

ND DOCUMENTS  
1/21 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 7

## C O N T E N T S

### IN OUR GERMAN SECTION

- I---- Statement by the National Committee of the German Left Opposition
- II--- Statement of Roman Well
- III-- Statement by the International Secretariat

\* \* \* \* \*

Note: The statements contained in this issue represent the documentary material in regards to the conflicting issues which existed within the German section. Statement No I, signed by the National Committee, is in reality a statement by Kurt Landau who has since severed his connection with the Left Opposition. The summary by the International Secretariat explains these subsequent events. Although belated in publication for unavoidable reasons these documents have their historical significance.

A statement by Comrade Trotsky on these issues was published in International Bulletin No. 6

\* \* \* \* \*

## The Crisis in the International Opposition and the Tasks of the European Conference.

**INTRODUCTION:** In a few weeks the conference of the European sections of the International Opposition is to take place. Questions of far-reaching significance stand before the Left Wing of the Comintern. The National Committee of the German Opposition has made a series of proposals in a resolution adopted unanimously on November 12. (Resolution of 11/12/30. See the supplement.)

This resolution has unfortunately not been taken into consideration by the international bureau, i. e., none of the points made were given serious attention. The National Committee professed the hope, nevertheless, that it would succeed in defending its proposals, its criticism and its differences with Comrade Trotsky within the frame of the international bureau.

Unfortunately this hope was not fulfilled, since the representative of the National Committee on the international bureau was almost completely eliminated from collaboration and even from all information by the international bureau. The international information and work of the German National Committee is a result of direct contact with the broader organizations, in whose struggles and development the German N. C. has shown the greatest interest. The N. C. hoped, finally, to present its point of view before the European Conference itself. However, since it appears at present that the N. C. elected almost unanimously at the National Conference of October 11 and 12 is to be removed by an international campaign, the N. C. is forced to unfold its point of view before the International Opposition in order to give the International Opposition an opportunity to participate in the discussion of these questions. Comrade Trotsky is of the opinion that it will be possible "to seek an issue out of the crisis on a principle basis without the distribution of the document by Comrade Frankel\* and without its publication in the International Bulletin." The N. C. of the German Opposition cannot, unfortunately share this hope of Comrade Trotsky's. The questions involved are of decisive, of principle significance for the life and the development of the International Opposition. They must be posed frankly and answered without reserve. Secret diplomacy contributed substantially to the disintegration of the Comintern. The German Opposition, which stands in the furthestmost front of the international struggle for the regeneration of the Comintern, considers it its duty to develop the element of internal democracy through the discussion which it has unfurled, without which the International Opposition will be incapable of fulfilling its historical tasks.

In the following, the criticism and the views of the German N. C. are only outlined. The N. C. of the German Opposition reserves for itself the right to develop the questions touched upon here more thoroughly in the form of theses which it will present to the European conference.

### I. THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE AND THE WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

On April 6th the Foundation Conference of the International Opposition took place in Paris. The conference which was prepared by representatives of the America, the Russian and the French Opposition, and at which the most important groups were represented, in no way fulfilled the minimum of the tasks the solution of which represents a burning necessity. Three months later Comrade Trotsky constated the unsatisfactory procedure, the lack of a Manifesto, etc. However, this criticism, no matter how correct and important it may be, passed up the most decisive point: the preparation of the International Conference. It has been thought possible to hold an International Conference, without even the preparation of theses--even in the most concise form--in which the most important criteria and a concrete estimation of the rising world economic crisis of that time were to be outlined. The International Conference elected a bureau of three members (representatives of the Russian, the French and the German Opposition) to whom the direction of the International Opposition was entrusted. Since Paris was designated as the temporary seat of the International Bureau and since the Russian and the German representatives are constantly absent from Paris, collective work, political directives for the individual sections and the political control of their work was only possible if the work of the International Bureau were carried on on the basis of a clear and firmly outlined platform, taking a concrete position toward the present tasks of Communism. The lack of such a platform made itself all the more heavily felt in the practical work. It appeared more and more clearly that the Opposition groups did indeed agree to the three criteria of the International Opposition (position toward the Soviet state, lessons of the Chinese revolution, Anglo-Russian Committee) but that they did not yet, or at least not fully understand the application of the fundamental principles of the International Opposition to the concrete political situations of the present and to the national conditions.

A whole series of groups adhering to the International Opposition came into contradiction to the policy of national centrism in the course of the crisis in the Comintern. Their opposition represented, it is true, a healthy reaction to the policies of centrism and the inner party regime of the post-Leninist period, but could not however assume that programmatic international character that it did in the U.S.S.R.

In order to become an international homogeneous faction it was necessary to surmount in a planned way national seclusion, which has been a prominent characteristic of almost all opposition groups.

The lack of international directives and of international control on the part of the International Bureau has made extraordinarily difficult the development and unification of the International Opposition into a firmly organized left wing of the Comintern. On the basis of a more or less formal recognition of the well-known historical criteria of the International Opposition, the national sections of the International Opposition have been developing their present policies in complete independence and self-reliance and their attempts to learn from the experiences and struggles of the other opposition groups received no support from the International Bureau.

It may be said, without any exaggeration, that up to the present there has been no international leadership in the International Opposition. All attempts of the N. C. of the German Opposition, insofar as it has found it possible, to participate in the work of the International Bureau have until now proven futile.

## 11. THE CRISIS IN THE FRENCH OPPOSITION

On December 19th, Comrade Trotsky directed a communication to the National Committee and announced: "In relation to the tasks of the Opposition, the group of Comrade Naville has taken a fundamentally false position in the field of the trade union question, which obstructs the development of the Left Opposition and which can discredit it for a long time in this connection. The foreign representation of the Russian Opposition will in the near future address itself to all the national sections with a detailed circular. Every group and every Opposition comrade will have to take a clear position toward the principle questions, that have divided the Ligue in two and which can lead to an organizational split."

The National Committee took a position toward the danger of a split in the French Opposition, which came to it entirely unawaited, in a session on December 27 and communicated its views to Comrade Trotsky in a letter as follows:

"The N. C. constates with deep regret that it has not up to the present been informed of the profundity, or even of the existence of the differences between the Russian and the French Oppositions..... We cannot hide from you the fact that we consider the present situation in the International Opposition as by no means normal. In our resolution of November 12 we made a series of proposals. We did not receive any reply at all, our proposals were not given consideration in a single point. On the other hand, the International Bulletin declared that the changes in regard to the International Bureau have been proposed with the approval of all the sections. The German section considered the creation of the Administrative Bureau with the tasks proposed for it as inexpedient. We proposed a European Conference for March and motivated our proposal. This, too, received no consideration from the International Bureau, in the publication of which we enjoy the same influence as in the International Bureau..... As to the concrete questions which have brought the French Opposition into such a conflict with the Russian Opposition, we will take a position on them immediately, as soon as we receive concrete material from the French and the Russian Opposition."

