

9/34

INTERNATIONAL BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST LEAGUE

English Edition Published for the International Secretariat by the Communist League of America, 141 Second Ave., N. Y. C.

For League Members and Sympathizers.

NEW SERIES NO. 2

SEPTEMBER 1934

PRICE 5 CENTS

Table of Contents

1. CONTRIBUTION TOWARD A DISCUSSION ON THE BASIC CONCEPTIONS OF THE I. C. L.
2. THE GERMAN LEFT OPPOSITION
3. THE TRADE UNION THESES OF THE R.S.P. AND THE O.S.P.
4. TOWARD A CONFERENCE OF THE LATIN AMERICAN BOLSHEVIKS
5. BELGIAN SECTION:
 - (a) ON OUR ATTEMPT TO FUSE WITH THE HENNAUT GROUP
 - (b) A LETTER FROM GOUROV
7. EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECH OF SNEEVLIET

WARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
D. I. TROTSKY ARCHIVE

FEB 20 1959

Contribution Toward a Discussion on the Basic Theoretical Conceptions of the I. C. L.

Foreword: We publish in the following the reply of comrade Trotsky to the theses of comrade L. P. who was formerly close to the Brandlerites and who today sympathizes with our organization. Unfortunately, lack of space and money make the printing of the theses themselves prohibitive.

—The Editorial Board.

1. Without any doubt the old controversy "between Lenin and Trotsky" over the perspective of the Russian Revolution is only of historical interest, and in any case membership in the Left Opposition is not conditional upon taking sides in the controversy. Whoever wants to take a definite position however, must analyze it in connection with the concrete course of the class struggle and the revolutionary groupings in Russia at that time.

2. The epigones have deduced from the old disputes, which went through various stages, a few general rules of revolutionary strategy and laid them down in the form of an antithesis between Leninism and Trotskyism. But the latter is no longer a question of history, but of today and tomorrow. Comrade L. P. declares himself (at least in principle) in agreement with those strategic principles which the Stalinists have decided to be "Trotskyism", but which are in fact the application of Marxism to the conditions of our epoch. This solidarity, as dictated by experience, is much more important than the difference of opinion over a long since settled controversy.

3. However where comrade L. P. refers in his theses back to the historical controversy, he makes a number of mistakes. "In reality", he writes, "the overthrow of Czar-

ism was factually the work of the worker and peasant masses". In this he sees the proof that Lenin's view was correct as against mine. In this connection, however, there existed no dispute between us. Already in the polemic with Radek, I sought to point out, that every "great" Revolution, i.e. a true people's revolution, was and is the doing of the proletariat (pre-proletarian) and peasant (petty bourgeois) masses. This thesis formed the common ground in the dispute. The only question was, which class would assume the leading position and consequently come into power. L. P. admits that the Russian proletariat actually seized power sooner than the western European proletariat; but he calls to attention the fact that this happened not in the "Revolution against Czarism, but in the second revolution against the Bourgeoisie". What does this imply? By a bourgeois revolution the Russian Marxists worthy of the name, meant above all the solution of the agrarian question. This concept which differentiated them from the Liberals and from the Mensheviks represented a basic viewpoint common to both Lenin and Trotsky (see the minutes of the 4th Party Congress). The circumstance that in February the propertied classes, among them the nobility, including the princes, surrendered (temporarily) the monarchy in the interest of self-preservation was an episode which no prognosis could predict. After the abdication of Nicholas II, the land problem i.e. the problem of the bourgeois-democratic revolution occupied next to the war problem the predominant position in political life. It was precisely on the basis of this revolution that

the proletariat came to power.

4. It follows then, that in countries where, despite of backwardness, the division into the basic classes (the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie, and the proletariat) cuts through the whole nation (China, India) the national-emanicipation and bourgeois democratic revolution cannot be brought to a conclusion without the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is precisely in this that the continuity (permanence) between the bourgeois and the socialist revolution lies. The revolution in China passed through a number of stages; its road in India will be no less complicated and tortuous. We shall of course follow and analyze each stage. But the task of the strategic prognosis is not to deduce the concrete stages and episodes, but to formulate the basic tendency of revolutionary development. This basic tendency is indicated by the formula of the Permanent Revolution which is based upon three conceptions:

a) The national bourgeoisie, which during the initial stages seeks to utilize the revolution for itself (Kuomintang, Gandhi), goes invariably over to the other side of the barricades, to the feudal classes and the imperialist oppressors, in the course of further development of the revolution.

b) The petty bourgeoisie (peasantry) can no longer play a leading role in the bourgeois revolution and consequently cannot take power. Hence flows the rejection of the slogan of the bourgeois-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.

c) Under the dictatorship of the proletariat

(Continued on Page 5)

The German L.O., International Communists of Germany

After Hitler's Seizure Of Power

The story of the German Opposition is well known, it is filled with difficulties and crises. The German Opposition grew from the little kernel formed within and without the Leninbund, through the literature of the Russian Opposition. Before it could make its first steps, it had, in 1930, to separate itself from the Leninbund, which represented an extraordinary mixture of ultra-leftist and opportunist ideas. For years its work was made still harder by the miserable historical tradition of the German Lefts, a la Maslow, Fischer, Urbahns. Up to the spring of 1931, another year passed in sterile discussions with Landau, before the German Opposition could really get into action. There were hardly two years left prior to Hitler's seizure of power, and the Opposition used these two years in intensive propaganda and educational work. Despite all material difficulties, despite the fact that the German Opposition was faced not only by the most powerful Socialist and Communist parties, but also by strong opposition groups, upheld by a certain tradition, such as the Brandlerites and the S.A.P., who had not acquired such strength in any other country; despite all this, the German Left Opposition at the time of its first national conference which took place under the Hitler illegality, in March 1933, managed to create an organization which spread into important centers all over Germany, and which had attracted a large number of veteran experienced Communists, but which had actually impregnated a cadre of young workers with the spirit of Communism and the ideas of the Left Opposition. We must also attribute to this education the fact that the capitulation of certain leading elements to Stalin on the eve of Hitler's seizure of power, created no stir in the organization and even produced a certain relief and increased the political homogeneity. The capitulation cleansed the organization of several elements who in any case under illegality would be shown up as so much refuse.

Politically Hitler's seizure of power was not unexpected by the Opposition, all of whose work was devoted to averting the catastrophe. It was not, like the S. P. or the C. P., confronted with ideological bankruptcy, but only needed to draw conclusions from the events.

