

FORGOTTEN WORDS

Lenin and the War Danger

Instructions to the Hague Anti-War Conference Delegation

On the question of combating the danger of war in connection with the Hague Conference, I think that the greatest difficulty is to overcome the preconceived idea that this question is quite simple, clear and comparatively easy to solve.

Perhaps the most correct approach to this problem would be to begin with a sharp refutation of all such opinions; to declare that especially now, after the recent war, only the most hopelessly stupid or confirmed hypocrites can believe that such an answer to the question of the struggle against war would have the slightest effect anywhere; to declare that it is impossible to "answer" war with a revolution, in the simplest and most literal meaning of the term.

It is necessary to explain the circumstances and the secrecy in which war is hatched and the helplessness of the ordinary workers' organizations, even though they may call themselves revolutionary, in the face of the actual approach of war.

It is necessary to explain concretely over and over again just what happened during the last war, and why it could not have been otherwise than it did.

"Defense of Fatherland"

Particularly it is necessary to explain the circumstance that the "defense of the fatherland" becomes the inevitable question which the great majority of the workers will inevitably answer to the advantage of the bourgeoisie.

Therefore, the elucidation of the question of "the defense of the fatherland" in the first place, in the second place the explanation in this connection of the question of "defeatism", and finally, the explanation of the only possible means of struggle against war, namely, the formation and conservation of an illegal organization of all revolutionists participating in war—for a prolonged work against war, all these things must be brought to the front.

The "boycott of war"—is a stupid phrase. The Communists must be ready to enter any reactionary war.

It is desirable, through, let us say, examples of German literature before the war, and in particular, through the examples of the Basle Congress of 1912 to point out very concretely that mere theoretical recognition of the fact that war is a crime, that war is not permissible for socialists, etc., means nothing, that these prove to be empty phrases because there is nothing concrete in such a presentation of the question. We give to the masses no really vital presentation of the question as to how war may break out and does break out. On the contrary, the press of the dominating class obscures the issues by spreading lies about it in vast numbers of copies against which the weak socialist press is entirely powerless, the more so, that in the time of peace they maintain a radically wrong attitude toward this very question. The Communist press in the majority of countries also disorganizes itself.

I think that our delegates at the international conference of co-operators and trade unionists should divide these questions among themselves and examine all those sophisms with which it has attempted to justify war at the present time, in the most careful detail.

It may be that the most effective means of attracting the masses to warfare are just these sophisms with which the bourgeois press operates on them, and the most important circumstance explaining our own powerlessness against war consists in the fact that we either have not examined these sophisms beforehand, or that we ourselves have spent our energy getting off cheap, boastful and empty phrases to the effect that we will not allow war, that we fully understand the criminality of war, etc., in the spirit of the Basle manifesto of 1912.

Task at Congress

It seems to me that if we will have a few people who are able to make speeches against war in various languages at the Hague Conference, then our most important job will be to refute the idea that those participating in the conference are real opponents of war, that they understand how war may and can burst upon them at the most unexpected moment, that they have the least comprehension of the means of combating war, or that they are in any way capable of undertaking an intelligent and effective course in combating war.

In connection with the recent experience of the war we must clear up that great mass of theoretical and practical questions which arose the day after the declaration of war, and which made it impossible for the great majority of those summoned to apply themselves to these problems with clarity of judgment and without prejudice.

I think that the elucidation of this question demands exceptionally detailed consideration, and from two angles:

In the first place, relating and analyzing what happened during the recent war and declaring to all those present that they do not know or that, they pretend to know it, and at the same time shut their eyes to the very core of the question without the knowledge of which there can be no talk of any struggle against war. On this point I think we must examine all the points of view, all the shades of opinion which arose at that time among the Russian socialists in regard to the war. It must be pointed out that these viewpoints arose not by chance, but were generated in the very

nature of war. It must be proved that without an analysis of these opinions, and without an explanation of the inevitability of their arising and of decisive importance in any consideration of the question of the struggle against war, there can be no discussion of preparation for war or even of any intelligent attitude towards it.

In the second place—we must take examples from conflicts now going on even though they may be of the most insignificant nature, and point out from these examples how war may break out any day from the sport of England and France over some details of the treaty with Turkey, or between America and Japan over some nonsensical disagreement on some question about the Pacific Ocean, or between any of the great powers over some colonial quarrel or from some dispute over their customs or general trade policy, etc., etc. It seems to me, that if there is the slightest doubt as regards the possibility of completing an entire speech against war at the Hague, then it is necessary to invent a whole series of clever devices in order to include at least the most important things in the speech and then to print in brochure form what has not been included in the speech. We must be prepared for being cut short by the president.

