

The RED FLAG

Monthly Organ of the British Section, International Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists)

Number 4.

Vol. I.

One Penny.

August 1933

A UNITED COMMUNIST PARTY?

Some remarks to members of the I.L.P.

The slogan of a "United Communist Party" is likely to be the central issue around which the discussion between the Communist Party and the Independent Labour Party will revolve. For this reason it is necessary to examine this call for unity in the light of the existing situation within the C.P. and the I.L.P. Many members of both parties, seeing the immediate advantages to be derived from organisational unity, are not concerning themselves with the political basis for this unity. There is the danger that this unity will be supported on sentimental, or so-called practical grounds. To avoid this we must insistently ask of those whose sole political programme appears to be unity, what are the political pre-requisites for this unity?

In order to lull any doubts that may have been engendered by past experiences, the C.P. officials make great efforts to convince the I.L.P. that this unity will be achieved democratically. A special Unity Congress is to be called with equal representation and with the full right of election of officers, etc. Such an enticing counterdisplay will dazzle only weak-minded individuals, the serious minded will wish to examine carefully their intended purchases. Nevertheless, it would appear that many I.L.P.ers take the word for the deed, the promise for the fulfillment. A closer examination of these proposals will reveal that, while there is to be equality of representation, the main question, that of the programme on which this unity is to be brought about, is to be decided beforehand. The basis for the unity is to be "the programme of the Communist International." Those very slogans, policies, and methods, which have themselves prevented the I.L.P. left-wingers from entering the C.P. are to be tied around the neck of the new "United C.P."

WHERE DOES THE R.P.C. STAND?

World congresses of the Comintern decide its programme. It is an interesting sidelight on the "democracy" inside the C.I. and its sections to note that, although supposed to be held every two years, there has not been a World Congress for five years! The last World Congress met after the suppression of the Left Opposition, and accepted a programme which has only to be read by serious revolutionaries for them to be aware of its eclecticism, its fatuous optimism, and its caricature of revolutionary Marxist policy. Since this World Congress "Plenums" have been held, the only result of which has been to drive the Communist Parties still further along the road to catastrophe. They have marched the German Party to devastating defeat. That the ac-

ceptance of such a programme should be required without discussion is an indication of the extent to which the bureaucracy have become divorced from Marxism.

The May issue of the Bulletin of the Revolutionary Policy Committee contains an article which supports this slogan of the "United Communist Party." We gather from the article, that the R.P.C., while accepting this slogan, takes the curious view that C.P.B.G. is weak, not because its policy has been wrong, but because it has wrongly applied the Comintern's policy. This is a truly extraordinary argument and will not stand any close examination. We would ask the R.P.C. whether the "united front only from below," the theory of "Social-Fascism," the building of Red Trade Unions, to mention only three aspects of Communist policy originated with the C.P.G.B. or the Comintern? Or does the R.P.C. think that on such matters as the united front "only from below" the Comintern's policy was correct but wrongly applied in this country? And by what curious chance does it happen that the same policy was pursued in every section of the C.I. throughout the world?

WHO DECIDES C.I. PROGRAMMES?

It is true that the May bulletin mentions, in passing, that the R.P.C. still has "minor differences." But when we look for a statement of these "minor differences" there is no clearly defined point of view to be found. For over a year members of R.P.C. have spoken of "differences of tactics but not of policy" (as though tactics do not flow from the general strategical line). It is the duty of a revolutionary, especially one occupying a leading position, to state clearly and unambiguously in what respects he differs from a given policy, and to fight for his own viewpoint. To pass over differences in silence is to deepen the existing confusion.

The revolutionary workers of the I.L.P. must fight for their organisation to declare itself openly upon the main political questions of our time. The problems posed by the German debacle, the problems of the united front, the question of the situation in the U.S.S.R., and the present leadership in the Comintern are just a few matters which must be faced up to and discussed, and upon which a standpoint must be taken. Without this there can be no advance for the revolutionary movement of this or any other country. For our part, we will do all in our power to assist in this necessary clarification of ideas, and, in the limited space at our disposal, are prepared to enter into discussion with the comrades of the I.L.P., on all questions of importance to the revolutionary movement.

