

4/31 Rmc

WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

# INTERNATIONAL BULLETIN OF THE COMMUNIST LEFT OPPOSITION

ENGLISH EDITION Published for the International Secretariat by the Communist League of America (Opposition), 84 East 10 Street, New York PRICE 10 CENTS

No. 3

May, 1931

## CONTENTS

### NEW PROBLEMS

"CHINA'S ANSWER" TO THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU'S PROPOSITION OF UNIFICATION

BULGARIA--To the Marxist Workers Group "Osvo-bedenie"--Letter by L. Trotsky

FRANCE--The situation in the Communist League

GERMANY--The October Conference of the German Left Opposition--by Roman Well

HUNGARY--The Life of the Hungarian Opposition

ITALY--DISJUNCTION

Political Resolution of the Italian Left Faction

GREECE--The United Front Proposal of the Archio-Marxists--Open Letter to the members of the Spartakos Group

MEXICO--Extract from a letter of the Mexican Comrades

CZECHO-SLOVAKIA--The Situation of the Left Opposition in Czecho-Slovakia

\*\*\*\*\*  
(Note: By a mistake in the technical work, pages eight and ten have been interchanged. The numbers are correct, but in reading reverse the order of the pages.)  
\*\*\*\*\*

NEW PROBLEMS

In its appeal to all the sections of the International Opposition (for the convocation of a conference of the European sections), the editorial board of the International Bulletin defined as follows the aim of No. 3 of the International Bulletin: "We are going to devote Number 3 of the International Bulletin principally to questions concerning the European conference. We immediately invite all the sections, on the one hand, to send us documents and material which describe their position and their activities in the sphere of every day work, and, on the other hand, to give their opinion on the documents which have been sent out and which are soon to be sent out, by adding their amendments, their counter-proposals, or supplements."

The readers of this Bulletin will realize that the proposed aim has not been accomplished. No. 3 of the Bulletin, like the two preceding numbers, is still informational in character, and does not contain the theses of our important European sections, which are to come up for international discussion.

Why? First, because the sections of two of the most important countries of Europe, the German and the French sections, are going through an internal crisis, which obstructs, to a certain extent, their development, and retards the work of ideological clarification. Further on will be found a note which explains the causes and effects of this crisis in the French League. We shall publish in the next issue documents which serve as a basis for discussion in the French section, and a detailed exposition of the situation in Germany.

But these facts explain only in part the postponement of the entire work of ideological preparation for the European Conference. It is to be noticed that nearly all our sections are still busy with their first task, with their initial task, so to speak, which consists in criticizing the erroneous policies of the official parties. Our role as a faction of the C.P. and of the C.I., well understood generally by all our sections, has, to a certain extent, emphasized the critical side of oppositional thought at the expense of positive ideological creation. It is a danger which should be pointed out today.

\*\*\*\*\*

CHINA

CHINA'S ANSWER TO THE I.B.'s PROPOSITIONS OF UNIFICATION

Shanghai, November 12, 1930.

To the International Bureau:

We received long ago Comrade L.P.'s letter on the subject of the unification of the Chinese Opposition and the Manifesto of the International Bureau to the Communists of China and of the entire world. We have closely examined these documents, and have concluded that unification is an urgent task of the Left Opposition in China.

On the ... of September the delegates of the four groups met. Discussion on the question of unification brought forth favorable results. All the participants recognized that differences on principle do not exist among them, and that tactical differences can be liquidated in the unified organization of the Chinese Opposition. It was decided, after two meetings of the delegates from all the groups, to create a unification commission on the 19th of October. The commission on unification started work at once. The task of this commission is to prepare theses and the platform for the unified Chinese Opposition, and, after their wide-spread distribution, to convoke on the basis of these theses the III Congress of the Chinese Opposition. The commission is divided into: (a) a committee of secretaries, in charge of the arrangement of general meetings and with the editing of common publications, (b) a committee in charge of preparing as soon as possible the theses of the platform, (c) the active committee in charge of propaganda work among workers and in the party, (d) the committee in control of the activity of the four groups.

... have been elaborated; we shall soon begin a thorough discussion of these theses. The committee has decided to conduct the discussion in common, and not in groups.

The commission on unification has decided to put the following questions on the agenda of the Chinese Opposition's Unification Congress: "Red Army", dictatorship of the proletariat and of the poor peasantry, relations between the Kuo-min-tang and the Chinese Party.

We are firmly fighting against all attempts to prevent unification.

Secretarial Committee of the Commission on  
Unification of the Chinese Left Opposition

The International Bureau has received a series of documents which refer to the activity of the Chinese Opposition and which present important problems. All these documents will be submitted to a thorough examination in the forthcoming issues of the International Bulletin. The European and American comrades follow with the closest attention the internal life of the Chinese Opposition, which is one of the most important sections of the International Left Opposition.

BULGARIA

November 29, 1930.

TO THE MARXIST WORKERS' GROUP, "OSVOBODENIE".

Dear Comrades:

I have only today found an opportunity to inform you about a few reflections on the subject of your manifesto. I appreciate very much your exposure of the zig-zags in the Stalin-Bukharin policies in Bulgaria; you have revealed the complete identity of the general line "in Bulgaria with that same line in Russia, in China, etc." Under the various longitudes and in different forms, opportunism and adventurism, succeeding and complementing one another, have revealed everywhere the same essential features. As for myself, two important facts have been disclosed to me by your manifesto: the opportunist electoral bloc in 1926 and the upward swing of the trade union movement in the same year. It would be very useful for you to make a short historical expose for our international press with a study of the minute details and the concrete conditions in which these two stages took place.

