

What Is to Be Learned from the Moscow Trial?

The act of indictment in the case of the saboteurs' center (the "Industrial Party") is of exceptional interest, not only because of its directly political significance but also from the point of view of the struggle of the tendencies within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Opposition asserted and repeated in all of its documents that the minimalist provisions of 1923-1928 in the sphere of industrialization and collectivization were dictated on the one hand by the Kulak, and on the other—by the foreign bourgeoisie, through the medium of the Soviet bureaucracy.

The leading Soviet specialists, called to responsibility, show what an intensive struggle they developed in the past for the minimalist program in the Five Year Plan. Thus, it is pointed out by Ramzin particularly the most important measure of the saboteurs in relation to all the basic branches of industry was "the slowing down of the tempo of development, which is particularly clear in the old Five Year Plan, worked out under the influence of the Center," (that is, the center of the saboteurs).

The Opposition and the Five Year Plan

The old Five Year Plan, in its day, was submitted to the most crushing criticism by the Opposition. It is sufficient to quote from the Platform its general evaluation of the first Five Year Plan of Stalin-Ramzin: "The gigantic advantages of the nationalization of land, the means of production, banks, and centralized direction, that is, the advantages of the socialist revolution, are not all reflected in the Five Year Plan." (Page 30.) The Central Committee declared our criticism of the Five Year Plan to be of an anti-Party nature. The Fifteenth Party Congress declared that we lack faith, because we became "frightened" of the allegedly unavoidable decline in tempo of the reconstruction period. In other words, during 1923-1928, that is, in the period of the development of the struggle against the Left Opposition, the Central Committee was the unconscious political instrument of the specialist saboteurs who, in turn, were the hired agents of the foreign imperialists and the Russian emigrant compradors. But didn't we always assert that in the struggle against the Left Opposition, Stalin is fulfilling the social command of the world bourgeoisie and disarming the proletarian vanguard? What were once sociological generalizations are now strengthened by irrefutable juridical proof in the act of indictment.

Intensity is the heart of the Five Year Plan. On the beating of the heart depends the life of the whole organism. But who were the ones to determine the rhythm of the heart itself? Ramzin makes a very precise reply to this:

"The execution of the basic provisions of the Industrial Party (that is, the party of the saboteurs) in the sphere of intensity was assured by the fact that the basic organs deciding the given question were wholly in the hands of the Industrial Party."

This is who directed the Stalinist struggle for a number of years against the "super-industrialists"!

What the Saboteurs Aimed At

It is not clear that the act of indictment of Krylenko against the Industrial Party is at the same time an indictment of the Stalinist upper layer, which, in its struggle against the Bolshevik-Leninists was really the political weapon of world capitalism? But the matter did not end with the old Five Year Plan. The same defendants show that "beginning with the second half of 1928"—observe the exactitude of the division into two periods!—"a continued reliance upon the slowing up of the tempo became impossible because," as Ramzin says, "of the energetic execution in life of the general line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." The second half of 1928—is just the time when the Central Committee turned down the Five Year Plan for a criticism of which Oppositionists were sent to Siberia. However, did the Saboteage of the specialists cease since 1928? No, from this time onward it was particularly strengthened in view of the expectation of intervention, but in the words of the same Ramzin, it took on a different character: "The basic measures in the sphere of industrialization"—he shows—"were supposed to be directed towards the deepening of the economic difficulties, unavoidable in any case."

But here Ramzin does not speak out entirely, or else Krylenko does not quote Ramzin's evidence to the end. In spite of this, the matter is quite clear. The method of

the specialists working under the direction of Krzhizhanovsky consisted of "deepening the economic difficulties", that is, of strengthening the disproportion of different branches of industry and of economy as a whole. Since, beginning with the second half of 1928, this aim could not be accomplished by a slowing down of tempo, the opposite road remained: an excessive acceleration of tempo of individual branches of industry. It is quite evident that one method is just as effective as the other.