Consequently the organization did not hesitate on the question of short or long perspectives. The March national conference had already abandoned the idea of the reform of the C. P. Propaganda for the new party struck certain snags, but this was overcome by a serious and thorough discussion. New processes in the S.P.G., the development of the S.A.P., caused the German Left Opposition to be the first to broach the question of the New International. In the general chaos of the German labor movement after Hitler's seizure of power, the wreckage of different organizations found themselves grouped once more not so much around a political banner as in behalf of traditional affiliations, and it is actually only now that that situation is giving way to a genuine new political grouping, constantly renewed by the actions of the state secret police. And it is in this chaos that

the Left Opposition will try to create the nuclei for the new party, by forming cadres consisting of former members of the C. P., the S. P. and from the unions, who are to take up especially the question of the defeat.

Two political questions especially were brought up for discussion, less because of the events themselves than because of the inventive gifts of certain theoreticians. Thus the question of the formation of "illegal unions" was thought up at the writing table of August Thalheimer, and Hitler's "state capitalism" issued from the typewriter of Hugo Urbahns. The first discovery, which corresponds to the German actuality as the fist corresponds to the eye, was repulsed by us as energetically as it was seized upon by the bureaucracy of the C. P. as a plaything. It was necessary to fight the second theory, in spite of the insignificance of the Leninbund, because it played a role, among a certain stratum of intellectuals, as a pretext for capitulating to Fascism.

Today, in the German L.O., besides discussion on the subject of the tactics of January 30, discussions with the S.A.P. are extremely important. The subject of this discussion is in the first place international in its nature and is made accessible to other sections of the I.C.L. The S.A.P., an organization centrist in its origin, has evolved so fast toward communism, that at the Paris Conference they arrived at the Declaration of Four and there was hope for a rapid fusion with the German Left Opposition. The fusion could be an important step on the road toward the new party. But a more profound discussion revealed the existence in the S.A.P. of residues, still very powerful, of rightist ideas and especially of new tendencies, arising since the depression after the defeat, according to which it was necessary to "improve" communist organization principles. But it is indubitable, as the future of the S.A.P. will show, that only a Bolshevik party, ideologically homogeneous, can surmount the difficulties of illegality and achieve victory.

The question of the nature of Fascism and the perspectives in Germany is so clear that anyone who speaks seriously can not put the question otherwise than as we do. Only the bankrupt bureaucrats of Moscow can chatter about "revolution on the order of the day". But the essential question has become that of organization, just as it was in the analogous situations in Russia in 1902 and 1906. It is here that all the divergent political, tactical, and strategic differences are reflected. If we observe the two old parties in bankruptcy, reconstituting themselves into two large "groups of conciliators" who leave out all bitter critics, but who will not break with the past and who thus can only form bases for transition either to the right or to the left. There we see those liquidationist tendencies in the very heart of the Communist movement, and here the L.O. (now called the International

Communist League of Germany) most energetically and most clearly defends the principles of Bolshevism and thus constitutes the ideological center of the renaissance of the German proletariat.

From the point of view of organization, the German L.O. showed itself particularly resistant, especially at the inception of illegality. It had no experience of the scattering and dissolution which so injured the big organizations. It was only in outlying districts, where the leading comrades were particularly well known, that we had great losses, at the beginning. Considering the relatively inconsiderable losses, turnover in the cadres of functionaries was equally inconsiderable. Having a paper printed outside of the country and yet appearing in Germany in sufficient numbers, and the publication of numerous local hectographed sheets, gave a considerable authority to the German section, aside from the fact that our political analysis had been confirmed by experience. The L. O. acquired an increasing power of attraction, not only among relatively restrained critics from the remains of the C.P.G., but especially among the completely stirred up cadres of the social democracy, who were equally determined to break with the past and to have nothing to do with the Stalinists.

Growing in efficiency, however, Goering's state police succeeded, finally, from July on, in causing considerable losses to our organization. Some comrades were arrested, others deported. The great lack of funds played a tragic role in preventing the security and extension of our organization. Now in many places new forces coming from the C.P. and the S.P. have replaced the old. But our documents are still circulating in the country, showing that this has not in any way caused a lowering of the level. For the most exact data on the life of the I.C.L. (as far as it is possible to publish this) we send out reports published in the bi-monthly paper *Unser Wort* appearing in Paris, and in the "Service d'Information" (I.F.I., supplement of *Unser Wort* and appearing every two weeks). Before going underground the L.O. together with a number of isolated groups, numbered seven federations. In six of these systematic work is still being carried on. The losses are for the most part compensated for by the acquisition of good new elements. Maria Reese's coming over and other symptoms showed that even the Stalinists can not continue to gloss over, the historic defeat by resolutions according to Heckert and reconciliations according to Brandler, without the better elements of the C.P. together with the L.O., setting themselves to create a new party.

The German emigres have obviously been on the job. In addition to work for supporting the German movement, for which purpose centers have been set up in seven countries, they take part actively and unsuccessfully in work of the Bolshevik-Leninists in other countries. In certain countries, through the work of our emigres, new bases of support for the I.C.L. have even been created by the work of our emigres. *Unser Wort* exercises an important influence, not only on the emigres, but also

(Continued on Page 7)

DRAFT OF THE TRADE UNION THESES OF THE R.S.P. AND THE O.S.P.

(Herewith we are publishing the theses on the trade union question in Holland, edited by the R.S.P. and the O.S.P. These theses will be discussed as a basis for unification of the two Dutch organizations, participating in the "Declaration of Four". For lack of space unfortunately we can not publish the declaration of principles which will be discussed at the same time. A clear solution of the trade union question is so much more important for our Dutch comrades because they are depending on the N.A.S. (National Arbeider Sekretariat), independent unions of 25,000 members. We also hope that our readers will take part in this important discussion.)

DRAFT OF THE RESOLUTION ON THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

1. The . . . rejects the reformist conception according to which the present crisis is a "temporary" episode which will disappear of itself, a period during which the workers can all the more try to maintain the positions they have won, and during which we appeal to them to cooperate in putting through measures tending to "reestablish" capitalism in order that later at the crest of the cycle they may with the help of existing organizations regain their lost ground.

On the contrary, we proclaim that in accordance with our program of principles, this crisis is a crisis of the capitalist system itself, a period of decay, in which it is not a change in the economic cycle, but the struggle for power which is the order of the day; a period in which all the existing workers' organizations, including the trade union movement, are ever more forced into the position of choosing: between either submitting to the violent introduction of a semi-fascist or fascist terror, or accepting the struggle for power and organizing it in every way possible.