On the 4th of January the National Committee wrote to the Executive of the French Opposition, demanding urgently that they send us the information about the substance and the story of the differences. Neither did the memorandum of the foreign representation of the Russian Opposition appear nor did the Executive of the French Opposition give us any information. Thereupon the N. C. drew up the following resolution on January 13th:

1. On the 27th of December the N. C. took a stand on the letter of Comrade Trotsky in regard to the crisis in the French

Opposition and in expectation of the communication of the foreign representation of the Russian Opposition of which it had been notified, it reserved for itself the right to take a position to the questions of the French Opposition after the receipt of the necessary information. Up to the present day, the declaration of the foreign representation of the Russian Opposition announced by Comrade Trotsky has not been received, nor has the Executive of the French Opposition answered the request of the German N. C.-- of the 4th current--to send information material concerning the disputed questions.

11. By accident, i. e., unofficially (through Comrade Senine) the N. C. has discovered that the Naville and Molinier groups have "settled" their differences in the form that a new Executive was created, consisting of five comrades, of whom two belong to the Naville group and two to the Molinier group. The N. C. is in no position to verify whether this information rests on truth. However, if this is the case, the N. C. protests against these methods of concealing and patching up of differences in the French Opposition by the various groups. The problems of the French Opposition which have led to a permanent crisis in the French Opposition are planfully being concealed from the International Opposition. They are kept secret by agreements, so-called compromises, the political basis of which is as unknown to the N. C. of the Left Opposition of the Communist Party of Germany as the political basis of the differences in general.

The N. C. of the German Opposition considers this condition, in which such significant proceedings fatal for the life of the International Opposition are neither dealt with officially in the International Bureau nor announced to the sections, as dangerous and abnormal.

The attempt to take up and settle the internal struggles of so important a section as the French in the narrowest circles, in conventicle, contradicts the principles of internal democracy and internationalism and necessarily leads to nationally secluded cliquedom. On the basis of this sort of secret diplomacy arises the arbitrary creation of legends. The concealed facts rise to the surface by various routes and in distorted form and act as a source of innumerable entanglements and deformations which outgrow the political content of the disputed questions more and more.

It is the duty of the International Opposition to openly pose the question of the essence and the causes of the French crisis. It is its duty to disclose objectively and without any consideration for anyone, the causes of this crisis.

The N. C. of the German Opposition is not even today in a position, due to lack of official information, to answer these questions. From a series of partial information it has gotten the impression that the source of the fierce internal struggles in the French Opposition are to be looked for in the completely insufficient preparation that preceded the foundation of the French Opposition.

The heritage of the past, which the Opposition around Paz, Souvarine and Treint have left behind them, was completely barren.

contained no positive features to enable the new French Opposition to develop further. It may have been possible to moderate the sharpness and the profundity of the crisis, had the International Opposition been informed of the differences in their embryonic stage.

This was not the case, however. There was no lack of indications (The letter of comrade Trotsky in June 1930), external symptoms became visible (Withdrawal of comrade Rosmer from the leadership of the Ligue and the editorship of the Verite) but the political basis of these phenomena was not made clear.

It is clear that that is a mistake. The German Opposition (also the International Opposition) is ripe enough to investigate what the political reasons are at the base of the internal struggles and the processes of regroupment in the Ligue. The crisis of the French Opposition has completely paralyzed the international bureau, in fact it does not seem to exist any longer. It would be better to put a stop to this fatal development, eventually to shift the seat of the international bureau temporarily, rather than to leave the International Opposition more or less isolated in a political situation with great revolutionary possibilities. What can be said, however, when an international campaign is being organized against the National Committee of the German Opposition because it points out these shortcomings, because it demands exact and detailed information concerning the differences in France?

### III. Concerning the Austrian Question

In the Austrian question the M.C. of the German Opposition had a series of differences with the International Bureau. On other occasions we have already defined our attitude in the different phases of the process of regroupment in the Austrian Opposition, on the basis of numerous documents. In the opinion of the German Opposition, the unification that took place on January 11 of the various Austrian Opposition groups and splinters that remained loyal to the International Opposition after the secession of the Frey group, does not represent a step forward. The adoption ~~xxx~~ of the capitulationist platform of comrade Frank -- even though it is only a question of its adoption as a basis for discussion-- throws the Austrian Opposition far back. There can be no doubt, that this "unification on a slanted plane" will prove to be only temporary. The contrast between the Left Wing workers, who with all their errors are devoted to the cause of the International Opposition and the capitulationist splinters will disrupt the formal unity.

The Austrian Oppositionists of the "Mahnruf" group have committed a very serious mistake in accepting as a basis for discussion a capitulationist platform proposed to them two days before the unification, which stands in sharp contradiction to the one the "Mahnruf" group itself originally proposed.

The German Opposition has been and still is of the opinion that in Austria there are also political differences between

the two groups. "We consider neither of the two groups as fully developed, but we believe that the worker-leadership of the "Mahnruf" group is a more valuable support for the International Opposition than comrade Frey. The questions of the past also have their effect on the future. When comrade Frey seeks to prove in his paper -- and in the year 1930 at that -- that the policies of his faction in Austria have been bolshevist policies since 1922, then that is not only wrong, but actually requires a decisive condemnation, since the policies of the Austrian Frey and Tomann factions are known in the Comintern as models of Opportunism." (Letter of the N.C. to comrade Trotsky, Nov. 27)

These views stand in contradiction to the views of comrade Trotsky who proposed the following motion: "The view of the preceding years, that the Comintern was wrong in the Austrian question, but held a correct position in general and toward the Russian Opposition -- although explainable by many excusable circumstances -- was a mistake to be stricken off (from the draft proposal of comrade Frey), "since" after the experiences of the last two years, filled out with theoretical and political work, we do not have to raise once more outlived and unimportant reminiscences." The view of the German Opposition concerning the Austrian Opposition has since proved to be correct. The fundamental tendencies of the fierce and constant factional struggles in the Austrian Opposition have come to the fore. Frey who has left the ranks of the International Opposition has showed by this step that our contention that the "ontire character of comrade Frey is identical with organic opportunism" was correct. The desertion of Frey was a result of his machinations for a bloc with another inner party group (Tomann) and of his belief that he would be in the minority after the unification. Concerning the political ideas of comrade Frank, who represented a non-existent "third faction", we have already referred to them on another occasion.

We have, therefore, in the Austrian Opposition a fully developed opportunist grouping (Frey) and a capitulationist tendency (Frank). We are of the opinion that in the Austrian question an immediate and Open condemnation of Frank's ideas is necessary. As a base for the International Opposition, only the "Mahnruf" group can come into consideration. It is a pure workers' group, which despite the heavy mistakes it has committed, must be considered a revolutionary group.

When the attempt is made by the administrative bureau -- over the head of the International Bureau -- to expel this group and when the Kernmayer case is designated for this purpose as an "offense against revolutionary morals" then such an argument is automatically disposed of, since after the result of the investigation in the case of Kernmayer there were still negotiations with the Mahnruf group for unification in Austria.