In this way, we get what may appear to be an unexpected, but in reality a quite natural, explanation of how and why the State Planning Commission, in which the saboteurs were the basic kernel and where they led their "superior" Krzhizhanovsky by the nose without difficulty, so easily passed from minimalist to maximalist tempos, and without any resistance sanctioned the conversion of the unverified Five Year Plan into a four year plan. The specialists understood perfectly that the unbridled acceleration of individual branches of industry without verification, without

foresight, without capable regulation, results, on the one hand, in a disproportion and, on the other hand, lowers the quality of production, in this manner preparing the explosion of the Five Year Plan at its succeeding stage. In this way it flows without the least doubt from the act of indictment that in the period of its economic lagging—up to 1928—as well as in the period of its economic adventurism—beginning with the second half of 1928—the Stalinist economic leadership acted under the dictation of the saboteurs' center, that is, a gang of agents of international capital. For the struggle against this "leadership", the Bolshevik-Leninists were put in jail, exiled and even shot. Here is the naked truth which cannot be refuted by any shrewd concoction!

Pravda and the Planning Commission

The act of indictment, revealing the picture of the saboteurs' command of the State Planning Commission and in the All-Union Council of People's Economy, is published in the November 11th issue of Pravda, and a day before, the same paper,

Imperialist Gunpowder in the Air :: By Paul Sizoff

PARIS—

A wind of panic seems to have swept over the French bourgeoisie since the last speech of Mussolini. From the perpetual revenge-mongers of the *Echo de Paris* to the "Pacifists" of the sacred union of *Populaire*, all are talking of the coming war. The former are rubbing their hands: an excellent opportunity for them to militarize the country a little more, to squander new billions in order to satisfy the appetites of the munitions dealers who pull them on their strings. As to the latter, they profit by refurbishing their pacifist armor, greatly discolored by years of social-patriotism; they launch themselves upon the country demanding peace and disarmament through merciless struggle against nationalism and Bolshevism.

After the Versailles Peace

The victorious imperialist state which has least profited from the Versailles peace is incontestably Italy. The treaty gave her neither sources of raw material nor markets; the two poles of capitalist production. Kept out of Africa by France and England which had carved themselves the lion's share there, the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire had no other result than that of favoring the vassals of French capitalism—Jugo-Slavia Roumania, Czecho-Slovakia, which defend themselves behind their tariff walls against Italian penetration. In this chiefly agricultural country, Italian capitalism has no internal market because of the extreme misery of the peasant masses; it has no external market in the midst of the world crisis of over-production. The trade balance reaches a deficit of six billion francs but Italian capitalism has not as much exported capital as its French or English neighbors to offset its passive trade balance.

On the contrary, it is only by repeated loans from the United States that Fascism has been able to develop and to rationalize its industry. The lowest wages in Europe and unemployment are the ransom that Italian and American capitalists extort from the toiling masses crushed by the Fascist terror.

The economic situation is so tragic, the Fascist power so distrustful of its political future, that Mussolini, while reenforcing his anti-working class terror, plans to recruit collaborators from the former parliamentary ministers of the Giolitti government.

This is the moment that Mussolini chose to make his loud voice heard over Europe. By his threats and by his war-music he seeks to restore the inner cohesion of Fascism, undermined by its contradictions, he hopes to group the vanquished powers and Bulgaria in a united front of resistance to French hegemony. The bourgeois press is pleased to compare his attitude with that of William II before the war. And that serves as a pretext for the nationalist crowd to increase armaments. However, there is nothing in common between the Germany of 1914 and the Italy of 1930.

1914 and 1930

Germany in 1914 was the foremost industrial power in Europe with a considerable productive capacity, a highly developed technique and the greatest army and the second navy in the world. Finally, she had, as did her French and English foes

an unprecedented accumulation of capital—the sinews of war. This abundance of capital was the result of long years of prosperity, interrupted only by periodical crises which appeared over Europe and from the point of view of economics, the war replaced this crisis. If it has massacred millions of men it has also destroyed billions in capital at the same time, and ruined and impoverished the majority of the European countries, transforming creditor nations into debtors. The war served as a safety-valve for capitalist over-production, but it was possible only due to that superabundance. The Italy of 1930 is suffering from the world crisis more severely than most of the greater capitalist countries. She has not England's reserves nor Germany's technique. Her war fleet, her only guarantee in case of war, amounts to no more than three-fifths of the French fleet. Her capital reserves are very weak and the crisis consumes them more and more every month. That is moreover, the common feature of imperialist war and the crisis of overproduction. Both are on a world scale, both destroy some capital and while the one massacres the proletariat, the other condemns it to a slower death. Italy would not be able to sustain an imperialist war except insofar as she will be aided by a powerful imperialism, that is Yankee imperialism.