Finally, allow me to express in all frankness several doubts as well as a few objections. It is possible that in one case or the other I will be knocking on open doors, that is to say, I will raise objections to points of view and tendencies which you do not at all uphold and which unfortunate wording in the manifesto wrongly attributed to you. If that is so, all the better. In politics a certain amount of scolding from one side or the other is far better than indifference and negligence.

(1) You justly condemn the tactic of individual and mass terror when it is applied in conditions other than those of mass revolution. But I believe that you attach to your judgment an excessively moral and pathetic character. You speak of the "inglorious epoch of the Russian social revolutionaries". I for my part should not have expressed myself in that manner. In the tactics of the Social Revolutionists there was indeed an adventurist element which we condemned, but we never spoke of an inglorious epoch, even in regard to the heroic acts of individual terror, although we warned against policies of this sort. The Social Revolutionists Party became inglorious after it had given up the revolutionary struggle altogether and made a bloc with the bourgeoisie.

(2) On Page 6 you speak of the adventurism of the "illegal communist party", and on Page 8 you speak of the "joy of the workers" when they witnessed the re-

birth of the labor party as "the legal political organ of the workers' movement". These two quotations give the impression that you condemn every sort of illegal organization in general, opposing to it legal forms as the only form of organization fitting for a mass movement. It is evident that such a point of view is entirely wrong, and I do not at all doubt that you do not share it. It is quite possible that you were tied down in this question by the censorship. Of course, we must take this into account. But if the censorship can restrain us from saying that which we have in mind, it cannot in any case force us to say that which we have not in mind, especially when it is so basic a question as that of the correlations between legality and illegality in the revolutionary movement.

(3) For the same reasons I consider it sufficient to characterize the attempted assassination in April as indiscrete, but it is superfluous to add into the bargain that it was "monstrous and criminal". We cannot in any case make concessions of this sort to bourgeois public opinion, despite all the reservations we may make as to the revolutionary usefulness of those terrorist acts. On this point, I would advise you to read the letters of Engels to Bernstein and the correspondence between Engels and Marx (on the questions of the attempts on the life of Dionarcus Napoleon III, etc.).

(4) On Page 7 you put the blame for the decomposition of the trade union movement on Pastoukhov and on Dimitrov, placing yourselves on neutral territory between the two. Here, too, it is only a question, I hope, of an unfortunate formulation and not of a principle deviation. Pastoukhov is an agent of the bourgeoisie, that is to say, our class enemy. Dimitrov is a confused revolutionary who combines proletarian aims with petty bourgeois methods. You say that the one as well as the other want to be the "sole rulers" of the trade union movement. Every socialist or communist tendency wants to have a maximum of influence in the trade union movement. When your organization will become a force you, too, will be accused of claiming the role of "absolute rulers" of the trade union movement -- and I wish you with all my heart to merit as soon as possible such an accusation. It is not a question of the tendency for one group or the other to try to gain influence in the trade unions (that is inevitable), but of the content of the ideas and the methods that each brings into the trade union movement. Pastoukhov tends to the subordination of the trade union movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie. The Dimitrovs are opposed to that, but by their false policies they assure, in spite of themselves, the success of Pastoukhov. We cannot put them all on the same level.

(5) I cannot see clearly how the successes of the liquidationist group, "Newly Born", can consolidate the Marxist group, "Osobodenie" (Page 13).

(6) On Page 14 you write that your task does not consist of creating "a sort of new political workers' group" which will compete with the Labor Party. You counterpose to that the creation of a Marxist group with purely ideological tasks. It is possible that this hazy formulation is also conditioned by considerations of the censorship. At any rate, a Marxist group which wants to influence the party and the entire labor movement cannot be anything but a political grouping. It is not an independent party that competes with the official party, but it is an independent faction which gets itself the task of taking a part in the life of the party and of the working class.

These are all my objections. I shall be very pleased to hear that you have made progress in the immediate task that you have set yourselves -- the creation of a Weekly.

Communist greetings,

L. TROTSKY

THE SITUATION IN THE COMMUNIST LEAGUE

The Administrative Secretariat occupied itself with the French question on Dec. 14, 1930, at the time when the internal crisis had become particularly grave.

To give here a brief glimpse of the facts which summarize the situation in the League at the time. The leading body, the Executive Commission of the League, was clearly divided into two factions, mutually fighting one another. The leading positions entrusted to each of the members of the E.C. were used in the factional struggle to combat the opposing party.

Such a situation existed where the comrades who were directing the trade union work, the work among the youth and in the party, the editorial board of the VERITE, refused to collaborate with the representatives of the E.C. minority. The minority comrades on their part utilized their posts to force the majority to respect their rights and the decisions of the organization they were directing.

Lately, when one of the editors refused to publish a notice from the District Committee of the Paris district, the responsible editor (Corant) of the VERITE, a member of the minority, demanded his rights as responsible editor, in order to force the editor to insert the notice of the D.U. The E.C., acting on this incident, decided with the votes of the majority to remove the responsible editor from his functions. The minority considered this decision as a move toward a split and as a sign of protest it decided not to participate further in the activities of the E.C., reserving for itself the right to appeal to the members of the League and to the International Secretariat. The work of the E.F. was completely paralyzed. A split seems inevitable.

