, his age, height, weight, his calculating brain. How he reads his Bible every day and how he alone, inspired by his English-educated wife and the ten commandments, is leading the Chinese proletariat and peasantry to the promised land. For ten years this military dictator has held full sway. For ten years he has striven for the unification of the Chinese nation. Now his task is completed. The Chinese soldiers have laid aside their broadswords and taken up machine guns. Giant bombers of 1,000 horse-power flash through the sky. A direct hit will sink a battleship or demolish the strongest building. He is matching the Japanese army with gun and plane for plane. Undoubtedly Chiang-Kai-Shek is a great man. He is recognised as such by the international financiers [REDACTED]

\* The giant Chinese coolie is giving the little Japanese officer an unexpected knock on the nose! The giant Chinese coolie is none other than

Chiang-Kai-Shek. The Stalinists should know because at one time he was an honoured guest at the Kremlin and was taught how to distribute knocks on the nose by the "genius of geniuses, Sun of the World," the great Joseph himself.

In 1925 the starving masses of China were stirring for revolt. In the textile mills of Chinese, Japanese and British capitalists, conditions were appalling. 40% of the employees were children of from 6 years of age, 40% were aged and broken women, aged not by years but by the inhuman conditions under which they slaved. Only 20% were men. They worked from 12 to 14 hours a day without a break, Saturday and Sunday included. The foreman paraded with a club in his hand and stirred those weary children who had never known childhood from falling asleep over their looms. Sometimes they did all the same, and the looms that produced such fine silk and cotton would produce a bloody mangled mess that was once a child.

Their brothers or fathers may have been riksha boys, those human draught animals who receive much of the whip but little of fodder. For fourteen hours a day, spurred on by the curses of the "ladies and gentlemen" and the batons of the International policemen, 25,000 sweating slaves would try to outspeed and undercut the trams and buses. Their reward was

\* I have not been able to find a copy where the words has not been blacked out and consequently I can not reproduce them in a footnote. See Al Richardson's remark on this "censorship". *SL*.

about 12/- a month and often families had to be supported on that. Over-exertion, heart disease, pulmonary consumption, danger and ill-usage were their lot; in 5½ years they died, but what did that matter? The French and British Settlements derived millions of taels from this industry. There was one thing, however, that did matter. The Chinese proletariat was becoming conscious: it was learning to say "Down with Capitalism."

Amongst the millions of peasants life was just as hard. The heavy taxation, the demands of the bandit war-lords, the bareness of the soil and the primitive methods of agriculture, provoked famine and death. When a drought occurred the countryside was strewn with thousands of corpses. Humanitarian appeals to the great wheat combines that were busy burning tons of wheat met with no response. Wheat is not grown to make bread but to make profit for the capitalist. If the Chinese peasantry would not pay the price then they must fertilise the soil with their emaciated bodies. In 1925 such conditions had given birth to a revolutionary movement that boded ill for feudalism and capitalism alike.

In 1920 Lenin had outlined the course of the Chinese revolution. The proletariat, organised in Trade Unions, and, the most advanced among them, in the Communist Party. The peasants organised in Soviets. The agrarian revolution, led by the proletariat, would pass directly into the proletarian revolution and hasten the disintegration of world Imperialism. By 1925 Stalin had become the voice of the Comintern. Lenin had been dead only one year and now Leninism as the science of revolution was to be brutally murdered. The Chinese C.P., the workers in the Trade Unions and the peasant masses, were ordered into the people's front—the Kuomintang, dominated by Chiang-Kai-Shek. We will not recapitulate the whole of this treacherous episode. People's Frontism can only lead to one result and that result is disastrous for the toiling masses. The history of the Chinese Revolution has been written in detail by Leon Trotsky, that history will be repeated in France and Spain if the workers do not learn in time. By 1927 the Chinese revolution had been drowned in blood. Chiang-Kai-Shek, whom Stalin supported as the revolutionary leader, entered Shanghai, and with Japanese assistance slaughtered thousands of Chinese revolutionaries. From first to last 100,000 Chinese workers and peasants lost their lives making the Kuomintang "revolution."

Ten years later the children in the textile mills are still falling into their machines. The riksha boys are still coughing blood and dying within 5½ years. The peasants are still landless and dying of famine. The Chinese capitalists and the foreign Imperialists are still reaping their profits. The profits have grown and so has the poverty of the masses.

No wonder Chiang-Kai-Shek is hailed as a great man by the bourgeoisie, no wonder *Isvestia* depicts him as the giant coolie who is knocking the little Japanese officer on the nose. Imperialism and Stalinism, although for different reasons, are interested above all in preserving the life of capitalism. Chiang-Kai-Shek is their ideal leader. He can keep the masses in subjection as no other Chinese leader can; he is the tried and trusted servant of the Imperialist; he

can be entrusted with the most up to date instruments of death and be relied on to use them as his masters dictate. To-day he is matching gun for gun and plane for plane with the Japanese armies, he can even drop his bombs killing British subjects and not provoke an "incident." Why? The answer is to be found in the amazing contradictions that are inherent in Imperialism.

Japan is the natural ally of Britain. The antagonism between Britain and the U.S.A. finds one of its expressions in the antagonism between the U.S.A. and Japan. The antagonism between world capitalism and the Workers' State, the Soviet Union, also expresses itself in the open hatred of Japan for the Soviet Union. Japan, therefore, can be used by Britain either as an ally against the U.S.A. or against the Soviet Union. Japan's industries and her armed forces were, in the early days, financed and developed by Britain. Since then she has developed to the point of being partially independent. Britain supports Japanese annexation of Manchuria, supports the proposed conquest of the North China provinces. British finance will find a profitable outlet in the capitalisation of these areas. But as Japan develops as an industrialised country she demands a share of the world markets, she competes with Lancashire in India and Australia, her financiers penetrate into all parts of China, she demands parity with the Great Powers in armaments. Britain has especial interests in Shanghai and Central China, she cannot tolerate any encroachment on these preserves. When Japan attempted to link the Chinese tael to the yen and thereby to control Chinese currency, the British bankers soon told Japan what was what and who was who. Japan, however, still persists in meddling. Economically and politically she is becoming difficult to control.

Compared with the last pre-depression year, 1929, Japan's industrial production has increased by 40%. France shows a decrease of 30%, U.S.A. a decrease of 25%, Britain shows very little change. Since the world market long since reached the limit of its expansion, Japan can increase her share of world trade only at the expense of the other imperialist powers. British shipping and cotton exports are adversely affected. By the financial experts in the City of London we are assured that so long as the Far Eastern war is isolated there is no threat of a setback to British trade. In fact, the war is regarded as a potential bull point, since Japan's concentration on armaments is bound to reduce her competitive power in world markets for manufactured goods. Diversion of Japanese shipping to war purposes will create a greater demand for the use of British ships. Already freight rates have risen to a highly profitable level. Earnings in the rayon industry are increasing rapidly through the removal of Japanese competition. The armament speculators are making a nice profit by supplying both sides. As in the Gran Chaco war, the actual combatants are doubtful as to what they are fighting for. Britain could have supplied the answer then: she can supply the answer to-day.

When an Imperialism is young it fights its own battles, or rather it uses its own wage-slaves as cannon-fodder. When it grows old and crafty like British Imperialism it often deposes one of its puppets to

do the dirty work. Chiang-Kai-Shek has rendered yeoman service in the past, he is a fellow-Christian anyhow, and Christianity implies "service." This one-time member of the Third International drops his servile, submissive attitude to Japan. The Stalinists have liquidated the peasant Soviets and the Red Army has become an anti-Japanese Army. So there is little likelihood of trouble in the rear. Although "incidents" have been plentiful, Japan is prepared to conciliate. She is in no position to carry on a prolonged war even with China. Her excess of imports over exports, her budget deficits, the huge sums already spent on military operations, her dwindling gold reserves, are leading to internal chaos and bankruptcy. But the prestige of Japan as a military power has been challenged: the irresponsible militarists carry the day against the more cautious financiers who prefer the method of "peaceful penetration." The Japanese colonies in Hankow and in all the river ports further up the Yangtse river are being brought down river to Shanghai and the Japanese colony in Tsinan is being brought down river to Tsingtao. This evacuation of the Japanese business community from the interior of China means the temporary loss of the Chinese market, and therewith the cutting of one of the principle sinews on which Japan is dependent if she is going to wage war, either with China or anyone else. Possibly her armies will manage to cut off another slice of Chinese territory. Hopei province containing the cities of Peiping and Tientsin may come under Japanese rule, but they are of little economic value. They will cost more to keep in subjection than Japan can draw from them. Japan is in a cleft stick and that is just where Britain wants her to be. The drain on Japanese resources will force her back into dependency on Britain, the irresponsible militarists will be exposed and the more amenable civil leaders will control the foreign policy of Japan. The plan or project that Britain is now putting forward to settle the dispute is in essence to face Japan with the alternatives: prestige, (which means a war which Japan cannot afford), or co-operation. Co operation means that Japan must cease being troublesome to Britain and allow British diplomacy to decide all future moves on the Chinese chess-board.