I think that for this purpose there must be invited to join the delegation not only capable orators pledged to make speeches, setting forth the entire case against war, that is, developing all the important arguments and all the necessary conditions for the struggle against war—but in addition there must be people speaking all three of the most im-

The Stalinists and Barbusse

The invaluable document from the pen of Lenin which we publish above is the most timely contribution of the day to the movement for the struggle against war. When it was first made public several years ago, shortly after the death of Lenin, it was just characterized as a historical document which constituted one of Lenin's last and most mature words to the party. Its timeliness is emphasized particularly by the confusion which prevails at the present moment in the ranks of the revolutionary movement in connection with the anti-war fight. The grossest example of this confusion is the so-called "Congress Against War" which has been called by an international committee of petty-bourgeois pacifists and liberals, together with unofficial representatives of the Communist International, to be held in Geneva on August 28.

The C. I. and Barbusse

The collusion of the Stalinists in this venture—ludicrous at best and perilous at worst—is beyond dispute to anyone with the slightest knowledge of the apparatus mechanism employed in similar affairs. The mere presence on the Barbusse Committee of Sen Katayama, the Stalinist leader of Japanese Communism and at least formerly a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, is already sufficient indication that the initiative and behind-the-scenes backing for the whole affair comes from the laboratories of Stalinism.

In the United States, this admixture of Communism and petty bourgeois pacifism—or more accurately, this disgraceful subordination of Communism to pacifism—is represented by the so-called "Dreiser Committee", the American section of the Barbusse venture. It has called a conference in the Labor Temple for August 8 which is to elect delegates to the world congress at Geneva.

In the New York Herald-Tribune of July 15, we read the announcement that "the purpose of the world congress, Mr. Cowley (the secretary of the Dreiser Committee) said yesterday, was not merely to arouse articulate opinion but to 'try to get some definite, practical, realistic methods of stopping the war which seems imminent in the next year.'" The composition of the American Committee is already sufficient for an understanding of what is understood by "definite, practical, realistic methods of stopping the war." On the Committee are to be found not merely confused Communist sympathizers like Dreiser and Lamont, but ex-war patriots and reformists like Upton Sinclair, out-and-out bourgeois reformers like Lillian D. Wald, of the Henry Street Settlement; petty bourgeois liberals like Harry Elmer Barnes, Robert Lovett and Franz Boas, plus a number of stars from the world of art and letters. What the vast majority of these people have in common with a struggle against imperialism war, except to contribute a dose of erroneous ideas and confusion, is an enigma that must remain unsolved to all but those who understand the policy of the Stalinist faction.

For the latter, the struggle against war is some special task disconnected from the general struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. With this treacherous approach to the problem, Stalin and Bucharin conceived the notorious Anglo-Russian Committee as the "organizing center of the struggle against war and imperialism" only to have it fall with a crash that inflicted a series of deep wounds upon the Soviet Union and the Communist International. The hope that the petty bourgeois labor leaders like Purcell and Cook would conduct a "definite, practical, realistic" struggle against war, was shattered upon the rocks of the class struggle. The similar hope entertained for the "world

portant languages who will devote their time to conversations with the delegates clearing up just how far they have understood the basic arguments and, in so far as there is any necessity, in bringing up other arguments or in pointing out the necessary examples.

It may be that in certain questions only actual examples drawn from the last war will have any serious effect. It may be that in certain other questions only the explanation of the present conflicts between the governments and their connection with a possible armed conflict will carry any weight.

Errors of Communists

On the question of the struggle against war, I am reminded that there are a whole series of declarations by our Communist deputies, both in Parliament and in speeches outside of Parliament, which contain the most amazingly mistaken and superficial ideas on the subject. I think that we must take a decisive and relentless stand against all declarations of this nature, especially if they have been made after the war, mentioning the name of every such orator. You may soften all you like, when it is necessary, your denunciation of such an orator, but it is impossible to pass by a single such instance in silence, because a light-minded attitude toward this question is so mischievous that it permeates everything else, and must on no account be treated with indulgence.