At this moment the Administrative Secretariat decided to study the situation together with the E.C. and the members of the Parisian district of the League. A plenary session with the E.C. and a general meeting of the Parisian groups convinced the Administrative Secretariat that to maintain the status quo in the E.C. means to prolong the crisis and approve of a split. At the Administrative Secretariat session of December 21st it was, therefore, decided:

(1) To urge all the comrades to clearly express their political differences, of which the incidents described above are only secondary expressions.

(2) That only a change in the leading organs of the League could prevent a split. The Administrative Secretariat condemns splits and strives to prevent them with all its forces.

(3) That every decision adopted by a vote of the general assembly with fair play both to the majority and the minority must be respected in full.

(4) That the Administrative Secretariat considers it the basic task of the E.C. to be elected to continue the discussion for the National Conference in the VERITE, which is to be open to all tendencies in the League. The VERITE and the discussion must be directed by the entire E.C.

At the second general meeting of the Paris groups to which the Administrative Secretariat had communicated its decisions, after inviting all the comrades to act according to them in order to avoid a split, a political discussion took place on the disputed questions.

The question of the trade unions divided the comrades more than any other. What should be the relations between us and the trade union tendency in the C.G.T.U. the Unitary Opposition -- whose aim is to redress the revolutionary trade union center? The U.O. in the creation of which the League actively participated has lately manifested a confusion and a very serious lack of stability in the political and trade union questions, which bring it into opposition with the C.G.T.U. This confusion was crowned by the theses presented to the first conference of the O.U. on December 28th. These theses contain exaggerated optimistic evaluations of the present situation.

... the unions -- conceptions which bring the U.O. very close to the position of the Committee for Trade Union Independence.

What attitude ought we, Left Oppositionists and members of the U.O., take toward this trade union tendency that is close to us but stands the risk of taking the path toward confusion and even reformism? How shall we act in the U.O. in line with our conceptions of Communist work in the trade unions?

A very lively discussion took place on this point. There proved to be among the members of the majority some comrades, notably the director of the trade union work in the Paris region, who allowed themselves to be misled by the false conceptions of the U.O. and adopted entirely the false policies of the U.O. But what is even more serious is the fact that the comrades not only did not themselves try to react against the mistakes of the U.O. and to formulate a Communist criticism of the theses which we considered wrong, but they even prevented the comrades who wanted to make such criticism at the regular meetings of the U.O. from doing so.

The comrades of the majority in fact denied the members of the League to constitute themselves into a faction within the U.O. for the discussion in order to be able to influence the U.O. within the framework of workers' democracy. This attitude on the part of the majority of the E.C. was all the more to be condemned because the U.O. was on the eve of its first conference and was about to adopt important political and tactical decisions whose political consequences as far as the League is concerned could be very great. We must note that the VERITE did not begin the discussion on the trade union question and on the theses presented to this conference until eight days before the conference.

\*\* \*\* \*

In the question of the "turn" that the C.P.F. made by abandoning certain ultra-Left slogans of the "third period" (political mass strike, politization of strikes, conquest of the street, mechanization of the trade unions, etc.), two points of view became evident at the time of the turn (August, 1930): (1) the turn is a step forward, and it is our duty to support the party in all its attempts to sincerely apply the turn, and (2) the turn leads to opportunism and must constantly be denounced before the membership by us.

The first discussion on this subject (August-September) ended in a unanimous resolution, inspired by the spirit of conciliation between the two groups and did not underline the capital difference in our tactics toward the party, stressed by each group.

In the course of our work in the party and among the youth, these differences concealed by the unanimous resolution, manifested themselves most clearly. The comrades of the majority, instead of applying the tactic of collaboration with the party membership by making use of the turn, only denounced the turn everywhere as opportunist, thereby cutting themselves off from the membership. The party and youth bureaucrats utilized the clumsiness and the tactical mistakes of our comrades and expelled them without an effective reaction on the part of the membership.

These facts stirred up anew the discussion on the turn. It became clear that the unanimous resolution on the turn was nothing but a foul compromise since it was made at the expense of political clarity in the most important question for the Left Opposition, notably -- on the question of our relations to the party.

Without falling back into the other extreme that several comrades of the minority fell into, who believed that after the turn the party found the correct road on many questions, the last discussion underscored the fact that our work in the party and among the youth was wrong because it was based on an evaluation according to which the turn necessarily had to lead to opportunism.

The discussion on all these questions was not exhausted by the last general

meeting of the Parisian region. It was decided to continue the discussion in the VERITAS, in the International Bulletin and in an internal bulletin if necessary. The National Conference will have to close the discussion by the adoption of political resolutions on all these questions.

The change in the E.C. through the re-election of the representatives of the Paris Region (5 instead of 11), plus the representatives of the provincial groups, was decided unanimously.

GERMANY

THE OCTOBER CONFERENCE OF THE GERMAN LEFT OPPOSITION

We publish below the note of Comrade Well on the October Conference at which he, together with the entire Saxon delegation, opposed the majority of the leadership. The Editorial Board does not as yet possess any document on this subject that gives the point of view of the administration of the German Opposition.

Comrade Well's view follows:

Since the Secretariat of the German Opposition has not as yet published an official report on the October Conference in the International Bulletin, I feel obliged to say a few words on the subject myself.

First of all, I believe that I am expressing the opinion of the entire Opposition when I say that the preparation for the conference was insufficient if not wrong.

A very unique mode of representation was elaborated by the Berlin section of the leadership. 1 vote was given for every 5 members. In this way one delegate alone from the South-West was able to hold 31 votes. Thus, a peculiar condition developed due to which the actual minority of the conference transformed itself into the majority.

