

# Stalin and his Agabekov

The White Guard emigration is celebrating a new victory of which we have already spoken in the Militant. A new Soviet agent, Agabekov, has just passed into its camp; he is under the special protection of the agents of Tardieu. The triumph of the Whites is not without grounds: a responsible collaborator of the G.P.U. has passed over to their camp. He is preparing or has already prepared a book in which he reveals the activity of the G.P.U. in the East. The model for this type of book has been furnished by Bessedovsky: the secrets and the clandestine affairs which are inevitably bound up with the class struggle of the workers' government against the imperialist foes are intermingled by these gentlemen of invention and calumny, according to the taste of their masters.

## Who Agabekov Is

The White press has already given a lively account of the great services rendered by yesterday's Stalinist, Bessedovsky, to the Rumanian Siguranza by his revelations on the Soviet government. Agabekov begins by giving directly the address of the secret agency abroad. At his work of denunciation, he passed the last few months in Constantinople where he arrived directly from Moscow. So it is not a matter of an official who passed a few years abroad without leaving and who "broke away" from his country. No, it is a matter of a man tested in a long-lasting work at Moscow itself, named quite recently to a new post. He is a man doubly tested, that is, from the point of view of his work and from the point of view of the Party line. Had he not been, Agabekov would not have been named for a post still fresh from the death of Blumkin. For such is the irony of the fate of Stalin: having killed Blumkin he found nobody to replace him with than Agabekov.

Now we receive first-hand confirmation: Agabekov has stated to journalists that Blumkin was shot for his "Trotskyism", and that he, Agabekov, was called to Moscow as an unbending supporter of the general line. He was initiated into the whole situation, from the angle of his special work as well as of "Trotskyism". Experts of Stalinism like Menzhinsky, Iagoda, Trilisser (didn't they take Yaroslavsky into this thing as a partner?) did not find the slightest blemish on the political face of Agabekov.

After an examination, and an authorized instruction, he was sent to Constantinople to replace Blumkin, shot a while before by Stalin. And immediately after his arrival, Agabekov began to write a book, or rather a report to the agents of world imperialism on the secret work of the G.P.U. and the Comintern in the East. The book finished, he went with it to Paris and immediately placed himself under the protection of Tardieu's agents.

The trustworthy diplomat of Stalin, Bessedovsky, before leaping over the Embassy wall to render his services to the Rumanian Siguranza, disposed of all the affairs and the documents belonging to Rakovsky. That is not all. Bessedovsky participated directly in the expulsion of Rakovsky from the Party. Christian Georgevitch Rakovsky was not "trustworthy" enough: in the first place, he did not admit that a genuine Russian socialism could be constructed with the Kulak, and then he denied that the Kulak could be suppressed in two years by means of the G.P.U. And, "untrustworthy" and "inconsistent" element that he was, Rakovsky was placed under conditions that prevent him from continuing his revolutionary work, uninterrupted for forty years, and which expose him to physical ruin. Death for Rakovsky! The open road for the Bessedovskys!

## The Breach in Stalin's Monolithism

Beginning with 1924, a rule was established in the G.P.U., then in the army, by virtue of which Communists not only have to fulfill their duty towards the Party, but they must also think every minute like the Central Committee. Subsequently, the rule was extended to the whole Party and rounded out with another: the Central Committee must think like Stalin. After this, Stalinist monolithism seemed to be 100 percent guaranteed. But now a breach is opened; not having the right to think, to doubt, or to reason, the monolithic Stalinists have begun to jump directly from the heights of their responsible posts to the French, British and Rumanian Secret

Service. In full battle array of Stalin-Eucharin against the Trotskyists, the Centrists drag behind them an immense reactionary tail which beats them over the head. The Bessedovskys, the Agabekovs are a part of this heavy tail. Debauched Thermidorians have completely revealed themselves abroad, for there there is only a wall to separate them from their real master. And in the U.S.S.R.? How many are there like Bessedovsky and Agabekov in every institution, in every region, in every district? Who could count them, when they are themselves to be counted? Who will purge the Party of them, when it is they who purge it of others? Who will perceive their "hesitations", when they ne-

## A Slanderer Answered

# Who and Where Are the Real Deserters?

The most revolting collection of slanders yet produced in the "struggle against Trotskyism" appeared in the *Daily Worker* on July 29, 1930. The individual best fitted by nature for this scavenger's job is, of course, Earl Browder. In this article, Browder sinks to a depth we had previously imagined nobody in the Communist movement could reach.