The German Opposition will by no means leave the Austrian question rest. Whatever can be said of the political mistakes of the "Mahnruf" group, will be said in all frankness by the German Opposition. However, the attempt to accuse a group of revolutionary workers of having consciously accused a comrade (Kernmayer) of being a fascist tool pigeon, only because he

went over to another faction (Frey), this attempt will form the subject for an intensive investigation, which the German Opposition, possibly with the collaboration of comrades from the International Opposition, will organize and the results of which will be presented to the European Conference.

If the German Opposition has undertaken the defense of the Austrian Left without any hesitation, then it is with the conviction that an injustice is being committed against revolutionary workers, which should not be tolerated.

The decisive question of political dispute between the National Committee and comrade Trotsky in the Austrian question was the demand of the German Opposition that the united Opposition and its component part admit openly and unreservedly their past mistakes. The National Committee has represented this view not out of factional narrow-mindedness, but because it stands fundamentally for the point of view that the preparation of the future depends upon the liquidation of the mistakes of the past. Only serious self-criticism can preserve revolutionaries from falling back into the old mistakes. Only open self-criticism can advance the development of our own cadres. The worst thing is to set corrective measures behind the backs of our own ranks. Such corrective measures are the basis for opportunistic deviations. False views, once they are thrown into the masses, continue to grow even if the leadership revises them secretly.

A political leadership that does not possess the courage for open self-criticism, which in the best case is inclined to explain its change of position with the fact that the situation has changed, whereas in reality political developments have destroyed the positions of this leadership, such a leadership will never build up its own revolutionary Marxist cadres, but will only prepare disintegration and corrosion and go to pieces because of its internal falseness. Only a leadership that is completely submerged in the prejudices of the petty bourgeois faith in authority will fear that it will undermine its prestige by openly testing its mistakes and by correcting them.

#### IV. The Crisis in the German Opposition. its Character and its International Significance

The crisis in the German Opposition is well known to the leading comrades in the brother organizations. But the political roots of this crisis are a matter of dispute not only in the international, but in the German Opposition as well.

It was undoubtedly a mistake on the part of the German N.C. that for a long time it was not clear itself concerning the basic tendencies of the groups fighting against it. For too long a time the leading comrades of the German Opposition assumed that in the constant attacks against them it was merely a question of a more or less unpolitical cliquedon and dispute that is caused by factional reminiscences and the destructive spirit of the circle. When, at the National Conference of October 11 and 12, the Well faction openly cap-



itulated, when—despite the fact that it announced counter-theses of its own—it approved the theses of the N. C. and after a month's long unexampled struggle against the leading comrades of the N. C. it reelected the same comrades to the N. C., it appeared that it was a matter of an earnest and sincere political and organizational disarmament of the Well faction. Already the first weeks after the National Conference showed that this hope was deceiving. According to all appearances the Well faction had actually dissolved itself at the National Conference; however the differences between the N. C. and Comrade Trotsky gave the Well faction new courage and it raised more sharply than ever before the banner of unprincipled factional struggle against the leadership of the German Opposition.

The N. C. was at no time in doubt that the international differences would revive the Well faction. However, could the N. C. for the sake of "domestic peace" keep silent on international questions, on the questions of the life of brother organizations? Nothing is more despicable than this brand of opportunism, which we all know well from the Stalinist Comintern. How many leaderships in the sections of the Comintern condemned the Russian Opposition, although they knew better, in order to preserve their "domestic peace"!

The N. C. of the German Opposition rejected this path. However, it declares openly, when the attempt is being made today more or less openly from one side or another to support the struggle of the Well faction in order, together with the N. C., to remove the voice of criticism from the International Opposition, then this attempt will not be to the advantage of either the German or the International Opposition.

Every member of the German and the International Opposition can gather from the following documentary presentation—which is by no means complete—where the German Opposition would land, if it were to take the path which the Well faction prescribes for it.

a) The Question of Fascism and the Position of the Well Faction.

The year 1930 stood in the ban of a growing international crisis. Under the exceptional conditions created by the Versailles treaty, the crisis in Germany took on a particularly sharp and acute form. The fall of the Mueller government (March) was the signal for a new chapter in the inner political development. The elections in Saxony (June 22, 1930) revealed with forceful clarity the processes going on among the masses, the powerful rise of fascism.

The N. C. realized immediately that the new changes in the objective condition demanded a tactical turn on the part of the Opposition. It signalled at the N. C. of June 29 the possibility of the growth of revolutionary situations, resulting from the conflict between advancing Fascism and the proletariat on the defensive, that—with a correct revolutionary strategy and leadership—it is possible to go over from the positions of defensive to the question of power. ("inverted 1923").

The N. C. expected a further consolidated growth of fascism

in case the party did not undergo a fundamental turn (policy of the united front). Despite the fact the Fascist counter-revolutionary mass movement also provides a channel for all sorts of anti-capitalist currents, the N. C. warned against the illusion that fascism would collapse of itself, i. e., by its inner contradictions.

Against this evaluation, Comrades Well and Buechner raised objections. Comrade Well saw in the splitting away of the Strasser group already the split in Fascism, and warned the N. C. against "sowing panic" when it declared that we must tell the party that "Hitler is standing before the gates". Comrade Buechner attempted, on the basis of his own experiences, to prove that in Thuringia, where the Nazis (National Socialists) are in the government, even the petty bourgeoisie was beginning to turn away from fascism!

The N. C. rejected these views, which coincide fully with those of the centrists, quite energetically. Today it is clear for every comrade how false and refuted by life itself this evaluation of the dynamics of Fascism by the Well faction was. However, comrade Well writes to the N. C. on January 21, 1931: "As far as the perspectives for the fascist developments are concerned, one cannot say that the position of panic: 'Hitler is standing before the gates' has proved to be correct." In still opposing his views to those of the N. C. today, he proves not only that he has learned nothing and forgotten nothing, but also that his political subordination to the pressure of centrism is not accidental.

"Above all, this is expressed in the question of the penetration of fascism into the state power. This theory of the party leadership was taken up by comrade Well when he wrote in June 1930. 'The Nazis are attempting to carry out a cold revolution, their main ambition is to capture the Ministry of Interior in most of the provinces:...' The N. C. decided to cross out this unique theory from the article of comrade Well and it succeeded temporarily to convince comrade Well that there can be no question of a "cold revolution" for fascism. Positions of power in the state apparatus can only be valuable pillars of support for fascism in the open, extra-parliamentary struggle; in the course of which, during the civil war, Fascism defeats the working class and abolishes the last vestiges of democratic institutions.

The course of Fascist development has confirmed the view of the N. C. At present, this process is taking place with extraordinary forcefulness. Not in the form of a "cold revolution" but in the bloodiest struggles on the streets, is Fascism clearing its road to power.

In this question, as in most of the others, the N. C. succeeded in convincing Comrade Well temporarily. But his organic centrism proved to be stronger. After some time spent in vacillating, Comrade Well returned once more to his old points of departure. This unique curve in the political development of the Well faction made it difficult for a long time to determine its political character precisely.

