

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE

FIGHT

FOR THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE BRITISH BOLSHEVIK-LENINISTS (TROTSKYISTS)

Subscription 2/6 a year, post free

Vol. I. No. 1. October 10th, 1936

Price 2d. monthly

CONTENTS

	Page
The Revolutionary Party and the British Worker	3
Will Brockway Swallow this too?	6
The Co-operative Movement To-day	7
Struggle for a Soviet Spain	8
The Coming French Revolution. By Leon Trotsky	10
<i>The Colonial Question: Egypt Eases the Grip</i>	12
<i>Documents No. 1: To the Public Opinion of the Toilers of the Whole World</i>	13
Trotsky and Terrorism	15
An Interview with Leon Trotsky	16
Four Page Supplement—Moscow Trial	

EDITORIAL

THE NEED FOR A NEW INTERNATIONAL

THIS first number of our journal, FIGHT, appears at an opportune moment. The civil war in Spain has once more shown to all thinking toilers that, overpassing the national boundaries of States, the population of the world is divided into two camps, not war-loving States and peaceful, democratic States, but the workers and exploited peasants on the one side and landlords and capitalists on the other, with the lower middle classes wavering uncertainly in between. Whether Fascist or Monarchist, the propertied classes in Spain, with their foreign riff-raff and colonial mercenaries, disregarding the law and order and respect for Government with which they, and all such, continually bluff the exploited, have launched an attack at the Popular Front Government in Spain, and capitalists everywhere have rallied to their side. Italian Fascism and German Fascism have given help secretly and openly, for their workers are beaten and cowed. The British National Government, Conservative democracy, always preaching about the sanctity of lawfully-elected Governments, have stood aside and watched while Hitler and Mussolini gave all possible assistance to the rebels. They, like all capitalists, love democracy just so long as democracy loves them. The French Popular Front Government has rushed frantically about Europe knocking humbly at the doors of Hitler and Mussolini begging these notorious bandits to sign papers about neutrality. All these Governments, Fascist, Conservative or Popular Front, are capitalist Governments, controlled by banks and big industries, and none not even the Popular Front Government will stretch a hand

to the workers and peasants of Spain in their struggle against Fascist brigands. However much his own workers may press him, if Leon Blum dares to attempt any such thing the capitalists and financiers of France, come what may, will bring him crashing down. To-day with the Spanish workers and peasants, and yesterday with Abyssinia, there is a united front of the exploiters against the exploited. Once more the principles of Marx and Engels, and Lenin and Trotsky have been proved true, that always, but particularly in the great crises of war and revolution, the workers of the world must unite and trust neither to Conservative, Liberal, Labour nor Popular Front capitalist Governments but to their own independent action.

Yet at this moment, with the Spanish workers and peasants, men, women and children, fighting against landlord and capitalist tyranny with a gallantry and determination that stirs the heart of every fellow worker and drags a grudging admiration from even their bitterest class enemies, the workers of the world are impotent. Slanderers of the working-class movement call them apathetic. It is a lie and an excuse for treachery. The apparent passivity of the workers under the shattering blows that capitalism has struck at them during recent years is an unnatural thing. The smashing of the Unemployment Scales in Britain in January, 1935, the stay-in strikes in France and Belgium, and now the unparalleled courage and self-sacrifice of the Spanish workers and peasants have shown that the workers are willing to fight. To-day, under the competent leadership of a strong and courageous revolutionary international, the

workers of the world would not be begging capitalist Governments to help smash Spanish capitalism, but would be organising battalions, large or small, that would carry in person the message of solidarity, would be subscribing not only for food and medical units but for guns, munitions and planes, and in all parts of the world would build a steel ring of proletarian support for the United States of Soviet Spain, and by so doing carry themselves nearer to their own victory.

But what instead is the leadership offered them? The Second International, the International of Attlee and Morrison, of Bevin and Citrine, of Leon Blum and Jouhaux and Vandervelde we know of old. They are tied hand and foot to their capitalist Governments. Their bullets against capitalism are speeches, their heavy artillery are resolutions, their air-force are telegrams of encouragement or protest. Never will they lift a finger except when their own capitalists tell them to do so and then it is always against the workers of another country. They led millions who trusted them to be slaughtered in 1914. While Mussolini systematically destroyed the Italian labour movement, they led the workers to put their trust in the King of Italy and the Italian Constitution, while Hitler openly prepared his destruction in Germany the leaders of the Second International encouraged the German workers to trust in Brüning, Hindenburg, and the Weimar Constitution. When Mussolini raped Abyssinia they encouraged the workers to have faith in the League of Nations. To-day, in England, they are hat in hand on the doorstep of the British Cabinet begging for neutrality while the German and Italian planes carry capitalist destruction and death to Spanish comrades.

Great as is their betrayal in this and in every other crisis, yet it is nothing to the present and recent treachery of the Third International. Formed by Lenin and Trotsky to be the leaders of the workers' independent action in just such a situation as this, the Third International is to-day shouting for the League of Nations and democracy, condemning the slogan of Soviet Spain, and, instead of mobilising the workers for independent action, has joined the reactionary Second International in the criminal folly of asking one set of capitalists to cut the throat of another: the same conscious and deliberate treachery that they practised on the working class over the Abyssinian question. The paper of the Independent Labour Party, the *New Leader*, in its leading article of August 14th called this an example of spiritual rot. It is nothing of the kind. Spirituality is a superficial, misleading and dishonest explanation. We, the Trotskyists, by theoretical and historical analysis, have been pointing out for years the inevitable degeneration of the Third International into reformism and, to-morrow when war breaks out, into naked and unashamed counter-revolution.

In the Soviet Union to-day, on the basis of the great industrial successes of collective ownership, a new ruling caste of bureaucrats has raised itself. The Russian proletariat, isolated by the failure of the world revolution (due chiefly to the incompetence and the treachery of the Stalinist leadership), is mercilessly exploited by eight million technicians, administrators, secret police and officials of all sorts. With power and privileges constantly growing, these bureaucrats no longer have any interest in the world revolution, and like the British and French capitalists are interested only in maintaining things as they are. Little by little they have given up even using phrases about the world revolution, leaving that to the International. But now that war threatens them and they are seeking

military alliances with Britain and France they have struck revolution from not only the activity but even the propaganda of the International for which they pay. Hence Harry Pollitt's love for democracy, the Communist sabotage of the stay-in strike in France, the drive for affiliation to the Second International, the promise to obey the Labour Party Constitution, the abandonment of independent workers' action, the slogan of democracy by the Spanish Communists, even while democracy is tumbling about their ears, and the Spanish peasants are seizing the land and the Spanish workers controlling industry. The I.L.P. leadership knows this as well as the Trotskyists, but it fears to say so lest it be accused of being enemies of the Soviet Union and call upon itself the abusive torrents of the *Daily Worker*. But the workers' struggle can be built only on the basis of truth. The Third International is no longer a revolutionary force but a brake on the workers' movement, and the reason for the change must be sought in Moscow. As the Second International is the noisy, but hypocritical tool of British and French Imperialism, so Stalin has transformed the Third International into the tool of the Russian bureaucracy.

And as these two Internationals could have given the workers a lead and helped Abyssinia, as they are stifling independent action of the workers on behalf of the Spanish workers and peasants, so day in and day out they are preparing to lead the workers to the massacre of the coming Imperialist War. Capitalism to save itself has told many dirty lies but no capitalist lie can ever be compared to the lie that the Soviet bureaucracy and the Third International are now spending millions on sowing in the minds of the workers, the lie that an alliance between the democratic countries and the Soviet Union is an alliance for peace. British National Government and French Popular Front Government are capitalist Governments and will seek alliances for capitalist purposes, for the protection of capitalist plunder. Nothing but the overthrow of capitalism can stop capitalist war, and nothing will overthrow capitalism but the unceasing opposition of the workers to capitalism at home and abroad. The Soviet Union, of necessity, must manoeuvre and seek allies: the Trotskyists recognise that and will defend the Soviet Union arms in hand, despite all the transparent faked trials about plots to murder Stalin. We shall defend the Soviet Union and call upon the workers to defend the Workers' State but not by fighting for capitalism, whether democratic or otherwise, but by waging ceaseless war against it, by supporting the Spanish workers in their struggle for a Soviet Spain, by supporting the French workers in their coming struggle for a Soviet France, by building international solidarity among the workers, in victory and in defeat, until the final purpose is achieved.

This journal stands for the old principles of international Socialism; for the independent action of the workers against all capitalism, Fascist or democratic; for the defence of the Soviet Union by the intensification and not the moderation of the class struggle; for the support of the colonial toilers against capitalist oppression and tyranny, but through their own revolutionary struggles and not through the League of Nations. We shall devote ourselves mainly to the problems of the British workers, but always seeing the British workers' struggle in its relation to the international class struggle. Had the Spanish Popular Front not been a capitalist Government it would have helped the Moors of Spanish Morocco to achieve independence and found allies instead of enemies. We shall devote space in

every issue to the colonial question. To the work of our comrades in Ireland, so near to us, fighting de Valera's tyranny, we shall pay regular and constant attention. To the youth we shall give in every issue two special sections, for the future lies with them.

Against the Soviet bureaucracy we declare relentless and uncompromising opposition, supporting them so long as they defend collective ownership in the Soviet Union but exposing their exploitation and oppression of the Russian proletariat, their infinite capacity for lying propaganda, and their attempts to corrupt the working class through the venal and degenerate Third International.