Chiang-Kai-Shek is undoubtedly a great man, just as Hitler and Mussolini are great men, because like these gentlemen, he serves the interest of a class that can bestow greatness on traitors and hangmen, and that class is not the enslaved masses. To imagine, however, that the social forces let loose by war can be strictly controlled by the ruling classes is to abandon all hope of the social revolution. The last world war shook the whole capitalist world to its foundations. Imperialist war was followed by a period of civil wars that tumbled Kings and Emperors, smashed old established forms of Government and demonstrated the revolutionary will of the world proletariat. In the one part of the world where the revolutionary principles of Marxism were applied, the first Workers' State came into being. Those principles, now trampled under foot by the Stalinist bureaucracy, are nevertheless being kept alive by the small band of 4th Internationalists under the leadership of Leon Trotsky. If the present war in the Far East is to progress beyond

the limits set upon it by the Imperialists and Stalinists and become a revolutionary war against both foreign Imperialism and national Capitalism, the Chinese proletariat will have to rearm itself, not merely with guns and bayonets, but with a Party, a programme and a banner. The road that Lenin mapped out in 1920 is the road that the Chinese masses must follow today. Despite all the obstacles placed in their path, the treachery of their leaders, the bitterness of past defeats, there are signs of reawakening militancy. The Shanghai workers still remember the slogan "Down with Capitalism." The peasants still remember the Soviets that they shed their blood to build. They both remember the execution squads of Chiang-Kai-Shek. The exploiters have again put guns into their hands and guns often suggest ideas that are unhealthy for those exploiters. In Shanghai the starving refugees are clubbed and murdered by the International military and police forces. In Japan the intensification of the war is leading to an intensification of the class-struggle. Today the cry of the oppressed masses in China and Japan is drowned by the slogans of the bourgeoisie, but history has taught us that this is no guarantee of what will happen on the morrow.

"Down with Imperialism. Down with capitalism. Down with Chiang-Kai-Shek. Down with the Japanese militarist and capitalists. Long live the revolutionary unity of the Japanese and Chinese toilers!" This is the cry of the proletariat and the peasants. It is in their breasts gathering strength and volume. When it breaks out, the world revolution will sweep across the face of the earth and link the East with the West under the banner of International Socialism.

## STUDY GROUP

To be held at

**THE MARXIST CENTRE,  
97 Kings Cross Road, W.C.1.**

A Study Course of six lectures has been arranged. The first meeting will be held at the above address on Sunday, September 5th, at 2.30 p.m. and subsequent meetings will take place on the first Sunday in October, November, December, January, and March.

- | Lecture  | Text Book                          |
|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. <b>The Dialectic.</b>                       | "Method in Thinking"<br>Fred Casey |
| 2. <b>Marxian Economics.</b>                   | 'Value, Price & Profit'<br>Marx    |
| 3. <b>The State.</b>                           | "State and Revolution"<br>Lenin    |
| 4. <b>Imperialism.</b>                         | "Imperialism"<br>Lenin             |
| 5. <b>The Role of the Revolutionary Party.</b> |                                    |
| 6. <b>Conclusions.</b>                         |                                    |

All revolutionary workers, their friends and contacts, are welcome.

# NEWS FROM SPAIN

## THE PROGRAMME OF THE SPANISH BOLSHEVIK-LENINISTS

**T**HE following is a translation of the concluding paragraphs of a leaflet distributed by our Spanish comrades on the 19th of July. It answers the question: what do the Trotskyists want?

1. To defeat Fascism with the only effective weapon, the weapon of the proletarian revolution. To destroy Fascism and its roots, which flourish only in the rotten soil of capitalist democracy, by the expropriation of the exploiters and by the total destruction of the old state apparatus. During a transition period we wish to set up the dictatorship of the proletariat, directed solely against the remains of the bourgeoisie, who, with the aid of foreign capitalists, will try to re-establish private property and the bourgeois regime. The best example of attempts like this are the dishonest manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie at the present time, and above all of the PSUC. The dictatorship of the proletariat will be genuine working class democracy, because the privileges of money will have disappeared and the workers, freed from capitalist exploitation, will decide their fate for themselves.

2. So long as the proletariat is not in a position to take power, we shall defend the democratic rights of the workers within the framework of the capitalist or transitional regime. That is why we have publicly and without any sort of manoeuvre demanded the United Front of Struggle, CNT-POUM-FAI; we shall never allow the class enemy to destroy workers' organisations, even when it is a question of our political adversaries. Yesterday we demanded the protection of the POUM; to-day we protest against those who want to exclude the FAI from the popular tribunals; and to-morrow, with arms in hand, we shall defend the CNT. We have been and we remain partisans of proletarian democracy.

3. We stand for the formation of Revolutionary Councils of workers, peasants and soldiers. These Councils should be democratically elected in each factory, village and company. It must be possible to recall the delegates at any moment if the majority so decide. Councils of this sort were formed during the July days. The true wish of the masses is allowed the freest possible play in them. These Councils will have for their task the defense of the conquests of the revolution, the maintenance of public order, the control of economy and distribution. Each party will propose its solutions: the masses will decide.

4. We are against the so-called Popular Front Government, which is in reality a Government in which the vast majority of the people is not represented. We are against class collaboration because it is a trap for the representatives of the working class. Compromises in such a Government lead inevitably to treason . . . The only solution is to set up everywhere Revolutionary Councils, to convoke a Congress of all the delegates of the Councils, and to elect a Central Committee from the delegates of the workers, soldiers and peasants Councils, which will take in hand the

management of the country. In such a Revolutionary Council there will be no treachery, and it will thus be able to bring the war to a victorious conclusion.

5. Our aim is the complete expropriation of the capitalists. So far the banks have not been touched, and the means of exchange are under the control of the bourgeois Government. We categorically reject the "municipalisation" feverishly demanded by the PSUC, which means in reality taking away the enterprises from the Syndicates, and putting them under the control of the reactionary Government. Our slogan is complete socialisation, and the establishment of a monopoly of foreign trade, under the direction of an Economic Committee of the Revolutionary Council.

6. We demand the nationalisation of the land: that is to say abolition of private landlordism. The usurers shall no longer be able to take the land from the peasants. We stand for the collectivisation of agricultural enterprises only where the peasants consent to it without constraint. Distribution of the land must be made by the peasants' Councils according to the principle: . . . "The land for those who work it."

7. We are of the opinion that only a centralised army under a united command can ensure military victory. But it must be a revolutionary army in which each soldier enjoys political rights, in which the officers are elected and can be recalled by assemblies of soldiers. The same salary for everyone. The united command under the control of a Council of War of the Revolutionary Council. In such an army, the enthusiasm of the soldiers and their revolutionary vigilance will counterbalance the lack of material and technique. It will be a victorious army.

8. We stand for the right of national minorities to dispose of themselves, and for the absolute freedom of the people of Morocco, including the right of separation. Morocco for the Moroccans: the moment that this slogan is publicly proclaimed it will foment insurrection among the oppressed masses of Morocco and cause disintegration in the mercenary Fascist army. We stand for a Federation of Socialist Republics, because this corresponds best to the interests of the working class. It must be constituted without constraint by the free and fraternal unification of all the workers.

9. We fight the Stalinist Bureaucracy which pretends to construct "socialism" in Russia while sabotaging the socialist revolution in Spain and throughout the entire world. Our final aim is the World Revolution and the establishment of Socialism over the whole world, which is the only guarantee against the usurpation of the proletarian conquests by a bureaucratic layer like that of the Soviet Union. We are against Non-Intervention as practiced by the Peoples' Commissars of the 3rd International and by the bourgeois ministers of the 2nd International. We demand the revolutionary intervention of the proletariat and trans-

formation of the Spanish revolution into European revolution.

10. The old organisations have led us into an impasse. Deeply convinced that victory against the Fascist barbarians and the whole capitalist class depends entirely on capable leadership, we shall concentrate our efforts on the creation during the struggle of a new revolutionary party, to be equal to that task. Its granite base will be the programme of scientific socialism, laid down by Marx and Engels, and continued by Lenin and Trotsky. Before the disgraceful treason of the 2nd and 3rd Internationals we shall bring together again all consistent revolutionaries in the new, the 4th International, which will be the world party of social revolution. Beneath its unsullied banner socialism will triumph!

COMRADES! We know that our first task is to put Franco's hands to rout. But you, like us, know that military victory is inseparable from the social revolution. Openly and without manoeuvres we fight

against a policy which seems to us disastrous. The deepening of the social revolution far from weakening the united front in the trenches, will strengthen the fighting spirit of our militians. We wish to revive the spirit of July 1936.

With the enthusiasm of those days and the arms and experience of 10-day, we shall celebrate July 1938 in a Socialist Spain free from the capitalist yoke.