There have been a succession of unpardonably stupid and hare-brained decisions of workers' congresses. We must gather at once all the material on this question and consider in the greatest detail every part and particle of this material, and prepare our "strategy" for the congress.

Not only will no mistakes be permissible, but we shall refuse to tolerate any substantial defects in the handling of this question. December 4, 1922.

—LENIN.

League against Imperialism", which became a stamping ground for every discredited and discreditable political adventurer who need a momentary protective coat of "revolutionary" coloration, suffered a like fate. By fostering the Barbusse adventure, the Comintern is preparing another debacle this time perhaps more disastrous in view of the growing need for clarity and action in the struggle against war and reaction.

Lenin's brilliant contribution to the subject of the struggle against the danger of war, in connection with the periodic conferences of pacifists and their allies, demands the widest popularization at the present moment. The Left Opposition, true to its duty, will carry on a fight for the victory of these revolutionary views even inside of the Barbusse Congress movement, both in Europe and the United States. That our readers will take as a foregone conclusion, for the past of the Left Opposition is an index of its stand in the present case.

The question is: WHAT POSITION WILL THE OFFICIAL PARTY TAKE? WILL IT SUPPORT THE VIEWS OF BARBUSSE OR THE VIEWS OF LENIN?

«The Foundations of Socialism»

by LEON TROTSKY

The German liberal newspaper Berliner Tageblatt, dedicated a special number, in May, to the economic construction in U. S. S. R. The political article was written by Radek. To the question as to which direction the development of the Union is taking, Radek answers as follows, "In the fourteen years, which separate us from the October revolution, in Russia have been created the foundations of socialism. In monstrous struggles, in unceasing labor, a new society is being born." In such a general form these words, of course, can evoke no objections, particularly since they are published in the columns of a bourgeois paper. But Radek does not confine himself to this. Spurred on by an insatiable need to prove the sincerity of his repentance, he goes on to write, "This situation is denied not only by outright enemies of the Soviet Union, but it is also impugned by Leon Trotsky; as he puts it, at such a time when in Russia there is a scarcity of milk, he who talks about the creation of the foundation of socialism compromises socialism. This remark shows only," continues Radek, "that the author has lost those scales which formerly he was capable of applying to evaluate historical events." Radek, who renounced his own platform, is accusing others of losing their historical scales! However, of what should these consist? We quote the answer verbatim, "Milk is the produce of cows, and not of socialism and in truth, one must really confuse socialism with the picture of that land where flow rivers of milk in order not to comprehend that a country may rise to the highest stage of development without temporarily thereby raising materially the condition of the national masses."

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF "FOUNDATIONS"

For the moment let us put aside the clownish tone of the discussion. And let us try to extract from it the serious kernel. There is, first of all, in Radek's answer the theoretical subterfuge, to which, in truth, Stalin resorted more than once when he was pressed to the wall. The matter concerns the tiny word, "the foundation" of Socialism. The present leaders of the Soviet Union have officially proclaimed that the country "has entered into socialism." This assertion we called and continue to call criminal bureaucratic charlatanism. Radek keeps mum on the entry into socialism. Instead he advises us that in the Soviet Union there have been created the foundations of the foundation of Socialism. One can agree with this or disagree, depending upon what one understands by "foundation".

Radek does not leave us without an answer on this point, "If we are convinced—says he—that the foundation of Socialism has already been laid in Russia, it is because our judgment rests, in the first place, upon the fact that the possessing classes have disappeared and that the means of production are concentrated in the hands of the proletariat state." In this sense the foundation has been indubitably laid. But in such a formulation the subject of the dispute disappears altogether. Radek reduces his proof to the fact that Russia has passed through the proletarian overturn. There is no harm in reminding

the honored readers of Berliner Tageblatt about it. Unfortunately, however, the proletarian overturn and the expropriation of the possessing classes took place as early as 1917-1918. And in the meantime the entry into socialism was made public in 1930-1931. We were advised about it not on the basis of the expropriation of the expropriators (we knew about this fact even formerly) but on the basis of the 100 percent collectivization, and the elimination of the kulak as a class. Why then, does Radek surrender without a blow the first line of trenches, "the Stalin line"? Why, while so bravely assuming military activities against Trotsky, does he immediately retreat far, far to the rear, and intrench himself in the line of 1918 that is threatened by nobody?