Workers of the World Unite. We, the Bolshevik Leninists of Britain, wherever we are, in the Labour Party, I.L.P., Co-op. or Trade Union, will fight with the workers, side by side, in their daily struggles, whether it be for the penny on the hour or for the support of the Spanish revolution, for the abolition of the Means Test or against the murderous cruelty of Stalin persecuting those comrades in Russia who wish to fight with us against capitalism. But whatever the struggle we shall never move from the line of the international Socialist revolution, in every hour and in every effort, building the British Section of the Fourth Revolutionary International.

THE REVOLUTIONARY PARTY AND THE BRITISH WORKER

IT is the millions of British workers who will save Britain. To-day they follow the Labour Party.

There is nothing surprising in that. What would be surprising is if they did not follow the Labour Party. The Fourth Internationalists understand the point of view of the British worker who votes Labour. What we are anxious for is that he should understand ours. This being our first number, we shall make at once a simple and comprehensive statement of our position on two fundamental issues, so that the ordinary British worker may have no misunderstanding as to our aims and methods. We believe that revolution is the only ultimate solution for the British worker. But the revolutionary party cannot make the revolution. It is the workers, the millions in the Labour Party, who have to make it.

But the rank and file British worker in the Labour Party is not thinking of revolution. His immediate concern is wages and living and working conditions. Can capitalism satisfy his reasonable demands? Our answer is, No! To-day insecurity is the constant companion of us all. Certain industries, the cotton industry and the ship-building, will never again be what they were. In certain others, the armament industries, for instance, there is a temporary boom. In the mining industry the workers face a misery which will continue to be their portion as long as capitalism remains. What then is to be done? Is the worker to fold his hands in despair, or start drilling for the revolution? Neither. He must fight to wrest the benefits it is still possible to wrest from capitalism. But an employer never gives anything unless he is forced to. The whole country, last winter, could see that the miners were entitled to a rise in wages. But the employers had to be threatened with a nation-wide strike before they could be brought to disgorge a few pence a day more.

Now, properly speaking, this struggle for better wages and conditions is a matter more of the Trade Unions than the Labour Party. The worker must consider it his first duty to belong to the organised workers' movement. Whatever his personal position, he ought to be a member of his union, he ought to encourage every other worker whom he can influence to join. In an economic struggle it is never a question of how much the employer can afford to pay. It is how much the workers can drag out of him, and that depends to a great extent on the strength of the organised movement.

But all economic struggles are ultimately political struggles, and the worker must see to it that his political

party re-enforces his economic struggle. Not only through his union but through his Labour Party he should voice his demand for the abolition of the Trade Disputes Act. A great wave of strikes is sweeping over Europe. It will inevitably come to Britain. The worker must demand that all who represent him in Parliament start a campaign for the breaking of this chain which attempts to prevent the workers acting together.

But the political issues go further. Take unemployment. The employed worker knows that the greatest danger to his own position is the unemployed worker. The employed worker, therefore, has a plain duty to assist the unemployed worker in his fight against capitalism. Here again, through his union and through his Labour Party organisation, he can demand the abolition of the Means Test, and a living wage for the unemployed. If his Labour Party member does not fight for those demands the worker must know why. It is quite true that the Labour Party has no majority in Parliament. The fight will not be won in Parliament. The fight for the unemployed will be won by the Trade Unions and by the masses in the streets, as the unemployment scales were smashed last January, but the mass struggle can receive a powerful re-enforcement by relentless parliamentary agitation. The workers, by mass-meetings, demonstrations, if necessary by one-day protest strikes in a whole area (e.g., in South Wales), can force the abolition of the Means Test. But every worker can see to it that his parliamentary representative plays his full share in that fight. He should scrutinise carefully the work that his M.P. does in this connection, he should demand an accounting whenever the M.P. visits the district, should send for him if he does not come, should demand that he play his part, not only in Parliament, but also in the mass actions of the workers. Never must the employed worker allow the fight for the unemployed to sink into abeyance. For the weakness of the unemployed is ultimately the weakness of the whole working-class. The organisation of the unemployed by the Government into Labour Camps must be fought, the Communist organisation of the unemployed into separate bodies, like the N.U.W.M., must also be fought. The unemployed worker must be organised in his union, he must be drawn into the struggles for better wages of the employed. Each must fight for the other as for himself.

But the worker may say: What has all this got to do with "revolution"? Why a revolutionary party? The answer is twofold. It is in the determined struggle by all

available means to improve his position that the worker will get into his consciousness the bankruptcy of the capitalist system and the little that Parliament can do. To assist the workers in the realisation of this necessary truth is our work. The Trotskyists are not propagandists for Trotsky against Stalin. We are members of the working-class movement, working in the Trade Unions and co-operative societies. We have confidence in our principles, but know that only by sharing the experience of the large body of workers will we be able to keep those principles alive and adaptable to the constantly changing political and industrial situation; only by constantly demonstrating to the workers the validity of our ideas when applied to practical conditions of working-class struggle will the workers ever begin to have confidence in us.

The second issue is War. The Press is full of it. Polish-French agreements and disagreements; France spending millions in reply to Germany's extension of army service; Italy boasting of being able to mobilise 8,000,000 men; Japan claiming equality with Britain and America; America arming equally with European and Asiatic Imperialism; Russia overburdened with one of the largest war budgets in history. The worker who is not aware of the danger is a simpleton. We take it that the workers on the whole are agreed with us on this question. The question now is, what must be done? But to answer that we have to know why this war situation exists.

The first thing that strikes us, as we look at the various countries armed to the teeth, is that all of them, except the Soviet Union, have what they call interests abroad. Take America. America is what the Communists would call a peace-loving country. It is rich, it is powerful. It is not bordered by hostile states. Yet it arms just like the rest. It arms against "the Japanese menace." Are the Japanese going to have a piece of America and enslave Americans? The idea is an absurdity. The Japanese menace America in China. Japan is bringing China under her political and economic domination, and American capitalists want their share of the Chinese market. Britain is in it also, fighting for her portion of plunder. Japan being nearer to China than the other two, and hard-pressed for markets, has started openly to steal portion after portion of China. She cannot wait. Britain wants to arrange assistance to China through the League of Nations, a camouflage for a European division of the Chinese market with British capital playing the leading part. America, a year ago, began suddenly to buy up Chinese silver and directed the flow of Chinese silver currency to America. Immediately Britain sent Sir Frederick Leith-Ross to China, and after a few months the Chinese Government announced that their currency would be linked to the British pound. Japan took this as a mortal offence, as indeed it was, for it affected Japanese domination. As soon as Britain got into trouble with Italy and had to move the Eastern fleet to the Mediterranean, the Japanese launched a new offensive against China. So it goes on, day after day, year after year; but as the division of the spoil becomes more and more difficult, they begin to threaten one another. They arm. Then they fight. We have chosen Japan, Britain and America purposely. For at first sight these should have no need to arm against each other. Yet they met in London for a naval conference last year and the conference broke up. Transfer this same economic struggle to Europe, and the British worker can see clearly the reason why Italy, France, Britain, Germany, Poland, are constantly having conferences which come to nothing and are all

arming for war. It is not because Italy and Germany are Fascist, and France and Czechoslovakia democratic. All that is just so much moonshine. If they were all democratic, all spoke the same language, the same competition, ending in war, would go on. For there is no other way for capitalists to carry on capitalism except by constantly increasing markets and control of raw material. "Agreed," one type of British worker may say, "but what can be done about it? If all are doing it, then British capitalism must do it, too, or British capitalists and workers will suffer." That argument is, on the whole, quite sound. But the worker who gives that argument must stop complaining about war. He must be ready to support vast armaments, he must be ready to support conscription, and he must make up his mind that he is going to do his best to carry out soon such destruction, devastation and slaughter as the world has never seen before. He will support a League of Nations, but only in so far as the League of Nations protects British interests, while the French worker who thinks the same way will support it only so far as the League protects French interests, etc., etc. He must prepare for war and, to be quite sure that his country must win, he must agree to spend enormous sums on arms. He must quiet the suspicions of those who do not want war by keeping up a lot of talk about the League. He must seek alliances with strong countries. He must, in fact, behave as any Tory behaves.

But most of the workers in the Labour Party hate war and all that a modern war may mean. They want to fight against war. They want to remove this nightmare hanging over them and their wives and children, that swallows up millions which can be so usefully spent in a thousand ways for the benefit of the community. With these ideas in mind the worker for years believed in the League of Nations. But he can see for himself now that after nearly twenty years the League has resulted only in an increase of armaments such as have never been seen before, and the most ghastly fiasco in post-war history, the Abyssinian failure. Many a worker is confused. Collective security has turned out to be a myth, a phrase meaning nothing. Yet Baldwin and the Tories are proposing another League: the same who destroyed the old League want to make a new one. Mussolini will be in this one, and Anthony Eden, too, will be there talking and promising, and perhaps Laval, if he is again Prime Minister of France; and they want to bring Hitler in also. What does the worker think of it? The Communist Party wants a League also. So do Herbert Morrison, Major Attlee, and Walter Citrine. But they want a League with stricter rules than the last one. Let the worker ask himself this question from his own experience: What capitalist has ever hesitated to break an agreement with his workmen? And when the worker remembers the vast interests at stake, does he think that any sort of rule, regulation or treaty, will prevent British capitalists fighting for British interests, French capitalists fighting for French interests, German for German interests, etc., and using any sort of new League in the same way that they used the old? The Trotskyists have a clear and simple answer to all these doubts. The League of Nations is a thieves' kitchen, and it cannot stop war. All that it can do is make minor adjustments, deceive the workers and make them have faith in capitalist manoeuvres. And we point out this to the worker. The Trotskyists, from the very beginning, have never wavered from this position, the position Lenin and all revolutionaries held, until last year. And the reason why we have never wavered is

because we base our political line always on economic forces, the most powerful forces in society. We do not concern ourselves with whether Eden is a post-war politician, while Neville Chamberlain is one of the old gang, whether Stanley Baldwin is honest or a bluffer. These things are trifles on the surface. These men represent British capitalism and, with all of them, British capitalists' interests come first. League or no League, all calculations based on anything else are doomed to disappointment.