## The "Final" Merger

That he repeats for the hundredth time, like a creature whose mind is wandering, that we have "finally" merged with the Lovestone group is of little consequence, for the workers in the movement know he is lying as he lied on previous occasions. Party comrades now know that this Stalinist floor-walker speaks so incessantly about the Trotsky-Lovestone "unity" in order to make them forget the real Browder-Lovestone united front which expelled the Left Opposition from the Party, burglarized us, and used gangsters to break up our meetings.

Nor will any serious person be impressed when Browder writes: "They act as stool-pigeons and provocateurs in the class struggle in the United States". For does not every Communist know that it is Browder's international faction—not ours—which has produced Chiang Kai-Sheks, Purcells, Bessedovskys and Agabekovs without number?

It is when this paid employee of the Stalin clique speaks of "desertions" that he deserves his proper reply. This person who hides away comfortably in an obscure office writes of the two noted fighters who have recently adhered to our platform: . . .

"Hugo Oehler deserted his post in the South at a difficult moment, without notice, and simply disappeared. When discovered later in Chicago, he was found in a pathological condition suffering from hallucinations, which was the only factor saving him then from expulsion from the Party. He is suffering from a serious case of paranoia. His 'conversion' to Trotskyism is a by-product of his mental breakdown. The case of George Saul differs somewhat; he ran away from a six months' sentence on the chain-gang in Carolina, covering up his desertion by leaving the Party and announcing himself as a Trotskyite."

Repelling as it is even to write about this garbage a few facts as well known to Browder as they are to us, must nevertheless be established. The unblemished records of comrades Oehler and Saul need no defense. It is sufficient to remind our readers that they fought for Communism and the textile workers in the South, under the daily threat of lynchings while their present detractors directed them from the safe vantage point of New York. That the "paranoiac" Oehler (Phillip Scheldemann used to say exactly that about Karl Liebknecht!) after his "desertion" from the South was offered the post of national secretary of the National Textile Workers Union and other responsible Party posts in New York and Chicago. That comrade Saul, after his "desertion", was made organizer for the International Labor Defense. That James Allander Party trade union director in Denver, wrote comrade Saul, under date of July 4, 1930, (after the "desertion"): "I was instructed by the Central Committee to take up with you, your coming into Denver to take the position of district organizer for our new district", etc., etc. That comrade Saul, now working in the Western wheat fields, has repeatedly written to the I.L.D. about get-

ting back to the South on his case without receiving the slightest reply.

ver hesitate until they have completely betrayed?

The International Opposition would not be worthy of its name if it were not capable of drawing all the necessary conclusions from the Agabekov affair and of explaining them to the Communist workers. Every member of the C.I. must be obliged to examine fundamentally the fact that Blumkin, the irreproachable soldier of the revolution, was shot by Stalin for "Trotskyism". In place of Blumkin was put the loyal Stalinist, Agabekov who passed over immediately to the service of the imperialist police.

The Agabekovs constitute an enormous layer of the Stalinist bureaucracy: they are a legitimate product of the Stalinist regime. Functionaries can close their eyes to these facts. The revolutionary worker must discern the grave peril from these symptoms.

—A.

But since Browder has spoken about "desertions", let us ask a few really pertinent questions:

Karl Reeve put on his hat and coat in Charlotte when the Party fraudition decided to go into Gastonia, and said, before he left to catch the train to New York: "You people can go down there and get lynched But I'm going home!" Is this not the same Reeve who was rewarded for his courage by being made Party district organizer in Minnesota by this same Browder?

Where is John Owen who left the South without permission? Where is Otto Hall who refused to go to Gastonia or any other part of the strike area? Where is J. W. Johnstone who refused to participate in the strike, saying: "I am not going to be made a fool of." Where is the president of the N.T.W., Jim Reid, who always refused to go to the South, was finally taken there almost by force, and then disappeared from Charlotte, turning up in New York and explaining his presence by the need to pay taxes on his Rhode Island properties! ? Where is George Pershing, who left the Bessemer City strike at the most critical moment without permission or notice and skipped North?

Is the Sroka who is still organizer for the N.T.W. the same Sroka who left the Pinevill strike without permission, so that the picket line collapsed and the strike was lost?

Is the Murdoch whom Browder just made secretary of the N.T.W. the same Murdoch who refused to heed the instructions to go to Elizabethton?