ANOTHER LIE NAILED

On September 21st (1932) the *Daily Worker* quoted the *Sunday Times* to the effect that Kilbom, described by the *Sunday Times* as "the Communist leader" in Sweden, had received £7,100 from Kreuger, the Match King. The *Daily Worker's* comment was that Kilbom was not a Communist leader but "the leader of the Trotskyist group in Sweden."

In spite of the fact that Kilbom, while in the party had distinguished himself by his attacks on the Left Opposition, this slander was printed in the Party press. At the Ninth Plenum of the C.I., held in 1928, Kilbom, for example said: "I think that the Trotskyists cannot be called the Opposition, they must be called Social Democrats... Trotskyism is identical with Social Democracy... Our Party has had several discussions on the question of the Russian Opposition. Already at the end of 1926 it identified itself entirely with the policy of the C.P.S.U."

Now the *Daily Worker* in making an attack upon the I.L.P. publishes a further article on Kilbom in which it is revealed that he was expelled in 1929, that is in the period of the drive against the Right Wing inside the International.

It is clear that there is no justification whatsoever for the charges made in September 1932 against the Left Opposition. And it is but a question of time before party members begin to realise that these wild and malicious accusations have no other purpose but to prejudice the Left Opposition in the eyes of the less informed of the members of the C.P.G.B.

LENINISM Versus STALINISM

Our German section has published a pamphlet under the title of "Leninism against Stalinism." This is made up entirely of extracts from the speeches and writings of leaders of the C.I. and of the Communist Party of Germany. These quotations reveal clearly the standpoint of the Comintern before Hitler's conquest of power on the problems which arose during the long drawn out political crisis.

Contrasted to these quotations are extracts from the publications of the German Left Opposition and the writings of Leon Trotsky, extending over the period from 1930 to 1933. No one reading this material in the light of recent events can escape the conclusion drawn by Leon Trotsky in his foreword to this pamphlet, where he says:

"In the course of the past year the Stalinist bureaucracy did all that was possible, without intending it, to render the Fascist victory easier."

Every Marxist will want this pamphlet, which we are anxious to duplicate without delay. But once again we are held back by lack of money. We appeal to all our readers to send in a donation to our Publication Fund without delay, so that we can, while maintaining the *Red Flag*, also issue such material as that described above.

TROTSKY ON GERMAN LEFT SOCIALISTS

The Left Opposition and the S.A.P.

Dear Friend,

I have received your letter of 20th April in which you inform me of your discussions with the leading comrades of the S.A.P. (The Left Socialist Party in Germany comparable to the I.L.P.—Ed.) Your information completes quite well the resolution of the last conference of the SAP, especially in the parts in which relations with you are demanded. Until 5 March the leaders of the SAP reproached us for still having hope in the regeneration of the Communist Party of Germany. To-day, this difference is resolved by the very course of events. We consider the Stalinist apparatus in Germany as condemned to death and we call for the assembly of cadres for a new party. In the domain of the relations between ourselves and the S.A.P. the problem should in consequence reduce itself to that of knowing what will be the programme of this new party, its policy, its regime. We need, obviously, not general abstract formulas, but the affirmation on paper of that experience which has taken place before us in recent years and in which the two organisations, the Left Opposition and the SAP, have participated. The fundamental deductions from that experience have been stated in telegraphic language at our pre-conference of February of this year (really, we must make corrections to those theses on the problem of our attitude towards the C.P.G.). We should have expected corrections, supplements, or counter-propositions of a programmatic character, from the leaders of the SAP.

In reality, we hear from them quite different arguments. I grant that I experience some difficulties in approaching this point; for it concerns me personally. But the problems of revolutionary policy are above personal considerations. It is necessary to take the arguments in the form under which they are presented by possible allies or enemies. The Left Opposition, according to the SAP leaders, is too closely linked with the personality of Trotsky, depends too much upon him, etc. . . . The German Section, it appears, undertakes nothing without the guidance of T., etc. . . . The concentration of an organisation round a single individual presents great dangers, etc. . . .