What then must the worker do? The outlook may seem hopeless. It is not. And this is where Soviet Russia comes in to teach us a great lesson. The Soviet Union is heavily armed as the rest, but it is armed only because it is the only Socialist state and all capitalism hates it. Under the Tsars, Russia was pushing into the Balkans against Austria; it was fighting with Japan for Korea and Manchuria, and stealing bits of China; it was at daggers-drawn with Britain over Persia, fighting for markets and raw material just like the other capitalist countries. To-day, Russia is much smaller than it was in the days of Tsarist Russia, and yet all that fighting for markets, etc., is over. Russia is the only country in the world that is arming in self-defence. That is why the Trotskyists who condemn the Soviet bureaucracy with all their lies about the Socialism they have built, call upon the workers to defend the Soviet Union. To defend the Soviet Union, to support the Soviet Union, does not in the least require, as the Stalinists seem to think, that we must tell stupid lies about it, worship Stalin, and call everything that is done there Socialism. We defend the Soviet Union because alone in the world the economic basis of the Socialist state makes for peace, while the economic basis of the capitalist states makes for war. Whatever the position of the worker in the Soviet State, whatever cruelty the Stalinist bureaucracy may be guilty of, we defend the Workers' State. However prosperous the capitalist worker in comparison with Russia, whether the capitalist state is Fascist or Democratic, the Trotskyists will not defend it. If it is not Fascist, we are certain that either the workers must overthrow it or it will end in Fascism. Whether Fascist or Democratic, the capitalist state moves steadily to war.

Does the worker agree with us? If he does, already

he knows our policy—the industrial struggle described above carried on unceasingly, refusal to have anything to do with war preparations of any kind, and, when war breaks out, carrying on the class struggle so intensely as to weaken the capitalist war machine, and, if the opportunity presents itself, overthrowing capitalism. So that the struggle against war is the industrial struggle in time of peace, carried over into war-time. But the worker will ask: "Suppose I help you to overthrow my government while other workers are helping theirs?" It is a legitimate question for the worker who has not yet adopted a revolutionary position. The Trotskyist answer is again simple: The workers' struggle against war is an international movement. It must go on in all countries at the same time. That is why the Trotskyists condemn Stalin and the Third International for telling the French workers to join with French capitalism to fight against German Fascism. That is one of the reasons why the Stalinists strive to discredit us and even frame-up charges against us as terrorists. We stand for the international struggle against war. And that is why we stand for the Fourth International. The worker will see, therefore, that with us an International is a necessity and not one put up merely in opposition to the Third, and will see why we insist that any national movement against war must have international foundations. This journal will, month by month, apply these basic ideas to current events, the industrial struggle, war, Fascism, etc. We write for the thinking worker. We do not want to talk him into Trotskyism or unloose a torrent of lying propaganda on him in the Stalinist manner. But we want him to compare our line with the Labour Party line. We shall analyse the Trade Union Conference report and the Labour Party Conference report, so that the workers may see them in the light of the principles which led Lenin and Trotsky to victory. We want the worker to come to us after he has seen for himself the correctness of our political line. It is not for lack of bravery and courage that the German workers went down. They proved in the War how they could fight for capitalism. They would have fought still better for themselves. But, with all their organisation, their political line was wrong. That is why Lenin said: "No revolutionary theory, no revolutionary party." But the theory must prove itself in practice. We want the workers to test our theories side by side with us.

Buy your Marxist Literature from

THE CLAPHAM SOCIALIST BOOKSHOP

(W. BURROWS)

79 BEDFORD ROAD, S.W.4

All the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky.

Also the journals of the Sections of the Fourth International.

THE VANGUARD — — Canada
 LA LUTTE OUVRIERE — — France
 UNSER WORT — — Germany

1d. each

. Read **THE RED FLAG**
 and **THE YOUTH MILITANT**

Monthly

WILL BROCKWAY SWALLOW THIS TOO?

WHAT sort of revolutionary is Fenner Brockway? Maxton, McGovern, and Campbell Stephen are what they are—a clique of parliamentarians—opportunists. The whole political world knows how Brockway took the correct revolutionary line of workers' sanctions on the Abyssinian question for months, how Maxton, McGovern, Stephen and Buchanan changed it to neutrality, how the I.L.P. Conference reversed their reactionary and pacifist decision and how they threatened to resign "on account of their conscience," and threw the party into disorder with a farcical plebiscite. Now Maxton, McGovern and Stephen will do anything, Buchanan will do what they do, but he is a different type, a man having expert knowledge of unemployment in this country. That does not prevent him from being opportunist, but he does know something. As far as politics are concerned the other three know nothing. But Brockway is a different story. Brockway took the correct line on the Abyssinian question. But when the others made their threats he climbed down. He knew that he was right but he would not fight on such a little thing. He preferred peace to principle.

The first important national issue which has followed Abyssinia is the Popular Front. Now Brockway knows that a Popular Front is a dangerous stupidity, particularly in an age like ours. Capitalists and Socialists must fly apart as soon as any serious crisis approaches. The Popular Front in Spain has thrown the Liberals into the corner already. So when the Popular Front proposal became a topic of the day, Brockway took the correct line. The *New Leader* of June 26th, 1936, reported Brockway's own words in a debate with John Lewis.

FEDERATION PROPOSAL.

"Brockway then turned to the I.L.P. Federation proposal. The example of the Popular Front Movement in Spain and France would undoubtedly influence British workers. He hoped that we would accept the good things in it and avoid the dangers. We ought not to accept any alliance with the Liberal Party and we should not tie ourselves down to any programme which involves support for the reconstruction of Capitalism or the administration of Imperialism.

He urged that it should be possible, however, for representatives of the Labour Party, Co-operative Party, I.L.P. and Communist Party to get together and agree upon a programme of common demands. This should form the basis of a Federation or Workers' Front. A joint campaign for this programme should be conducted under a joint committee; this committee should avoid electoral conflicts between the parties. At the same time differences should not be glossed over, and liberty of advocacy and action beyond the agreed programme should be allowed.

A WORKERS' FRONT.

If such a Workers' Front were conducted in a proper temper a common spirit would develop which would stimulate the whole movement, both politically and industrially. The best feature of the Popular Front in Spain and France is not the parliamentary victories, but the new militancy of the working class, finding expressions in strikes

and mass pressure on the Governments. Such a spirit will find expression here if the inspiration of unity and a revolutionary lead are given."

Jennie Lee condemned the Popular Front. Again, on July 24th, 1936, the *New Leader* published an official statement on Communist affiliation to the Labour Party. In it we see the following proposals:—

"(1) Representatives of all the political sections of the working class—the Labour Party, the I.L.P. and the Co-operative Party, and the Communist Party—should get together round a table.

(2) They should prepare the maximum programme on which they agree.

(3) They should take common action on this programme on every possible occasion—on the platform, in united campaigns, in the Press, in localities, nationally.

(4) They should form a permanent Committee to federate all the working-class organisations, in order to encourage common action on every possible occasion and to avoid conflicts between them.

At the same time this proposal is realistic. It does not ignore that differences of policy—and, on some issues, such as war, serious differences—exist. It therefore suggests that on these issues liberty of criticism and action should be allowed, although it is hoped that the common fight on the agreed issues would develop the common spirit, and in time the common mind, enabling us to move forward to further unity."

Once again very good. Brockway heartened many comrades by his Marxist analysis and his stand for the Workers' Front. But at the I.L.P. summer school McGovern, as reported in the *Manchester Guardian*, talked about some sort of People's Front. Still, McGovern will say anything. But as we go to press Maxton himself comes out in the *News Chronicle* for a Popular Front. It is an article full of those sonorous absurdities which even Maxton's voice finds it difficult nowadays to carry off on the platform, but which reveal the whole pitiful background of their author when naked on the page.

"Great Britain, pioneer country of modern industry, ought to be in a position to lead the world forward to the next stage of civilisation.

She cannot possibly do it under the present National Government . . ."

Britain, Maxton obviously thinks, will develop under a Popular Front (and throws over, without a tremor, all the I.L.P. analysis of the downfall of capitalism, etc., etc.) if only the Liberals come in. He admits that the Liberals have deceived twice, in 1929 and 1931. Why a Liberal capitalist should be accused of deception because he behaves like a capitalist passes comprehension. But Maxton leaves it to them to decide whether they will come in and deceive the working class again.

"The question to be decided now, and I am inclined to think only the Liberal Party can decide it, is whether any more stable and sincere support in the interests of democracy and progress can be secured from the Liberals in such circumstances than has been forthcoming in the past.

Can they make up their minds whether they are on the side of the rich or of the poor?"

Can they indeed? Can Sir Archibald Sinclair become a revolutionary or does Maxton expect David Lloyd George, that great admirer of Hitler, to join with himself and Harry Pollitt and Attlee to fight the battle of the workers?

Brockway has clearly exposed this for the folly that it is. What will he do this time? Will he swallow his Workers' Front Movement as he swallowed his workers' sanctions? There wouldn't be much left of the workers' movement in the I.L.P. if Brockway goes on like this.

If David Lloyd George decides that he is sorry for having fought and won the War and been with the rich

until he is seventy, but that henceforth he will be with the poor, then the I.L.P. is in for the Popular Front. Maxton will try to make reservations and prevarications but a Popular Front means Liberals plus workers. If Brockway goes in then he disgraces himself for ever and shows that in national as well as in international politics he is no more than a revolutionary tout for the parliamentarians. He will lose the respect of every revolutionary inside and outside the I.L.P.