2. The . . . admits that the trade union movement, under reactionary and reformist leadership, stands for the development of capitalism, not as an instrument of struggle for improvements in wages and other working class demands, but as an institution which on the one hand is becoming constantly more and more an appendage of the bourgeois state, and which on the other hand increasingly becomes a hindrance to the genuine economic struggle of the proletariat, by systematically avoiding that struggle and adapting itself to the reactionary demands of the boss class (the policy of the "lesser evil"); and which thus finally as in Italy and in Germany, is completely obliterated in the apparatus of the corporate fascist state.

3. In opposition to this concept, the . . . asserts that in the present period the trade union movement can retain some measure of usefulness for the working class only on condition that it orientates itself in a political and revolutionary manner and devotes its forces to propaganda and organization of the masses, and of the revolution which will be born from this organization. It follows that the . . . is conscious who are its allies in the struggle to realize this situation within the trade union movement.

olutionists within the trade union movement, reformist as well as reactionary, where they must work organizationally and loyally, must always and with all our strength consist in leading the masses of organized workers to take a revolutionary stand by putting political questions and the revolutionary struggle on the order of the day and precisely in those places where they have been interdicted by the reformist leadership.

By putting forward constantly the connection between the offensive on working conditions and on the general political and economic reaction; in opposing the dictatorship of the leaders and the monstrous violations of the democratic rights of members; in heralding the disintegration of government unions and, what goes with them, the incessant capitulations without a struggle to the demands of the government and the employers, its members will produce a profound and serious interest by which the kernel of militant class-conscious workers may be reinforced and increased in number. This will permit, at decisive moments, the organization of revolutionary resistance which will come with the increase of misery and oppression, and which, if it remains without conscious revolutionary direction, will be absorbed once more by the apparatus of the reformist and reactionary unions and which then weakened and undermined by promises and threats, will be once more delivered up to "the law".

5. In consideration of what has been said in the previous paragraphs, the . . . recognizes that the revolutionary trade union movement, represented by the N.A.S., must be considered as a real factor in the revolutionary class struggle; that is to say, in the N.A.S. the members of the . . . are to cooperate loyally in the reinforcement and expansion of the organizations of the N.A.S. This is all the more necessary now that the government and the employers answer every attempt at resistance on the part of the N.A.S. by the most brutal attacks on the organizations belonging to the N.A.S., thus putting the N.A.S. practically on the same level as a political party "endangering the state".

In accordance with the above, the revolutionists who because of their work as indicated in the reformist trade unions have been silenced or expelled and who see their efforts to check this reign of terror without effect, should join the N.A.S.

By maintaining political independence in relation to the N.A.S. as a trade union center the . . . will give powerful support to this trade union movement in its struggle against the government and the employers, while supporting every movement in which it finds itself in the vanguard of the revolutionary movement against the capitalist system.

6. The . . . takes a stand against the politics and tactics of the P.C.H. which orientated itself against the formation of the O.S.P. in the different corporations; against organizations entirely led by the P.C.H. and

workers, consisting in provoking defiance against the struggle in the trade union movement itself, and which provoked the unleashing of irresponsible and badly led movements that can only lead to defeat, thus adding to the indifference of the workers to the class struggle.

7. Independently of the question of the role of the unions in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, when the power of the working class will be based on new organizations of the proletariat, the . . . believes that in the present capitalist relations the creation of new organizations for economic struggle could only set up more confusion and splits among the workers. In the present circumstances it considers the unions as the natural form of organization for workers in the corporations, nevertheless it wishes from now on to work for the ideological preparation of the workers, so that in a directly revolutionary period they may be capable of exercising a decisive influence on the formation and leadership of the eventual new organizations.

TOWARD A CONFERENCE OF LATIN-AMERICAN BOLSHEVIK-LENINISTS

The Stalinist press, thinking to injure the international Bolshevik-Leninist movement, which they call "Trotskyist", has repeatedly pointed out that this movement shows signs of growth in the Latin-American countries. It is a fact that the Bolshevik-Leninists of Latin America are developing in: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Mexico, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia. This is a very significant sign if we consider how important the liberation of oppressed peoples is for the revolution, and also if we consider that it is most of all in that field that the Stalinist policies of the bureaucratized Comintern have contributed confusion and disaster.

Hence it is entirely natural that the revolutionists of these oppressed countries, in a serious search for a way out of their situation in the anti-imperialist struggle, should turn away from the theory and practice of "socialism in one country" that is cracking up under world imperialism, and turn to the proletarian internationalism of the Bolshevik-Leninists. But from now on we must think of preparing a new step in the development of our outside forces and our means of struggle in all the countries of Latin America. The idea of organizing a "Conference of Latin-American Bolshevik-Leninists", advanced particularly by our Argentine comrades, should be taken under serious advisement. First of all the preparatory work must be done: elaboration of theses and documents on the bases of individual experience and needs of each country (Brazil, Cuba, Argentine, Chile, etc.), coordination of activity of each group and each comrade, in order to conduct our struggle against imperialism jointly, under the same banner and by the same methods.

A special "bulletin" is needed to coordinate and direct all this activity. The comrades in the U. S. and in Spain are especially asked to send contributions and assistance. We appeal for immediate beginnings of this work and for sending constantly all suggestions and documents that may be of use, to the International Secretariat. The Conference of Latin-American Bolshevik-Leninists is a first step toward the formation of a new international movement.

BELGIAN SECTION

On Our Attempt to Fuse With the Hennaut Group

In 1930 the Belgian Opposition split into three segments, the minority of the Central Committee, the Federation of Charleroi, took the initiative for the break. They were determined by the following three reasons: a) the abandonment by the majority of the C. C. of the policy of reform, b) a general let-down of militant work on the part of the leadership, of which Van Overstraeten was the most responsible, c) organization least of all.

This rupture, unfortunately, cut off the Federation of Charleroi, a French language district, from the groups in the Flemish language districts, the latter being grouped politically behind the position of the majority of the C.C. For the sake of more precision, the Antwerp Federation (by far the most important of the majority) came under the influence of the R.S.P. of Holland. Its position on matters of reform was much more radical than that of the Brussels Federation.

For three years the two groups lived apart.

The Charleroi Federation with which at the very beginning two comrades joined from Verviers and one from Brussels, never stopped progressing, strengthening itself and increasing in influence; groups gathered around these comrades. Other groups were set up in Louvain and in Liege. The "Voix Communiste" continued to improve and to increase in circulation. At the present moment 2,400 readers read our press regularly.