To all revolutionaries who feel that they are approaching us, we appeal; come and join our ranks! In friendly discussion we shall clear up points of disagreement and, united in struggle, we shall put to rout our common enemy!

DOWN WITH FASCISM AND CAPITALISM!  
LONG LIVE THE SPANISH PROLETARIAN  
REVOLUTION!

LONG LIVE THE WORLD REVOLUTION!

Barcelona, July 19th, 1937.  
Bolshevik Leninist Section of Spain  
(4th International).

## PERSECUTION IN CATALONIA

**W**E print below some extracts from a letter from one of our comrades in Barcelona, which give a good idea of the social changes which have taken place and the problems which face revolutionaries in Spain since the May days.

14th July, 1937.

"The local groups of the FAI are carrying on illegal propaganda. Unfortunately their slogans are abstract. What occupies the revolutionaries most is the arrest of hundreds and hundreds of revolutionaries of the POUM and of the FAI, without being put on trial. Under pressure from the CNT the police have given the undertaking not to hold prisoners more than 30 days without bringing them before a court; but they don't keep to it. There is a rumour that on Monday, the 12th, the foreign prisoners started a hunger strike. This is likely enough. Four Americans started a hunger strike last week. They are now in hospital. The number of foreign prisoners is at least 60 (in Barcelona alone) but probably more.

"The repression is much worse in Catalonia than in the rest of the country. The "Soli" only speaks about the most important political events in the language of flowers. But the Anarchist press of Madrid and even Valencia, although often suspended, speaks more freely. The national committee of the CNT of Valencia has now taken up publicly the defense of the POUM. The "Soli" only dares to print the speech of the Secretary of the National Committee of the CNT, Mariano R. Vasquez, but we read the following in the "Castille Libre de Madrid" of the 4th of July.

"The suppression of the POUM. We must point out that we consider it an injustice, an unqualified attack on liberty, and it is our duty to say so, even though it is directed against our opponents. In the case of

the Proum, what is inadmissible is that they attack this organisation, accusing these people of being in contact with Franco and many other things. An organisation; that does not mean individuals. An organisation which has a faith, a doctrine, an orientation, a position, is as worthy of our respect as any other. We cannot, consequently, accept the conduct of this attack, etc., etc."

July 21st, 1937.

"July the 19th, the anniversary of the Spanish revolution, passed like an ordinary day. All the Catalan parties were agreed to celebrate this glorious day by a united demonstration. But at the last moment the Valencia government intervened with the cynical excuse that the anti-Fascist sentiment, as well as the "inter-penetration between the front and the rear" can always be shown when the occasion arises, and that public order must be an effective thing.

"This attitude is only logical on the part of the Valencia authorities. How could a counter-revolutionary Government permit the celebration of the revolution?

"The same general who suspended the demonstration arranged for the 18th of May, gave, himself, a very characteristic demonstration on the 19th. A thousand Assault Guards and police, armed to the teeth, patrolled the streets of Barcelona; between each platoon two machine guns (1937 pattern), with cases of ammunition. Public order is an effective thing.

"Order is also maintained by other methods. All the Catalan police have been sent to the front or to the depths of the country. In Barcelona there are

only the 'Cossacks.' The only exception is the criminal police. For this job one needs a perfect knowledge of the town and of the Catalan language. But this local police is kept under a very rigid discipline. There is no confidence in anyone who might be at all in touch with the Catalan people.

"This applies even to the fire brigade. Some weeks ago, we read in 'La Vanguardia' that our firemen had gone to Madrid to help the comrades there who have too much to do. But the real reason was this. If, for example, the workers were to set fire to the Hotel Colon or other PSUCist centres, the firemen might be unwilling to protect these buildings just as a year ago they did not protect the churches and monasteries burnt by the people. The hate against the PSUC to-day is as great as the hate against the Catholic clergy was yesterday. Perhaps even greater.

Another new method of preserving public order is that the whole town is covered by a network of guards, carefully placed in empty shops or ground floor rooms. These posts with 15 men in each are only 3 minutes walk from each other. In this way they hope to crush any spontaneous uprising at the first moment.

"Meanwhile the PSUC is working feverishly to recruit members. Its members are rather specious. We read for example, in an illegal tract of the Libertarian Youth, 'Members of the School of War are arrested, and offered their liberty on condition that they join the PSUC.' Another method; If they arrest a man who says that he is not a revolutionary, the police suggest to him that he should enter the PSUC. This party is developing an activity which can only be compared to the activity of the SA and the SS in Germany before 1933."

## THE POLITICAL BASIS OF THE ACCUSATION : TERRORISM

The following is an extract from Trotsky's final speech to the Preliminary Commission of Enquiry.

(Mexico, April 17th, 1937).

If terror is feasible for one side, why should it be considered as excluded for the other? With all its seductive symmetry this reasoning is corrupt to the core. It is altogether inadmissible to place the terror of a dictatorship against an opposition on the same plane with the terror of an opposition against a dictatorship. To the ruling clique, the preparation of murders through the medium of a court or from behind an ambush is purely and simply a question of police technique. In the event of a failure some second-rank agents can always be sacrificed. On the part of an opposition, terror presupposes the concentration of all forces upon a preparing of attempts, with the fore-knowledge that every one of them, whether successful or unsuccessful, will evoke in reply the destruction of scores of their best men. An opposition could by no means permit itself such an insane squandering of its forces. It is precisely for this, and for no other reason, that the Comintern does not resort to terroristic attempts in the countries of the Fascist dictatorship. The Opposition is as little inclined to the policy of suicide as the Comintern.

According to the indictment, which banks on ignorance and mental laziness, the "Trotskyites" resolved to destroy the ruling group in order in this way to clear for themselves the path to power. The average philistine, especially if he wears the badge of a "Friend of the U.S.S.R.", reasons as follows: The Oppositionists could not but strive for power and could not but hate the ruling group. Why, then, shouldn't they really resort to terror? In other words,

for the philistine the matter ends there where in reality it only begins. The leaders of the Opposition are not upstarts, nor novices. It is not at all a question of whether they strove for power. Every serious political tendency strives to conquer power. The question is: Could the Oppositionists, educated upon the enormous experience of the revolutionary movement, have entertained even a moment's belief in this, that terror is capable of bringing them closer to power? Russian history, Marxist theory, political psychology reply: No, they couldn't!

At this point, the problem of terror requires clarification, even though briefly, from the standpoint of history and theory. Insofar as I am delineated as the initiator of the "anti-Soviet terror," I am compelled to invest my exposition with an autobiographic character. In 1902, I had no sooner arrived in London from Siberia, after almost five years of prison and exile, than I had the occasion, in a memorial article devoted to the bi-centenary of the fortress of Schlüsselberg with its hard-labour prison, to enumerate the revolutionists there tortured to death. "The shades of these martyrs clamour for vengeance. . . ." But immediately thereafter, I added: "Not for a personal but for a revolutionary vengeance. Not for the execution of ministers but for the execution of the autocracy." These lines were directed wholly against individual terror. Their author was 23 years of age. From the earliest days of his revolutionary activity he was already an opponent of terror.

From 1902 to 1905 I delivered, in the various cities of Europe, before Russian students and emigres, scores of political reports against terrorist ideology which at the beginning of the century was once again spreading among the Russian youth.

Beginning with the eighties of the last century, two generations of Russian Marxists in their personal experience lived through the era of terror, learned from its tragic lessons and organically instilled in themselves a negative attitude toward the heroic adventurism of lone individuals. Plekhanov, the founder of Russian Marxism; Lenin, the leader of Bolshevism; Martov, the most eminent representative of Menshevism, dedicated thousands of pages and hundreds of speeches to the struggle with the tactic of terror. The ideological inspiration, emanating from these senior Marxists, nourished during adolescence my attitude to the revolutionary alchemy of the shut-in intellectual circles. For us, the Russian revolutionists, the problem of terror was a life-and-death problem both in the political as well as the personal meaning of the term. For us, a terrorist was not a character from a novel but a living and familiar being. In exile we lived for years side by side with the terrorists of the older generation. In prisons and in police custody we met with terrorists of our own age. We tapped out messages back and forth in the Peter and Paul fortress with terrorists condemned to death. How many hours, how many days were spent in passionate discussion, how many times did we break personal relationships on this most burning of all questions! Russian literature on terrorism, nourished by and reflecting these debates, would fill up a large library.