#### b) Turn or Centrist Zig-zag?

In the middle of July 1930 the Well group came out with a new

view in opposition to the N.C. It affirmed, on the basis of the elections in Saxony, that the party was executing a serious turn, that it was giving up the theory of social fascism and had gone over to the issuing of transition slogans. At the same time the Well faction speculated on a new coalition government and the dis-  
carding of the fascists by the bourgeois parties (German Peoples Party, Thuringia). At the meeting of the N.C. on July 18, Comrade Well declared:

"We must see what is now going on in the party. The party is going over to the issuing of partial demands and to the application of the united front tactic. Our Leipzig comrades report that the party comrades are saying: "You see, the party has recognized its mistakes". As a consequence the Rights are facing open capitulation to the party. Now that is of the greatest importance. In the question of fascism we must be forewarned against the sentiment of panic, into which the party is now falling. We must not ascribe to the party what it does not do. I cannot agree with Comrade Landau. We must realize that the party is departing more and more from the theory of social fascism."

Against this view, Comrade Landau represented the point of view of the majority, at the same meeting: "In a whole series of questions I consider the views of Comrade Well incorrect. Insofar as the Rights are concerned, it is dangerous to speak of their present capitulation to the party. Their capitulation to the S.P.G. is just as likely. The party cannot and will not give up the theory of social fascism, without making a real turn. Such a turn, however, is impossible on the basis of the VI World Congress and the Wedding Convention. Nor can we speak of the party really going over to the tactic of the united front and to partial demands. The best example of this is the trade union question, in which the C.D.C. has not departed an inch from the false line. If such illusions about the turn exist among the party masses and even among our own members, then we must dispell such illusions..."

The political developments in Germany have already rendered judgment on these questions, so heatedly disputed at the session. The views of the Well group have proved to be wrong and disastrous on every single point. Where would the German Opposition have landed if it had taken the course, not of the National Committee, but that of the well group? No revolutionary can doubt for even a moment today that the road of the Well group would have led the German Opposition to disaster.

#### c) The "Reserves" of the Well Faction

At the meeting of the N.C. on July 19 Comrade Well got up and demanded, after his views had been unanimously rejected by the N.C. meeting of July 18, that the following comrades be co-opted into the National Committee: Frank (Vienna) and Hurn.

The entire National Committee was against this proposal. Schwalbach: Comrade Hurn defended the theory of socialism in one country at a Wedding membership meeting. The Wedding comrades were outraged by his Stalinist conclusions. Those views ought to be communicated to Comrade Trotsky and the International Bureau. We do not want a National Committee of intellectuals.....

Mueller: It is significant that the editorial board of the (Russian) Bulletin must add a note to Frank's article, that it is not in agreement with the content. Hurn has expressed views for which he should no longer be permitted to remain a member of the group, let alone the National Committee.

The National Committee, which had at the same time, rejected

not in agreement with the content. Hurm has expressed views for which he should be no longer allowed to remain in the group, let alone the National Committee.....

The National Committee, which had at the same time rejected the semi-centrist views of Comrade Well in the German questions, could not understand why Well demanded so passionately that two comrades be coopted into the National Committee, whose views in the Russian question represented complete capitulation before centrism.

The complete unprincipledness of the Well group has been proved in a whole series of questions. Its "policy of blocs" has always been devoid of any political fundament. Before the National Conference, it formed a bloc with comrades Plep and Jahnke, and this bloc fought with all its energy for the Grylewicz-Joko-Neumann group. Who are the political allies of Well? For whom did the Well-Jahnke-Plep bloc fight at the National Conference?

Comrade Plep is the last representative of the Maslow school in the German Opposition. He rejects both the policy of the National Committee as well as that of the Well group as opportunist. In almost all tactical questions, comrade Plep has differences with the National Committee. In the Russian question (elements of double government) he took the floor against the Well group at the National Conference. All this does not prevent comrade Well from forming a bloc with Comrade Plep in which, it must be admitted; Comrade Plep has made no concessions, whereas Well, because of his bloc interests, calls the Koonigsburg group, which is existing in the most complete state of stagnation (at present it has nine members) one of the best groups. The bloc with Jahnke (Hamburg) rests on a similar basis. The interests of this bloc prevent comrade Well from seeing that the small Hamburg faction (six members) is being destroyed by internal clique conflicts, and he attempts to stay the hand of the N. C. when it proceeds to cleanse the Hamburg organization of conditions that compromise the entire opposition. Politically, Hamburg is not even in agreement with the Well faction in the tactical problems of the Red Trade Union Opposition.

The "chief reserve" of the Well faction consists of the "classical-literary-bureaucratic" clique Grylewicz-Neumann-Joko. It is true that Neumann and Joko are already on the path of capitulation, it is true that their views--insofar as they have expressed any--have long ago been rejected as wrong and perverted. Still, in their search for political motives, these comrades turn with all possible sharpness against the "opportunist" National Committee because of its tactics in the Saxon elections. All this does not prevent Comrade Well from looking for support from these "reserves".

The Well faction likes to ascribe to itself this achievement: they have a correct position in the trade union question. In this field they have not succeeded--which is quite conceivable from the schematic and rigid manner in which they approach the question--in convincing even the active members in Leipzig alone, as has been proved by the district Conference of September 28, at which a whole series of delegates represented an ultra-left point of view. Their "Leninist" trade union position did not prevent the Well faction from defending the following view, in their

bloc with Neumann: "As our chief task, H. W. (an article in No. 2 of the "Kommunist" is referred to) proposes to us to force the party onto the road of the organization of a broad left wing in the trade unions. But it is precisely this advice that the party is following for some time now."

The "reserves" of the Well faction, the bureaucratic clique around Neumann did not even realize in May 1930 that the party leadership was pursuing the disastrous strategic path--that it was preparing the foundation of its own trade unions!

The N. G. does not consider it necessary to occupy itself on this occasion with the Neumann-Joko clique. It has already been judged by the National Conference.

#### d) The Platonic Internationalism of the Well Group.

In the hands of the Well faction, the banner of internationalism is turned into a rag, which according to its needs, it sometimes drags through the gutter, and sometimes uses as a standard.

When, in May, the International Bureau decided against the Grylowicz-Joko-Neumann clique, the Well faction joined in the complaints of this clique against the International Bureau. Well covered up in silence the shameful practice assumed by Jungk's so (Hamburg) in letters against the International Bureau.

One of the chief criteria of revolutionary internationalism is that of refraining from embellishing artificially one's own conditions. What can we say, however, when the Well faction systematically and quite consciously uses the methods of deception? When it calls the weakest and most inactive groups--Hamburg and Koenigsberg--the best groups at the same time as it systematically derides the Berlin and the South German organizations? When in Leipzig itself it bows the tendency toward particularism, in order to maintain the Leipzig organization in the spirit of petty local patriotism? The N. G. has for a long time entrusted its faith in the contention of comrade Well that he was attempting to combat Saxon federalism. The experiences of the last few weeks prove that the Well faction systematically betrayed the faith of the German Opposition.