On the other hand, the group of Van Overstraeten-Hennaut, which after the departure of Van Overstraeten called itself the League of Communist Internationalists, has been in constant decline since the beginning of 1933. Recently some young elements have re-enforced the Brussels group. Without exaggeration, one could say that as a national group it has completely disappeared. The connection between the different groups has almost ceased to exist. The French organ of their group disappeared almost immediately after the rupture; only two more numbers appeared. A peculiar characteristic: In the first of the two numbers there appeared an article from the pen of Van Overstraeten, but unsigned, in which they buried all the fragments of the united Opposition. Our tendency was buried with numerous well-constructed and highly literary phrases. After the rupture, the Flemish organ was re-issued by the Antwerp group, and nine numbers appeared. Since then the Brussels group published a mimeographed bulletin that appeared irregularly.

Until August 1933, it appeared that the only difference with the International Communist League was the policy of reform in relation to the Comintern. They were for the creation of independent groupings on a national scale.

The new orientation of the O.G.I., the decision to orientate toward the creation of a new International and new parties caused the automatic disappearance of the fundamental political question which was at the root of our separation. After consultation with our group, our leadership sent the following propositions to the International

Communist League:

The convocation of a joint meeting of the leaders of our respective organizations, for which we propose the following points on the agenda:

- 1) Joint elaboration of a declaration of principles (acceptance on principle).
- 2) Elaboration of rules of the new organization (acceptance on principle).
- 3) Distribution of tasks for the publication of these documents.
- 4) Preparation and organization in each group of a general discussion on these documents.
- 5) Organization of a national conference to pass on these documents, on the creation of the united organization and the election of leaders.
- 6) Examination of the possibility of launching a Flemish paper.
- 7) Elaboration of a manifesto for the proletarian.

8) Organization of a campaign of meetings in the principal cities of the nation.

Since then a series of documents have been exchanged between our two organizations that have indicated to us that there exist "other divergences". We put these other divergences in quotes, because up to now we have been unable to learn anything definite about them.

What it means is that this group is floundering in an ideological confusion and that several divergent trends are defining themselves in its midst.

In Brussels certain comrades find themselves directly under the influence of the fraction of the Italian Left. Hennaut is approaching them gradually on the question of the united front, on the trade union question and on the tactics to be employed toward the left wing formations inside and outside the 2nd International. In Verviers and Liege the members of their group are collaborating actively in a new movement for independent trade unions. The group that is coming close to us ideologically is the Antwerp group, which is in constant touch with our comrades of the R.S.P. of Holland.

The ideological confusion on all sides, and the accusations and slanders launched against the O.G.I., which the leadership of the League is pleased to repeat under the pretence of hearing them for the first time, are not of such a nature as to facilitate rapprochement.

In the next Bulletin we shall give the important extracts of the documents exchanged.

—GOUROV.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS NOTES

A new edition of "A Criticism of the Program of the Comintern" by comrade Trotsky is now in preparation. This classic of Marxian literature and the fundamental document of the Left Opposition has appeared in English in the form of two pamphlets: "The Draft Program of the Comintern: A Criticism of Fundamentals" and "The Strategy of the World Revolution."

The new and complete version will contain many sections which did not appear in the first English texts.

A Letter From Gourov

Comrade Gourov's letter to the Belgian section of the Bolshevik-Leninists:

Dear Comrades,

It is with great interest that I read through No. 10 of your internal bulletin which confirms the report of the negotiations with the International Communist League. I rejoiced at the accuracy with which my friends put the questions. On the other hand, the words of Comrade Hennaut produced a most unfortunate impression on me. As he is now, he represents at least a complete model of theoretical and political confusion. There is not a single question to which he contributes anything but doubts, hesitations, and fears. This is the most fatal condition for a man who wishes to be a revolutionist!

The first four congresses of the Comintern! But in them there was "something" erroneous, since the results have been so lamentable. Just what was wrong? Hennaut does not know. In fact the fault is entirely on the part of comrade Hennaut. He thinks that the fate of the Comintern is determined not by the struggle of living social forces, but by some original "error" that has to be discovered—as if it were a matter of mathematical calculation. Why not go further and say: Three Internals were born of the teachings of Marx and all three were born to collapse—therefore we must find a "fundamental error" in Marx. We can go even further and say that in spite of science people continue to suffer and undergo calamities; it is clear there is some "fundamental error" in science. The problem is not approached historically or dialectically, but dogmatically, in the spirit of the Catholic Church, which explains all human ills by original sin. Souvarine's theory about the Comintern is also the theory of original sin. And Hennaut—alas!—has become the disciple of the sterile scholastic that is Souvarine.

According to the same Hennaut (that is to say, Souvarine), our political line in Germany was wrong from start to finish. It is necessary to have a fair amount of impertinence to make such an assertion: And wherein lies our error? Not in our analysis, nor in our prognosis, nor in our directives, but in the fact that we called on the Communist workers to bring pressure to their party to force it onto the path of correct policies. Instead of this we should have said to the workers: Don't waste your efforts, it is of no consequence, the Comintern is sunk. At the same time Hennaut thinks: The time was not ripe to create the new International. Then what practical proposal were we to make to the German workers? To reject the old International, was it building a new one? Then we could all go to sleep. Our error—these pedants, divorced from reality, see error in the fact that, without hiding anything from the workers, we did not discourage them, but bestirred ourselves to help them make the most out of the situation. Any strike leader would.

(Continued on Page 7)

Contribution Toward Discussion on the Basic Conceptions of the I. C. L.

(Continued from Page 1)

the bourgeois-democratic revolution goes over into the socialist revolution, which can triumph completely only as a link in the world revolution.

The transgression of these principles has already resulted in great damage in China, India, Japan and other countries.

5. The theory of the permanent revolution stands refuted according to comrade P. by the fact that the peasantry has failed in 16 years to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat, contrary to the old fears of Trotsky. This argument, too, goes wide of the mark. Not only before but also after the October revolution Lenin expressed dozens of times the thought that without the speedy support of the world proletariat the Soviet power would be overthrown. It was a question of estimating empirically numerous and contradictory factors, which it is impossible to forecast according to the calendar. If thanks to an entire series of circumstances Soviet power has maintained itself for 16 years in a single country, that is as little evidence against the international character of the revolution, as it is against the fact that the power of resistance of the proletarian dictatorship is the weaker the more numerous the peasantry.

6. Comrade P. approaches very closely to the long refuted argument of Bucharin, that on an international scale the proportion between workers and peasants is not more variable than it is within the borders of the Soviet Union. This is scholasticism. The question is decided not by static, but by social forces, not by the average percentage of workers in the entire world, but by the order in which the individual countries are drawn into the revolution. If, for example, the Brandler leadership had not wrecked the German revolution in 1923, the statistical proportions between proletariat and peasantry on a world scale would have naturally remained unchanged, but the forces of the proletarian revolution would have been multiplied manifold. Soviet Germany would have pulled Europe headlong into the revolution. The transformation of Europe into a socialist fortress would have changed the relationship of forces in the entire world. The backward countries would have entered into the revolution under the most favorable circumstances, the counter-revolutionary convulsions would have been infinitely less dangerous.