Isolated terroristic explosions are inevitable whenever oppression transgresses certain boundaries. Such acts almost always have a symptomatic character. But politics that sanctifies terror, raising it into a system—that is a different thing. "Terrorist work," I wrote in 1909, "in its very essence, demands such a concentration of energy upon 'the supreme moment,' such an over-estimation of personal heroism and, lastly, such an hermetically sealed conspiracy as...excludes completely any agitational and organizational activity among the masses...Struggling against terrorism, the Marxian intelligensia defended their right or their duty not to withdraw from the working class districts for the sake of tunnelling of mines underneath the Grand Ducal and Tzarist palaces. It is impossible to fool or outwit history. In the long run history puts everybody in his place. The basic property of terror as a system is to destroy that organization which by means of chemical compounds seeks to compensate for a lack of its own political strength. There are, of course, historical conditions where terror can introduce confusion among the governing ranks. But in that case who is it that can reap the fruits? At all events, not the terrorist organization itself and not the masses behind whose backs the duel takes place. Thus the liberal Russian bourgeois, in their day, invariably sympathized with terrorism. The reason is plain. In 1909 I wrote: "Insofar as terror introduces disorganization and demoralization in the ranks of the government (at the price of disorganizing and demoralizing the ranks of the revolutionists), to that extent it plays into the hands of none other than the liberals themselves." The very same idea, expressed virtually in the same words we meet a quarter of a century later in connection with the Kirov assassination.

"The very fact of individual attempts is an infallible token of the political backwardness of a country and the feebleness of the progressive forces there. The revolution of 1905, which disclosed the vast strength of the proletariat put an end to the romanticism of the single combat between a handful of intellectuals and Tsarism. "Terrorism in Russia is dead," I reiterated in a number of articles. "...Terror has migrated far to the East—to the province of Punjab and Bengal... It may be that in other countries of the Orient terrorism is still destined to pass through an epoch of flowering. But in Russia it is already a part of the heritage of history."

From 1907 I found myself again in exile. The broom of counter-revolution was savagely at work, and the Russian colonies in European cities became very numerous. The entire zone of my second emigration was devoted to reports and articles against the terror of vengeance and despair. In 1909 it was revealed that at the head of the terrorist organization of the so-called "Social Revolutionists" stood an agent-provocateur, Azef. "In the blind alley of terrorism," I wrote, "the hand of provocation rules with assurance" (January 1910). Terrorism has always remained for me nothing but a "blind alley."

During the same period I wrote: "The irreconcilable attitude of the Russian social democracy towards the bureaucratized terror of the revolution as a means of struggle against the terrorist bureaucracy of Tsarism has met with bewilderment and condemnation not only among the Russian liberals but also among the European Socialists." Both the latter and the former accused us of "doctrinairism." On our part we, the Russian Marxists explained by the opportunism of the leaders of European social-democracy, who had become accustomed to transfer their hopes from the masses to the ruling summits, their sympathy for Russian terrorism. "Whoever stalks a ministerial portfolio...as well as they who, clasping an infernal machine beneath a cloak, stalk the minister—his personality and his post. For them the *system* itself disappears or recedes far away and there remains only the *individual* invested with powers." We shall presently, in connection with the Kirov assassination, meet once again with this thought which runs through the decades of my activity.

In 1911, terrorist moods arose among certain groups of Austrian workers. Upon the request of Friedrich Adler the editor of *Der Kampf*, the theoretical monthly of the Austrian Social-Democracy, I wrote in November, 1911, an article on terrorism for this organ. "Whether or not a terrorist attempt, even if "successful" introduces confusion in the ruling circles depends upon the concrete political circumstances. In any case this confusion can only be of short duration. The capitalist state does not rest upon ministers and cannot be destroyed together with them. The classes which the State serves will always find new men—the mechanism remains intact and continues to function. But much deeper is that confusion which the terrorist attempts to introduce into the ranks of the working masses. If it is enough

to arm oneself with a revolver to reach the goal, then to what end are the endeavours of the class struggle? If a pinch of powder and a slug of lead are ample to shoot the enemy through the neck, where is the need of a class organization? If there is any rhyme or reason in scaring titled personages with the noise of an explosion, what need is there for a party? What is the need of meetings, mass agitation, elections when it is so easy to take aim at the ministerial bench from the parliamentary gallery? Individual terrorism in our eyes is inadmissible precisely for the reason that it *lowers the masses in their own consciousness*, reconciles them to impotence and directs their glances and hopes towards the great avenger and emancipator who will some day come and accomplish his mission." Five years later, in the heat of the imperialist war Friedrich Adler, who had spurred me to write this article, killed the Austrian Minister-President Stuerkh in a Vienna restaurant. The heroic sceptic and opportunist was unable to find any other outlet for his indignation and despair. My sympathies were, naturally, not on the side of the Hapsburg dignity. However, to the individualistic action of Friedrich Adler I counterposed the form of activity of Karl Liebknecht who during wartime went out into a Berlin square to distribute a revolutionary manifesto to the workers.

On the 28th of December, 1934, four weeks after the Kirov assassination, at a time when the Stalinist judiciary did not know as yet in what direction to aim the barb of their "justice," I wrote in the *Bulletin of the Opposition*: "...If Marxists have categorically condemned individual terrorism...even when the shots were directed against the agents of Tsarist government and of capitalist exploitation, then all the more relentlessly will they condemn and reject the criminal adventurism of terrorist acts directed against the bureaucratic representatives of the first workers' state in history. The subjective motivations of Nikolaiev and his associates are a matter of indifference to us. So long as the Soviet bureaucracy has not been removed by the proletariat, a task which will eventually be accomplished, it fulfills a necessary function in the defence of the workers' state. Should terrorism of the Nikolaiev type spread, it could, given other unfavourable circumstances, render service only to the Fascist counter-Revolution.

"Only political fakers who bank on imbeciles would endeavour to lay Nikolaiev at the door of the Left Opposition, even if only in the guise of the Zinoviev group as it existed in 1926-27. The terrorist organization of the Communist youth is fostered not by the Left Opposition but by the bureaucracy, by its internal decomposition. *Individual terrorism, in very essence is bureaucratism turned inside out.* For Marxists this law was not discovered yesterday, Bureaucratism has no confidence in the masses, and endeavours to substitute itself for the masses.

"Terrorism behaves in the same manner; it wants to make the masses happy without asking their participation. The Stalinist bureaucracy has created a revolting leader-cult, endowing leaders with divine attributes. "Hero" worship is also the religion of terrorism, only with a minus sign. The Nikolaievs imagine that all that is necessary is to remove a

few leaders by means of revolvers in order for history to take another course. Communist-terrorists, as an ideological grouping, are of the same flesh and blood as the Stalinist bureaucracy." (Jan. 1935, No. 41). These lines, as the reader has had the opportunity to convince himself, were not written *ad hoc*. They summarize the experience of a whole lifetime which was in its turn fed by the experience of two generations.

Already in the epoch of Tsarism, a young Marxist who went over to the ranks of the terrorist party was a comparatively rare phenomenon rare enough to cause people to point their fingers. But at that time, there was at least taking place an unceasing theoretical struggle between two tendencies, the publications of the two parties were waging a bitter polemic, public disputes did not cease for a single day. Now, on the other hand, they want to force us to believe that not young revolutionists but old leaders of Russian Marxism, with the tradition of three revolutions behind them, have suddenly, without criticism, without discussion, without a single word of explanation turned their faces to terrorism which they had always rejected as a method of political suicide. The very possibility of such an accusation shows to what depths of debasement the Stalinist bureaucracy has dragged the official theoretical and political thought, not to mention Soviet justice. To political convictions gained through experience, sealed by theory, tempered in the white heat of the history of mankind, the falsifiers counterpose inchoate, contradictory and utterly unsubstantiated testimonies of suspicious nonentities.

Yes, say Stalin and his agents, we cannot deny that Trotsky did warn with the very same insistence against terrorist adventurism not only in Russia but also in other countries in various stages of political development, and under different conditions. But we have discovered in his lifetime a few instances which constitutes an exception to the rule. In a conspiratorial letter he wrote to one Dreitzer (and which nobody ever saw); in a conversation with Holtzman who was brought to Trotsky in Copenhagen by his son (who at the time was in Berlin) in a conversation with Berman and Davis (of whom I never heard prior to the first reports of the court proceedings) - in these four or five instances Trotsky issued to his followers (who were in reality my bitterest opponents) terrorist instructions (without making any attempt either to justify them or to tie them up with the cause to which my entire life has been devoted). If Trotsky had imparted his programmatic views on terror orally and in writing to hundreds of thousands and millions in the course of forty years, it was only in order to deceive them. His real views he expounded in strictest secrecy to the Bermans and the Davids... And then a miracle came to pass! These inarticulate "instructions" which rest wholly on the mental level of the Messrs. Vyshinsky, proved sufficient for this: that hundreds of old Marxists - automatically, without any objections, without uttering a syllable - turned to the path of terror. Such is the political basis of the trial of the sixteen (Zinoviev et al.). To put it differently: the trial of the sixteen completely lacks a political basis.