A symptom of the foulness and rottenness in the Well faction is the fact that Comrade Jungk, in a letter to Comrade Trotsky on September 29 characterized himself as the "leader of 10,000 jobless".

The N. G. condemns these methods of systematically misleading the International Opposition. To deceive one's own class, party and faction is the most contemptible method of political struggle. The whole character of the Well faction, however, is deception, disloyalty and unprincipledness;

#### e) The Political Character of the Well Faction.

Nothing would be more fatal to the further development of the German Opposition than to tolerate within its ranks the demoralizing regime of double bookkeeping, which is the product of the bu-

reaucratic system of the Comintern and which is destroying the latter: that sort of diplomacy which means one thing and says another.

How could the Well faction approve of the theses of the N. C.? How could they elect the same comrades, whom on the previous day they insulted in the most shameful manner?

This conception is wrong. In a whole series of decisive situations the Well faction has proved that it submits to the pressure of centrism. It is no accident that they belong to the ideologists of centrism (Hurm), that they are closely connected with capitulators like Neumann, Joko, Frank. The N. C. has come to the conviction that the Well faction embodies that vacillating part of the Opposition which slides down from the path of intransigent revolutionary Marxism at every sharp curve of political development, which submits to the pressure of centrism all along the line and which as a faction belongs to a current in the international Opposition which is developing objectively along the line of capitulation, and whose most consistent representative is the Left Centrist, Frank, who was proposed for the German N. C. by Comrade Well.

This is the international significance of the Well group and of its struggle against the German Opposition. Yet only on the rarest occasions does it dare to stand up openly with its views as a group of open opportunists, but rather take the road of clique-like attacks, intrigues and attempts at sabotage. This makes it difficult for many comrades of the German Opposition to recognize in time the subterranean basic political tendency of the permanent factional struggle of the Well group. The complaint can be made with justice against the German N. C. that it did not realize soon enough that behind the fierce clique struggle of Neumann, Joko, Frank, Well, etc., there was hidden a centrist current that had not yet matured. It was the mistake of Comrade Landau above all that was not recognized in time. This mistake was the root of his conciliatory position toward a group, behind the mistakes of which he saw only unclarity, behind whose attacks he suspected only factional reminiscences, whereas in reality, behind these secondary and superficial phenomena there was maturing the process of the formation of a Left Centrist group.

f) The Results of the National Conference and the Transition of Well to the Split.

After the centrist Well group was defeated at the National Conference, it immediately began a secret struggle against the N. C. In a political situation of historic significance it proceeded by means of open sabotage, refused to carry out the instructions and the directives of the National Committee and attempted in this manner to cause the resignation of the National Committee. In order to force the Well faction to carry on its struggle on a political level, the political bureau decided on December 13, 1930

"The Saxon members of the N. C. are instructed to lay down their differences with the National Committee (a) in the Russian question (elements of double government), (b) in the estimate of the political situation in Germany, (c) in the RTUO question, as well as on all points in which the Saxon members disagree with t

views of the N. C. in a declaration or in a draft thesis and to communicate it to the N. C."

To this, the District Committee of Saxony answered: "The D. C. of Saxony holds the view that the elaboration of separate theses on our part is superfluous, since every fundamental point of this question has been dealt with in the pamphlet of comrade Trotsky, on the ground of which the D. C. of Saxony stands without any reservations."

The centrist Woll faction prefers to hide behind Comrade Trotsky, following the example of Comrade Frank.

These methods are closely connected with the hermetic inclosure of Leipzig, from whose membership meetings the N. C. has been excluded (1). The result of this seclusion has had terrifying effects: the activity of the Leipzig group is sinking. Whereas the circulation of the paper in Berlin amounts to four copies per member of the organization, that of Leipzig has sunk to 1.4. The sale of the pamphlets is sinking in an alarming manner. In the fall of 1929 the group sold about 350 copies of the pamphlet against Urbahn, of the pamphlet for the 16th party convention it sold only 145 copies, and of the pamphlet on the Situation in Germany only 75 copies have been settled for, although it was published three months ago. Concerning the decision of the N. C. to call a membership meeting for January 20, the D. C. answered with a promise to call one for the 11th of January. At the last moment, however, it was postponed, despite a telegraphic demand from the N. C. On the basis of this systematic sabotage the National Committee declared in its last letter to the D. C. of Saxony on January 9th, 1931:

"The basis of revolutionary organization is democratic centralism, the most fundamental component part of which is the right for the membership to decide. The members of the Left Opposition, who have come to us after hard struggles full of sacrifices, have a right to be informed on all questions involving the group."

In its struggle against the N. C. the Woll faction has gone to adopt the methods of splitting. The Woll faction needs these persistent organizational conflicts in order to realize its sinister political aims.

The unity of the German Opposition, the maintenance of its political basis, proved correct by life itself, demands of the N. C. today to proceed to the liquidation of the Woll faction. If the Administrative Secretariat holds it back in this attempt, if an attempt is made to put the German N. C. under pressure in this hard struggle by the organization of an international campaign, then this campaign is directed against the basic principles of the International Opposition itself, which the N. C. of the Left Opposition of the C. P. G. defends and represents, in the struggle against centrism in its own ranks and for a regime of internal democracy in the ranks of the International Opposition.

The N. C. of the German Opposition is far from declaring itself infallible and from maintaining that what it does itself is absolutely correct, unchangeable, perfect. In the process of revolutionary work mistakes and shortcomings are inevitable. The German Opposition and its duly elected leadership does not reject serious and practical criticism.

We do not dispute over petty matters, over more or less complete formulations. Hairsplitting and squabbles we leave in all security to those sectarians and windbags for whom the whole content of their lives consists in "sniffing around for deviations".

That does not mean, however, that the N. C. will withdraw to the "national turtle's house", in order to carry on the struggle far away from the intervention of the brother organizations. Such a position has nothing to do with real internationalism.

In a proclamation for a split, Comrade Well declares: "The time of compromises with a clique that is splitting and destroying the organization, is past."

That is quite correct, although in a different sense from that which the Well faction presumes. The N. C. has tarried long enough in the hope that the Well faction would surrender the weapons of its unprincipled struggle.

Now, however, the time has come where every single comrade of the German Opposition will have to decide for the duly elected N. C. and its policy or for the centrist Well faction. The German Opposition has carried on its struggle on a firm principle basis. It will go to pieces if it does not put an end to a struggle carried on by a centrist tendency, in order to drag down the German Opposition to its own backward political level. The ideas of the Well faction are not our own ideas. Its shameful methods have nothing in common with the democratic regime in the German Opposition. Let the Well faction go the way which its confederates Neumann, Joko, and Frank have already gone. If there will be groups or comrades in the International Opposition, who, deceived by the manoeuvres of the Well faction, will stand against the German Opposition in this struggle, then the future alone will prove which tendency in the German Opposition embodies international revolutionary Marxism.