No profound political discussion, on the basis of theses, took place. The cause of this was not the lack of time alone, but above all the deficiency of the theses elaborated for the most part by Comrade Landau. According to the opinion of nearly every one of the organizations these theses did not allow for the possibility of a genuine political discussion. The Saxon organization was opposed particularly to the theses on the German question; according to the latter, the theses contained a good deal of confusion and required profound changes.

The Saxon organization presented in the short time of which it disposed some supplements and amendments to the theses on almost all of the questions and full theses on the trade union question.

The poor preparation of the Conference inevitably had to have some repercussions on the Conference itself. There was no sort of possibility to start a political discussion on questions as essential as the economic crisis, the perspectives of fascism, the united front, the trade union question, etc....The discussion on the Russian theses, elaborated by the author of these lines, did not take place either.

The greatest part of the conference was taken up with organizational questions and with personalities, instigated by Comrades Landau and Mueller. The pre-conference (which preceded the conference by a day) was forced to devote all its time to unfounded accusations of Comrades Landau and Mueller and others against Comrade Drylewitz. This unjustified accusation was unanimously rejected by the delegates.

Nevertheless, the morning of the following day was occupied with the same question. It was only in the afternoon that conference approached the political questions. After the two political speeches of Comrades Landau and Well, no time was left for a serious political discussion. Consequently, no thesis could be

adopted and the German Opposition still remains without a platform. That is why a new conference was planned for January.

The contention contained in the report on the conference, published in "Der Kommunist", No. 12, that the theses of the Saxon organization on the trade union question were adopted do not, unfortunately, correspond to the truth.

It is natural that the delegates, especially those of the provinces, whom the Conference caused considerable expense, were dissatisfied with the results of the Conference.

The conference brought no change in the methods employed by certain comrades. The questions of internal democracy and of collective work were not solved in a positive sense.

R. WELL

HUNGARY

THE LIFE OF THE HUNGARIAN OPPOSITION

The question of the Hungarian Opposition has already been posed at the provisional conference of the International Opposition in April. At that time the Hungarian Opposition could only in part be represented, because it was scattered all over the different countries which made the regroupment of our Opposition very slow and difficult.

At Budapest there is a group of youth (see International Bulletin No. 2). This group is very active and its connections with the International Opposition help to reinforce it ideologically and to bring it near to the membership of the party and the adult Opposition comrades who have not as yet declared their adherence to the International Bureau.

There are emigrant groups of Oppositionists in America, in France, in Czechoslovakia and in Austria. Communication between these groups for the publication of an Opposition paper in the Hungarian language becomes a self-evident necessity.

The provisional organ of the Hungarian Opposition, the OSZTALVEZES, will appear shortly. This paper will have as its task the preparation and the organization of a conference of the Hungarian Opposition. At this conference the Opposition must put on the agenda the elaboration of a platform and of the political tasks as well as the organization of the work in Hungary. The question of a paper or of a theoretical bulletin must equally occupy the attention of the conference.

In order to solve all these tasks, we will have to encounter innumerable difficulties. Our own forces are not enough to surmount these difficulties. We shall issue an urgent appeal to all our comrades of the Left Opposition, especially in America, in France, in Czechoslovakia, in Austria, in Germany, and in the U.S.S.R. as well, to facilitate our tasks by sending us through the mediation of the Secretariat of the International Opposition useful information concerning the situation of their respective groups, by getting us contacts with isolated comrades and by sending us financial aid.

We have at our disposal pamphlets and propaganda papers to be used by our comrades.

THE BUREAU OF THE HUNGARIAN OPPOSITION

DISCUSSION

POLITICAL RESOLUTION OF THE ITALIAN LEFT FACTION

(1) The faction confirms the fundamental characteristics of its nature, as declared at the time of its formation (Conference of Pantin, 1928). The tendency within the proletarian party becomes transformed into a faction when the development of alien and contrary forces have achieved such successes as to threaten the very fundament of the proletarian organization. The free play of tendencies is a



reflection of class currents. Opportunism represents the policies that orientate toward the preparation of the failure of the party in the face of revolutionary situations. The Left represents the policy that bases itself on the relationship in the class movements in order to liquidate opportunism and to prepare the victory of the party for the conquest of its fundamental objectives.

The struggle between the tendencies gives place to the struggle of the factions, which become the reflection of opposing class interests inside the party, capitalism and the proletariat. The Left reflects the interests of the proletariat. Opportunism reflects the interests of the bourgeoisie.

The struggle between the factions gives way to the construction of a new party when opportunism becomes the direct agent of the enemy in the PROLETARIAN CAMP.

These three phases materialized within the II International. The subsequent development of the Left from a tendency into a faction and finally into a party was regulated by the different roles of opportunism; whereas the period in which the construction of a new international became necessary took place when the class relations and the development of the situation made possible the interlinking of the appeal to build a new party with the upsurge of the proletarian movement.

The different roles of opportunism and the fact that these different roles exist depend upon the process of the class struggle itself. The process of the struggle and its outcome in opposite solutions (proletarian or capitalist) and the three phases of the struggle inside the proletariat depend upon the rhythm of development of the class movements. These movements brought about by the situations are produced by the explosion of the contradictions on which capitalism rests. Before the occurrence of the decisive explosion which leads to pitched revolutionary battle, the contradictions produce intermediary movements, the success of which depends upon the presence of a Communist organization. Inside the party, if the rhythm of these movements is very strong, it is possible that the succession "tendency-faction-new party" will be arrested at a point where the faction will be able to liberate the party from the forces that reflect the historic interests of the enemy.