First of all, I wish to make a correction to this picture of the inner relations of the Opposition. I shall not speak of the past through which the German section lived and of the serious differences and sharp inner crises, in relation to which it happened that I personally played the part, at the most, of outside adviser. Now, the problem of a new party in Germany is on the order of the day. The Left Opposition is the only organisation that openly, under the eyes of all, discusses this problem. The majority of the leadership of the German section find themselves differing in relation to this question with the International Secretariat and with me and energetically conducts its campaign, accusing me of "sophisms" and of "diplomacy" and of other sins, as is the strict rule of the game in a discussion struggle. I firmly hope that the examination will end in the elaboration of an agreed point of view. But in any case, neither in the SAP nor in the CPG does one really polemise as openly and decisively against Walker-Froelich or Brandler-Thalheimer as in our German section one polemises against me or the International Secretariat of the Left Opposition. I by no means wish to idealise the Left Opposition such as it is. The principal fault of our organisation is that it is weak. The weakness of the organisation, the insufficiency of contacts with the masses create conditions under which it is possible, and even inevitable, that individual personalities have an excessive influence. For this, however, there is but one remedy: to construct a stronger, a more massive organisation. If the basic positions and the methods of the Left Opposition are fundamentally correct, then the creation of

such an organisation is assured, or at least fully realisable. Hence, let us fully turn to the programmatic, strategical, tactical and organisational problems.

From what, basically, do the comrades of the SAP defend themselves: from the influence of a definite personality or from the influence of definite ideas with which that personality is connected? On this point there is not yet all the necessary precision. In the resolution of the conference of the SAP it is said that the SAP is in agreement on many points with the Left Opposition and with the C.W.P. (Right Wing Opposition). One is at once struck by the lack of precision in the expression "on many points." That is not Marxist. The resolution of a responsible organisation before the vanguard of the workers is required to say clearly and exactly: on what problems it is in agreement with other organisations and on what problems it differs. There can be no revolutionary policy without clearness and exactness in the field of ideas. The situation is complicated by the fact that the resolution proclaims at the same moment solidarity with us, Bolshevik-Leninists, and with the Brandlerites.* This enormously decreases the value of the declaration since the Brandlerites are separated from us by irreconcilable differences.

CLARITY NEEDED

These two last years the key to the international situation was in Germany. In relation to tactical problems (but not in relation to those of strategy) it could at times seem that the differences between ourselves and the Brandlerites were not great. The German proletarian vanguard has, in the meantime, allowed the key to escape from its hands. Austria is now on the order of the day. But the problem of Austria has, in spite of everything, an episodic character. The principal key to the situation of international proletariat is actually in the USSR. We assume that the policy of bureaucratic centrism and the great dangers it engenders are known to the comrades of the SAP. Are they in agreement with us? If they are in agreement even in general, how can they be in agreement at the same time with the Brandlerites who support the Stalinist policy in the USSR (which in practice means—in the entire world) and who have more than once treated us as counter-revolutionaries? One gets the impression that the leaders of the SAP, by not declaring themselves in relation to the most important and urgent problems, desire to have on their left the Bolshevik-Leninists, to their right the Brandlerites, in order to conserve, by separating the two flanks, their independence (which is not a calamity) and their lack of precision (which is very bad!)

Such a tactic is able to appear very "clever." In reality it would be ruinous. It would signify the continuation of the policy of Seydevitz in a new situation. I say this truly not for polemical purposes. On my part, I am ready to do everything to facilitate a mutual understanding and a drawing together with the comrades of the SAP. But the first condition for this is an honest political understanding.

The leaders of the SAP complain now and then that the Left Opposition poses too "mechanically" the problem of the policy of centrism in China, of the Anglo-Russian Committee, of the course of the C.I. in Spain, of the policy of Stalin in the USSR etc. In reality, the question is not one of arbitrary criteria on our part or of unmatched creeds of the faith. The question is a single and unique problem: that of the policy of the directing centrist fraction in different countries and under different con-

*The Brandler Opposition is the right wing opposition which has relations with Lovestone in America, Kilbom in Sweden and Roy in India. These sections, which were at the head of the national sections of the C.I. during the expulsion of the Left Opposition, were afterwards excluded by the C.I. in the general drive against the Right Wing during 1927-28.

ditions. We have put to the front the most important events of the last ten years in order to oppose most brutally on the basis of their experiences, the policy of Marxism to that of centrism. At the centre of our attention we hold, obviously, living political facts and real problems. But for the education of revolutionary cadres, the continuity of revolutionary thought is necessary. From the experience with the Kuo-Ming-Tang, the Canton adventure, the bloc with the English strike-breakers, etc., etc. . . . runs an uninterrupted line of centrism to the German catastrophe.