We have made every sacrifice up to the present to preserve the unity of the German Opposition. However, when the sacrifice of giving up our views on the principle problems of the International Opposition is demanded of us, then the question of unity steps to the background. The majority of the German Opposition stands with full conviction on the ground of the political views of the National Committee.

On this occasion the duly elected German N. C. raises the sharpest protest against the unfair methods of struggle consciously employed by the Well faction, the method of poisoning the political atmosphere and of creating that internal tension, which it needs in order to unfold its disintegrating political activity.

The N. C. knows that the struggle which is being conducted against the person of Comrade Landau, signifies the struggle against those principles for which the majority of the N. C. has fought and will continue to fight.

#### V. Closing Remarks.

The crisis has become a general phenomenon in the interna-



tional Opposition. Tactical and partly, principle questions, stand up for discussion. The crisis is sharpened through the lack of international leadership.

All this requires the convocation of a European conference as quickly as possible. The International Opposition must lay down its views in a platform, which will form the basis for the platforms of the different sections.

Berlin, January 25, 1931.

For the NATIONAL COMMITTEE  
OF THE LEFT OPPOSITION  
OF THE C. P. G.  
(BOLSHEVIK-LENINISTS)

\* \* \* \* \*

### I. THE UNPRINCIPLED SUB-FACTION OF LANDAU AND THE RESULTS OF ITS POLICY

After a systematic silence, the Landau group of the German Opposition has decided to take a position on some political questions in the above declaration, on which to base their Stalinist methods which are heading the German Left toward destruction.

Before disclosing to the members of the International Opposition the disastrous effect of the bureaucratic methods employed by the Landau group, we wish to take a position point by point to each chapter of the "declaration" of the Landau group.

#### I. THE AUSTRIAN QUESTION.

We have little to add in this question. All that is essential has been said by Comrade Frankol. The last "unification conference" was the best test for the Mahruf group. When, after this experience, the "National Committee continues to believe that the Mahruf group must be considered as the nucleus of the International Opposition in Austria", then the latter can only come to one conclusion: In this question, Landau is defending his factional interests. We energetically protect against the recognition of any one of the groups by the International Opposition as its representative in Austria. Up to the present, these groups have done nothing but compromise the cause of the International Opposition. There remains only one thing for the International Opposition: to wait for the moment when conditions will become favorable for the creation of a genuine Left Opposition in Austria.

#### II. THE CRISIS IN THE GERMAN OPPOSITION.

The "declaration" speaks of the "capitulation" of the "Well faction" at the conference of October 11-12 where it is supposed to have approved "the theses of the National Committee".

First, have these theses really been adopted by the conference? If so—what theses? No. 12 of the "Kommunist" published a report on the conference, by Landau. In this report it says that the trade union theses of the Saxon organization were adopted. Unfortunately, even this information is incorrect. The conference took place in a lamentable political atmosphere and did not adopt any political theses.

What do the trade union theses of the Saxon organization represent? They are counter-theses! At the district conference in Saxony, Comrade Landau defended the ultraleft point of view in this question. He literally declared the following: "The Red Trade Union Opposition (RGO) is not an autonomous trade union organization of the party. It is a trade union opposition and the entire Left Opposition must belong to it in a body." This conception means nothing else but the liquidation of our Leninist opposition in the trade union work. Landau's enthusiasm for the trade union policy of the centrists hit up against the resistance of the conference. The trade union theses which were published in #5 of the BULLETIN are radically opposed to Landau's conception in this question. If the Saxon theses were adopted by the conference, including Landau, how can the "capitulation of the Well faction" be explained? Instead of accusing us of capitulation, would it not have been more correct to admit that the former trade union position was anti-Leninist?

Did we capitulate in the other questions? In the same report on the conference we read: "Comrade Landau reported on the international situation and the tasks of the international Opposition. Comrade Well reported on the situation in Germany and our tasks." On the eve of the conference, the Landau group informed me that I would not be able to make my speech unless I spoke along the lines of Landau's theses. But the majority of the organizations recognized unequivocally that these theses were inadequate and even confused. I rejected the conditions that were posed before me and based the conclusions in my speech on the spirit of our position on the questions of Fascism, the united front, the trade union tactics, etc.—that is to say, precisely the questions on which the differences between ourselves and the Landau group were most acute.

Wherein, then, is our "open capitulation" expressed? It is only an empty phrase, a statement devoid of all foundation.

We admit that we voluntarily "capitulated" in one single question—the organizational question. We did not want to split the conference, that is why we conceded in this question. Today we realize that this was a mistake.

### III. THE QUESTION OF FASCISM.

The demagogy of Landau is revealed with most precision in this question. He attempts to attribute to us the point of view of the party leadership in order to justify the accusation of "centrism" that he hurls against us. (A comrade of the National Committee informs us that one session of the N. C. for a long time sought for a label to attach to the "Well faction". The former characterization of "federalists" was out of date. Finally it decided, after a long discussion, to call us "centrists".)

What about the formula of the "cold revolution" that Landau pins on to us? For us it was only a question of the fascists facilitating their march toward the seizure of power by capturing positions in the state. In actuality, this is how the policy of fascism has been developing. In certain provinces of Germany (Thuringia, Brunswick) they constitute coalitions with the bourgeois parties. They seize the ministries of the interior in the hope of executing the counter-revolutionary insurrection with the

aid of the state apparatus. It was only in this sense that we employed the formula of the "cold revolution". Landau was the only one to "misunderstand" the real meaning of my expression; the other comrades who do not belong to the "Well faction" have understood it quite well. The following quotation from the letter of Comrade Seipold proves it: "Comrade Well said at a meeting of the National Committee that it was necessary to discuss the question whether the fascists are not taking the path of a cold putsch to facilitate their decisive struggle." But, according to Landau, we are defending a point of view that "the fascists want to make a 'cold revolution', that is, a revolution without an insurrection."

However, there is a genuine difference in the estimation of fascism between Landau and the Saxon comrades. At a meeting of the N. C. Landau defended the point of view according to which fascism is an anti-capitalist movement. Only after a discussion lasting two hours, in the course of which we showed that with fascism it was a question of anti-monopolist tendencies among petty bourgeois elements, Landau withdrew his views. That did not at all prevent him from stating a few weeks later that he never held such a view. The discussion has disappeared from the minutes of which we have only three copies all in all. There is nothing astonishing in this. The minutes are written by Landau and his most trusted faction friends. But this belongs to the chapter on the "methods of Landau".

The "declaration" accuses me of centrism because I was against the formula: "Hitler is before the gates". I am still against it today and consider it an expression of petty bourgeois panic. Landau wanted to give this title to one of his articles dealing with the results of the elections in Saxony. At a meeting of the N. C. we discussed this title and we rejected it with Landau's consent.

Why were we against this title?

Landau was frightened by the parliamentary victory of fascism and foresaw its decisive victory for the immediate future. This was the estimation of the frightened petty bourgeois who confuses the beginning of a process with its conclusion. While Thaelman foresaw the immediate defeat of fascism, Landau foretold immediate victory. As to ourselves, we thought that it was not our duty to sow panic in the ranks of the party.