The problems of the proletarian struggle against opportunism are not regulated by the proletarian will of the members of the faction nor by the exploits of opportunism, but by political action that corresponds to the class analysis of the situations.

It is possible that the process of the class struggle should lead to a situation where capitalism inflicts defeat upon the proletariat with the aid of opportunism inside the party of the proletariat, and that nothing is left for the faction to do but to begin rebuilding the class movement of the proletariat from the ground up. That is what happened in the II International. One cannot dismiss this possibility except through the timely victory of the faction, in relation with the rhythm of the class struggle. If a different motive should guide the factions in the struggle against opportunism, it will be detected when the faction detaches itself from the class movements and when it loses itself in anti-proletarian directions or disintegrates. That is what happened in the II International in regard to syndicalism.

(2) The constitution of the faction relating to situations where the membership of the party itself is menaced by opportunism, indicates clearly the perspective of the inevitable decline of the party or its salvation solely through the victory of the faction.

(3) The constitution of the faction in the III International, a constitution proclaimed at the epoch of imperialism, of wars and revolutions, has been justified in view of the victory of opportunism in the first proletarian state, a victory which has broken the circle of development of the world revolution that has its pivot in the Russian revolution. Opportunism can be defeated either by a proletarian victory in Russia or by a revolutionary victory in some other country. On

either hypothesis the same action of the defense of the Russian revolution must be placed on an international plane of preparation of the factions for revolutionary situations in the different countries, and not orientated simply in the sense of the solution in Russia alone.

(4) The faction constitutes itself in the presence of the following contradictions: opportunism reflects class interests opposed to those on which the proletarian party bases itself. Within the III International and in the proletarian state, this contradiction finds a bloody expression in opportunism passing over to the use of physical terror against the Left.

That does not transform opportunism into an apparatus of capitalist action against the proletariat. The apparatus, however, does not identify itself with the interests of the proletariat and the Russian Revolution. If the factors of judgment are modified, we abandon the class basis and support ourselves on criteria which lead to the inevitable disintegration of the faction.

The faction establishes the fact that the conditions of Communist crisis that engendered its formation persist and that they can only arrive at their conclusion by a shake-up of the class relationships in Russia itself. The slow down of the class movements, particularly after the defeat of the Chinese revolution, has added to the consolidation of opportunism in the midst of the C.I. and the various parties.

Due to the march of events which tends to an aggravation of the class antagonisms that lead to an issue either in war or in revolution, the plan of capitalism develops along the line of the destruction of the Communist influence among the masses. The principal force that acts along the plan of capitalism is represented by opportunism which has taken possession of the Communist parties and of Soviet Russia. To such a stage of developments corresponds the duty to issue the slogan of the struggle for the faction.

(5) The policy of the faction must envisage a struggle against this plan of the destruction of the Communist movement, in connection with the events of the class struggle. This policy finds application in the adoption of a series of political positions that the faction applies in an autonomous and independent manner. This series of political positions must be systematically presented as tending to become the guiding factor of the proletariat and as the element which from a general point of view can solve the Communist crisis.

As to the realization of such a Communist policy, the faction must emphasize the fact that the more the necessity of the proletarian struggle will advance, the more will it become clear that only the victory of the Left is the fundamental condition for the success of this struggle.

(6) The faction is the organism which must solve the Communist crisis and which brings about the possibility of this solution as a result of movements created by the class struggle in the direction of the victory of the Left faction. This role is realizable by drawing in all the proletarians into actions on the specific terrain of the faction, a terrain which remains that of the Communist solution of the crisis through the triumph of the proletariat.

#### The Italian Left Faction.

\* \* \* \* \*

The resolution of the Italian Left Faction contains several false estimations of the role of the C.I. and of the Communist Parties which the editors of the International Bulletin do not share at all. We will restrict ourselves here to indicate two points that seem to us particularly erroneous.

(1) The resolution says that "the principal force that acts along the plan of capitalism (the destruction of Communist ideology among the masses) is represented by opportunism which has taken possession of the Communist parties and of Soviet

DISCUSSION

The International Left Opposition describes the policy of the C.I. and of the C.P. of the U.S.S.R. as an expression of a centrist current. The difference between our estimation and that of the Italian Left Faction is of capital importance. The policy of the C.I. leadership in the period 1924-1927 was clearly opportunist. But it would be impossible to characterize as opportunist the adventurist policy of the "third period" and of the "one hundred percent collectivization" of the years 1928-1930 (although the results are just as disastrous for the proletariat and the revolutionary movement). It is because the leadership of the party has come under the influence of the petty bourgeois layers, represented in the apparatus of the party and the Soviets by the bureaucracy, that the party policy deviates from the revolutionary line in the direction of centrism. On an international scale it is the weakening of the Communist movement, caused by the reflux of the labor movement, aided by the opportunist and ultra-leftist mistakes, which contributes to the consolidation of the centrist current in the revolutionary movement.

(2) To such a stage of development, say our Italian comrades, corresponds the duty to issue the slogan of struggle for the faction.

No. If the leadership of the C.I. really were to represent opportunism that "acts along the plan of capitalism", the duty of every Communist would be to issue the slogan of struggle for a new party. The false point of departure of the comrades of the Italian Left leads them, in fact, to erroneous tactical conclusions when they say: "This policy finds its application in the adoption of a series of political positions that the faction must apply in an autonomous and independent manner." As to the International Left Opposition, it demands the rights of a faction of the Communist Party because it considers the C.P. as the only party of the proletariat for the redressment of which the way of the faction and of workers' democracy on the basis of the ideas of the Left Opposition is a historic necessary.