In the SAP, as in other organisations, there are thousands of workers to whom this connection is not obvious, who have never studied nor reflected on the policy of Stalin in China, in Bulgaria, or in Spain. To demand of these comrades that they recognise in a purely formal fashion the correctness of our position towards the problems enumerated above would be, in any case, senseless. A long work of propaganda cannot be accomplished at a single stroke. But it is right for us to demand of those leaders who take upon themselves the responsibility and the initiative of forming an independent proletarian party, to indicate now their attitude towards the fundamental problems of proletarian strategy and to do that, not in a general and abstract form, but on the basis of the living experience through which the present generation of the world proletariat has passed. Nor in relation to the leaders do we pose these problems mechanically. We say: "Before deciding definitely on the possibility of our collaboration, which we desire to be the closest possible, it is necessary to be quite clear whether we regard in the same manner the fundamental problems of proletarian strategy. Here are our opinions formulated at the end of the struggle in different countries. What is your attitude towards these problems? If you have not yet defined your attitude toward them, let us try to examine them in common commencing with the sharpest and most burning political problems. I sincerely believe that the posing of the problem in this fashion does not have a shade of sectarianism. Marxists have in general no other way of posing the question. It is necessary to add to this that we are ready, it goes without saying, for a practical collaboration without waiting for the definite solution of all the problems under discussion.

The comrades of the SAP, consider as indicated the early convocation of a conference of all the organisations, existing communist groups, who would respond to such an appeal. If such a conference is convoked, the Left Opposition would, I believe, participate in it in order to explain its point of view; but to expect serious results for the establishment of communist work from such a conference would be false. If it were a question of helping emigres, of defending their interests, or of some such partial political campaign, the conference would be able, perhaps in all these cases, to take on a practical appearance. But it is actually the question of working out the fundamentals of revolutionary policy for a long period. Such problems have never been solved by motley conferences called together in an improvised manner. On the contrary, the lack of political preparation, the hasty convocation of the conference in an atmosphere of helterskelter, would only be to run the risk of increasing the ideological chaos and the mutual exasperation of the different groups.

AN ANSWER TO LIVING PROBLEMS

The leading centres of the German revolutionary movement in the period which is now opening will necessarily be found among the emigres. But the ejected German comrades still feel as though they were merely camping out. Even those among them who understand theoretically the significance of the catastrophe that has taken place are not yet psychologically adapted to the new situation. Within Germany, the different groups continue to live in the inertia of yesterday. That applies also to the SAP, the most numerous but the least firm of all the communist oppositional organisations. The Left Wing of the S.A.P., in spite of the fact that its leaders have no organ of their own, has conquered the majority of the Party, removing the Seydevitz fraction. This fact demonstrates best the general direction of the development of the S.A.P. in which we have already seen the beginning of a "living cur-

(Continued on page 4)

SAVE THE LIFE OF CHEN DU SIU!

It is now some weeks since Chen du Siu was sentenced to 13 years imprisonment by the Courts of the Chinese Nationalist Government. In the last number of the Red Flag we reported the details of his trial; and his courageous defence before the Judge. Chen is 55 years old, and conditions in the jails of Chiang Kai Shek are such that his life is threatened by sentence of 13 years.

His arrest took place last October and at the same time were arrested all but two of the Left Opposition Central Committee. The Chinese and imperialist bourgeois press was jubilant at his arrest, the imperialist Shanghai Times speaking of him as "the father of Chinese Communism." Other papers described his arrest as the "most important since the drive against communism began." His sentence of 13 years is in itself a powerful tribute from the Chinese capitalists to the great work of Chen Du Siu in the struggle for Communism. Chen has been the most prominent figure in Chinese revolutionary circles for the last fifteen years.