# 1937 TRADE UNION CONGRESS

THE British Trade Union Movement reflects to-day the tendencies and conflicts within the working class. On the one hand we have the intentions of the ruling class and their servants, the T.U. leaders to assure "national unity" on the industrial field. On the other is the reaction of the workers to the rising cost of living, worsened conditions, the menace of diluted labour and the war danger. We outlined last month the course of the struggle between these two forces, the success of the reactionaries with the assistance of the Stalinists, and raised the urgent issue of the workers defending themselves against attack and betrayal in order to prepare for the future offensive. Within the Unions changes are taking place, the old craft conceptions are being challenged by the need for industrial unionism forced upon the workers by the developments of modern industry. Slowly, in the face of fierce opposition from the bureaucracy, a new type of Unionism is coming into being, demanding struggle at the point of production for better rates and conditions. The unofficial strikes of the last few months, many of them spontaneous, and the sharp conflicts between militants and the bureaucrats in the Unions indicate this process. The Trade Union leaders in general and particularly in periods of legality have great advantages over the militants. Control of a powerful machine (registered Rules), drawn up in such a way as to protect their interests, and access to the whole membership enable them to dominate in the absence of widespread and organised revolts from the great mass of workers. Thus the official Conferences of the Unions tend to reflect a more backward development of militancy than is actually occurring in the workplaces and Trade Union branches. Election of delegates to Conferences is often a matter of bureaucrats selecting each other, all allowed by Rule. At the Conferences the platform usually has a bunch of bloc votes in hand, and will use all their well learned arts of manipulation to get "reasonable" decisions accepted. Under certain pressure from the members the leaders will move left, but all history and experience has proved that they will merely seek the first convenient opportunity to betray the workers.

Thus, when we are considering the importance of this year's Trade Union Congress, to be held this month at Norwich, in order to draw for future action the necessary conclusions, the above points must be kept in mind. The British T.U.C., with its executive the General Council represents the federated strength of Trade Unions embracing about 4 million workers (a third of those employed), and in this position is of considerable importance. Itself a reflection of the need for co-ordinated industrial action, it has earned from the bourgeoisie attention and respect by its "loyal" policy and methods. Deriving strength, as do the Unions, for reactionary purposes from the whole development of reformism and constitutionalism, it is more removed than the latter from rank and file influence. Delegations to the Congress are

often from Union executives, in other cases these latter use their power to assure a "sensible" delegation. The big dominating Unions, i.e., the N.U.R., A.E.U., Miners, and T.G.W.U. settle their policies first and then carry out their fraction work to control the Congress. Speaking of the Labour Party Conference (the T.U.'s political expression) an Executive member of the National Society of Painters, was quite frank, — "Usually those Trade Union groups, which represent the large organisations meet on the Sunday prior to the opening, and on all main issues to be discussed, decide how their collective vote shall be exercised, and woe betide him who dares to oppose the group decision." We have no particular objection to "fraction work" in itself. Indeed, the militants, in the face of the superior manoeuvring abilities of the bureaucrats, are forced to organise their struggle in the interests of the working class. But experience has demonstrated that the fraction work of the T.U. leaders is on behalf of the employing class. These gentlemen, while carrying this out, are the first to attack the rank and file's independent efforts at organised resistance. By any methods as outlined above, by the use of the bloc vote, and if necessary going to the length of ignoring their members' instructions, the caucus will seek to keep the Movement on the path of class collaboration. At the same time they have to consider the tendencies among the rank and file. Any leftward swing must be kept under control, and to do this, "left" speeches and even action may be obligatory (General Strike 1926). Thus, while the revolutionaries have no illusions as to the role of the bureaucracy (highest expression the T.U.C. General Council) they must participate in the struggles within the Conferences in order to prepare for the re-organisation of the Movement as an instrument of struggle, now on the immediate issues, ultimately for the revolutionary actions in the factories and streets against Capitalism. Continual pressure on the leaders for action, fighting for democratisation, utilisation of the Conference floor as a tribune to state the revolutionary case, must be allied with organisational work aimed at ensuring the winning over of the greatest possible sections of the organised workers from the hold of the bureaucracy at the decisive moment for revolutionary action.

This year's Congress will be of value chiefly in demonstrating to the workers the anti-working class character of Reformist and Stalinist policy. The big Unions have already decided policy on the major issues (reported in our last issue), and the Congress will merely put the rubber stamp of approval on the wishes of the caucus. The left-wing, in the past somewhat troublesome, will be respectable, under "Communist" leadership, chiefly concerned with unity for "social progress, defence of peace and democracy," C.P. affiliation. The result will be therefore the passing of a number of pious resolutions declaring for and urging the Government to do something about

hours of labour, wages and conditions, etc. This will be accompanied by a campaign against the militants, called, of course "disrupters" and against "irresponsible" strikes etc. With the next Imperialist great war approaching the leaders hasten to prepare the Movement for the ruting class service. The agenda illustrates this process strikingly. We will take the leading items: --

### THE FORTY HOUR WEEK.

Much discussion will be spent on this question, the leaders will hold forth on its great desirability, but will urge that it is a matter for negotiation with the Government. A shorter week and holidays with pay are issues which are receiving plenty of publicity today. They represent demands that can be fought for by the workers, only when linked to the fight for higher wages, and better condition, T.U. recruitment etc.

There are signs that the forty hour week issue will be used by the leaders to canalise the unrest among the rank and file into safe channels. Congress will support it in principle, and the General Council will be instructed to prepare a leisurely campaign to bring pressure to bear on the authorities. Thus the workers worried about defending their existing standards against "scab" or diluted labour, and ready to take the offensive for increases to offset the increased cost of living, will be given the opportunity to agitate for a forty hour week. Faced with the urgency of organising the remaining 8 million workers, the T.U.C. are content to distract attention by talk of shorter hours and holidays. In this they show astuteness. The Trade Union Movement has for many years advertised the shorter working week and holidays with pay as part of its ultimate aims. Thus the fire of immediate struggle is to be extinguished while the bureaucrats negotiate for a far distant candle.

### YOUTH AND FEMALE LABOUR.

The steady inroads made by this cheap labour is a potential menace to T.U. conditions. Although at present these workers are chiefly engaged in repetition tasks, in industry after industry there is a gradual process of undermining the Trade Unionist. While the Unions are content to see that their actual members get the rate, great masses of young workers are learning routine operations in underrated factories. At the next slump these workers will be used by the employers to break down existing standards. In the face of this we find the T.U.C. recognising on paper the danger and limiting themselves to interviews with the Minister of Labour. The left wing at the Congress must raise the slogan of organising the youth and oppose the narrow craft-protection attitude of the A.E.U. leaders.

The other issues of unemployment, wage agreements, pensions etc., provide opportunities for the militants to demand the co-ordination of working class struggle and to expose the insincerity of the leadership.

### WAR AND REARMAMENT.

The big Unions having decided policy on this question, Congress will have the task of making the decision of supporting the Imperialist war preparations palatable to the masses. The leaders stand for the "defence of peace and democracy" against the Fascist aggressors (whoever may be Britain's opponents in the next war). It is likely that Congress will adopt the A.E.U. resolution, which supports armaments for the purpose of collective security, while opposing the too pro-Fascist aggressor National Government's war programme. With reservations for the protection of craft or trade interests, this formula provides a convenient method of lining the workers up behind the bourgeoisie. The left wing under Stalinist domination will be paralysed by such a resolution, and will afford no effective opposition. Indeed, it is the success of Stalinism that makes such a betrayal possible.

### UNITY AND MILITANCY.

The T.U. leaders having utilised the Stalinist's new line to continue their old game of selling the workers, will reject the C.P. demand for affiliation, pointing out that unity for "peace and progress" can best be achieved if workers join the "trinity" i.e. Labour Party, T.U.'s and Co-operatives. Their task will be easier because, while the left moving workers are deceived into giving growing support for the "anti-Fascist" Stalinist line, they have a distrust of the acrobatic C.P.G.B. If the British Labour leaders can utilise the C.P. propaganda to strengthen their hold upon the masses without the necessity of accepting these troublesome bed-fellows, they can force the frantic Stalinists to discredit themselves by further leaps to the right. The needs of bourgeois alliances places upon these gentlemen the role of leading exterminators of the revolutionaries and militants throughout the whole industrial field.

Amid a general chorus on the need for Trade Union recruitment the leaders will launch attacks upon the "disruptive" militants. The bourgeoisie require industrial peace to prepare for war. The miners, transport workers, and engineers have been troublesome, and the workers in general are becoming restive. Any drive for new members will be accompanied by precautions to ensure that the new membership will be "loyal" to collective bargaining, etc. The militant workers are the danger. Under their leadership young unorganised labour takes up the struggle. So the sinister red-herring of the really quite innocent Comintern will be dragged across the stage to enable the Labour leaders to get ideological sanction to crush the best working class fighters.

### WHAT MUST BE DONE.

The 1937 Trade Union Congress will thus give the workers nothing. It merely demonstrates the strength of the Labour bureaucracy, its reactionary and pro-British Imperialist role. Together with the Labour Party Conference, to come shortly after, it signifies the preparations of the leaders to take the workers into the coming war behind their Imperialist masters.

by the road of class collaboration, of the crushing of the militants, and of the rotten liberalism, that they dare to call Socialism.