The Editorial Board.

\*\*\*\*\*

GREECE

In its letter to the Communist organization, Bolshevik-Leninists of Greece\*, the International Secretariat insisted upon the necessity of a conciliation between the organization of the Bolshevik-Leninists and the "Spartakos" group, both having declared their solidarity with the International Left Opposition. The International Secretariat declared that: "In any case, the possibility as well as the impossibility of unification can only become manifest in practice, that is, if you pose yourselves the task of attempting unity of action in the form of an agreement on every political question, since the fusion of the organizations is not possible."

At the same time, the International Secretariat asked the Archio-Marxists -- having in mind the serious danger inherent in the practice of terrorist methods in the Greek labor movement -- to realize a united front by addressing themselves to the official party and to the "Spartakos" group: "demanding of them to condemn decidedly and categorically the application of violence in the internal relations among themselves and to take it upon themselves to submit each similar case of violence to the scrutiny of an impartial inter-factional commission".

The document that follows -- we reprint it in full -- is the proposal of a united front against the terror that the government is carrying on against the working class, which the organization of the Archio-Marxists addressed to the official party and to the "Spartakos" group.

-----  
\* See International Bulletin No.2.

On December 7th, at the public meeting of the C.P.Gr. -- the first under a police permit since the promulgation of the Anti-Communist law -- in protest against the military-fascist-monarchist danger, two of the Archio-Marxist comrades, who had come there two hundred strong, presented to the chairman of the meeting the proposal we publish below: But instead of reading the proposal of the Archio-Marxists to the audience, the bureaucrats of the presidium deliberated among themselves and the speaker of the party described the proposal of the Archio-Marxists to the workers present as "a share of the police". And he concluded: "The united front has been consolidated and will remain so -- from below, against the 'Archio-Fascist' leaders and the other renegades. The workers who have been deceived and derailed -- their place is in the Communist Party, in the revolutionary movement, but not that of the renegade leaders."

When such methods are used, it is not at all surprising that the Stalinist section in Greece loses all its influence among the workers. On the other hand, it is quite certain that by lies and calumnies the Stalinist bureaucrats will not be able to regain the confidence of the workers that they have lost. We still do not know how this proposal was received by the "Spartakos" group. However, a proposal for collaboration has been made them in the Labor Exchange by the Archio-Marxist fraction of the Athens Labor Exchange. To this proposal, the six representatives of the "Spartakos" group that were present at the L.E. replied by abstaining from the vote taken, which permitted a reactionary police-agent element to remain in power in the Labor Exchange, obtaining 43 votes against the 42 votes of the Archio-Marxists.

In spite of this, the Archio-Marxists renewed their proposal for collaboration with the "Spartakos" group inside the Labor Exchange as before, through an open letter that appeared in the "Pali Ton Takeseon", No. 4, parts of which, dealing with the collaboration of the two organizations, we reproduce below. The Administrative Secretary, in its letter of January 3 to the "Spartakos" group, protested vigorously against its attitude of sabotaging the united front.

#### The United Front Proposal of the Archio-Marxists

The Communist organization of the Bolshevik-Leninists (Archio-Marxists) call Communists of our country to first of all realize their united front against the terror, in order to be able to attract the laboring masses, those influenced by the reactionaries and by the "Socialists", as well as those who are still unorganized. Concretely, our organization proposes the constitution of a commission against the terror. This commission should be composed of 5 members of our organization, 5 of the Party and 5 of the "Spartakos" group.

The work of this commission is to be:

- (1) The immediate mobilization of the workers of our country for the annulment of the decision of Janina.
- (2) A systematic daily struggle against the terror, for the abolition of the Anti-Communist law, and for the recognition of the political and trade union liberties of the workers.
- (3) The struggle for the immediate liberation of the imprisoned and deported militants of the working class.
- (4) The struggle against the Venizelos government which today represents a regime of exploitation and of terror; which has promulgated and applied the Anti-Communist law; which condemns to death the soldiers of Kalpaki and which is preparing to unleash an even greater terror. By calling upon the workers to fight against the Venizelos government, we call upon them to struggle against the regime of exploitation in general, against the militarists supported by the government, which attempts to utilize them to its advantage.

(5) The commission will organize for this purpose meetings and demonstrations for the success of which the three Communist organizations must work, retaining, of course, their independence in so far as slogans are concerned which each can issue on their own account for judgment and approval by the workers.

We believe, comrades, that despite the differences that separate us, despite the sharp form that these differences have taken on on several occasions in the past, the present critical moment of the revolutionary movement of our country will induce you to consider this calmly and to contribute toward the realization of the united front of the Communist forces against the terror, a united front that will permit us to draw the oppressed masses into this struggle against reaction and against the socialist chiefs.

Open Letter to the Members of the "Spartakus" Group

Comrades:

The Communist Opposition movement of Greece represents an anomaly due to the existence of two organizations recognizing the fundamental principles of the Communist International and the perspectives and points of view of the International Left Opposition.

Despite the differences between our organization and your group on various internal questions of the revolutionary labor movement of our country, the acceptance without reserves by the two organizations of the position of the International Left Opposition imposes on each of us the duty to work for the disappearance of this anomaly and to create a united Left Opposition in our country.