The Role of America

The crisis is also shaking American capitalism and its attitude at the London Naval conference shows clearly that in the present situation it is interested in preserving a conciliatory attitude on the military terrain. A course towards armament at this time would be very unwelcome to the American bourgeoisie (excepting the clique which gravitates around Hearst), and Hoover attached great importance to the ratification of the naval accords, an importance which he has underlined in a recent speech. The American press rails at the pretensions of Mussolini and compares them with the feeble means at his disposal. Gibson the American delegate at the disarmament conference went to Rome to remind the Fascist government of its dependence upon American capital. The Washington government is anxious to obtain a temporary Franco-Italian accord which will permit it to put the Treaty of London into application the treaty which, as we have frequently emphasized, actually consecrates the naval supremacy of the United States.

As the banker of Italy and as an imperialist power of the first order, it does not want to steer into an international conflict in which it would necessarily be embroiled. Especially in the present state of the crisis in which its own economy is involved.

The Real Danger

War does not depend upon the political form assumed by the bourgeois state, but on the real economic and military relationship of forces. Hitler and Mussolini are not dangerous because of their nationalist bravado but because they represent the physical destruction of the proletariat, its economic and political subjugation to the most ferocious exploitation of the bourgeoisie. They are dangerous because they represent concretely the desire of the bourgeoisie to solve the crisis on the backs of

in a feuilleton under the extraordinarily fresh title: "Merciless Fire against the Right-Left Bloc", writes the following with regard to the snares of the Opposition:

"And this means the usual factional trick: by attacking, let us say, the State Planning Commission and the control figures for the 'bureaucratism of the economic organs'—they conduct an attack upon the Central Committee, upon the policies of the Party and the Party leadership."

This quotation seems absolutely incredible. A criticism of the State Planning Commission, for a number of years a toy in the hands of the bourgeois wreckers is made identical by Pravda with a criticism of the Central Committee and by that alone is declared to be blasphemy. Didn't somebody play a "trick" here on Pravda itself? And in the approaching crisis we will find out from the second act of indictment that the Stalinist super-tempo, against which we issued a timely warning, were ordered from the saboteurs by the compradors. Such is the logic of the Stalinist regime!—L. T.

the proletariat.

The proletariat must fight them to the death; not because they want the revision of the Versailles Treaty, but because they are the bloody rampart of capitalism in distress. The Versailles Treaty will be much more surely destroyed by the proletarian revolution than by the parades of Hitler and Mussolini. It will be suppression with the suppression of the capitalist class, whether it calls itself Mussolini or Tardieu Hitler or MacDonald.

Without attaching too much importance to the phrases of Mussolini, it is true that war, without being probably imminent, is a perpetual menace of capitalist society. This menace will become more precise according as certain big capitalist powers are able to disentangle themselves from the crisis and enrich themselves at the expense of the others. For this competition France occupies the foremost place. She abounds in gold and in capital; she abounds in soldiers, in cannon and in airplanes; she abounds in allies who are the police of Europe. The fortifications of Tardieu have a firmness quite different from the bellicose speeches of the nationalist agitators. By its existence alone in the midst of a ruined Europe, of a shaken world, she constitutes a genuine danger of war.

The French Communists do not have to fight directly against Hitler they must precipitate the defeat of their own bourgeoisie, of their own government before its dream of hegemony finds its realization in a bloody venture.

—o—o—o

A VERY OBLIGING REPLY

An Associated Press dispatch of December 8 reprinted in numerous papers including the New York Evening Post, gives the following bit of instructive information:

"Mr. Henderson (British Foreign Secretary), despite heckling as to whether he intended to permit the case to rest in the present state, deferred his answer the protest against a recent broadcast in English from Moscow in which miners were urged to resist the owners' terms. The broadcast had been made by a trade union station over which the Soviet Government has no control, the message explained.

"However, it continued that 'taking into consideration Foreign Secretary Henderson's declaration of the undesirability of such broadcasts, in the future it will be impressed on the Union of Central Councils that no such messages should be transmitted'."

Henderson the Labor minister considers messages to the British miners urging resistance to the capitalist offensive as "undesirable", while Stalin promises to impress the Russian trade unions not to send such messages again. There are such things, under certain conditions as good agreements with reformists, but Stalin seems to have the sorry knack of always making bad ones.

If the number on your wrapper is

60

then your subscription to the *Militant* has expired. Renew immediately in order to avoid missing any issues.