To our Bolshevik-Leninist comrades in the I.L.P. we say: Attack and expose those who will give up the experience of centuries and imperil the lives and futures of millions for the sake of a visionary trifling advantage.

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT TODAY

REVOLUTIONARIES have given the Co-op. movement very little attention. The main incursions in this field by the Communist Party have been through the mushroom organisations which they have set up; as these satellite committees dissolve the moment the workers discover their real nature, this affiliation hunting has not brought any result. No society of any size has remained under Stalinist influence.

The wealth of the Co-ops. has made them a fertile field for careerists and scroungers. These people have entrenched themselves into the leadership of the various societies and guilds behind the slogan of "Defend the Divi." The dividend, in fact, is absolutely sacred except when the numerous and expensive excursions are being planned by committee men. It takes precedence over the conditions of the staff, the reduction of commodity prices, assistance of workers in struggle or any other expenditure which does not directly benefit the bureaucrats.

Can these people be shifted? A very large swing to the left could be obtained if a sufficient pressure were exerted. The usual vote at meetings of a local society is somewhat less than the number of employees, so that an amalgamation of the employees with the revolutionary elements could, without any doubt, secure big changes in the personnel of the local committees.

The following is an immediate programme for revolutionaries in the movement:—

1. Combination with the employees on the basis of agreed programmes for the improvement of conditions of labour.

2. The attack against the leadership which is preparing to hand over the Co-ops., lock, stock and barrel, to the Government on the occasion of the coming war.

3. The utilisation of the Education Committee as a weapon for the radicalisation of the mass membership.

4. The campaign for the eradication from all offices of careerists, scroungers, reactionaries and unreliable elements.

5. Pressure for an offensive against Marketing Boards, penal taxation and other anti-co-operative legislation.

6. The campaign based on a low-price policy for all items of essentials of working-class consumption.

Let us deal with these in order.

1. The rallying of employees on a specific issue affecting their conditions should not present much difficulty. Unwarranted dismissals, unpaid overtime, excessive employ-

ment of juniors beset the staffs daily. Most societies exclude them from the management committee. Approaches to the management are usually only secured through the medium of the Trade Union paid organisers. Many district agreements in existence can only be improved if whole groups of societies can first be brought together, when months of discussion and wrangling follow. Representation, therefore, on the committee secured through militants prepared to discuss their policy line from week to week with meetings of the staff would readily be accepted as a more direct method of securing improvements. The membership must be well informed of the staff's point of view, and for this purpose some kind of news sheet could be regularly produced by, say, a joint committee of a few advanced members and some employees.

2. The assurances which have recently been given by leaders of the Co-operative Wholesale Society that the Co-operative Movement would offer its resources to the Government in the event of war have apparently evoked very little criticism or discussion in the localities. Pressure must be organised at once; special bulletins and leaflets produced; resolutions passed at business meetings and in the Guild rooms and streams of individual postcards and letters should be sent to local and national co-operative organisations contesting the right of the C.W.S. directors to give away the movement so lightly for such a vile purpose.

3. But even more important is the general education of the membership in a leftward direction. At present approximately £500,000 a year is spent by education committees. This amount is largely frittered away in useless concert meetings. Large sums are absorbed by local Wheat-sheafs, which recount innumerable presentations, official openings, social evenings at which "a good time was had by all," golden weddings and the like. Never were working-class pennies so pitifully squandered. This policy of waste must be vigorously countered by a bold policy of real education. Here the National Council of Labour Colleges can be of considerable assistance. But in any event, classes at which the working-class viewpoint on current political and social problems can be thoroughly thrashed out must be advocated. All publications must direct themselves to mobilising working-class opinion on a class struggle basis. Local scholarships should be offered to week-end and other schools where really vital issues are under discussion. Facilities should be given for workers in

local factories and in non-co-operative retail firms to voice their grievances. Guilds should be supplied with discussion syllabuses and panels of militant speakers. Public meetings should be held to justify, in the face of bourgeois criticism, every left-wing step taken by the local society, managerially, educationally or politically. With the vast sums at its disposal the movement could then prove a tremendous influence for swinging the masses in a leftward direction. The capture by militants of education committees for this purpose is not only absolutely necessary but should prove reasonably easy.

4. In view of the attack by the Fascists on all the democratic organisations, it should prove an easy matter to impress the Co-operative membership with the necessity of removing all corrupting influences from its ranks. It is easy to single out those whose sole interest in the movement is found in the large number of free excursions and social functions called "delegations." This is a positive ramp throughout the movement to-day. The writer of these notes has twice within the last few months been compelled to listen to the painful recitals of the good time "delegates" had had when they were supposed to be controlling the affairs of the Co-operative Movement. In each case the fares and expenses of these people would have more than paid for the issue of this paper. This practice has two principal results, the first is that these smaller office seekers are very plastic material in the hands of the upper bureaucracy, whose own excursions include visits to the Royal Garden Party, and stays at the most fashionable hotels in Europe; secondly, this very evident corruption disgusts workers, who feel that such a movement is not worth defending; it provides ammunition for the Fascists who unceasingly attack it. To the extent the revolutionaries win the battle against careerists and scroungers (always reactionaries as well) they will win the support of the best elements from among the membership.

A further danger is that Tory and Fascist spies, who are known to be in the movement at the moment, may

do a good deal to sabotage the movement towards working class utilisation of the Co-ops. These people must be singled out and exposed on every possible occasion and driven from office once and for all.

5. The Co-operative Party has shown itself extraordinarily weak in the face of oppressive legislation. A demand must be made for continuous pressure to be brought upon the Government by every method at the disposal of the movement. This demand in itself would expose the feebleness of the present political leadership and pave the way towards the mass realisation for the necessity of a revolutionary party. Questions can be raised at business meetings from the balance sheet in such a way to show plainly to all present the actual local effect of this legislation. This can be followed by the moving of resolutions, the addressing of guilds and circulation of leaflets based on a policy of threatening the Government with spirited working-class resistance if this legislation is not withdrawn. The despicable anti-co-operative attitude adopted by the Labour Party on the question of Marketing Schemes must everywhere be critically analysed. The demand through the local political councils should be made to the Co-operative Party leadership to withdraw from the working agreement with the Labour Party if the latter body does not forthwith abandon its treacherous policy of Marketing Schemes and Boards whose sole objects are to bolster up capitalism and find better jobs for the Trade Union bureaucrats.

In a later article I hope to be able to deal with the price policy of the Co-operative Movement and its very important political repercussions. In the meantime I would urge that all people with revolutionary sympathy should become active members of the guilds, comrade circles, political councils, etc., and should raise the standard of revolt against the degenerate, half-hearted bureaucracy which is at present leading the movement into an impasse from which it stands no more chance of escape than the once mighty movement in Germany. W.

STRUGGLE FOR A SOVIET SPAIN THE WORKERS IN CATALONIA

By A Comrade in Barcelona

THESE have been weeks of harvest; and with great labour history is being made. In great red letters the Spanish proletariat is engaged in writing the pages of it. Pages which for Spain, if not for the whole of Europe, mark the end of the chapters of the pre-history of humanity. By their energy and their revolutionary unity the Spanish workers show to the proletariat of the world the way of the future.

The time when the tide of the revolutionary movement was receding is over. A new revolutionary epoch is beginning. But there has commenced a race between war and revolution, or rather between imperialist war and civil war. For the moment the latter is gaining ground. But the imperialists will try to crush the revolution and drag the world into a new massacre. This time, however, it will be opposed by the proletariat of the world in a very different fashion than in 1914. Spain has shown the way. Her workers have at last understood that you

cannot smash Fascism by imperialist war or by parliamentary decrees, but only by the direct action of the armed workers in the struggle for power.

The events in Spain have shown that there can never be any question of a purely anti-Fascist fight, that, on the contrary, it is impossible to smash Fascism without at the same time smashing the bourgeoisie, whose economic and political base is the same as that of Fascism. All the big bourgeoisie, all the clergy, all the great land proprietors and all the officers of the army are to be found in the camp of the Spanish rebels.

If the proletariat had not been thrown into the streets, dragging with it the Civil Guard and the Workers' Militia (built by the beaten revolutionaries in 1934); if the proletariat had not taken over the key positions in the economy of the country, collectivised the means of circulation, put under its control the war industries, organised provisions, occupied the frontiers and the town halls,

confiscated the reactionary Press, limited the activities of the banks, then victory over Fascism would have been impossible.

The democratic reform of the Federal system of Spain which five years of bourgeois Republic failed to accomplish, the insurrection of July has completed: it has expropriated the Church, the richest, most parasitic and fiercest caste of reactionaries in Spain; the revolution has nationalised and democratised industry, distributed the land among the poorest peasants and collectivised agriculture and the primary means of production.

The slow way of reform and organisation, the way of class collaboration has once again been shown to be not only impossible but dangerous in the highest degree to civilisation itself and once more proves itself the digger of human graves. It is the reformist method which is the method of blood; the revolutionary method is the rational method.*

The tactic of the Popular Front has also been shown up in all its absurdity. Four months after the victory of the alliance of the left bourgeoisie with the proletariat the reactionary bourgeoisie decided to avenge itself for the partial default, and has set in action the most terrible civil war that Europe has ever seen.

Despite their very sincere desire to collaborate, despite (or because of) their election victory, the leaders of the working class did not dare to enter the Government of the Popular Front, so that the Radical bourgeoisie were pushed further and further away from the formula. But the day after the Fascist putsch it was necessary for the Radicals once again to take up the cloak of camouflage. But before there was time to permit their leaders to enter the Government the workers had taken the revolutionary road and had themselves created the proper coercive and administrative organisations. (In Catalonia the collaboration of the new Socialist-Communist Party, member of the Third International, did not last one week.)

