

RED FLAG

Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

NUMBER 1. VOL. 2.

TWO-PENCE.

NOVEMBER 1934.

SPAIN and the BRITISH LEFT

On Oct the 4th the General Strike was called in Spain: within a few hours armed conflict had begun which soon spread throughout the Republic, involving a considerable portion of the Spanish workers. The workers suffered a set-back; not permanent, nor necessarily long-lasting in its effects; for, short-lived though the main resistance was, it lasted long enough to unsettle seriously the Government, to display the readiness of the workers to fight in defence of their organisations and to show the effect, even of such a limited armed struggle, upon the soldiers who in many cases were unwilling to fire upon their class brothers and, in one or two instances sided with the workers. But insurrection demands moral and material preparation; demands definite organisational links between the workers and the armed forces: demands above all a leadership trained in the art of insurrection and enjoying the fullest support and confidence of the bulk of the workers. Lack of these things resulted in temporary defeat for the Spanish workers and in the loss of thousands of their best and bravest fighters. The causes of defeat must be faced and understood if future victory is to be assured.

The actual fighting is not yet ended. The miners of the Asturias are still unconquered and with their rifles hold their mountain strongholds against the aeroplanes, tanks and artillery of the State. Reports filtering through tell of the heaps of shot and mutilated workers; the tortured women; the prisoners brutally treated and starved by the Spanish Foreign Legion, troops sent by the "cultured" bourgeoisie against the miners.

Alone the miners of the Asturias cannot decisively affect the course of events in Spain. Vital power rests with the workers in the Capital and in the main industrial towns. The speedy re-formation of their ranks under revolutionary leadership is a vital condition for success. In the meantime the British workers must do all in their power to save the lives of those at present in the prisons of reaction.

It appears, from newspaper reports, that, in the early stages of the struggle at least, the Anarchists and the Syndicalists stood aside. Spain has for long been the stronghold of "Anarcho-Syndicalism" and

although the conditions which gave it birth and which nourished it are slowly dying. Anarchism still numbers within its ranks a large section of the Spanish workers, among them many of the bravest. If courage alone could have overthrown the autocracy the anarchists would have accomplished this many years ago; but courage of itself is insufficient. Without theoretical clarity courage can achieve nothing of lasting value. Spain shows this for with in the last two-and-a-half years the anarchists have organised three risings, all unsuccessful despite the great heroism of the participants. The anarchists sought to overthrow capitalism by proclaiming the "Free Republic" and by defending captured buildings vainly and hopelessly against the superior forces of the State. Anarchism feeds upon the backwardness of Spain, upon the remnants of feudal economy upon the isolation of its districts, upon the slowness of its industrial and transport development in the priest-ridden, landlord-ruled interior. The essence of anarchism belongs to the days of the undeveloped State power and weak capitalist economy: it stands for the forced rising, for shock tactics, for guerrilla warfare in which the class conscious minority throws itself against the State forces whilst the mass of the workers remain indifferent or, not fully grasping the implications of the battle, stand aside. There is something noble in this folly but its results are disastrous, for over the last twenty years the lives and liberties of the best of the Spanish workers have been sacrificed without the overthrow of the capitalists being any nearer accomplishment.

◇ ◇ ◇

Anarchism, as a school of political thought, has never aroused any response from the British workers. The modern British proletariat was born with the heavy industries; and for a hundred and fifty years the heavy industries have been the basis of British economy. All else has rested on them and these circumstances have moulded the forms of working class industrial and political organisations. Syndicalism - in other countries the industrial echo of anarchism - found some support here in pre-war days but then only in the shape of a demand for more centralised unions and for general strike action. Even in the small-shop industries where

conditions create the anarchist outlook the weight of the heavier industrial organisations has been sufficient to tow in their wake these small-shop workers. It is interesting, then, to find today resemblances to anarchist thought among sections of the British workingclass movement.

With certain important differences and some exceptions the revolutionary section of the working class movement in this country embodies some of the worst features of anarchistic thought. Lenin, attacking similar weaknesses, called them "an infantile disorder". But the Communist Movement has grown up since then, in years at any rate. Childish complaints in grown-ups are not only unusual; they are more serious. So with the Communists of today. The infantile disorders of years ago have come out in the adult; they have become almost incurable and may easily prove fatal. For want of a better term we can call it anarchism, or communist-anarchism. This definition is none too exact but at least the term anarchism has the virtue of being widely associated in the minds of the workers with irresponsible and dangerous actions.

Elements who provide material for movements demonstrating anarchistic tendencies are the long term unemployed - more especially in London where the influences of the workers industrial organisations are more dispersed - and intermediate groups like the students. These are separated by occupation, or lack of it, from the collective thinking and organisation of the workers and are therefore an easy prey to those offering short-cuts to revolution. Attached to the mass movement such elements can be valuable and useful and overcome, through this association and through experience, the weaknesses arising from the position they occupy in society. But, attached to the Communist Party and the left movement generally, their faults find free expression, become in fact a political virtue.