There is no gainsaying it, in the first years after the October overturn, all of us said tens and hundreds of times, "the foundation of socialist construction is laid with us." And that was correct. But this meant only that the political, and the legal property pre-requisites for the socialist transformation were created. And that is all!

SOCIALIST FOUNDATION IN 1921

If it were possible to speak in any manner seriously with Radek on serious subjects, we would have made an attempt to explain to him that it is impossible, in 1932, in answer to the question whether does the development of U. S. S. R. lead to refer to the political "foundation" of the socialist construction. The insufficiency of this reference alone was exposed for the first time on a major scale in 1921 when the question of the reciprocal relations with the peasantry was posed point blank. The creation of the economic jointure between the city and the village was then proclaimed to be the creation of the genuine foundation of socialist construction. Of such nature was the basic task of the N. E. P. The theoretical formula of the jointure is very simple: the nationalized industry must provide the peasantry with products indispensable to it, in such quantity, of such quality and at such prices as would entirely eliminate or reduce to a minimum, in the reciprocal relations between the state and the basic mass of the peasantry, the factor of extra-economic force, that is, the administrative seizure of peasant labor. The discussion concerns of course not the kulaks, in relation to whom a special task is posed; to limit their exploiting activities and not to allow them to turn into the dominant power in the village. The establishment of a reciprocal relationship of voluntary "barter" between industry and rural economy, between the city and village would impart an immutable firmness to the political interrelation between the proletariat and the peasantry. To socialism, of course, in such a case, there would still remain a long and a difficult road. But on this foundation—the foundation of a jointure between the city and the village acceptable to the moujik, the economic work could be confidently pushed ahead, without rushing space or dropping back, by maneuvering on the world market and in accordance with the tempo of the development of the revolution in the Occident and the Orient. Not only would the road not have lead to national

socialism, but it would have been of use to nobody. It would suffice, if the still isolated economy of the Soviet Union became one of the preparatory elements of the future international socialist society.

He who talks about "the foundation of socialism" in 1932 has no right to retreat to the line of 1918, without even making an attempt to hold to the line of 1921; i. e., without giving an answer to the question: Did we succeed, during the 12 years that elapsed since the introduction of the N. E. P. to realize the jointure, in the Leninist sense of the word? Did the 100 percent collectivization assure such reciprocal relations between the city and the village as would reduce the extra-economic force, if not to zero, then clearly approximately to it? In this is the whole question. And to this fundamental question one is still compelled to give a negative answer. The 100 per cent collectivization has come about not as the crowning and the fruition of an achieved jointure, but as an administrative screening of its absence. To keep mum on this question, to circumvent it, to beat around the bush with words, is to call the greatest dangers upon the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . . But of course, it is not from Radek that one should expect an analysis of the problem of the jointure.

LENIN ON RADEK

From Radek one can only expect journalistic pirouettes. One cannot without some squeamishness observe those capers, let me say in conclusion, that Radek cuts on the question of the substance of socialism in the pages of a liberal paper. Socialism is not the land of rivers of milk. Do not demand milk from socialism. "Milk is the produce of cows." If one takes into consideration that precisely around cows in the Soviet Union at present a battle is occurring, which takes on at times tragic forms, then Radek's grimaces become utterly unbearable. One cannot but recall the merciless, reserved as it is, evaluation which Lenin placed on Radek at the VII party Congress, at the time of the controversy over the Brest-Litovsk peace. In reference to a remark of Radek that Lenin "conceded space in order to gain time", Lenin remarked, "I take notice of comrade Radek, and I want to make note here that he has succeeded accidentally to say a serious thing. This time, it has so happened that comrade Radek has come out with an entirely serious statement."

Lenin meant unequivocally to make clear that serious statements could emanate from Radek only accidentally, and in the guise of the rarest exceptions. With the years, matters on this score have no whit improved. There is less hair outside, and more light-mindedness within. Stalin proclaimed, "We have made entry into Socialism." Don't boast prematurely, objected the Opposition, for the babes still lack milk. A Jester takes the spotlight, and jingling his bells announces that milk is the produce of cows and not of socialism. In Radek's tone, one might answer from the Russian proverb, "Bide a day, bide till you're gray, you can't get milk from a buck-goat." Even a buck-goat grown bald is capable only of prancing, not more. That is why we prefer to return to serious questions on more serious occasions.