We could speak about more notorious cases, some of which will yet be heard from but not being stool-pigeons, we do not furnish the state prosecutors with information as to who skips ball or who runs away from sentences—even when there are such cases. This contemptible work we leave to the Browders who are so skillful at it . . . .

Why is Browder so recklessly venomous against the Opposition and its supporters? For two reasons. The first is a quite personal one. The Militant has already exposed this "revolutionist" as the banquetting companion in China of the butcher of Canton's Communists, General Li Ti Sin. Browder dared not and could not deny this, and it sticks in his craw.

The second reason for his bile is the growth of the Opposition in the face of all his attacks, both "literary" and gangsterist. The step taken by comrades Saul, Oehler and others recently has been additional proof that the truth of the Opposition continues to penetrate into the ranks of the Party, convincing its best workers. Naturally this enrages the Browders who have no ideological weapons with which to combat the Opposition, but only falsehood, calumny and thuggery. Their rage conceals their fear. The victory of the Marxist Opposition means an end to the Browders. Their spirit is incompatible with revolutionary movement.

As long as we still have capitalism and socialism, we cannot live peacefully—either one or the other will be the victor in the end. The obituary will have to be sung either over the death of world capitalism or the death of the Soviet Republic.—LENIN

Φ

If it is at all possible, to realize socialism in one country then one can believe in that theory not only after the conquest of power but also "prior" to it. If socialism can be realized within the national boundaries of backward Russia then there is the more reason to believe that it can be realized in advanced Germany. Tomorrow the leaders of the C.P. of Germany will surely bring forward this theory. The Draft Program empowers them to do so.

—TROTSKY

# Comrade A. C. Miller Suspended

At its recent meeting, the national committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition) adopted a decision to suspend comrade A.C. Miller, of Williston, No. Dakota, from the organization for a period of three months. The decision was caused by the failure of comrade Miller to acknowledge the correctness of the League's position in condemning the action he took in the recent North Dakota primaries. It was his position that since there was no Communist Party organization in the field, nor even a farmer-labor party or non-partisan league, he was justified in running for the nomination to office on the primaries of the Republican Party so long as he announced himself as a Communist and advocated a Communist policy.

The national committee of the League took a categorically opposite stand to this action, which flies in the face of all the teachings of the leaders of the revolutionary movement, of decades of experience, and more directly, of the platform of the Opposition. To run, even as a Communist, on a Republican primary or list is to sow illusion and confusion in the minds of the workers and poor farmers. To take such an action is to create the illusion in their minds that the machinery of the bourgeois parties can be utilized to any extent by the toilers. In this particular instance, it was a repetition on a small scale of Townleyism (Non-Partisan League), against which revolutionists must conduct the most merciless struggle. The aim of the Communists is to separate the masses from the bourgeois parties, not to attach them.

Comrade Miller's position in the movement, and his years of devotion to the cause, convinced the national committee that the error arose out of an unclear understanding of the principles involved rather than a conscious departure from Communism. The three-months' suspension was therefore decided upon, as well as an attempt by correspondence to change the opinion of comrade Miller. In addition, it was decided, that should comrade Miller fail to acknowledge the complete incorrectness of his position at the end of the suspension period, his expulsion will follow automatically. It is the desire and hope of the national committee that this step can be avoided and comrade Miller return to his active functioning in the organization.

## The Epoch of Stalin

Three years ago a certain Xenophon discovered that besides the epochs of Marx and Lenin there was still another: the epoch of Stalin.

At the 13th Convention of the Communist Party of White Russia that just took place it remained for Manuilsky to prove that this epoch puts that of Lenin in the shade. Manuilsky stated:

"Comrades, I ask you: when was the Party, even in the period when it stood under the gifted leadership of Ilitch, so consolidated, iron a power as today?"

From this deification of the Stalinist regime, which throttles every opinion in the Party, to a disguised accusation against Lenin, who, as is known, "undermined the iron power" of the present Party by the methods of inner-Party democracy—is only a short step.

At about the same time, *Pravda* publishes in a leader a brief outline of the history of the Moscow Party generation. Main content: The struggle against "Trotskyism".

And most remarkable: the history of the Moscow organization is begun with the year 1923! What was there up to 1923? What was there under Lenin? Why does the history of the Moscow Party begin only with the date of Lenin's illness?

The answer is clear. It is with 1923 that the new epoch of the Stalin regime begins, the "highest perfection of Party development"

—VALENTIN OLBERG

Φ

—VALENTIN OLBERG