The dual power now exists in Spain, but it has nothing in common with the participation of Socialist ministers in the direction of imperialist affairs, as in France, and cannot be broken by the simple intervention of the conservative forces of society or of the working-class movement. In Spain it has meant the erection of autonomous organisations of the proletariat, working-class alliances, Militia Committees, in short, Soviets which are tending to replace more and more the functions of the bourgeois State. And if in Madrid the bourgeoisie still possesses the most power, the double régime in Catalonia is infinitely nearer to the dictatorship of the proletariat than that of the bourgeoisie. The anti-Fascist military committee is the chief executive power, and the economic organisation is more and more being taken over by trade unions and workers' committees of control. And the representatives of the Liberal bourgeoisie have had to admit that these organisations and the manner in which they are controlled are excellent.

Yet the Spanish workers have entered into this great and decisive battle without a true leadership, without a revolutionary party, without that clear understanding that is necessary of the end and aims of the revolution. All

**What our correspondent means is that if the revolution had boldly seized the power and held it, as it could have done before, much bloodshed would have been saved.*

the historic factions of the working class are to be found to-day in Spain, even though their doctrines have been formally disavowed by history itself, as with the Anarchists, although they still form part of the Internationals which have acted with such great treachery. The Socialist youth has many authentic revolutionary elements; the Anarchists have not again fallen into their treacherous role of 1934, and they have hardened under the pressure of the masses and of events, and renounced the application to the letter of their sectarian and anti-disciplinary conceptions. The Stalinists, those professional stranglers of proletarian revolutions in the interests of the bureaucracy of Russia, do not represent a strong movement within the masses. The Reformists have taken rifles in their hands, accepting this as the only way of going into the fight against Fascism. But all these factions have accepted the battle and revolution, despite themselves, and it is quite natural that they will endeavour to re-establish the *status quo* as soon as possible. None of the working-class leaders wish to take over power.

The most progressive element in the working-class movement of Spain is the P.O.U.M. (Spanish Marxist Workers' Party), which has become a mass party in Catalonia. And Catalonia is the most important region of the peninsula, providing a third of the taxes on all production, with a proletariat that is the most advanced and the most organised. The P.O.U.M. has an influence over the masses here and its influence should go on growing day by day. The Anarchists are frightened and unnerved. Their influence is diminishing despite all the historic concessions which they have made to revolutionary Marxism. The influence of P.O.U.M. can be put as about a quarter of the combined militias of all the parties and the different unions.

Left Catalan Militia Total	23,000
Militia of Syndicalists and Anarchists (C.N.Y. and F.A.I.)	13,000
Militia of Trade Unions and Reformist Parties (S.U.G.T., P.S.U.C.)	5,000
Militia of P.O.U.M.	5,000

In the measure that P.O.U.M. can surmount its serious centrist deviations and separate itself from hesitant elements within itself, it can become the instrument by which power can be taken in Catalonia, and as a consequence and more or less immediately, in the rest of Spain. For if in October, 1934, Spain conquered Catalonia it is now Catalonia which will conquer Spain.

The most fearless policy is necessary for the advance-guard of the Spanish proletariat if it is not to lose the advantages that have been gained, or to have spilled its blood in vain. Already the Liberal bourgeoisie is manoeuvring to re-establish forces in its own favour. It will sabotage the advance of "legal" troops, knowing that these troops, once victorious, will recognise only proletarian legality. The task of the bourgeoisie in Madrid, as well as Catalonia, is to canalise the military power of the workers' organisations in a way that will permit the ultimate disarming of the workers. Behind the screen of the General Staff it is grouping and will regroup the surviving reactionary forces. And more dangerous than the bourgeoisie proper, decimated and scattered, will arise the spectre of imperialist intervention against this semi-colonial country, fortress of international finance capital, a port of call for British imperialism, an important card in the game of "unsatisfied" imperialisms. The Spanish bourgeoisie, with the international bourgeoisie, wish to

gain time to reassemble the reactionary forces. It is prepared to treat with the rebels and to disarm the workers by means of the rest of the army and the Civil Guard. The principal danger for the Spanish revolution is not foreign intervention from the side of the Fascists, it is the strengthening of the Bonapartist forces ranging from Prieto to Lerroux who already prepare openly for the massacre of the proletarian revolution.

The Spanish workers, who have already shed much blood on the altar of liberty, find themselves again face to face with a multiplicity of enemies. It will have to vanquish all the forces of reaction and of conservative Socialism which stand to-day within the Government. The task is immense but the process of revolutionary regrouping of the Spanish proletariat is already to be seen. The Spanish workers have liberated themselves during the

course of revolutionary action from the chains of reformism and anarchy. Now they turn in the direction of the Marxist-Leninist forces represented very feebly by the P.O.U.M. Night and day the revolution labours in Spain, and revolution is the finest architect in the world.

But the counter-revolution also works and is organising internationally. There is only one instrument capable of being used successfully against the international bourgeoisie, and that is the Fourth International, the organisation of world revolution. Its task, our task, is the immediate organisation of active solidarity with the Spanish proletariat, not with the republic of the bourgeoisie. But we know as well that the best means finally of helping the Spanish revolution is in preparing the downfall of capitalism in our own country.

MOULIN, August 14th, 1936.

THE COMING FRENCH REVOLUTION

By Leon Trotsky

Editorial note: The following article appeared in the first issue of "La Lutte Ouvriere," organ of the new French Party of the Fourth International. This issue was seized by the police of the Popular Front Government during the stay-in strikes because of its revolutionary content. It is not only invaluable for the understanding of the struggle in France; it exposes the weakness and dangerous folly of the Popular Front.

THE rhythm of events in France has been abruptly accelerated. In the first place it is necessary to appreciate the pre-revolutionary character of the situation on the basis of a theoretical analysis and of the various political symptoms. Facts now speak for themselves. It can be said without exaggeration that in the whole of France there are only two parties whose leaders do not see, do not understand, and do not wish to see the profoundness of the revolutionary crisis; the "Socialist" and "Communist" Parties. The "independent" Trade Union leaders can be added to these.

The working masses are now creating a revolutionary situation through direct action. The bourgeoisie mortally fear the development of events and are taking, behind the scenes, under the very nose of the new Government, all the necessary measures of resistance, of self-protection, of trickery and of bloody revenge. Only the "Socialist" and "Communist" leaders continue to boast about the People's Front as if the class struggle had not already upset their miserable house of cards.

Blum declares: "The country has given a mandate to the People's Front, and we are not able to go beyond the framework of this mandate." Blum deceives his own party and is trying to deceive the proletariat. The Stalinists (they still call themselves Communists) are helping him to do it. In fact, the Socialists and Communists are utilising the machinery, the dodges and the difficulties flowing out of the electoral machinery, to keep down the working masses in the interest of the alliance with the radical bourgeoisie. The political lessons of the crisis express themselves in the fact that the people are disgusted with the Radicals and their third republic. This is what the Fascists are utilising.

What have the Socialists and Communists done about it? They have become the guarantors for the Radicals, have represented the Radicals as being unjustly slandered, they have made the workers and peasants believe that their whole salvation is in the Daladier ministry. It was this tune that their electoral campaign orchestra played. How did the masses respond? They gave an enormous increase of votes to the C.P. as the extreme left.

The turns and zig-zags of the mercenaries of Soviet diplomacy have not been understood by the masses because they have not yet been verified by their own experience. The masses learn only in action. They have no time to learn theories. When one and a half million voters gave their votes to the Communists their majority said to the latter: "We want you to do in France what the Russian Bolsheviks did in their homeland in October, 1917." This is the real wish of the most active part of the population, of those who are capable of struggling, and of assuring the future of France. This is the first lesson of the elections.

The Socialists maintained about their previous number of votes, despite the split of the important "Neo" group. In this question also the masses gave their "leaders" a great lesson. The Neos wanted the coalition at any price, that is to say, collaboration with the Republican bourgeoisie in the name of salvation of the Republic.

It was precisely on this line that they split with the Socialists and became rivals in the elections. The electors turned away from them. The Neos were broken. Two years ago we predicted that future political developments would first kill all the little groups which were gravitating around the Radicals. Thus, in the conflict between the Socialists and the Neos the masses have judged and have rejected the group which proposed the most systematic, resolute, blunt and open alliance with the bourgeoisie. This is the second lesson of the elections.

The Socialist Party is not a working-class party either in policy or social composition. It is the party of the new layers of the middle class (public officials, clerks, etc.), and partially of the small bourgeoisie and the working-class aristocracy. A serious analysis of the electoral statistics

indubitably shows that the Socialists have ceded to the Communists an important fraction of the workers and poor peasants and have received from the Radicals in exchange, important groups of the middle class. This signifies that the support of the petty bourgeoisie is going from the Radicals to the left—towards the Socialists and the Communists, whilst with the groups of the big and middle bourgeoisie the separation is from the Radicals towards the right. The regrouping operates according to the class axis and does not follow the artificial line of the "People's Front." The rapid polarisation of the political relations underlines the revolutionary character of the crisis. This is the third lesson, the fundamental lesson.

The elector manifested consequently his desire—to the extent that there existed the possibility of manifesting it within the strait-jacket of parliamentarianism—not in favour of the policy of the People's Front but against it. Certainly, in the second ballot the Socialists and Communists, by retiring their candidates in favour of the Radical bourgeoisie, still further altered the political desires of the workers of France. Despite this, the Radicals went out of the experiment with broken bones, losing a good many deputies. *The Temps* said: "It is because they entered the bloc with the revolutionaries." Daladier replied: "Without the Popular Front we would have lost more." Daladier is incontestably right. If the Socialists and Communists had conducted class policies, that is to say, had they struggled for the alliance of the workers with the semi-proletarian elements of city and of village against the whole bourgeoisie, including also its rotten Radical wing, they would have had considerably more votes, and the radicals would have been returned to the Chamber an insignificant group.