Born in 1875 of a rich Mandarin family he carried on revolutionary activities from his youth mainly in the sphere of editing radical literary papers and in work among the youth of China, founding for this purpose the monthly called "La Junesse" (The Youth), which played a most important role in the history of the Chinese social and cultural movement. His work during the period 1916-19, known as the

period of "ideological and literary revolution" paved the way for the development of the mass movement, beginning with the anti-Japanese student demonstration of May 4th, 1919. During this time Chen was forced to resign his job in the Literature Department of the Peking University because of the opposition his activities roused among conservative circles.

The Editor of "Izvestia" on "Trotskyism."

"I was present at the conversation with comrade Kamenev when he said that he would openly declare at the Plenum of the Central Committee how they, that is, Kamenev and Zinoviev, together with Stalin decided to utilise old differences of opinion between Trotsky and Lenin, so as to keep Trotsky from the leadership of the Party after Lenin's death. Besides this I heard repeatedly from the mouths of Zinoviev and Kamenev how they invented "Trotskyism" as an actual slogan."

Karl Radet, December 25th, 1927.

At the height of the student anti-Japanese agitation Chen wrote a leaflet denouncing the treachery of the existing Peking Government for which he was imprisoned for several months. After his release he went to Shanghai where, in 1920, he founded the Chinese Communist Party. He was twice arrested during 1921-22 by the French authorities, the second time his release being secured through mass pressure of the Chinese workers. In 1922 he attended the Fourth Congress of the C.I. as the delegate from the Chinese Communist Party and did remarkable work on his return to China.

Throughout the period of the growth of the national revolutionary movement up to its defeat in 1927 Chen was general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party.

Only in 1929 did he begin to make the acquaintance of Comrade Trotsky's writings on the Chinese Communist Party and became convinced of the errors of the Stalinist policy and the correctness of the Opposition's criticisms. For this he was expelled from the Chinese Communist Party in the fall of 1929 and then worked to unite the various opposition groups then existing in China. For some time his arrest has been sought by the government and at last they were able to capture Chen. His arrest is described by a member of the Chinese Opposition as the "greatest loss sustained by the movement in the last two years."

The silence of the Stalinists, their refusal to protest against the imprisonment of our comrade, renders aid to the executioners and is a stab in the back for the Chinese revolutionary movement. The C.I. leaders by such an action stain the pages of the revolutionary movement with another infamous crime. This comrade had devoted his life to the world revolution and to the working class movement. We urge all working class organisations to protest against the sentence to the Chinese consulate, and we again ask: What is the International Labour Defence doing in the fight for Chen Du Siu's life?

WHAT DID THEY FEAR?

Gangster Methods at Anti-Fascist Congress

The much boasted Anti-Fascist Congress held in Paris on June the 4th and 5th, was the scene of violent anti-working class hooliganism on the part of the organisers of the Congress. The reply of the Stalinists to their revolutionary critics is not argument but abuse and blows. Conscious, apparently, of their political impotence they introduced into the working class movement gangster methods. We give below some examples of the treatment meted out to our comrades.

Saraceno, former editor-in-chief of "Unita," the central organ of the Italian Communist Party, possessing a regular press card, entered the congress. This comrade was taken into the cellar by the "Italian Reception Committee" and there he was forced to surrender his credentials. Before being allowed to leave he was brutally attacked by the Stalinist "Nazzieri," twenty of them against one. His glasses were broken and his face severely bruised.

Comrade Atlan was unable to obtain his delegates card at Grange-aux Belles and appeared at the Pleyel Hall on the first day of the Congress. His credentials were wrested from him, he was drawn into a corner of the Hall, violently assaulted and thrown into the street. Atlan returned to the attack and gained entry into the Hall. Under the pretence of investigating his credentials the officials drew him into a small retreat, closed the door, and brutally beat him. To the protests of some of those delegates that witnessed this the excuse was made that Atlan was a police spy.