7. As regards the question of Socialism in one country, comrade P. offers a number of ambiguous formulations. He begins by adducing without comment the famous quotation from Lenin's article in the year 1915, on the possibility of "the victory of socialism at first in a few countries or even in a single country". As is well known, Stalin placed his entire theory from this quotation.

In the literature of the L. O., however, it is proven irrefutably, that Lenin in this, as in many other cases implied by "the victory of socialism" the seizure of power by the working class, i.e., the creation of the socialist state, but not the erection of a socialist society. Or is comrade P. the least bit in doubt on this score? A careful reading of this quotation will dispell his doubts.

theory of socialism in one country to a hollow abstraction. If intervention from without, and counter-revolution at home fail to materialize, the technology of the Soviets will keep on growing, the standard of living and the culture of the masses will continue to rise steadily and socialism can be realized. But as comrade P. concedes, this abstract possibility is unrealizable in the face of the extreme sharpness of the class antagonisms on a world scale. In his opinion Russia's "backwardness" has nothing to do with the case. National backwardness may be overcome without overcoming the sharpening of the class war in the entire world.

But that is just the point. To overcome backwardness takes a long time; in the meantime the development of the world class struggle does not grant the U.S.S.R. an unlimited respite. Moreover, the overcoming of backwardness puts terrific burdens upon the toiling masses, the fact that the Russian workers 16 years after the revolution have not enough to eat frightens off the workers of other countries; hinders the development of world revolution and increases the danger for the U. S. S. R.

9. How is the abstract "possibility" of the building of socialism in one country to be understood at all? If Russia were alone in the world, there would have been no October Revolution in 1917. If one dismisses in his mind world economy after the October Revolution, then Russia left to herself would have reverted back to capitalism. For within the framework of the Soviet Union capitalism had far from exhausted its possibilities as yet. In the field of production the Soviet regime is only now "catching up" to the capitalist countries. The dictatorship of the proletariat maintains itself in the U. S. S. R. because world economy of which Russian capitalism was a part, drove into a blind alley. But mortal danger (Fascism) threatens the dictatorship from that very same source.

10. The real question "is not the possibility of socialism in one country but the international unity of the revolutionary class struggle". In this formula P. transforms the international unity into the same sort of an abstraction as he previously did with the building of socialism in one country. If one teaches the workers that the warding off of military intervention guarantees the complete and final victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R., then the question of world revolution loses its significance, and the foreign policy comes down to the prevention of intervention. In this way the Stalinist bureaucracy has ruined the Comintern and can ruin the Soviet state. The theory of socialism in one country and the international unity of the proletarian struggle exclude each other in reality.

11. The bureaucracy in the U.S.S.R. is neither a moral nor a technological factor but a social one, i.e., a class factor. The struggle between the socialist and capitalist tendencies assumed primarily the character of a struggle between the social interests represented by the state and the personal interests of the consumers, the peasants, the

In the given situation the overcoming of class antagonisms means the harmonizing of the social interests of production with the personal interest of the consumers, while during the present stage of development personal interest still remains the prime mover of economy. Has this harmonizing been accomplished? No! The growth of bureaucracy reflects the growth of the contradiction between the private and social interests. Representing the "social" interests, the bureaucracy identifies them to a large measure with its own interests. It draws the distinction between the social and the private in accordance with its own private interests. This creates a still greater tension between the contradictions and consequently leads to a further growth of bureaucracy. At the bottom of these processes lie the backwardness of the U.S.S.R. and its isolation in its capitalist environment.

12. The empiricists say, that for 16 years the Soviet power has been making rapid strides and should this continue socialism will most certainly be completed. We reply to this that "should this continue", the process must inevitably lead to an internal explosion, most probably with the aid of a shock from outside, but possibly also without one. Military intervention is, generally speaking, only dangerous to the extent that, first, it finds within the Soviet Union an extreme sharpening of the contradictions and, secondly, that military intervention creates a breach for the intervention of cheap capitalist goods. Both of these conditions show that the problem of socialism is not solved and insofar as it is not a question in the domain of abstraction but in the sphere of reality—that it will not be solved without the international revolution.

13. From these considerations some especially clever people draw the conclusion, that we are robbing the Russian workers of their "perspectives". Others go still further and accuse us of denying the usefulness and necessity of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R.: why indeed build if nothing (!) results anyway (!). It is hardly worth while to reply to such an absurdity. If I say that the human organism cannot live without breathing fresh air, I do not deny thereby the benefits of nutrition, nor the importance of the stomach as an organ of digestion.

14. U.S.S.R. AND COMINTERN. What comrade P. says about the dependence of the Comintern upon the political interests of the Soviet bureaucracy is by and large correct and has been contrary to his assertions, repeatedly stated in the literature of the L.O. Nevertheless, even here comrade P. permits himself ambiguous formulations if not mistakes. Thus he says that the Soviet bureaucracy has artificially transferred its internal controversies into the Comintern. If one disregards the criminal methods of the bureaucracy (the throttling of criticism, fraud, forgery, framed accusations and venality), the fact nevertheless remains that the factional groupings within the C.P.S.U. were essentially of international significance. This is especially true of the L.O. True, it developed on the immedi-

tempo of industrialization and the regime in the party. But even these questions immediately came to assume international importance. The problem of bureaucratism affected the Comintern immediately and directly. Back in 1924-1925 the struggle centered entirely around the question of the German revolution ("the Lessons of October"). In 1926 the struggle became acute on the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the Pilsudski coup d'etat in Poland. The year 1927 stands completely under the sign of the Chinese Revolution. Through all these years runs the struggle on the question of the "Workers and Peasants Parties" for the East, on the Crestinern (Peasant International, and by the by, where has it disappeared to?), etc. 1928 is the year of the struggle over the program of the Comintern. 1929-1933: ultra-Leftism in the economic policy of the U.S.S.R., the "Third Period", the Spanish revolution, the problem of Fascism. The C.P.G.-Opp. ignored the most important questions of international revolutionary strategy and unfortunately this reflects itself today quite negatively in the S.A.P. leadership.