The opposition, confused and betrayed by the Stalinists, will be unable to function effectively. Of the other left wing forces at the Congress the I.L.P. militants, while very possibly sincere, will be hampered by the continual vacillations of that Party. If they confine themselves to the "regrets" of the "*New Leader*" of August 13th, which spoke as follows on the T.U.C.: -

*"With the bias of planning production to meet all human needs, the Socialist demands the 40 hour week -- that the T.U.C. make this a fighting matter -- we know from -- capitalist economists that planned production can meet all needs on far less than a 40 hour week." "It is only by linking these immediate objectives with an exposure of Capitalism and with the alternative planned system of Socialism, that the whole Movement can advance towards the new system of society. Such a constructive method of looking at the day to day struggle is sadly lacking, I fear, from the leaders of Trade Unionism today." -- "Where the A.E.U. has gone all wrong is first in failing to point out that Capitalism is itself the root of War." they will be uttering quite worthy sentiments, but deceiving the workers as to the actual position. What should have been said is as follows: -*

1. The socialist supports the demand for industrial struggle for the forty hour week because, as Rosa Luxemburg so clearly points out, "The daily struggle for reforms, for the amelioration of the conditions of the workers within the framework of the existing social order, and for democratic institutions, offers to the social-democracy the only means of engaging in the proletarian class war and working in the direction of the final goal -- the conquest of po-

litical power and the suppression of wage labour. Between social reforms and revolution there exists for the social-democracy an indissoluble tie. The struggle for reforms is its means, the social revolution its aim."

2. The working class movement will advance to the overthrow of Capitalism against their reactionary leaders, when their class consciousness developed out of the struggle places them behind the revolutionary party. We link the immediate issues with the general question of class emancipation in order to educate and to raise this class consciousness. Revolutionaries understand that any constructive method of looking at the class struggle can never be hoped for from the Reformist leaders. We state this openly to the workers and declare that Socialism will be obtained only when they have been completely driven out of the ranks.

3. The A.E.U. War policy is a continuation of the reformist policy, which in practice is support of one's own imperialism. With a war situation approaching the T.U. leaders prepare accordingly.

The Congress proceedings should be studied by all workers. Despite the apparent strength of the reactionaries, decaying Capitalism, with its increasing bloody repression, must arouse into action such masses of the rank and file, that the plans of the bureaucracy can be swept aside. Consequently all revolutionaries and militants should begin to work in the localities, Branches, Shop Committees, Stewards Councils. Let us work now, that the future Trade Union Congresses will reflect the growing up of a powerful left wing, which, developing its own organs of struggle from the Unions and workshops will, under revolutionary leadership, go forward to the sweeping aside of the reformists and Stalinists and to the overthrow of Capitalism.

## THE COLONIAL QUESTION

# IMPERIALISM IN SOUTH AFRICA

THE recent dealings between the representative of the Government of the Union of South Africa, General Hertzog, and the representative of the British Government, Mr. M. Macdonald, regarding the question of the Protectorates, reported in the bourgeois Press, is an opportunity to raise a number of questions on South Africa which are of interest to the British working class.

First of all, however, about the dispute itself. Popularly speaking, the wealth of South Africa is derived from gold and diamonds. All wealth, however, arises from the application of labour power to the earth's natural resources. The less the capitalist has to pay for labour power, the more surplus value will he derive from the commodities produced. The natives of South Africa therefore, the Bantu peoples, are forced by the ruthless oppression of insatiable Imperialism to become the wage slaves of the Chris-

tian whites. For a long time there was a great shortage in the supply of such labour. The Bantus were not willing to slave either for the mining magnates or for the huge landowners. And naturally, so long as they possessed a bit of land themselves there was no pressing need for them to do so. To remedy this "laziness" on the part of the natives, one of the first acts of the S. African ruling class was to perpetuate a class of landless natives. The Native Land Act of 1913 was passed, which prohibited natives from purchasing any land outside a tiny area, despite the fact that huge tracts of land remained uncultivated. But even this did not achieve the desired result of forcing the natives to work for the whites, and many a native remained on the small Land Reserves who could usefully be exploited. To force them out of the Reserves the Government imposed a Poll Tax of £1 per head per annum, payable in cash. This at last forced the

penniless natives to go to the white masters in order to earn the necessary cash to pay the tax.

But although the South African ruling class succeeded in forcing the overwhelming majority of the native male population to work for them, by means of the Land Act and the imposition of taxation, there was still a shortage of labour. This labour shortage has formed the basis of the clash between the mining magnates belonging to the British imperialist section, and the huge landowners, who mostly belong to the Dutch speaking population, known at present as Afrikaanders, who are both struggling for the limited supply of cheap native labour. Politically this clash found expression in the South African Party, representing the interests of the British, and the Nationalist Party representing the interest of the Dutch. General Smuts is the leader of the S.A.P. and General Hertzog the head of the Nationalist Party.

While the Nationalists were in power, from 1924 for about ten years, they naturally passed certain legislation the object of which was to secure a more ample supply of native labour for the huge farmers and plantation owners. The more recent legislation is the Native Service Contract Act, which compels every native working for the farmers to work for his boss a period of 180 days in the year free of charge, a period which does not necessarily have to be consecutive, but could be spread over the whole year; further, that no native is allowed to take on employment elsewhere without the consent of his former employer. In addition the Act gives the employer the right to flog his employees, provided they "appear" to be over eighteen years of age.

The mines, as a consequence of the shortage in the labour supply were forced to recruit part of their labour supply in the adjacent territories, notably Rhodesia and the South African Protectorates. Being outside the control of the Union's Government, the

Protectorates served the interests of the British imperialists exclusively. The Nationalists have, of course, always had an eye on these labour reservoirs, but they were entirely out of their reach.

The world economic crisis changed the South African situation entirely. For the first time in its history there was an adequate supply of labour. Thus the contradictions between the British imperialist group and the Dutch landowning group began to decrease, and eventually resulted in the fusion of the two parties into one single Fusion Party. A new Government was constructed with General Hertzog of the old Nationalist Party as Prime Minister, and General Smuts of the S.A.P. as Deputy-Premier and Minister of Justice.

Now that a general agreement has been reached between the two ruling sections, the question of the Protectorates is not so acute as it was, although it is still far from being settled. Both the South African Chamber of Mines and the landowners, in dealing with this question have more an eye on the future than on the present. What if a shortage of native labour arises again? The former Nationalists want, for this reason, to incorporate the Protectorates into the Union. On the other hand, the former S.A.P.'ers, also with an eye on the future, are not in such a hurry to give in. But in all probability the Protectorates will go to the Union.

For the Bantu peoples, incorporation into the Union is the greater of two evils, because it would subject them to the same laws as those under which the South African natives suffer, laws which are the most vicious, the most oppressive of any in the whole African continent.

In a later article we will deal with the actual conditions of the natives in South Africa and with the problems of struggle ahead of them.

## "IT CAN BE DONE" SAYS POLLITT "NOT POLLITT'S WAY" SAYS LENIN

**T**HE Communist Party of Great Britain has published a Report of its Fourteenth Congress under the title of "It Can Be Done," and we recommend every worker who has the least smattering of Marxism to borrow the book and read it. "It Can Be Done" is the best exposure of the Stalinist yes-men in Britain that has ever been put into print.

Let us take first of all Mr. Pollitt's opening 'Report': "The National Government is a rich man's Government. For six years it has represented the interests of a handful of millionaires, big bankers of the City of London, big monopolists and landlords." So says Pollitt. (Each for their particular ends, both Pollitt and Mosley say the same!) You see, in the interests of unity with the bourgeoisie it is necessary to shield the small and medium bankers, the small and medium monopolists, etc. The French C.P. does ex-

actly the same thing with its talk of the '200 families.' If it were really a question of a **handful** of millionaires, big bankers, big landowners and monopolists standing between the working class and its emancipation, the affair could be settled between midnight and dawn any day.

In an attempt to appear "revolutionary," Mr. Pollitt goes on to deal a really smashing blow at those "who have recently declared that there is no difference between a capitalist monarchy and a capitalist republic." In the interests of capitalist republics Mr. Pollitt is prepared to scrap Marx, Engels and Lenin, for does not the whole line of Stalinism depend on currying favour with "peace-loving" capitalist republics? Lenin (if one may quote him in these days of the Great Stalin and the Leader, Kautsky-Pollitt) said:

"The difference between the republican democratic and the reactionary monarchist bourgeoisie disappears (under Imperialism) precisely because both are rotting alive . . . Secondly the decay of Capitalism manifests itself in the creation of a **huge section of rentiers, capitalists, who live by clipping coupons.**" Reprinted in the "Labour Monthly," page 117.