Two delegates were thrown out immediately after entering, simply because they were recognised as members of the Left Opposition. Many of our comrades were imprisoned in the cellar. It was only after the police had arrested the group of Left Oppositionists who came to the Congress to demand their release and to protest against the treatment accorded them, that our comrades were freed.

An attempt was made to excuse our exclusion from the Congress by saying that the Left Opposition represented nobody. Even if this were true it would not justify such methods being employed. But there is no truth in this statement as the Left Opposition were delegates from a large number of working-class organisations, some of which are given below.

Spain—Spanish Section of the International Left Opposition, Autonomous Building Workers Trade Union, Oil Workers Trade Union of Astillero, United Trade Union of Ilerena.

Belgium—Belgium Section of the L. O., Knights of Labour (Gilly Miners) Delegation from a meeting of 500.

Greece—Greek Section of the L. O. General Federation of wounded War Victims; Union of War Veterans; Union of Widows and Orphans; Woodworkers Trade Union of Athens, Barbers Trade Union of Athens; Bakers Trade Union of Athens.

Germany—German Section of the L. O.

Italy—Italian Section of the L. O.

France—French Section of the L. O. Amsterdam Committee, Charente-Inferieure (Oleron); Public meeting in Lille, Red Aid (Cavigny Section); Railroad workers; Indo-Chinese Group of the Paris district; Trade Union Section, Committee for the defence of l'Humanite, and various other sections of the Red Aid and workers' meetings.

It is worth noting that one of the organisations represented by us, the General Federation of Disabled War Victims of Athens consists of Sixty thousand members.

The viewpoint of the Left Opposition was set out in a very full document in which were analysed not only the nature and role of Fascism, and the treachery of Social-Democracy, but also

the tragic blunders of the C.I. leadership in Germany. We are unable to publish this document in full, but we give below the proposals of the International Left Opposition to the revolutionary workers at the Congress.

1. To immediately accept the proposals of the 2nd International for an agreement on an international scale. Such an agreement does not exclude, but demands, the concrete application of the slogans and the methods for each particular country.
2. To condemn the formula of the "united front from below only," which means the rejection of the united front generally.
3. To reject and to condemn the theory of "social-fascism."
4. In no case and under no condition to renounce the right to criticise the temporary ally.
5. To re-establish freedom of discussion and election within the Communist parties and all organisations under their control and those that make up the Anti-Fascist Congress.
6. To renounce the policy of independent Communist trade union organisations and to participate actively in the mass trade unions.
7. To condemn the infamous competition with Fascism which was expressed by such slogans as "for national liberation," and the "peoples revolution."
8. To renounce the theory of socialism in one country, which nourishes petty-bourgeois nationalist tendencies, and weakens the working-class in the struggle against Fascism.
9. To mobilise the European proletariat against Versailles and against anti-Versailles chauvinism under the banner of the Soviet United States of Europe.
10. To prepare through an open and honest discussion the convening of an extraordinary Congress of each section of the C.I. within the period of one month, to examine the experience of the struggle with counter-revolution and to elaborate a programme of action for the future.
11. To convene a democratically prepared Congress of the C.I. within a period of two months.
12. Re-instate the Left Opposition into the ranks of the C.I., its sections and all the organisations that it controls.

The statement also drew attention to the situation in Austria which was not considered seriously by the Congress. Referring to the present position in Russia, the statement warned that "The situation in the first Workers' State has never been so tense as at present... The October Revolution has need of militants who fearlessly speak the truth, even if it is harsh, but who nevertheless maintain an unshakeable loyalty to the Soviet Union."

ON ZINOVIEV & KAMENEV

So they have once more capitulated. The Soviet press reports it triumphantly and the T.A.S.S. communicates the capitulation to the whole world. Meanwhile, it is hard to conceive of a fact which more mercilessly compromises not only the capitulators themselves but also the regime which requires such sacrifices. Broken backbones can no longer serve as props. And the Stalinist apparatus has become a machine for crushing backbones.