All the political facts testify that neither in the social relations in France nor in the political state of the masses was there any support for the People's Front. This piece of politics was imposed from above by the Radical bourgeoisie, by the horse-traders and Socialist business men, and by the Soviet diplomats and their lackeys, the "Communists." With their united strength they did all they could, with the help of the most dishonest of all electoral systems, in order to deceive and decoy the masses and change their real desires. Nevertheless, the masses knew even under these conditions how to show that what they wanted was not a coalition with the Radicals but the mobilisation of the workers against the whole bourgeoisie.

If, in every electoral centre where the Socialists and Communists withdrew in favour of the Radicals, revolutionary workers' candidates had been put forward in the second ballot they would have obtained a very important number of votes. But, unfortunately, there was no organisation capable of such initiative. This shows that revolutionary groups, central and local, remain outside the dynamic of events and prefer to absent themselves and to escape where it is necessary to act. This is unfortunate. But the general orientation of the masses is, despite everything, absolutely clear.

The Socialists and Communists had prepared all their forces for a Herriot ministry; strictly speaking, a Daladier ministry. What did the masses do then? They imposed a Blum ministry upon the Socialists and Communists. Is that not a direct vote against the policy of the Popular Front?

Perhaps further proofs are needed? The demonstration in memory of the Communards, it appears, surpassed this year all the popular demonstrations that have ever been

seen in Paris. The Radicals had not and could not have the least relation to this demonstration. The working masses of Paris, with unequalled political instinct, showed that they were ready to come in double numbers where they were not forced to suffer the repugnant fraternisation of their leaders with the bourgeoisie exploiters. The strength of the demonstration of May 24th is a denial of the most convincing and infallible kind of the Paris workers of the policies of the Popular Front.

But without the Popular Front, the parliament in which the Socialists and Communists, despite everything, have not the majority, would not be capable of existing, and the Radicals—woe to them!—would have been thrown "into the hands of the reaction." This reasoning is completely worthy of the Philistines who stand at the head of the Socialist and Communist Parties. The non-viability of parliament is the inevitable consequence of the revolutionary character of the crisis. With the assistance of a series of political tricks they have succeeded in concealing, as well as possible, this non-viability, but it reveals itself in spite of everything. In order not to push the quite reactionary Radicals into "the hands of the reaction," it is necessary to unite with the Radicals for the defence of capital. In this and only this does the mission of the Popular Front reside. But the workers are preventing it.

Parliament is not capable of existing because the present crisis has no solution on the parliamentary road. And for the first time the French working masses, with the sure revolutionary instinct that distinguishes them, have seized upon this important characteristic of the situation. In Toulon and in Brest they gave the first alarm signals. The protests of the soldiers against the "radiot" (lengthening of military service) signified the most dangerous form of mass action for the bourgeoisie order. Finally, during the days in which the Socialist Congress accepted unanimously (in common with the phrasemonger Marceau Pivert) the mandate of the Popular Front and placed this mandate with Leon Blum, when he was looking at himself in the mirror from all sides, was making pre-Government gestures, was uttering pre-Government exclamations and was commenting on them in articles in which it was a question of Blum and never of the proletariat—precisely in those days a magnificent wave of strikes spread over France. Without finding leadership, and marching without it, the workers occupied the factories with daring and assurance after they had ceased from work.

The new gendarme of capital, Salengro, even before taking power, declared (just as would have Herriot, Laval, Tardieu and even de la Rocque), that he would defend "order against anarchy." This individual calls capitalist anarchy "order." The still peaceful occupation of the factories and mills by the workers has an enormous symptomatic importance. The workers are saying: "We wish to be the masters in the establishments in which we have only been the slaves up till now."

Leon Blum, in deadly fear, desiring to frighten the workers, said: "I am not Kerensky, and in the place of Kerensky in France would not come Lenin but somebody else." One would imagine that the Russian Kerensky understood the policy of Lenin or anticipated his arrival. In fact, exactly as Blum, Kerensky did believe that in case of his downfall power would be taken not by Bolshevism but by "somebody else." Precisely where Blum wishes to distinguish himself from Kerensky he servilely imitates him. It is impossible, however, not to recognise that, to the

extent to which the matter depends on Blum, he really paves the way for Fascism and not for the proletariat.

More criminal and more infamous than anything in this situation is the conduct of the Communists: they have pledged complete support to the Blum Government, without entering it. "We are very terrible revolutionaries,"—said Cachin and Thorez—"our Radical colleagues may die of fright, it is much better that we stand aside."

Ministerialism behind the scenes is ten times worse than open and declared ministerialism. In fact, the Communists wish to preserve their external independence in order to more easily subdue the working masses to the Popular Front, that is to say to the discipline of capital. But here also an obstacle appears—the class struggle. The simple and honest mass strike pitilessly destroys the mystics and mystifications of the Popular Front. It has already received a mortal blow, and from now on can only perish.

There is no outlet on the parliamentary road. Blum will not use powder because he fears powder. The subsequent machinations of the Popular Front can only prolong the agony of parliamentarianism and give de la Rocque more time to prepare himself for a new coup, more serious—if the revolutionaries do not forestall him. After February 6th, 1934, some impatient comrades thought that the issue would be resolved "to-morrow" and that was why it was immediately necessary to accomplish some miracle. Such a policy could produce nothing but adventures and zig-zags, which would have hindered the development of the revolutionary party. Lost time cannot be regained. But no more time must be lost for so little remains. Even to-day we cannot determine the lapse of time left. But after the great strike wave events can develop only on the side of the revolution or of Fascism. An organisation which does not find support in the present strike movements, which does not know how to bind itself closely to the workers in the struggle, is unworthy of the name of a revolutionary organisation. Its members would do better to seek a place in the monasteries or masonic lodges (with the protection of M. Pivert).

In France there are numerous gentlemen of both sexes, ex-Communists, ex-Socialists, ex-Trade Unionists, who are living in groups and in cliques, exchanging their impressions

The Colonial Question

EGYPT EASES THE GRIP

THE treaty signed between Britain and Egypt, in the Locarno Room of the Foreign Office, with the gold fountain pen of Nahas Pasha, the Wafd (Nationalist Party) leader, is a document of great importance to a student of British Imperialism in its present crisis. The British Tory Government to-day has gone much further to meet the Egyptian demands than that protector of Imperialist interests, Ramsay MacDonald, in 1924, and that arch-apostle of peace, Arthur Henderson, in 1930. Not only is Egypt recognised as a sovereign state, with the right to appoint an Ambassador to the Court of St. James', but for the first time she is given a theoretical share in the exploitation of the Sudan, that bone of contention which has embittered Anglo-Egyptian relations so long. With the head-waters of the Nile under its sole control, British Imperialism had a close

of events inside of four walls and think that the movement is not ready for their enlightened participation. "It is still too soon." And when de la Rocque will arrive they will say: "It is now too late." Sterile reasoners of this kind are numerous, particularly among the Left Wing of the Teachers' Union. It is the greatest crime to lose time with these people, even if it is only a moment. Let the dead bury their dead.

The fate of France will not be decided in Parliament, nor in the editorial offices of the conciliationist, reformist and Stalinist newspapers, nor in the circles of whining and phrasemongering sceptics. The fate of France is being decided in the factories, which have, in action, shown the road of escape from capitalist anarchy toward the Socialist order. The place for revolutionaries is in the factories.

The last C.I. Congress, in its eclectic menu, posed, the one beside the other, Coalition with the Radicals, and the creation of mass action committees, i.e., Soviets in embryo. Dimitrov, like his inspirers, imagines it is possible to combine class collaboration with class struggle, the bloc with the bourgeoisie, with the proletarian struggle for power, friendship with Deladier and the building of Soviets. The French Stalinists have given name "Popular Front Committees" to the Committees of Action, thinking that they can thus reconcile the revolutionary struggle with the defence of bourgeois democracy. The present strikes have broken this pitiful illusion into fragments. The Radicals fear the Committees. The Socialists fear the fright of the Radicals. The Communists fear the fright of both. The slogan of the Committees cannot be set aside by a truly revolutionary organisation, devoted absolutely to the masses, to their cause and to their struggle.

The French workers have shown anew that they are worthy of their historic reputation. They must be given confidence. Soviets are always born out of strikes. The mass strike is the natural element in the proletarian revolution. The Action Committees can at present be nothing more than strike committees, occupying the factories. From corporation to corporation, factory to factory, district to district, town to town, the committees must establish close connections with each other, meeting productive groups, by districts, to culminate in a Congress of all the Action Committees in France. This will be the new order that will replace the present anarchy.

grip on the throat of Egypt. Now, with Mussolini's black-shirts entrenched in Abyssinia, and the Palestinian Arabs carrying on a violent movement of strikes and revolt, the British Government has thought it wiser to relax even that grip over the waters which bring life and fertility to the land.

All this climbing down is occasioned by the threat of war in the Mediterranean. Most of the clauses of the treaty pertain to the future military, naval and air adjustments. To conciliate the Egyptian Nationalists, the British troops in Cairo and Alexandria are to be moved to the Canal zone, though the 400 aeroplanes of the R.A.F. will still have the right to fly anywhere and everywhere, and British battleships will still dock in Alexandria's naval harbour.

Egypt will have to provide strategic roads and railways,

build barracks for the troops and aerodromes for the bombers. The non-military clauses of the treaty merely treat of the gradual abolition of the British police in the towns and the right of the Egyptian Courts to try foreigners. The era of Cromer, Kitchener, Milner and Lloyd, the pro-consul masters of Egyptian destiny on the British side, and Arabi Kemel, Zaghal and Mahash Pasha, the leaders of national revolt on the Egyptian side, is at an end. Egyptian politics enters a new and advanced phase.