Well, Mr. Pollitt, is Lenin a "Trotskyist skunk, a foul abortion," or are you still afraid openly to slander Lenin, but merely suppress his teaching and falsify his writings to achieve the same end? With Lenin we say:

"Your propaganda for "unity" with the opportunists . . . is objectively a defence of the **enslavement of the workers by the Imperialist bourgeoisie, aided by its best agents in the working class movement.**"

The "Leader" calls upon "all democratic people" to "force the National Government to abandon their repression" of the colonial peoples, and states that "under capitalist democracy social progress can be guaranteed." (On pages 36-37).

To force a government, which, in Pollitt's words represents millionaires, big bankers and big monopolists (and according to Lenin, a huge section of rentiers and capitalists) to abandon their repression of the colonial peoples, (a government in fact representing the very class **which exists only because it can exploit the colonial peoples**) whilst still retaining Capitalism! Was ever such contempt shown for Marxism? Kautsky, Bernstein, and Macdonald are all overshadowed by the counter-revolutionary Pollitt.

There must be many in the C.P.G.B. who know that the Imperialist bourgeoisie cannot cease their exploitation and repression of the colonial peoples and still live. There must be many in the C.P.G.B. who know that **only** the revolutionary overthrow of the Imperialist bourgeoisie, big, medium and small, by the working class can end the repression and exploitation of the colonies. Why then do they stay in the ranks of the counter-revolutionary C.P.? What further betrayals will be necessary to convince them that the Stalinists usurpers of the October Revolution have long ago ceased to be Communists? These comrades immerse themselves in a welter of "activity," cease to think, and hope for the best, whilst actually they are assisting in the work of driving the awakening masses into the arms of the reformists and Fascists, into class-collaboration with the "democratic" Capitalists in the next Imperialist war.

Worker Communists, proletarian followers of the C.P., face the situation as it is. Think, read Marx and Lenin, and abandon what is objectively a counter-revolutionary organisation. Join those who have never ceased to hold high the banner of the proletarian revolution, despite slanders, frame-ups and murders at the hands of the new bureaucratic caste which has abandoned the October Revolution and gone over to the enemy, disguised as the "democratic" bourgeoisie.

The whole of Marx's and Lenin's teaching on the nature of Capitalism, democracy and Imperialism is

trampled in the mud by Pollitt in six lines. Truly a great Leader of something! Not a "foul abortion" unfortunately, but the Leader of a Party which has set out deliberately to destroy Marxism and the revolutionary Socialist movement of the working class, whilst masquerading under the cloak of the Revolution they have betrayed.

The "Report" of Pollitt gives the keynote to all that follows. From the book, 312 pages of it, we get no indication of any discussion or theoretical analysis, but only of a stage show before an audience of goggle-eyed children. One can neither compare it nor contrast it with a Bolshevik Congress under Lenin, for at no point is there the slightest similarity. Two leaders, in two opposite camps, two Parties advancing in diametrically opposite directions the one, under Lenin towards the dictatorship of the proletariat: the other, under Pollitt, towards collaboration with its own bourgeoisie in the next imperialist war.

On page 171 we learn that "The overwhelming majority of the London Party membership is entirely new and lacks political education." We would like to assist in the political education of Mr. Pollitt's dupes by quoting, first of all, Mr. Pollitt at the Thirteenth Congress of the C.P.G.B. Said the Leader on that occasion: "At the same time the Congress expresses a warning against the attempts of reformism to exploit the peace policy of the Soviet Union in order to build up pacifist illusions in the working class, or trust in the League of Nations as an instrument to prevent war . . . only the working class revolution in the main Imperialist countries can make war impossible." "Harry Pollitt Speaks," page 7.

Further, for the benefit still of those whom Mr. Kautsky-Pollitt is deceiving for their political education, we quote from the Decisions of the Thirteenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. (Modern Book, Ltd., Price 2d.) "It is only for the **purpose of deceiving and disarming the workers** that Social Democracy denies the fascization of bourgeois democracy and **draws a contrast in principle** between the democratic countries and the countries of the Fascist dictatorship."

That decision was taken **after Hitler came to power.** We suggest that the honest revolutionary workers still in the C.P.G.B., demand from Mr. Pollitt an answer to this question: "Who is deceiving and disarming the workers? The Trotskyists, or the satisfied bureaucrat, the counter-revolutionary, Pollitt?"

We call upon the "overwhelming majority" of new members in the C.P.G.B. to read Marx, Lenin and Trotsky. We call upon them to cease being used as pawns in Stalin's plan to sabotage the world revolution in the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy and bourgeois "democracy."

To stay in the C.P.G.B. is to act as an agent of the bourgeoisie within the working class movement. All sincere workers will leave this sham party and take the road to the World Revolution marching under the banner of Marx-Leninism—the banner of the Fourth International.

# LETTER TO A COMRADE

By LEON TROTSKY

(The following is an answer to certain questions raised in a letter to Trotsky).

Dear comrade:

I do not think that the questions which you ask me have a direct connection with the investigation of the New York commission, nor that they can influence its conclusions. Nevertheless, I am entirely ready to answer your questions, in order to help all those who are interested in grasping my genuine conceptions.

Like many others, you see the source of evil in the principle: "The end justifies the means." In itself this principle is very abstract and rationalistic. It allows the most diverse interpretations. But I am ready to take upon myself the defence of that formula—from a materialist and dialectic point of view. Yes, I think that there are no means which are good or bad in themselves, or in dependence upon some absolute, super-historic principle. Those means are good which lead to the increase of man's domination over nature and to the liquidation of the domination of man over man. In this large historic sense the means can be justified only by the end.

Does that not signify, however, that falsehood, perfidy and treason are admissible and justified, if they lead to the "goal"? Everything depends upon the character of the goal. If the goal is the liberation of humanity, then falsehood, cheating and treason can in no way be appropriate means. The adversaries of the Epicureans accused them of sinking to the ideal of the swine in preaching "happiness," to which the Epicureans answered, and not without reason, that their adversaries understood happiness . . . like swine.

You refer to Lenin's words to the effect that the revolutionary party has the "right" to make its enemies despicable and hateful in the eyes of the masses. In these words you see a principled justification of amorality. You forget, however, to indicate where, in what political camp, are to be found the representatives of high morality? My observations tell me that all political struggle to a great extent employs exaggerations, distortion, falsehood, and calumny. *The most calumniated are always the revolutionaries:* Marx, Engels, and their friends in their time; later the Bolsheviks, Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg; in the present epoch, the Trotskyites. The hatred of the possessors for the revolution; the stupid conservatism of the petty bourgeoisie; the presumption and arrogance of the intellectuals; the material interests of the working-class bureaucrats—all these factors unite in the man-hunt after revolutionary Marxism. Furthermore, Messrs. Calumniators do not forget to wax indignant over . . . the amorality of the Marxists. This hypocritical indignation is nothing else than an instrument in the class struggle.

In the words which you quote, Lenin means only that he no longer considers the Mensheviks as proletarian militants and that he poses for himself the task of making them odious in the eyes of the workers. Lenin expressed this idea with the passion which was peculiarly his, and allowed ambiguous and indignant interpretations. But on the basis of Lenin's complete works and the actions of his whole life, I declare that this implacable fighter was the most loyal adversary, because, despite all exaggerations and despite his excesses, he always strove to tell the masses *that which is*. Contrariwise, the struggle of the reformists against Lenin is completely shot through with hypocrisy, falsehood, subterfuges and frame-ups, under cover of the eternal truths of morality.

Your appraisal of the *Kronstadt insurrection of 1921* is radically false. Kronstadt had been completely evacuated by the best, most devoted sailors, who played an important role at the fronts and in the local soviets throughout the entire country. There remained the grey mass with great pretensions ("We, men of Kronstadt!") but without political education and without readiness for revolutionary sacrifice. The country was gripped by famine. The men of Kronstadt demanded privileges. The insurrection was dictated by the hope of receiving privileged rations. The seamen had canons and ships. Then all the reactionary elements, in Russia as well as abroad, were drawn into the insurrection. The white emigres called for the sending of aid to the insurgents. The victory of the insurrection would have resulted in nothing but the victory of the counter-revolution, entirely apart from knowing what ideas were in the sailors' heads. But even these ideas were profoundly reactionary. They reflected the hostility of the backward peasant towards the worker, the arrogance of the soldier or the sailor toward "civil" Petersburg, the hatred of the petty bourgeoisie for revolutionary discipline. Thus the movement had a counter-revolutionary character, and since the insurgents had seized the armaments of the fortresses, they could be crushed only by the force of arms.

No less mistaken is your appreciation of *Machno*. He was himself a combination of fanatic and adventurer. But he became the centre of the tendencies which provoked the Kronstadt insurrection. The cavalry is generally the most reactionary division of troops. The man on horseback disdains the pedestrian. Machno created a cavalry of peasants, who had their own horses. They were not the poor oppressed peasants whom the October revolution awakened for the first time, but the well-off and satisfied peasants who were fearful of losing what they had. Machno's anarchist ideas (negation of the state, scorn for the central power) corresponded in the best possible manner to the spirit of this kulak cavalry. I add that hatred for the city and for the

city worker was rounded out in Machno by a combative anti-semitism. When we were conducting a life-and-death struggle against Denikin and Wrangel, the Machnovists, becoming confused between the two camps, tried to pursue their own policy. The petty bourgeois (Kulak), who had taken the bit between his teeth, thought that he could dictate his contradictory conceptions to the capitalists on the one hand, and to the workers on the other. The kulak was armed. We had to disarm him. That is precisely what we did.