Zinoviev and Kamenev were subjected a few months before to expulsion from the party and exile not because of any oppositional activity of their own, but because of "knowledge of and failure to report" oppositional activity of the Right wing. At all events, this was only the formal cause. The real reason was the fact that in the atmosphere of general discontentment, Zinoviev and Kamenev constituted a danger. They did, it is true, capitulate back in January 1928. But to whom? To the anonymous bureaucracy passing under the name of the party. Today, such a capitulation has lost all value. One must acknowledge the infallibility of Stalin in order to have the right to live and breathe politically. Zinoviev and Kamenev simply could not force themselves to such a moral prostration. They had been in the Lenin staff too long for that, too well did they know Stalin, his role in the past and his real calibre. The oath of personal fidelity to Stalin stuck in their throats. And that was just why they were expelled.

It is not hard to imagine what took place afterwards behind the scenes. For some time now the apparatus has been calculating that Stalin's leadership is too dear. Stalin himself feels it. It didn't go, of course, without the meditation and humble intercession on the part of the so-called "old Bolsheviks" on the one side, and their cynical exhortations on the other. "Acknowledge his genius—that costs very little nowadays—and come back to Moscow: after all it is better to be in the party." And Zinoviev and Kamenev "acknowledged," that is, they finally sank down into the depths. Their personal fate is profoundly tragic. If the future historian will aim to show how pitilessly the epochs of great convulsions devastate men, he will bring forward the example of Zinoviev and Kamenev . . .

At the time of the first capitulation they could still foster the illusion: "Work in the party," "Contact with the party," "Influence upon the masses." To-day there is not even a trace of these illusions left. Zinoviev and Kamenev do not return from the opposition to the party, but merely from exile to Moscow. Stalin needs their return for the selfsame purpose as he needed the appearance of Bucharin and Rykov on the tribune during the celebration of May Day: thereby the void around the "leader" is, if not filled up, then at least concealed.

The failure of Zinoviev's and Kamenev's first capitulation, which had a political character, proved to be a relentless, and thereby an all the more effective demonstration of the correctness of the Left Opposition: the party can be served only by serving its ideas and not its devastated apparatus. The second capitulation, which has a purely personal character, strengthens that conclusion from the opposite end. Like Gogol's hero, Stalin gathers together dead souls for want of the living. The salvaging of the heritage of Bolshevism, the training up of a new revolutionary succession, remains not only the historical task but also a lofty privilege of the Left Opposition.

Prinkipo, 23rd May, 1933.

LEON TROTSKY.

INFORMATION :

The *Daily Worker*, in reporting the "comradely discussion" between Brockway and Pollitt at the Conway Hall on July 19th, stated that the discussion was opened by two "thinly-disguised" Trotskyists. Knowing the *Daily Worker's* desire for exactitude, and dislike of exaggeration, we are sure the information that neither of these comrades is a member of the Left Opposition will be appreciated. We have no need to disguise even "thinly," our representatives.

Our speakers' names were handed to the chairman but "democratically" ignored.

"Answer or be branded—"

The following statement in heavy print appeared in the *Daily Worker* of Thursday June 15th, 1933:—

WHY DOESN'T WESTWOOD REPLY?

In last Saturday's issue of the *Daily Worker* in a leading article we dealt with a statement made by Mr. Joe Westwood, Under Secretary for State in the Labour Government, in a speech at W. Stirling, that he knew the names of Agents Provocateurs in the pay of Scotland Yard who were inside the ranks of the Communist Party.

In this article we demanded that Westwood make known the names of the spies. He has remained silent. We are prepared to publish any statement Westwood cares to make on this important issue to the working-class movement.

Westwood must answer or be branded as a traitor to the working-class.

The British Section of the International Left Opposition has had occasion to send the following letter with reference to an applicant for membership to our organisation:—

The Secretary, C.P.G.B., Dear Comrade, We have received an application for membership from — who was at one time a member of the Party.

— was, we understand, expelled from the Party on the charge of "political unreliability." The exact basis for this charge we do not know although there seems to be some suggestion that he was connected with the authorities. Naturally we are anxious to avoid contact with people of this character but unless we have definite information we cannot act.

It is to your interest and the interests of the working-class movement that any charges that you have against — should be placed at the disposal of any organisation with which he seeks to associate. We therefore request that any information you have about — be given us by interview or by letter so that we can decide upon acceptance or rejection in full knowledge of the facts.