The Pashas and Beys, descendants of the old Turkish and Arab military aristocracy, will no longer be able to play off the economically ruined fellaheen (peasant) against Britain. In the whole treaty the name of the fellaheen and finance does not appear once. The leaders of the Wafd, though free from the reaction of the Court Junta, which has been ruling Egypt under the direction of the British High Commissioner, are only middle-class Nationalists. They have no other programme or slogan except absolute independence.

Egypt, practically without any large-scale industry, has no town proletariat approaching the size and importance of the Indian or Chinese. The million people in Cairo, and another three-quarters of a million in Alexandria, are mainly traders, artisans and Pashas, small and big, with a claim on the rents of the land. Eighty per cent. of the population is composed of the fellaheen, who cultivate the fifty-mile fertile strip along both banks of the Nile and the wider strata of the Delta. The land is mainly owned by the old feudal army aristocracy and the new intelligentsia, students, clerks, administrators, engineers, "financial advisers," and military officers.

When Britain began to exploit Egypt, British officials pushed out these Egyptians from the best posts in the Government at once, so these people became Nationalists and allied themselves with the peasantry against the British-controlled Court. But now, when they have come to some sort of agreement with Britain, fissures will begin to appear in this apparent unity. The lack of big industry, and hence an

organised proletariat, has kept Egypt more or less free from Communism, but the wide gulf between the hungry tax and debt-ridden peasantry and the parasitic elements in the towns, can no longer be bridged by a party of pure Nationalism.

The economic crisis and the fall in the prices of agricultural goods has hit the fellah hard. Egypt, by deciding to remain on the gold standard, has still further reduced the exports of the country. Cotton and wheat, the staple products of Egypt, have brought very little money to the fellah in the last few years. Britain, with its control of Egyptian finance and administration, and its troops suppressing the peasant risings, as in 1919 and 1925, has long been the villain of the piece. The Wafd is incapable of producing a programme of social and economic change, as its leadership represents only smaller and newer exploiters. The fellah will have to look to the oppressed and warlike tribes across the frontier in Sudan if he wants allies and direction in his fight for economic and political freedom. He will have to link up his fate with the elements which produced the Mahdi in the 'seventies and 'eighties of the last century.

They, the Negro and Arab tribes of the Sudan, given a favourable opportunity, will again produce the necessary leadership and the movement for the final overthrow of Imperialism and feudal landlord tyranny in this corner of Africa. That their military and fighting spirit is not dead is evidenced by the revolt of military cadets and the army in the Sudan in 1924.

As the conquest of Egypt came from the Mediterranean coast, the liberation is to come from the hinterland, where tribes with a warlike tradition are just waiting for the chance. It is when the Imperialists are destroying each other in another war that the chance will come. Then Egyptian peasant and Sudanese tribesman will be able to deal with both foreign and native exploiters at the same time.

Documents of the International. No 1

TO THE PUBLIC OPINION OF THE TOILERS OF THE WHOLE WORLD

Theses of the Geneva Conference of the Fourth International, August, 1936

THE question of the fate of the Soviet Union is near to the heart of every thinking worker. A hundred and seventy million human beings are carrying out the greatest experiment in social emancipation in history. The destruction of the new régime would signify a terrible blow at the development of the whole of mankind. But precisely for this reason arises the necessity for an honest, i.e., critical attitude towards all those complex processes and contradictory phenomena which are to be observed in the life of the Soviet Union.

The most alarming symptom of the internal life of the U.S.S.R. is without doubt the continued and severe repressions which are carried out in most cases not against the supporters of a capitalist restoration but against revolutionaries who have come into some sort of conflict with the ruling stratum. In recent months there have penetrated into the world Press numerous communications concerning

exceptionally severe repressions against the oppositional members of the ruling party itself and also against foreign Communists who cannot count upon the protection of the embassy of their own country. Prisons have already proved inadequate. Concentration camps have been developed to a greater degree than was ever the case during the Civil War. Ever-increasing collective and individual hunger-strikes and suicides have been the answer of the prisoners to the unendurable persecutions. The numerous tragic facts have been confirmed by persons meriting full confidence and ready to appear before any tribunal with confirmation of their evidence. A critical mind refuses to reconcile these facts with the official affirmation that a Socialist society has been "finally and irrevocably" set up in the U.S.S.R.

On June 5th *Pravda*, the leading paper of the U.S.S.R., announced the acceptance by the Central Com-

mittee of the ruling party of the project of a New Constitution, "the most democratic in the world." The leading article, in commenting upon this most important decision, announced at the same time new and yet more terrible repressions against the oppositionists. The question is so important that we consider it necessary to repeat word for word the statement made by *Pravda* as the direct mouthpiece of the ruling circles. Having pointed out "the tremendous victories of Socialism" which find their expression in the New Constitution, the paper at the same time demands "increased watchfulness" against "the class forces hostile to Socialism." It would, however, be a mistake to think that it is here a question of advocates of the restoration of the monarchy, the nobility or the bourgeoisie. On the contrary, by means of a series of decrees, and subsequently in the corresponding paragraph of the New Constitution, the inequality of citizens by reason of their social origin has been finally removed. According to the official explanations Socialist society has become so strong that it need no longer fear those of noble or bourgeois origin. So far as "the class forces hostile to Socialism," against which sterner measures are demanded, are concerned, *Pravda* says the following:—

"The struggle continues. Too weak for a direct attack, the remains of the counter-revolutionary groups, the White Guardists of all colours, especially the Trotskyists and Zinovievists, have not given up their base, spying, sabotaging and terrorist work. With a firm hand we will continue in the future to strike down and destroy the enemies of the people, the Trotskyist reptiles and furies, however skilfully they may disguise themselves."

These words speak for themselves. While publishing "the most democratic Constitution in the world" the ruling group of the Soviet Union promises at the same time to "destroy" the supporters of a definite section of Socialist thought, accusing them of such crimes as "spying," "sabotaging" (?) and "terrorist work." The accusation has obviously a hallucinatory character. It is not one jot better than the accusations against the mediæval heretics of causing droughts and epidemics or the accusations against the Jews of using Christian blood. But this does not detract from the terrible reality of the threat of destruction.

The so-called "Trotskyist" movement has an international character and publishes books and papers in no less than 15 languages. One can regard this movement in various ways, one can sympathise with it or, on the contrary, condemn it, but every thinking worker, every serious-minded man is able to convince himself from irrefutable documents that it is a question of a revolutionary grouping setting itself the task of emancipating the toilers. Thus, during the June events in Paris the bourgeois Press unanimously attacked the "Trotskyists" for stirring up strikes and the Press of the Comintern accused them of trying to evoke a revolution artificially. Can it be believed for a moment that one and the same movement, guided by the same people and ideas, strives in all capitalist countries to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie, but attempts in the U.S.S.R. to restore capitalism with the assistance of "spying," "sabotaging" and "terrorist work"?

Every distinguished friend of the U.S.S.R., i.e., every friend of the Soviet toiling masses, must say to himself:—The official explanations contain an open, an obvious, falsehood. While openly preparing the physical destruction of its ideological opponents, the ruling group

cannot find a single serious word to say in explanation or justification of such repressions. Can such a position be borne passively and silently?

We, the undersigned, declare, in the face of the public opinion of the whole world, that it is not true that the "Trotskyists" and "Zinovievists" are striving or can strive towards the restoration of capitalism; that it is not true that they have, or can have, any connection with the spying intrigues or terrorist attempts of the counter-revolution; that it is not true that their activity is directed, or can be directed, against Socialism. But, on the other hand, it is an incontrovertible truth, as is evident from the whole literature of the question, that the "Trotskyists" are the opponents of the policy of the ruling Soviet group, the opponents of the ever-increasing social inequality in the U.S.S.R., the opponents of the restoration of the officer-class, and, above all, the opponents of the unlimited power and unlimited privileges of the bureaucracy. It is not this Soviet proletariat which is punishing its "class enemies," but the Soviet bureaucracy which, in the struggle for the maintenance of its power and privileges, is destroying a group which is trying to express the protest and discontent of the toiling masses.

We, the undersigned, take upon ourselves the full responsibility for our words, which can be verified at any moment without difficulty; it is only necessary for the Soviet Government to give an impartial international committee the opportunity of freely acquainting itself on the spot with the real or alleged crimes of the Trotskyists, Zinovievists and other oppositional groups. We desire nothing better.

Every working-class organisation, every progressive social group, every honest newspaper, every friend of the toilers is interested in the full and conclusive clarification of this burning question. It is necessary to withdraw the curtain from an unending series of tragedies. It is necessary to obtain an investigation. It is necessary to discover the whole truth. In working-class organisations, at meetings, in the Press, it is necessary to raise and support the demand for the sending to the U.S.S.R. of an impartial commission, authoritative for all, with the object of investigating the real reasons for the repressions with which the bureaucracy threatens the revolutionaries, both Trotskyists and Zinovievists, and also the representatives of other movements. If the Soviet bureaucracy has nothing to hide in this matter from the world working class it must meet such a demand.

Editor's Note: These theses were written by L. D. Trotsky long before the recent Moscow trial and show quite clearly that the preparations of the Stalinist bureaucracy to destroy the Trotskyists in Russia and their unscrupulous methods were well understood by us.