Your attempts to make the frame-ups of Stalin follow from the "amoralism" of the Bolsheviks is radically false. In the period when the revolution was fighting for the emancipation of the oppressed masses, it named all things by their right names and had no need for frame-ups. The system of falsifications follows from the fact that the Stalinist bureaucracy is struggling for the privileges of a minority and has to hide and disguise its true aims. Instead of seeking the explanation in the material conditions of historical development, you create a theory of "original sin," which is suitable for the church but not for the socialist revolution.

Sincerely,

LEON TROTSKY.

July 6th, 1937.

Read regularly the journals of our international sections:

**LA LUTTE OUVRIERE** (French Section)  
**LA LUTTE OUVRIERE** (Belgian Section)  
**UNSER WORT** (German Section)

Read also

**THE SOCIALIST APPEAL** (America)

The following booksellers and newsagents also stock **FIGHT** and other Trotskyist literature:

**Bibliophile**, Little Russell Street, W.C.1.  
**Burns and Berry**, Shaftesbury Avenue, W.C.  
**Clapham Socialist Bookshop**, 79 Bedford Road, Clapham North.  
**Johns**, Torrington Place, W.C.  
**Librairie Internationale**, 73 Russell Square, W.C.  
**Librairie Internationale**, Percy Street, W.C.  
**Lahr**, Red Lion Street, W.C.  
**London Weekly Mail**, New Bridge Street.  
**Parton Street Bookshop**, Parton Street, W.C.  
**Petis**, Little Russell Street, W.C.  
**Solosky**, Charing Cross Road, W.C.  
**Strauberg**, Coptic Street, W.C.  
**Socialist Bookshop**, 35 St. Bride Street, E.C.4.  
**L.S.E. Bookshop**, Aldwych, W.C.  
**Socialist Bookshop**, 1 St. Hilda St., Liverpool.

## THE A.E.U. TO-DAY

**T**HERE can be no doubt that nearly all gains by the working class, whether partial, day to day affairs of immediate conditions, or advances of a more general nature with Socialism as their ultimate goal, must come through the efforts of Trade Unionists and their Trade Unions.

The way to such progress is open at the moment in the engineering field. This is offered by the boom in armaments and the demand for aircraft. The chief Union in this field is the A.E.U., and to it we must look for a struggle for better conditions for all engineering workers while the boom lasts, and a strong resistance to the depreciation of these conditions when the boom is over, or when war intervenes.

We look to the A.E.U. and what do we find. We find that all the conditions necessary for obtaining concessions are there with one important exception.

First of all the financial columns of every paper in the country furnish ample proof that the firms engaged in re-armament, particularly the aircraft firms—and this article is written with aircraft mainly in view—are all making profits so far in excess of the present normal rate of interest, that a considerable reduction of that profit in the shape of increased wages would not affect the investors' market. That is to say, the employers *can* pay.

Secondly, the frantic desire of the National Government and the Isolationist Press for immediate and increasing delivery of aeroplanes, means that the employers must hasten on production by all possible means. They cannot afford stoppages.

Thirdly there is a record of militancy among the workers concerned which has not been equalled in this country since 1926.

Can there be any doubt that in these circumstances, a demand for better conditions, backed by a Union which has nearly £2,000,000 in reserves, would be immediately successful? But here is the crux of the matter. We have the requisite conditions, but we have no demands; no demands, that is to say, from the T.U. leaders. On the contrary, the A.E.U. Executive is using all its power to kill the militancy of its own members; but, ultimately, an E.C. exists only by sanction of the members, and they must therefore fight as a whole, using the militant shop-stewards' organisation to drive the Union to victory and Workers' Power.

---



---

The American Commission for the Defence of Leon Trotsky will start its sittings in New York on September 8th.

A full report will be issued as soon as its is received.

---



---

## THE LABOUR PARTY'S "IMMEDIATE FRAUD"

**W**ITHOUT doubt the Labour leaders have great power of vision. They can see much further than the average worker because they stand on his back and paint beautiful pictures of the land that is to be when Labour's Immediate Programme is accomplished. It is true that writers in "Fight" have pointed out that this programme is a deception and a fraud, but these writers, who believe in workers' action, are unlikely ever to be the recipients of capitalist Honours and what they say does not trouble Sir Walter and his friends.

The keystone of Labour's policy is their attitude to democracy. The Labour Party stands for democracy. "It is irreconcilably opposed to dictatorship by any individual or group." The Marxists say that this democracy is part of the state machine by which the boss class dictates to the working class in order to maintain its rule. While the appearance of freedom is permitted, the real power is concentrated in the hands of a small group of individuals. The British Labour leaders, however, have other views. They are prepared to proceed with their policy of reforms, kidding the workers all the time that Capitalism will sit quietly by and allow itself to be legislated out of existence. Capitalism will do nothing of the kind, as the experience of Germany, Italy and Spain prove; although it will permit the Labour leaders to play about with minor reforms, it will lash out with all the brutality of a Hitler or a Mussolini as soon as its power is threatened.

What does the "Immediate Programme" say on this subject? "Labour will . . . carry out its plans without inflicting injustice on individuals. A fair price will be paid for all private property transferred to public ownership." Or, as Colonel Blimp might put it, "Gad Sir, Mr. Dalton is right! Labour can carry out its plans without inflicting injustice on anybody—except, of course, the workers."

We all know, of course, that the present system inflicts injustice on nobody, and that the bosses invariably pay us a fair price for our labour. Exactly how the Labour lieutenants of capitalism propose to pay a fair price for the worker's labour we are not told. Perhaps it is a problem that only great minds are capable of grasping—a truth that is above reason but revealed by the Labour leaders. In any case, it does not matter: they will never have an opportunity of putting their fantastic proposal into practice.

Unfortunately for the Labour Party, the Ideal State, which is above classes and which will permit them to reform the present system, does not exist, and the fact that modern society is nothing else but a class dictatorship is daily becoming clearer to the workers. Suppose that the masses decide that this state of affairs has gone on long enough and that it is time the workers dictated to the bosses—what then is Labour's

attitude? Is it still irreconcilably opposed to dictatorship even of the working class? Yes, the Labour Party is opposed to dictatorship, be it from the Right or from the Left. We remember hearing of certain gentry called the Mensheviks who held views very similar to those expressed by the British Labour Party. They too were opposed to dictatorship of the working class, although they were perfectly prepared to support the dictatorship of capitalism. The Mensheviks ended up in the camp of the bourgeoisie, fighting against the Workers' Government. If Sir Walter and Co. want further details of how this happened, they can always drop round to the Soviet Embassy and see Mr. Maisky—he knows all about it!

Our Labour leaders will "strenuously resist all attacks on British liberties either from inside or outside the country." Nothing could be plainer than that. Mark you, it is British liberties which are mentioned, not the few remaining liberties that are retained by the British working class. So if workers get ideas into their heads and attempt to interfere with the freedom of Capitalism to exploit them for profit, they will find themselves up against Sir Walter, Ernie Bevin, Mr. Dalton, old Uncle George Lansbury and all. More than this, Labour will strenuously defend the liberties that British capitalism takes with the Colonial peoples. (They hardly needed to tell us this, we noticed it during their last term of office.)

Moreover, you notice that Labour will resist attacks on British liberty from outside—a nice way of saying that Labour will support a war in the defence of democracy. In 1914 the Labour Party found that it had to save Europe from German militarism and to do this Labour members participated in the Coalition Government and supported British militarism. Nothing has changed: Labour remains true to its great tradition as a bulwark of Capitalism. In time of peace the boss class is prepared to allow certain rights and liberties to the workers, but in time of war it must have national unity, and for this it must have the co-operation of the Labour Party. The Labour leaders promise this co-operation in advance. Unfortunately, even during the last war there were misguided people who would not stand for national unity, people who said that, war or peace, the workers' enemy was in their own country. Labour leaders all over Europe did their best to silence these people but somehow they managed to make themselves heard, and although the German Labour leaders murdered Liebnicht and Luxemburg there are workers who still remember what they said and did. No wonder our Labour leaders are uneasy, and therefore prepare well ahead for the next great betrayal and paint rosy pictures of the democracy that they are going to call on us to defend. Only it happens that this rosy picture is of the same stuff that dreams are made of, and there is often very little difference between a dream and a nightmare anyway.

**RETURN SLIP**

No. 10.

Published by THE MARXIST GROUP, 97 Kings Cross Road, London, W.C.1.

Printed by THE NAROD PRESS (T.U.), 129-131 Bedford Street, London, E.1.

Printed in England.