#### IV. THE UNITED FRONT

In the question of the united front, one of the most important questions, Landau contents himself with minced phrases. In no document whatsoever has Landau taken the trouble to concretize the tactic of the united front.

His faction friend, Comrade Miller, proposed at one of the meetings of the N. C. to eliminate from the theses the passage on the "united front from above". This same mechanical conception of the united front has always been defended by the centrists.

On the other hand, the "centrist Well faction" formulated long before the publication of Comrade Trotsky's pamphlet on the German situation, its own clear and precise point of view on the tactics of the united front. In circular #3, at the beginning of July

(1930) we wrote: "...It is necessary to pit against fascism the closed ranks of the united front of the working class. In the factories, the united front must embrace not only all the workers but the social democratic functionaries as well. The propaganda of the Communists must be linked up with the daily interests of the working class (against wage cuts, for the seven hour day, etc.) without forgetting the principal aim, the dictatorship of the proletariat. On the basis of the united front, the struggle against fascism must be conducted in the factories, not with the slogan: "smash the fascists wherever you meet them" but by calling out: "drive the fascist lackies of capital out of the factories!"...

"It is necessary to create the defense organizations of the proletariat in the factories on the basis of the united front. The party members must stop giving these organizations the form of shops of their own"...

"The party must resume with all the necessary energy the work in the trade unions, in order to reconstitute and consolidate the trade union opposition. At a time when the fascists plan the disruption of the trade union organizations, the party must take the lead in the defense of the trade union organizations. It must become clear to every social democratic worker and to every worker organized in the trade unions that it is the Communist party and not the trade union bureaucracy that is defending their organizations"...

Nothing except these quotations can show the International Opposition the position of the Saxon organization in the important questions in Germany (united front, defense question, trade union question).

At the same time Landau restricts himself to phrases. The "open letter to the party" is conceived in this spirit: negative criticism, the state of mind of panic, phrases and more phrases.

#### V. THE TURN IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE C. P. G.

The Landau clique has become used to manufacturing minutes in which they attribute points of view to comrades that they have never held. The entire activity and the entire policy of these comrades prove the direct contrary of what Landau attributes to them in the minutes..

According to these minutes I am supposed to have stated that the party was going to make a serious turn, in the course of which it will renounce the theory of "social fascism". Landau knows very well what I actually said. I said that the party press and the leadership of the party were no longer employing the word "social fascism" in their propaganda among the masses, as heretofore.

In order not to waste too much time, let us quote here a passage from a circular of the D. C. of Saxony, in which the "turn" was evaluated as follows:

"...the present turn is nothing but an ultra-left zig-zag. The policies of the Sixth World Congress and of the Wedding Convention have not been renounced....The concept of social fascism remains."

That is all insofar as the turn is concerned.

### VI. REAL DIFFERENCES

What we hold against the Landau group is the fact that it does not make an attempt to face the party's policies seriously. It does not take the trouble to make positive proposals to the party. The Landau group replies to each step by the party with a flood of stereotyped phrases. With this, Landau hopes to win over the party members to the Left Opposition!?

It is not accidental that the Berlin organization has made no progress. If the former figures of the Wedding group before the unification are correct, if the Berlin organization could hardly retain a fourth of its membership, Landau cares very little about such facts. His whole aim seems to be to weaken the organizations who have made some progress in order to "equalize" the number of their membership with that of Berlin.

There are serious differences in the German Left Opposition. On the one hand—the un-Marxist estimation of fascism, the phraseology in the question of the united front tactics. Complete incompetence in the concrete problems of the class struggle in Germany—on the part of the Landau group. On the other hand, a clear position on the subject of the perspective for the development of fascism, concrete treatment of the tactics of the united front, of the trade union question; positive proposals in the defense question, etc.—on the part of the Saxon Executive. These are the real differences between the two groups.

Defeated on the political field, Landau believes that he will obtain political authority through organizational measures.

### VII. THE ORGANIZATIONAL CRIMES OF THE LANDAU FACTION.

#### a) Bureaucratic methods.

Landau holds against us our good relations with comrades whose tactic differs from our own. But it has been and always is our duty to create an opportunity for the development of a friendly discussion on all the political problems of the organization. We have risen above the Stalinist methods and are not at all inclined to employ them against our comrades in a political analysis. We believe that a fruitful discussion can only be held in a friendly atmosphere which will give the comrades who share different views an opportunity to become convinced of the correctness of our line. What pushes the other organizations of the opposition to the Saxon D. C. is the bureaucratic methods of the Landau group toward the dissenting comrades.

No serious comrade wants to submit to the regime which Landau has introduced into the German Opposition. There is no Well faction. We have never concealed our struggle against the false politics of Landau. We openly carry on our struggle against Landau's disruptive influence.

#### b) Information.

Before the fusion of all the Left groups into a single Left

Opposition in Germany, Landau falsely informed the International Opposition about the numerical strength of the different groups. He told us that the Wedding group numbered nearly 200 comrades. The Palatinate was supposed to have had 400 comrades. However, the October conference discovered that the total number of the Berlin organizations, composed of members of the old Wedding group and the former minority of the 4th Dist. of the Leninbund did not rise above 50 to 60 members, just as in South West Germany where the former Palatinate and Bruchsal organizations (who had formerly belonged to the minority) fused, there were, according to the figures presented by Comrade Fraenkel before the conference, 150 comrades. What happened to the hundreds of members? Where were they lost? We believe that the Landau group consciously gave false information.

### Saxony

The methods Landau used against the D. C. of Saxony are partly known to the International Opposition. The Saxon comrades were excluded from participation on the National Committee and on the paper.

By means of systematic provocations, they wanted to force the Saxon organization to quit the Opposition. Even at the Conference, the Landau clique did not succeed--despite the splitting tactics--in the attempt to force the delegates to leave the Conference. Comrade Fraenkel has treated the preparations for the Conference extensively in his letter. The majority of the Conference, of which Landau talks so much, was obtained through the redistribution of mandates by the Landau group, so that one delegate from the South West was able to hold 31 votes. In this manner Landau achieved his majority. Unfortunately, we restricted ourselves merely to protests against these criminal manoeuvres, basing ourselves upon the necessity for unity in the organization.

But after the Conference Landau did not make a halt and continued to destroy the strongest group--the Saxon group--which rose after only a few months from 20-25 members at the time of the unification to 120 members. With this aim in mind, Landau attempted to form a faction in Saxony.

He secretly sent three Berlin comrades to Leipzig, to accomplish this aim. Unsuccessful in their attempt, they returned to Berlin with empty hands. Landau cannot complain that he did not have an opportunity to speak to the comrades in Saxony. For, even after his attempt to form a faction, he was given an opportunity to address a membership meeting, and after a speech lasting an hour and a half, he had to admit the unanimous rejection of his policy.