FIGHT

Monthly Organ of the British Bolshevik-Leninists

SUBSCRIPTIONS **2/6** A YEAR (Post Free)

... All donations, subscriptions, correspondence and enquiries, to

ROBERT WILLIAMS,
99 KING'S CROSS ROAD, LONDON, W.C.1

TROTSKY AND TERRORISM

The Workers must Demand an International Working-Class Investigation

AFTER the abortive revolution of 1848, Europe was haunted by the spectre of Communism. Under Stalinist reaction, the Soviet Union is haunted by the spectre of Trotskyism.

Vishinsky, the Public Prosecutor at the trial, lashing himself into a fury, screeches that though the "mad dogs" Zinoviev, Kamenev and the others must die, it is the head of Trotsky that is wanted. Throughout the trial the desire to discredit Trotsky stands out plainly, but plainly visible also is the desire of the Stalinist bureaucracy that Trotsky shall be assassinated. It is the Stalinists who seem to believe in individual terrorism, believing that if Trotsky were killed, Trotskyism would also die.

Trotsky, the chief accused, though not present at the trial, and without any proof other than that offered by the abject confessions of sixteen victims, was found guilty of a terrorist plot against Stalin. With this thin legal pretext, the Stalinists can summarily execute Trotsky if he ever lands in the Soviet Union.

At the trial they suggested that he offer himself up to be executed. Now they have brought pressure to bear on the Norwegian Government to extradite him, threatening to withdraw their trade (by which Norway benefits) if this is not done. But unfortunately for themselves, the Stalinists some years ago took away Trotsky's citizenship. Trotsky fought them on this issue. But now, having once legally disowned him, they have no right to demand of another government that he be given over to them to be murdered. Incredible as it may seem to some, the Stalinists, making this demand, used a statute of the League of Nations which states that a terrorist acting in a foreign country should be given up to his own national authorities for trial.

This move has failed for the moment. But Trotsky is in danger. The Stalinists want him dead. They incite their own blind followers, and also the Fascists, to assassinate him. The Norwegian Labour Government, though it has in the past boasted of its democracy in having harboured Trotsky, the world revolutionary, may give way to the pressure of the united efforts of the Soviet Union and its own Communists, Fascists and Conservatives, who all howl for his expulsion.

In the meantime they have interned him. This makes him safe for the moment, but he is suffering a great injustice by it. It is interesting to go over the facts which led to his internment.

On August 5th he left his lodgings with his Norwegian host, Knudson, to go for a short fishing holiday. The same night the house was raided by Norwegian Fascists.

A case was opened on August 10th. *The Fascists stated before the judge that they were working in direct collaboration with the German Gestapo.* They demanded the expulsion of Trotsky, and, to support their accusations, they cited all the articles by Trotsky on France, Spain, etc. The Press of the big bourgeoisie supported the Fascists'

demand for the expulsion. Going on to prove the accusation that Trotsky had violated the conditions of exile by political activity against foreign powers friendly to Norway, these Norwegian Fascists, collaborating with the German Gestapo, cited the Soviet Union as a country in point. These people stood as defenders of the Soviet Union! In their journal, *Fritt Folk*, of August 14th, in great letters across the page they put: "Trotsky has used Honefoss as his base to direct agitation for the overthrow of Stalin. . . ."

It was on August 14th, the same day, that T.A.S.S., the Russian Press Agency, issued the statement accusing Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others of being engaged in terrorist activity against Stalin. What sort of coincidence was this?

Trotsky is anxious that the accusations against him should be investigated by an independent Norwegian or Danish court. When he heard that the executions in Moscow had taken place, he said: "One of the greatest crimes in history has taken place. It is my duty to unmask and avenge it. To-day, those who indicted themselves are dead. I figured at the trial as the one chiefly responsible for the plot, and I remain alive. I have the right to have a judicial examination of my actions carried out. My alleged terrorist activity is said to have been primarily in Denmark, France and Norway. The crimes of which I am accused are punishable in these countries. Proceedings can therefore be brought against me." To force the issue, Trotsky has tried to bring a libel action against the Norwegian Communist Party and the Norwegian Fascist Party, but the Government will not allow this.

It is necessary for the working class of the world to demand an international investigation into the accusations made against Trotsky. The working class must also demand for him the right of asylum in Norway, free from internment but with proper police protection.

On August 31st a meeting of 200 or 300 people met in Hyde Park to support these demands, and a deputation was sent from the meeting to the Soviet Embassy. But the only reply that the deputation received was to have the bolts slammed into position. Another meeting was held on September 9th, in Essex Hall, with speakers from the Labour Party and Independent Labour Party. But the Trotskyists in Britain and their sympathisers have, unfortunately, very little money for publicity (despite being in the pay of the police, according to the Communists). Smaller meetings in other districts have been held, and resolutions have been passed in many Trade Union and co-operative branches.

Ask that a resolution on the following lines be put to the members of your Trade Union, co-operative, or political party branch:—

"This meeting of workers views with disgust the charges made against Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bucharin, Rykov, Sokolnikov, and other prominent Bolshevik leaders. It demands that the organised workers' movement appoint an international working-class commission

to investigate these charges, and all relevant documents, so that the workers may know the truth regarding the allegations against these men."

If their case is genuine, why should the Stalinists fear such an investigation?

The most advanced workers in the Spanish fight, those of the P.O.U.M. (United Marxists Workers' Party), have vigorously asserted their belief in Trotsky and have suggested to the other workers that Trotsky be given asylum in Barcelona.

AN INTERVIEW WITH LEON TROTSKY

Extracts from an interview with Comrade Trotsky by the Liberal paper of Oslo, *Dagbladet*, published August 21st, 1936.

IT is a question now of the lives of many men in the U.S.S.R. and of my honour as a politician. I have my opinion and I have always defended it. To-day I hold the same opinion as I held before. I am a revolutionary, not a terrorist.

In what follows chronology plays an important part, he continued. That is why I want you to pay the most careful attention to the way things developed. The G.P.U. are very clever, but they do not possess the art of scientific chronology. In February, 1929, I arrived in Turkey, expelled from the U.S.S.R. On the 4th March I was writing this for the Russian review, "*Bulletin de L'Opposition*," which appeared in July, 1929, in Paris.

"For Stalin there remains only one thing: to try to draw a trail of blood between the official party and the opposition. For him it is an absolute necessity to link the opposition with crimes, with preparations for armed insurrection, etc. But the leaders of the opposition form an obstacle to that. Hence Stalin's plan to send these leaders abroad (at the time he was preparing for the expulsion of several people) so that in this way he might have his hands free to deal with the young partisans of the opposition, whose names are unknown to the large masses of people, especially abroad. It is for this reason that one must pay attention to the fact that Stalin, after expelling the opposition leaders, tries, in one way or another, to push this group or that group, supposed to be in opposition, to an adventure, or tries to concoct, in case of failure, a 'crime' or a 'military plot' to make the opposition responsible for it."

Everyone, no matter to what party he belongs, understands the great importance of this quotation. If you can read Russian you will be able to see in this bulletin, in which all my articles have been published for seven and a half years, that I have always opposed individual terrorism but that already, at that period, I was aware of what would happen.

The first crime which occurred was the assassination of Kirov, in December, 1934.

[Some] weeks later Zinoviev was drawn into the trial and accused, together with his partisans, of being an assassin. In 1926 Zinoviev collaborated with me in the framework of the party and was considered a member of the opposition. But when in 1928 the bureaucracy strengthened its position Zinoviev gave way. And from 1929 to 1934 Zinoviev and Kamenev were considered traitors to the opposition—all this emerges with all the clearness that can be desired from the *Bulletin de L'Opposition*.

To my mind the crime against Kirov was arranged to crush the opposition: however, they did not intend to kill Kirov; at the last moment the crime was to be prevented. When events turned out contrary to what had been intended the chief of the G.P.U. at Leningrad, Medved, was blamed. That was the third trial centring round the crime! Medved and some other officials of the G.P.U. were accused of being accomplices in the crime, and of having done nothing to prevent it. Medved confessed everything and was sentenced to three years' imprisonment. I knew Medved. He was not an independent politician. It was Stalin himself who directed this affair to strike at the opposition. I do not know to-day whether Nikolaev was himself an agent of the G.P.U. The fact that he succeeded in insinuating himself into Kirov's office—Kirov held a high office and from a distance it was not everyone who could obtain access to him—is a sign which seems to prove it.

Among my papers I found the following facts which help to clarify things: In 1930 a certain Olberg tried to get into my house as a secretary. Franz Pfempfert, at this time Editor of *Die Aktion*, warned me in a letter of the 1st April, 1930, in the most determined way, that Olberg was a suspicious person and probably an agent of the G.P.U. Since Olberg seems to be the foundation of the whole accusation I shall willingly put the material describing him at the disposal of the Press. Quite simply it is absurd to affirm that I would have charged with terrorist missions a man whom I myself did not know and against whom a good friend had warned me.

During my stay in Norway I received no visitor from the U.S.S.R. From here I have no longer written to the U.S.S.R., neither directly nor indirectly. In the telegram sent by Moscow in connection with the trial a letter was reproduced which I was supposed to have sent to Smirnov through my son.

According to this letter I had three aims in view, viz., 1. To kill Stalin and Vorochilov; 2. To organise (revolutionary) cells within the army; 3. In case of war to draw profit from all mistakes in order to obtain power.

The whole letter comprised five lines! Five lines for these three tasks! This is, however, a little too concentrated!

All this is a gross falsification, a lie, an infamous lie brought against me, but in the U.S.S.R. there is no longer the possibility of raising one's voice to criticise. There criticism is stifled, and there these absurd accusations will remain for the time uncontradicted. But here it is possible to criticise and, gentlemen, I do criticise.

Next month we shall have an article dealing with the political background of the trial.—Editor.

WE WISH TO APOLOGISE TO ALL READERS FOR DELAY IN PUBLICATION, BUT IT WAS DUE TO CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND OUR CONTROL