15. On CENTRISM Comrade P. makes a major methodological mistake when he refuses to recognize the apparently "Russian" division of the Communist camp into Lefts, Centrists and Rights. In his opinion the Rights in Russia are actually liquidators. In the West, however, the percentage of liquidators among the Rights is not large. "The course of the best section of the C.P. G.O., which by way of the S.A.P. has come around very close to the L.O. . . . speaks clearly enough for itself". All these considerations apart from whether they are essentially correct or not, do not refute but support our classification, especially the division of the Centrists into Rights and Lefts. In order for the S.A.P. to approximate the ideas of the L.O., its members had to split away from the left wing of social democracy while its leaders had to break with the Brandlerites. Ideologically, however, this process is not yet completed.

If comrade P. wants to say that not all the Brandlerites are lost for the revolution, we will gladly admit this. To take the path of revolution (under the present historical conditions, the path of the New International) they must break with the right centrist and especially with the Centrist peculiarities and methods (the disdainful attitude toward theory, the inadequate understanding of the international organization, and the disregard for problems of revolutionary strategy or the supplanting of them by questions of tactic etc.).

One may set up as a general rule that the antipathy toward the concept Centrist and toward all further subdivisions of centrism is typical of tendencies which are either Centrist themselves or have not yet finally freed themselves from their intellectual absorptionness.

16. The collapse of German social democracy and the German Communist party ushered in a whole period of degeneration, fermentation and recrystallization within the proletarian vanguard. But in the given case "fermentation" means nothing else than passing through intermediate or centrist stages of development. Whether in any individual case we have to deal with degeneration or revolutionary recrystallization de-

pends upon the direction in which the movement in question takes place: from left to right, or from right to left, and so on. Hence flows the necessity to differentiate between right centrism, left centrism, etc. These concepts of course are nothing absolute. But relative as they are, they are quite indispensable for Marxist orientation, in contradistinction to a vulgar and empirical orientation. Proletarian politicians can as little dispense with them as the mariners with the map and compass.

17. Let us take two examples: the Norwegian Workers Party (N.A.P.) and the Swedish Independent Communist Party. The N.A.P. is steering a course from Centristism to Reformism. To complete this development without internal explosion Tranmael needed a mask and a cover. This covering was supplied him by his connection with the Independent socialist parties of other countries. Today, feeling himself firmly in the saddle, he is beginning to repay by kicking those who held his stirrups; an experience by no means new.

It is a grave opportunistic mistake for the S.A.P. and O.S.P. leaders to have signed together with Tranmael the resolution for a joint fight for the rebirth of the revolutionary (!) movement; which mistake resulted from a vulgarly empirical attitude toward the task of gathering forces and a lack of Marxist evaluation of their tendencies and course of development.

The Swedish Independent Communist Party, as far as I am able to judge on the basis of extremely meager material, is developing from the Brandler position toward the left. It goes without saying that every revolutionary Internationalist will strive with might and main in order that this development may lead toward a rapprochement and to common endeavors on the basis of the principles of the New International. But it is impermissible to pass off hopes for actual facts by substituting a possible tomorrow for today. The Swedish party not only voted for the same resolution together with Tranmael but it also refused to sign the declaration for the 4th International. Although they are agreed upon the necessity of a New International in principle, the party leaders consider its proclamation to be "premature". Actually a centrist vacillation lies behind this attitude. Today it is not a question of proclaiming the New International but of proclaiming the necessity for the New International and of formulating its basic principles before the eyes of the working class of the world.

Inasmuch as under these circumstances the S.A.P. and O.S.P. signed the declaration for the New International with one hand and with the other the declaration together with Tranmael, Balabonova, Paul Louis and others, they hinder the formation of necessary clarity, they set the vacillators a new example of vacillation, they retard the revolutionary development of the Swedish Party as well as that of a number of other organizations. One cannot be guided solely by the ambition to amass as much as possible. One has to keep a political chart and a compass before oneself. Mass quantity can be the result only of principled quality.

18. Comrade P. is quite correct when he insists that the sections of the old L.O. cease to feel themselves only as the opposition or only as auxiliaries to the Russian Opposi-

tion. They must act as cadres (a part of the cadres) of the new national parties and New International. Comrade P. differentiates himself favorably in this question from these empiricists who do not understand the vanguard role of the L.O., because they allow themselves to be guided at bottom by a purely trade union criterion (the question of bare numbers), instead of by a Marxist criterion which proceeds from the decisive role of theory, principles and methods.

19. The idea of comrade P. that we should keep a catalogue of the dead and living sections of the Comintern is false. This question has been sufficiently dealt with in our discussion. If in this or another country we shall be able to capture the majority in the national section, then it will not be by means of the idea of reform, but through openly establishing the New International. Thus did the Third International in its own day capture the majority of the French social democracy.

20. It is quite correct that in the literature of the L.O. very important questions of most modern economic and political developments have not been treated. Treatises of such nature presuppose the growth of the cadres, the assimilation of new forces, a broader division of labor including the theoretical work.

On the other hand one must realize that the theoretical work of the various tendencies as well as the immediate development of world economy and politics during the last decade has produced nothing in contradiction to the most important programmatic and strategic principles of the L.O. and its revolutionary perspective. In this lies the greatest guarantee for the success of a future construction. (P.)

Notice to All Sections

Here is your second BULLETIN. But to date no section has responded to the appeal in our first number.

"The problem of the regular appearance of our BULLETIN is the problem of close and regular collaboration of all the comrades with the I.S. It is not only necessary to set up a regular information service about the life of the sections, but also a regular sending of the necessary funds (from subscriptions, sales, etc.)

Each leadership must appoint an international correspondent for our press and one responsible for our BULLETIN, in direct contact, both of them, with our editors and our administration."

As to both the ideologic collaboration and the material support, nothing has come through to us so far. But if our BULLETIN is to appear regularly, both of these conditions must be met.

Each BULLETIN comes to about 300 francs. Upkeep (printing letter heads, etc.) also takes about 250 francs. The I.S. has advanced the necessary funds until now. Nevertheless the BULLETIN should be entirely the responsibility of the sections - its improvement and maintenance depend on it.

We insist upon this once more in order that the national leaderships may get busy on it at once.

—The Editors and Administration,

A Letter From Gourov

(Continued from Page 4)

act in the same way. Otherwise, he is no leader, but an untrustworthy capitulator!

The road to health for Hennaut is to start a "discussion" with Souvarine, the Bordigists, Urbahn, and other hopeless groups. As if this discussion had not been conducted during the past years; as if it had not undergone the test of events, as if a round table discussion at a "conference" could add anything to political experience already clarified by a long theoretical discussion!