An early reply would be appreciated.

Yours, etc.

This letter was delivered by hand. It was sent on April 7th, 1933. We have received no reply, in spite of repeated reminders.

(Continued from page 2).

rent." Nor can one be blind to the fact that the S.A.P. represents even now the raw material of communism. Moreover, the situation has radically changed: on the order of the day are not the tasks of immediate combat but a long work of preparation under conditions of illegality. The less the organisation is formed ideologically, the less is it able to resist the factors of destruction (disillusionment, fatigue, repression, agitation of other groups, etc . . .) Only ideologically tempered cadres will be able to endure in the coming period the counterblows of adverse forecast.

The Left Opposition, nor can there be any doubt on this point, is ready to do everything within its power to facilitate a mutual understanding with the S.A.P. The technical forms for the examination of litigious or unresolved problems are not difficult to find; discussion bulletin, common theoretical journal, a series of discussions at the centre and within the groups.

I think that it is necessary to pose with perseverance these problems before each member of the S. A. P.

Prinkipo, 27 April, 1933

L. TROTSKY.

PUBLICATION AND BOOK NOTES

Leon Trotsky's Copenhagen speech on "The Russian Revolution" has been published in full by the Labour Literature Department, price 6d. Copies can be obtained by writing direct to the Labour Literature Department, Lanark House, Seven Sisters Road, London, N.4.

Practically all our stock of books by Leon Trotsky has been exhausted. Copies of "What Next in Germany," (2/-), "The Permanent Revolution," (2/6), "The Only Road," (1/6), "The Strategy of the World Revolution" (1/6), and "Communism and Syndicalism," (10d), can be obtained by writing direct to "The Pioneer Publishers," 84 East 10th Street, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.

The following pamphlets by Leon Trotsky are available:

"Letter to a German Worker." Written in December 1931 and laying down clearly the danger of Fascism. Post Free 2d.

"The Alarm Cry." The present situation in the U.S.S.R., (Post free 3d).

"Conversation with a Social-Democratic Worker Concerning the United Front of Defence." is sold out.

We also have a few copies of number one of the "Red Flag" containing L. Trotsky's "Tragedy of the German Proletariat" and of number two in which is L. Trotsky's "Austria Next in Order." Post Free 3d. per copy.

RED FLAG RATES

Literature sellers can obtain not less than a dozen copies for resale at the rate of 8d. per dz.

SUBSCRIPTION RATE—One shilling and sixpence per twelve issues post free.

A few copies of L. Trotsky's book on Germany, "What Next?", are available in cloth covers, price 4/3d, post free.

WHERE THE "RED FLAG" CAN BE OBTAINED.

HENDERSON'S, 66, CHARING CROSS ROAD, W.C.1.

LAHR'S, 68 RED LION STREET, HOLLORN.

F. WESTROPE, 1, SOUTH END ROAD, N.W.3.

H. STRAUSSBERG, 10, COITIC STREET, W.C.1.

THE NORTHERN PUBLISHING SOCIETY, 22, RUSSELL STREET, MANCHESTER.

LAHR'S, 21 STEPHEN STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD.

F. MAITLAND, BOOKSHOP, 11 WEST NICOLSON STREET, EDINBURGH.

SOCIALIST BOOKSHOP, AMEN CORNER, 68 LUDGATE HILL.

THE SOVIET UNION?

What is the present position in Russia?

What are the results of the first 5 year Plan and the perspectives for the second Plan?

All these points and many others are dealt with by

LEON TROTSKY

in our pamphlet

THE ALARM CRY

Price 2d.

Post Free 3d.

Get Your Copy NOW!

NOTICE TO WORKERS' ORGANISATIONS.

Speakers are available to address Co-Operative Guilds, Trade Union Branches, I. L. P. Branches and working class political societies at any time on the policy and history of the Left Opposition. All requests for speakers should be sent to H. Dewar, 36 West Side, Clapham Common, S.W.4.

Published by H. Dewar, 36 West Side, Clapham Common, S.W.4.

Printed by B.N., and set by H. ROBIN (T.U.), 48 Mile End Road, E.1.