### c) Hamburg

Landau destroyed the Hamburg organization under the pretext of financial mismanagement. The leading comrades Jahnke and Jungclas were expelled by a decision of the Landau faction. This faction declared that it had been informed of financial irregularities since May or June (1930). Why didn't Landau take organizational measures against these comrades previously? Already in July, Comrade Schwalbach (instigated by Landau) wrote a letter to Jahnke promising to finance his trip to Berlin for participation at the plenum of N. C. (Reichsleitung). At the same time an attempt was made in the very letter to win over Comrade Jahnke to the Landau faction in or-

der to conduct a common struggle against the "taxen "federalists". Comrade Jahnke informed the delegates of the October Conference about these factional manoeuvres.

...This is one of the causes for the expulsion of the Hamburg organization. The Hamburg case is a typical example of Landau's methods. The accusation of stool-pigeonry against Kernmayer in Austria, suspicion of embozzlement against Jahnke and Jungklaus in Hamburg, the attempt to accuse Grylewicz of embozzlement (this attempt was unanimously repulsed at the October conference)--all this is one and the same method for Landau.

When a comrade really commits an injustice against the organization, we will be the first to apply the necessary measures against such a comrade. But such cases must first be submitted to a serious and objective investigation. The constant intrigues of Landau against comrades who fight against his clique policy destroy all belief in his accusations.

d) The Splitting Actions of Landau.

1. Landau is conducting a campaign of personal slander against the leading comrades of the International Opposition and especially against the new E. C. of the French Opposition.

2. The Executive of the German Opposition consists of 16 members. But Landau takes the liberty of utilizing the minority (7 members in all), speaking in the name of the entire Executive.

3. The "Kommunist" is closed to all organizations who fight against the bureaucratic methods of Landau: their articles and correspondence are not published.

4. The four Leipzig comrades who are members of the N. C. have actually been removed from the Executive. To the demand of Comrade Buechner (Leipzig) to call a meeting of the Executive, Landau replied: "We shall deal with you at the conference that will consummate the split."

5. The Hamburg organization has been expelled. Comrade Jahnke, a member of the Executive, has also been expelled.

6. Comrade Grylewicz, who is carrying on important work for the Opposition and especially for the Russian Bulletin, has just been expelled from the organization.

7. A workers' group of 18 comrades near Berlin (in Luckerwalde) has not been admitted into the Opposition because these comrades do not approve of Landau's methods in advance.

VIII. LANDAU THREATENS TO SPLIT.

We read in the "declaration":

"But when the sacrifice of giving up our views on the principal problems of the International Opposition is demanded of us, then the question of unity steps to the background."

We do not understand very well what views are involved here?

Landau has something else in mind. Under fundamental views he understands the approval by the International Opposition of his bureaucratic methods.

But this game will not turn out to be successful for Landau. His manoeuvres will clash with the revolutionary resistance of the members of the German and the International Opposition.

Here we demand the energetic intervention of the International Secretariat in the German conflict. Landau must not be allowed to break up the German Opposition and thereby to spread his demoralizing influence in the International Opposition.

We demand the convocation of a conference of the German Opposition which will have as its task to adopt a political platform, and at the same time, to put an end to Landau's work of political disruption.

R. WELL

#### IN OUR GERMAN SECTION

#### A Statement by The International Secretariat

Comrade Trotsky's letter of February 17th, published in No. 6, and the polemic between the Landau group and comrade Well, which are published herewith, serve to make our readers sufficiently familiar with the basis for the crisis in the German Opposition. It must be said quite openly that it was not differences of a serious political character that divided our German comrades. As comrade Trotsky wrote on February 17th: "neither the Saxon organization nor the Landau group, neither of them represents any independent tendency much less an irreconcilable one." It was only later that Landau began to manufacture political differences by labeling each of the comrades that deserted him either with a "left" stamp (com. Leonhardt) or else with a "right" one (com. Seipold). In reality, the essential basis of the struggle of the majority of the German Opposition against Landau and his little Berlin clique consisted in a struggle against the intolerable regime which Landau imposed from Berlin, upon the entire German Opposition. Landau is the "ideological leader" of the Mahnuf group. That says enough. That means intrigues, defamation, slander. It is enough for a worker to protest against this petty clique policy for him to see himself accused publicly the next day, as an agent provocateur, or as a thief. Our German comrades could not tolerate this regime very long. They revolted within their organizations, they appealed to the International Secretariat and to all the national sections of the Left Opposition. These latter did not wait long in coming to the aid of the German Opposition in helping it rid itself of the poisonous regime imposed by the Landau clique.

We have published all the important documents relating to the crisis in the German Opposition and to its solution. Out of the 12



national sections consulted, 10 charged the International Secretariat with the task of intervening in the German crisis according to the proposals of comrade Trotsky. As was to be expected, Landau, remaining a minority even in the Executive, (5 out of 16 members) refused to submit to the arbitration of the international organization. Then there was nothing left for the delegate of the I. S. to do except to call a plenum of the members of the Executive (Reichsleitung) that accepted the intervention of the international organization and to go over the situation of the German Section with them. Eight members against five of the Landau group responded to the call of the delegate of the I. S. (Three out-of-town delegates one of them from Hamburg and one from Koenigsberg -- who agreed with the proposals of comrade Trotsky -- were unable to come to Berlin) Thus, the majority of the Executive rallied around the I.S. and rejecting international control, thereby automatically put itself outside the ranks of the International Opposition. This departure will profit the development of the German Opposition greatly: rid of the "Austrian" methods of circle intrigues, of the stifling atmosphere of "family politics", our German Section will at last be able to take the path of extensive growth.

For a certain time, our German comrades will still suffer the effects of the disastrous work of Landau. Remaining in the minority, Landau and his friend Maeller have kept for themselves the paper, "Der Kommunist" and the publications of the German Opposition. Landau is already employing this weapon to sow confusion in the mind of the German workers. He says in the "Kommunist" that he is fighting against comrade Trotsky... for a regime of democratic centralism in the Opposition (!) But lies, bluff and hypocrisy will not bring him anywhere. The German Section has just established as its organ "Die Permanente Revolution" with which it will successfully counteract the destructive work of Landau.

According to a statement he made to comrade Wegener, Landau intends to organize his faction internationally. With the "Anarqui" Vicana and the Courgot group at Paris, the "International" of Landau will rapidly be constituted. (The Courgot group had since deserted Landau and returned to the French League, etc.) This is another understanding of the "circle politics" type which has as its only basis, Landau's principle: support me in Paris and I will support you in Berlin.

It is also necessary to mention here that according to this same declaration of com. Wegener (the document will be published in no. 6) "great international projects" are being elaborated by Landau in co-operation with the comrades of the Italian Left (Bordighists). Every member of the International Opposition can well understand the right to desert the international organization and to join or create another. But have not the International Secretariat and the national sections a right to demand that this departure take place, not in the dark, but to the full view of the entire world?

The I.S. has acted in Germany according to the will of the vast majority of the national secs. There can be no doubt that the entire Intl. Opp. approves of the action of the I.S. and will give its support to the German coms. grouped about "Die Permanente Revolution".