We must see, says Hennaut, if there is not "something" correct in Souvarine and all the "Communist" groups and grouplets. Hennaut himself can not make up his mind to say clearly and simply just what he has found about them that is correct. He recommends that we "search". But all our daily labor is to search out for each question the most exact answer. We have elaborated our methods, we have our answers, we have our criticisms of other points of view. Hennaut does not grant this enormous collective labor his approval, passes by all that we have done, and proposes to busy himself with "researches" and "discussion" as if we were just born today. A sterile position, entirely impregnated with the spirit of Souvarinism!

It is particularly naive to say that our participation in the Paris Conference, when we were "seated at the same table" with the Pupists and others, represents an "opportunist error". Thus, for Hennaut, what unites is not Marxist principles, but—the table! He does not say a word about the contents of our Declaration and our resolution which received four signatures. He forgets or he can not understand that we have preserved complete freedom of action and of criticism of our allies. The fact that the S.A.P. and the O.S.P. voted for the resolution of the seven without reservations and consequently entirely wrongly, shows surely that our allies have not arrived at the clarity indispensable for Marxists. But were we not the first to herald this error in our press? Through joint labors as well as through criticism we can help our allies to attain the necessary clarity.

Hennaut's arguments against the struggle for the Fourth International are no less false and removed from life than the rest of his rationalizations. "For the creation of the Third International", he says, "the war and the Russian Revolution were needed". Many repeat this formula without reflection and without reservation. The war did not facilitate, but on the contrary rendered enormously more difficult the work of the revolution, especially internationally. This is why all skeptics like Hennaut considered the slogan for the Third International "inopportune" and even "absurd" during the war. Now, to a certain extent, Fascism plays the role played by the war in 1914-18, all the more since Fascism is pre-paring a new war. But—says Hennaut—to create the Third International the Russian Revolution was also needed. A remarkable discovery! But did the Russian Revolution fall from heaven? For the October victory of the proletariat the Bolshevik party was necessary, permeated not with the spirit of Stalin-Kamenev (March 1917) but

with the spirit of Lenin. In other words: It was necessary for Lenin, even at the beginning of the war, under the most difficult and unfavorable circumstances, to begin the struggle for the Third International without reckoning with the skeptics, those who hinder and confuse everything. The creation of the Communist International took place not at the First Congress in 1919 (that was a pure formality) but in the preliminary processes of preparation, under the flying colors of the Third International. The deductions for our immediate tasks flow automatically from this historical analogy.

By this letter I do not in the least intend to interfere in your negotiations. If Hennaut's group or, a part of it joins with our section, I can only rejoice. But Hennaut's idea that the condition of future success is the reunion of all the oppositional wreckage with the Third International, is radically wrong. It is necessary to weigh and appraise this wreckage, not by names and pretensions, but by actual theoretical and political content. Anyone who has something to say does not wait for a general conference of unknown date, but publishes his ideas in the form of a program, of theses, articles, and discourses. Whoever appeals to a future conference to save him, a conference which is to find "something", discover "something", only demonstrates that he has no ideas whatsoever. I have no doubt this is as plain to you as it is to me.

With warmest good wishes for your success.

—G. GOUROV.

International Communist League Formed in South Africa

(We have received the following letter from our newly constituted Communist League of South Africa.—Ed.)

Dear Comrades:

The Bolshevik Leninist League of Johannesburg, which held its first meeting as a formally constituted group in April 1934, has instructed me to get into touch with the Militant, with a view to affiliating our group to the Fourth International. Since it is as readers of the Militant that most of us were drawn together, we turn naturally to you for assistance in building up a South African section of the Fourth International. Our group consists at present of twelve members, five of whom are Africans, the rest Europeans.

You will probably be interested to learn what became of the previous group which communicated with you. It finally collapsed through lack of experience, of political leadership and of perspectives. Our comrades made an attempt to revive the group. At first this was not successful but we did establish a training class for African workers, it has continued for more than a year and is now part of our present activities.

It is with circumspection that we now approach you; there is, of course, no guarantee that our group will not suffer the same ignominious collapse as its predecessor. We can only hope to demonstrate our sincerity and theoretical soundness by our future activities.

Our activities up to the present have been restricted to hammering out a program at

League meetings held once a week, besides such training classes, weekly lectures, study circles, fraction work—in trade unions and other workers organizations—as our severely limited material and human resources permit. We are also tackling the task of organized African workers, a task which the C.I.'S.A., with its bureaucratic regime and Comintern leadership has not only failed to inaugurate, but has rendered even more difficult. We have begun with the native bakery and laundry workers.

We also hope to publish a monthly duplicated bulletin in the very near future and are preparing a declaration of our program and principles for publication in the first issue. We hope to increase our membership considerably upon the appearance of this bulletin.

We have written to the Lenin Club, Cape-town, and have received formal acknowledgment of receipt of our letters and the promise of a detailed reply at a later date, but up to the present no discussion has taken place between us.

During the recent period our trade union committee has held a series of factory gate meetings at the laundries which employ on the Rand about a thousand native workers. As a result of these meetings, a general meeting at which nearly all the laundries were represented, was held in June, and a new African union formed, the last union having disintegrated after the expulsion of its crooked secretary. The secretary and organizer of the new union are excellent militants. At this general meeting the Stalinists were decisively rejected by the workers. Our efforts are now bent towards ensuring a correct policy for the laundry workers union by building up the Bolshevik-Leninist fraction within the union. We have also tackled the task of reorganizing the native bakery workers. Leaflets are being issued and contacts made. We fear that the bakers' union, however, will present immensely greater difficulties than the laundry workers union and it is not unlikely that we may fail in this task owing to the many adverse factors.

We enclose a copy of our draft constitution to be formally adopted upon affiliation to the Fourth International; and a copy of a letter to the Political Bureau of the C.I. S.A. submitted in April 1934 and followed by the immediate expulsions from the party of Comrades . . . for open "Trotskyist" activities. These expelled comrades are now members of the League.

With revolutionary greetings,

The German Left Opposition

(Continued from Page 2)

in the German-language revolutionary groups, which, in the light of the German experience, hope to avoid a similar fate.

The German L.O. is deprived of its material base. Enormous tasks and remarkable opportunities are offered to us in our struggle for a new Communist Party in Germany, in our struggle against the most powerful and the most dangerous Fascism in the world. Our successes, so far insignificant, can become more important if we enjoy a greater moral and material support from our foreign comrades. The German L.O. (I.K.D.) is convinced that the appeal to international solidarity is not made in vain.

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH BY SNEEVLIET

What Is the Socialist Revolutionary Party?