«WHAT NEXT?»-the Book of the Hour

(Continued from page 1) their theoretical confusion—"social Fascism"; their disastrous slogans—"For National and Social Emancipation of the German People", "People's Revolution", "Down With Versailles"; their self-discrediting actions—the support of the Fascist referendum in Prussia during July of last year; their hapless policy of the "Red United Front under the leadership of the Communist party"—all of which have kept the German Communists from measuring up to the tasks imposed by the needs and possibilities of the hour, from uniting the working class for a victorious struggle against Fascism—all these are traced through the zigzag course of the post-Leninist Comintern to their roots, to the principle political character of the Stalin faction and its basic tenet: socialism in one country. The why and the wherefore of the Stalinist policies, their flesh and blood expression stands out as clear as daylight after a reading of What Next?

These sharp and penetrating lenses of historical research and theoretical analysis are all focussed on the present German scene: "The contradictions within German capitalism have at present reached such a state of tension that an explosion is inevitable. The adaptability of the social democracy has reached that limit beyond which lies self-annihilation. The mistakes of the Stalinist bureaucracy have reached that limit beyond which lies catastrophe. Such is the threefold formula that characterizes the situation in Germany. Everything is now poised on the razor edge of a knife."

The Leninist Program Unfolded In this poignant, epigrammatic rhythm, the leader of the International Opposition unfolds the Communist program for the German crisis in full. His criticism is positive as well as negative. There is not a trace of pessimism in his words. Every line breathes an inspiring, optimism. And if his negative criticisms have the effect of stinging needle points, his positive proposals react like hammer blows. We read:

"... Involuntarily the question arises: Won't it be altogether too late? And each time one answers oneself: No! The armies that are drawn up for battle are too colossal that one need fear a simultaneous settlement of the issues at the speed of greased lightning. The strength

of the German proletariat has not been drained. Its powers have not been brought into play. The logic of facts will make itself heard more imperiously with every passing day."

The propositions are put forward. The manner of correcting the mistakes of the Communist party leadership. The methods of establishing the united front of the entire German working class. The role of the Communists to leadership and control of the class. The ways of international revolutionary cooperation in the proletarian solution of the epoch-shaping social crisis in Germany. We have before us an outline of Communist action as precise, as concrete, as complete as a military campaign plan.

What Next? is the book of the hour. No other work on the German events exists, as informative as instructive, as thought-provoking as this masterpiece by Leon Trotsky. For the Communists everywhere it is an indispensable source of education and training, a guide to Leninist action. For the world at large, it is a clarion call to rally against the inevitable relapse into barbarism that a prolongation of the capitalist system entails. It is the voice of historical truth speaking. —S. G.

Luzerne Hears Opposition

A meeting of the Left Opposition was held in Luzerne, Penn., on Sunday July 24, with over 40 miners present. The party and the Lovestonites were well represented. The majority of the workers present were sympathizers and former members of the Communist party. Prior to the meeting the Stalinists informed the comrades that they would break up the meeting. However, all the miners who attended wanted to hear what the Left Opposition had to say and prevented the carrying out of the threat.

Hugo Oehler presented the position of the Left Opposition. The miners showed great interest in the program of the Left Opposition and the present situation in Germany. The question and discussion period was sharp but very orderly. The Marxian teachings of the Left Opposition and comrade Trotsky are being planted in this mine region and return meetings are assured.

LEON TROTSKY WHAT NEXT? Vital Questions for the German Proletariat. BRANDLER? NATIONAL SOCIALISM? HINDENBURG? LEFT OPPOSITION? DOLEF HITLER? SOCIAL DEMOCRACY? PEOPLE'S REVOLUTION? ULTIMATISM? THAELMANN? RED STRATEGY? SEYDEWITZ? RED ARMY? HILFELDING? BOLSHEVISM? DICTATORSHIP? SOVIET UNION? BRUENING? CENTRISM? FASCISM? STALIN? COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL? DEMOCRACY? With Germany on the edge of the volcano that threatens to erupt at any moment, Leon Trotsky's penetrating analysis of what is next on the order of the day in Germany is the most timely revolutionary document of the moment. It is priced so low for a quick sale. Order your copy now! 35 c In Paper 65 c In Cloth PIONEER PUBLISHERS 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y. NEXT ISSUE Leon Trotsky HANDS OFF ROSA LUXEMBURG! A Smashing Reply to Stalin!