Our organization is of the opinion that if the two organizations prove consistent in the conceptions that they profess, it will be possible to solve the question in a short time. An open discussion before the workers on the tasks of the movement in our country, regarding which different conceptions exist, will open the way for the solution of the questions and will result in the elaboration of a basis for close collaboration between the two organizations and perhaps in their fusion....Your attitude in the trade unions and in the trade union movement of our country in general is completely false.

In supporting and re-enforcing the Unitary General Labor Federation that exists only on paper and its organizations that do not exist in reality, you are forced to approve and to adopt the adventurist policy of the party in the Greek trade union movement in acting against our efforts to create a strong mass trade union organization, which will constitute the revolutionary vanguard, the foundation of which we contemplate in the near future as a living and revolutionary U.G.L.F....

Comrades, we address ourselves once more to your group and demand your real and sincere collaboration in order to be able to apply ourselves to the immediate questions of the labor movement and particularly to the trade union question, a collaboration that will be of profit to the workers' movement and will demonstrate at the same time our loyalty to the principles that we profess. We demand of you close collaboration against the terror and against the reactionaries in the labor movement.

With the certainty that on your part, as on ours, every possible effort will be made to realize this collaboration which is absolutely essential,

We salute you fraternally,  
THE COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION OF THE BOLSHEWIK-LENINISTS  
(Archio-Maxists) Left Opposition.

(5) The commission will organize for this purpose meetings and demonstrations for the success of which the three Communist organizations must work, retaining, of course, their independence in so far as slogans are concerned which each can issue on their own account for judgment and approval by the workers.

We believe, comrades, that despite the differences that separate us, despite the sharp form that these differences have taken, on several occasions in the past, the present critical moment of the revolutionary movement of our country will induce you to consider this calmly and to contribute toward the realization of the united front of the Communist forces against the terror, a united front that will permit us to draw the oppressed masses into this struggle against reaction and against the socialist chiefs.

Open Letter to the Members of the "Spark" Group

Comrades:

The Communist Opposition movement of Greece represents an anomaly due to the existence of two organizations recognizing the fundamental principles of the Communist International and the perspectives and points of view of the International Left Opposition.

Despite the differences between our organization and your group on various internal questions of the revolutionary labor movement of our country, the acceptance without reserves by the two organizations of the position of the International Left Opposition imposes on each of us the duty to work for the disappearance of this anomaly and to create a united Left Opposition in our country.

Our organization is of the opinion that if the two organizations prove consistent in the conceptions that they profess, it will be possible to solve the question in a short time. An open discussion before the workers on the tasks of the movement in our country, regarding which different conceptions exist, will open the way for the solution of the questions and will result in the elaboration of a basis for close collaboration between the two organizations and perhaps in their fusion... Your attitude in the trade unions and in the trade union movement of our country in general is completely false.

In supporting and re-enforcing the Unitary General Labor Federation that exists only on paper and its organizations that do not exist in reality, you are forced to approve and to adopt the adventurist policy of the party in the trade union movement in acting against our efforts to create a strong mass trade union organization, which will constitute the revolutionary vanguard, the foundation of which we contemplate in the near future as a living and revolutionary U.G.L.F.

Comrades, we address ourselves once more to your group and demand your real and sincere collaboration in order to be able to apply ourselves to the immediate questions of the labor movement and particularly to the trade union question, a collaboration that will be of profit to the workers' movement and will demonstrate at the same time our loyalty to the principles that we profess. We demand of you close collaboration against the terror and against the reactionaries in the labor movement.

With the certainty that on your part, as on ours, every possible effort will be made to realize this collaboration which is absolutely essential,

We salute you fraternally,  
THE COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION OF THE BOLSHEWIK-LENINISTS  
(Archic-Markists) Left Opposition.

MEXICO

Extract from a Letter of the Mexican Comrades (December 10, 1930).

The work of our small group in the City of Mexico seems to be for the moment at almost a complete standstill. The recent persecutions have hit our comrades very hard. On November 7th, in sharp contrast to former years, the party was unable to mobilize even its own membership for the occasion. No indoor meeting was held and the street demonstration, poorly arranged, was a failure. What little showing was made was the result of the efforts principally of the comrades of our group and their sympathizers, also expelled. As a result, one of our Opposition comrades is at present confined to the reformatory. This is a very young comrade, J. Another of our members, S, was arrested and his house was raided on the 13th of November. His wife was beaten up in jail. The only typewriter in our possession was taken, as also books, files, etc. Comrade L is still in prison in Mexico City.

Another one of our comrades, X, is in the penitentiary at the same place, together with Y, ex-General Secretary of the YCL, who has also been expelled from the party and who is close to us. They are together with a half dozen party members and for over two weeks (since last November) have declared themselves in a hunger strike, of the results of which we have as yet no reports. Other comrades of our Mexico City group have not written us of late.

It is on one hand very favorable to us politically to have the party membership see that the expelled comrades continue struggling with the party and go to jail with them. But our movement cannot, of course, live on psychological effects and the group being so small, it may be said to be temporarily non-functioning.

Claridad seems to be creating a favorable impression in some places where it has reached the party members and sympathizers. From one agrarian settlement in the State of Vera Cruz the secretary of the YCL group there (there is no party) writes in, commenting on the complete abandonment of the whole party organization in the region on part of the center in Mexico City since over a year ago. He declares himself sympathetic with us, although he has not, of course, any clear conception as yet of our position. Through Claridad we are managing very slowly to establish correspondence with other points in the republic, but the task is one which can only be judged on a very long perspective.