It was founded in 1929, after the decline of the Comintern had become apparent to a kernel of revolutionary workers of this country. At its foundation the party took as its point of departure the October 1917 Revolution in Russia and recognized the great merits of the first years of existence of the Comintern under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky. It based a continuance of its work on this period and rejected on principle the anti-Marxist theory of socialism in one country invented by Stalin. We established that parallel to the degeneration of revolutionary theory, the practice of the Comintern also became a practice of vacillating back and forth between the most irresponsible putschism represented by attempting to strike for demands under circumstances where they were condemned to failure in advance and other hopeless conflicts, and on the other hand of attaching themselves to all sorts of bourgeois intellectuals with an idea of riding in on their ticket. Examples of the bankruptcy of the Comintern and the abominable tactics in the Far East in relation to the Chinese workers, can be matched by examples from here, from the West, in Spain and in Germany, to demonstrate the hollowness of the phrases of the Comintern and its representatives . . . corresponding in no case to the activities actually conducted by the Comintern. It is the usual phenomenon of transformation from quantity to quality, according to which the movement must reach the point where differences in tactics become principled differences which justify the formation of a new organization just as previously we saw the birth of new party organizations in the bourgeois world and among the social democrats.

Our Revolutionary Socialist Party must therefore take as its point of departure the bankruptcy of the Second International as shown in the years 1914-18, and the bankruptcy of the Third International shown just as clearly in Germany at the beginning of 1933.

Our Revolutionary Socialist party must commit itself to the path of the new International, of the reassembling of forces, by which international revolutionary Marxian socialism, as practiced by Lenin, shall be restored to its former place of honor, and in order that we may no more witness such miserable results as that the principal successes of the Communist movement are those accomplished by Litvinoff in the world of capitalist business.

The Cabinet of the "Seven Provinces"

Events in the "Seven Provinces" played a great role in the elections. In the bourgeois parties there was an agreement to play up the idea of the necessity for Authority, and in this way the base was laid on which M. Colljn succeeded in forming his cabinet. The cabinet has a strong position, although it is unparliamentary. The self-styled liberal democracy is so pleased with its role that it retired from the "Seven Provinces", declaring to the indignation of the "Standard" that the action of M. Colljn definitely put an end to the former political antitheses. The liberal democrats wish to install themselves permanently in their new character.

Mr. President! It seems that we run into more difficulties among the counter-revolutionists, the more principled we are. We see an analogous circumstance in the political history of this cabinet since its short existence, we see that just as the German Nazis reaped all the benefit from the provocation of the Reichstag fire, just as the bourgeois parties in this country where, in accordance with the words of Marx, they are for the first time united in a single reactionary bloc, are reaping here all the benefits accruing from the "Seven Provinces".

This cabinet carries out the orders of the big employers' organizations in recent years. This cabinet claims to be democratic but it is preparing to bury democracy. This cabinet would be unable to prevent the desertion to the fascist camp of the large groups that have broken away from the bourgeois parties. On this question I am fundamentally opposed to the opinion of M. de Geer who entertains us with magic formulas, and who in my opinion works too much with these magic formulas when he asserts and swears that the character of the Dutch people is such that in this country we have no need to fear submergence by the fascist wave.

The Rise of the Fascist Wave

On this subject perhaps it is fortunate (we are speaking now of the N.S.B.) that the daily influx of elements from the most diverse layers of our population have such confidence in their own development.

Since M. Alberse in his argument speaks seriously of these matters, he is perhaps reacting in response to the speech made in the Concert Hall in Amsterdam by the propagandist of the N.S.B., where M. Vlekke, speaking of the encyclicals of the N.S.B., remarked that one third of the N.S.B. were Catholics. Actually there is no need for anyone to speak of any general desertion of liberalism by the youth. In the first place we have to deal with a stage of intellectual life in the Dutch universities, an intellectual life used to dealing with political and social problems and having given birth to the De Masseur movement; and I consider that the present circumstances are such that no bourgeois party is in a position, even if it wished to do so, to put up an effective dike against the fascist flood.

The paper, De Standaard, devoted to the President, has several times tendered its appreciation to the German Nazi movement which has saved Germany from the rise of the proletarian revolution. M. Josephus Jitta expressed himself similarly before the democratic liberal youth, when he said that fascism might have its uses. He who finds himself in this frame of mind and conducts propaganda such as that put out by the Standaard and the democratic liberals, should understand that the great perplexity of the middle classes, for which the government knows no solution in spite of its plenary powers and in spite of the great power of Mr. Verschnur, will inevitably contribute to provoking the displacement of considerable layers of peasants, of the middle classes, of intellectuals, and of members of the liberal professions.

Some time ago I formulated a political opinion according to which the special treat-

ment of the N.S.B. movement by the government should be considered and explained in this way—the use of this movement as a last resort when it will no longer be possible to govern by parliamentary democracy.

I have to modify this opinion since the explanations which have been offered to this very Chamber and I must say that on this subject it is more correct to draw an analogy between the Colljn government and the Bruening government that did not recognize the gravity of the fascist danger in Germany, just as here this danger is not understood by the government.

It Is a Question of Forms of Property

That is why this perspective shows it up. None of the points mentioned mean that the government that raises itself by force can assume as a fundamental basis the certainty that it can assure a further rise. It has not this certainty and it is for this reason that it has not the important justification for its acts that it might have. No bourgeoisie can have this certainty. I could cite extracts to prove that even in the official documents on the orientation we are following, there is no question of it. The members of parliament that supported the government in their last summing-up remarked that it is impossible to attack the government for not having definite plans in an epoch when there is no stability anywhere. But this stability will never return because there is the great truth and the kernel of my argument—Marx's prophesy is carried out. The system of production has arrived at reconcilable contradictions with property, and those who support these property relations:

(The original manuscript is mutilated here for fifteen lines. It is possible to get a general idea. He speaks of the golden calf and the government's attempt to bolster up private property and attacks them for provoking danger [undoubtedly in regard to the N.S.B.]).

The Existence or the Non-Existence of the Working Class

To this we oppose the "to be or not to be" of the working class, and there is no question of sending truckloads of letters and requests, as in Germany, to Bruening, Von Schleicher, or Von Papen, who will certainly find a place to file them away; but it will be a question of mobilizing the actual forces of the working class in a united front, which the social democrats and communists completely bungled in Germany until February 27 when Stamphfer, chief editor of the Berlin "Vorwaerts", wished to have an interview with Torgler at the Reichstag to create at the last minute a defense front against Hitler. This united front is necessary.

"THE NEW INTERNATIONAL"

We call to the attention of the readers of the International Bulletin that the monthly theoretical magazine of the League "The New International" carries regularly . . . Its "Archives" section important and hitherto unpublished documents of the Left Opposition. The coming issue will contain L. D. Trotsky's analysis of the Stalinist course in relation to the Anglo-Russian Committee.