In the United States we have been attacked in the party's Spanish organ as police spies and the membership warned against us, which is a result of the penetration of Claridad among the Spanish-speaking membership, which in New York is quite large (perhaps about 50). In Texas, according to the reports of Comrade C now there, the Party is doing nothing, while the right wing is carrying on certain activities and even planning the publication of a paper in San Antonio for the Mexicans. As soon as it becomes possible for Claridad to convert itself into more of a popular paper and appear in printed form, there will then be great opportunities for work to be done in the southwestern states of the U.S. where a majority of the workers are Mexican immigrants.

The Mexican party's paper, El Machete, struggles out once every few months in tabloid form and all indications are that while the objective situation is favorable for the carrying on of certain activities in spite of the repressions, the party is doing next to nothing. Both the reformists and the anarcho-syndicalists of the Confederation General de Trabajadores seem to be holding their own at the present time, the CROM (reformists) in their usual manner, and the anarcho-syndicalists through more or less active participation in the general labor movement. These latter are also suppressed to a certain extent. They have many of their members and leaders in jail, and have commenced the publication of a new organ (Verbo Nuevo), after the suppression of their other papers (Verbo Rojo and Avanti)

THE SITUATION OF THE LEFT OPPOSITION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

After various intermediary organizational stages, the Communist Left Opposition in its present composition was founded at the time of the V Party Congress of the C.P.Cz. in March, 1929. The Prague group around Comrade Lenorovits formed its nucleus. The preparatory activities of the Czechoslovak Opposition began under extremely unfavorable circumstances. It was not the first Opposition to set itself the task of defending the ideas of the Left in Czechoslovakia, although the first to continue on a consistent path. In the period that concluded the bloc between the Moscow and the Leningrad Oppositions, there was formed in Prague and in several places in the province a not unimportant group under the leadership of Dr. A. Pollak and F. Michaletz, which collapsed after an unprincipled bloc with the ultra-Right also-Trotskyists, Eula-Goerlich-Farschizek, at about the time of the Zinoviev-Zemenev capitulation. The particular period of the collapse appears to us hardly accidental. This is proved by the subsequent development of its component parts: some capitulated to the party, others to the Rights (Michaletz), still others before the tasks of the Communist movement in general (Pollak). The bloc with outspoken reformists, the miserable collapse of this opposition and the evolution of its leaders of necessity had to undermine considerably the confidence of many Communist workers in the ideas of the Left Opposition. This, along with the pseudo-left course of the party leadership after the notorious "Red Day" and the not unimportant mistakes of the Opposition itself caused the obstreperous road of development at its start.

At present, the Czechoslovak Left Opposition has active groups in Prague and Bratislavia (capital of Slovakia) and different points of support in the other parts of the country. It is composed in its majority of industrial workers, who have fought for years and are still fighting in the front ranks of the party and the revolutionary labor movement. This social composition lends our activity its special imprint. Aside from factional activity within the party and the Communist organizations (in one of the largest working class districts of Prague one of these organizations lies completely in the hands of our comrades), aside from -- as yet extremely insufficient -- factional activity among the Rights and in the trade unions, quite a lively activity is being unfolded in the factories and among the unemployed. In the last few months our comrades have systematically appeared at the Communist Unemployed meetings with the slogan of economic collaboration with the Soviet Union and have caused the official speakers quite often a great deal of embarrassment. The bureaucrats were forced to open up the "ideological" struggle in the press. One of their articles has been answered by Comrade Trotsky in a letter to the Czechoslovak workers, which is now being given an effective distribution.

The Prague branch has further decided the regular publication of factory papers for four of the greatest metal works (with a personnel of several thousand workers). The contributions are made almost exclusively by the workers of the various factories and deal with the acute questions and struggles in the factory (at present a wage movement is in process), as well as with the slogans of the Left Opposition (through contributions about the economic collaboration with the Soviet Union in connection with the unemployment question; about the party crisis, etc.). The initiative of the Opposition in face of the complete incompetence of the party apparatus in regard to factory work exercises a great influence on the Communist workers. Our comrades plan the creation of Opposition nuclei in the factories by means of this activity, which will naturally not be opposed to those of the party, but which will seek ties with the Communist workers through the Opposition's united front tactic.

The Opposition is still examining the correct methods for its activity and the correct relationships in the different regions. It is a question which is posed before every Left Opposition group at the beginning of its development: torn away from the great organism of the party it is threatened on one side by the danger of standing on the sidelines of the struggle of the revolutionary labor movement as a passive, critical, sectarian observer. No less dangerous, however, is the tendency on the other side, to lose sight of the tasks of the Left Opposition faction and to imitate by



uncontrollable as to its final effect, the methods of a mass party. The correct road cannot be reached without internal conflicts and struggles.

Lately the Opposition has taken a decisive step forward: in September of the past year the first number of its bi-lingual monthly organ, Iskra (The Spark), appeared, the contents of which have been described by other Opposition organs. The first success became immediately apparent: a group of "inner party" Oppositionists is at present seeking contact with our organization. By means of the regular publication of a newspaper, by a consistent approach to the problems of the Czechoslovak Communist movement, by close collaboration in the struggle of the International Opposition and an energetic front against the Rights, especially against the Neurath-Michaletz group, which in order to deceive its workers, who are making their way to the Left, are very cautiously flirting with "Grotskyism", the Czechoslovak Left will be able to develop much faster than up to the present. Aside from the further improvement of the paper, the next task of the Opposition consists of a consolidation of all its groups and fractions and fractions into a regulated, centralized organization, in the immediate convocation of a national conference and the preparation of its platform.

J.

-----  
SECRET