Anarchism substitutes for the winning of the masses to revolutionary struggle the heroic and, as they hope, the electrifying action of the minority. Ignoring the relationship of classes, the favourable-ness or unfavourableness of the situation, the ebb and flow of mass feeling, they rely upon shock and surprise and upon the purely military action of the leading groups. The "Communist-Anarchists" in this country put in the place of serious and sustained effort to win the masses, stunts, publicity, and slogans. Its hosts of unrepresentative committees are all meant to replace the existing mass organisations; its frantic calls and readiness to engage the enemy in action under the most helpless circumstances are meant to overcome the slowness of the masses' reviving confidence and readiness for struggle. The Communist Party, a section of the I. L. P. and some of the Socialist youth may get their phraseology from the Bolsheviks but they get their actions from the anarchists.

This would not matter if the real work was being done elsewhere. It is not. Southport Labour Party

Conference showed the terrible weakness of the left wing of the working class movement. The feeling is growing among the trade unionists and labour party members that more militant action is needed if British workers are to be saved from the fate of their continental comrades. The elements for the building of a strong revolutionary section of the movement are there or in the process of growth. And the fact which holds back the Left and hampers its work is the anarchistic propaganda and actions of the Communist Party and those directly or indirectly under its influence, propaganda and activities which make a strong appeal to many of the Socialist youth. It can be understood, for it arises from resentment against the bureaucracy of Labour and from impatience with the older trade union workers who are still under the influence of their Liberal leaders. The learning of a few phrases, the shouting of a few slogans - these are the qualifications for a revolutionary today among the elect of the C.P.G.B. and the youth easily responds to this, finding that it provides an easy substitute for the experience and painfully acquired knowledge of the Socialist workers. It is easy to understand, but this corruption of the naturally progressive character of youth will be fatal for the movement unless it is checked. There is no short-cut to an understanding of the science of revolution; it is to be found in the writings of Marx and Engels, of Lenin and of Trotsky, men who embodied in their lives and their work the compressed experience of the working class during some of its most important actions, and who built these experiences into the body of doctrine which today is variously called Marxism or Communism. Only by building on their experiences and by check-up policies and programmes with the living needs and actions of the workers can revolutionary leadership be created.

The ruthless sweep of reaction across Europe and the rise of Fascism in this country, protected by the State, provide revolutionaries with very urgent and real issues upon which to win following among the trade unionists, the co-operators and the Labour workers. But it is in this connection that "Communist-Anarchism" is most pronounced and can, if allowed to continue, wreak the most harm. The mistake made is in the effort to crush Fascism with the vanguard alone, or rather, with the vanguard and any motley following it can collect. Instead, the revolutionary section should be formulating the policy for the movement as a whole, and winning support for this policy.

Fascism cannot be beaten by the communists alone, however big a crowd they muster for the battle. A crowd is always a crowd, and, against organised forces of little use. The fascists are organised and on military lines. True they are outnumbered by the workers, hopelessly so; but numbers without organisation are useless in the long run. The power of the workers rests, not just in their superior numbers, but in the effective organisation of their numbers. Fascism can be

rendered impotent, can be prevented from getting mass support only if the workers' organisations can be swung into the fight for class power; if they can so take up the battles of the workers and so boldly raise the issues of power that the bulk of the population, including a section of the middle-class, can be swayed to their side. To this end must revolutionary policy be directed to helping the workers movement find the correct path and the correct methods of struggle and so win their respect and confidence, aided by the commonly-shared experiences.

Not only is this not being done; the reverse policy is being applied. Breaking up "Blackshirt" meetings, chasing the Fascists off the streets, selling rolls of toilet paper carrying Mosley's portrait, - these are the methods of undergraduates and high-school boys, not of serious revolutionaries. Setting up Anti-Fascist Committees means, in most cases, the separation of the militant workers from the main body of the workers. No "Anti-Fascist" movement can give permanent results, not only because it tends to move away from the mass organisations with this hampering conservatism, but also because opposition to Fascism is not a policy but a protest. The workers have to take the road to power; they must get the will for that task, they must re-form their ranks for that purpose, they must fashion the means and the weapons. None can guide them correctly to this but revolutionaries. The "Anti Fascists" are hindering the really vital work.

The highest and only success achieved by the "AntiFascists" was the Hyde Park Counter Demonstration. The crowd was large, unusually so for an unofficial demonstration. It astounded even the ever hopeful C. P. G. B. members. So large that the Daily Worker found its overworked adjectives and superlatives for once hopelessly inadequate. But when the shouting and the tumult has died away, what remains? Was it really a "blow to Mosley"? Or a "working class victory"? This apparently great achievement for the "Anti-Fascist" movement in reality proves beyond all doubt that our criticisms are justified. The demonstration, good and cheering though it was in some ways, advanced the workers' fight against fascism hardly at all.

Why should it? A demonstration in itself can accomplish nothing. It can open a campaign, it can forward a campaign, it can show the strength of certain forces, but in itself it ends when the crowd disperses and the press publicity has ended. Had it been part of a sustained effort towards a concrete end it could have been splendid. But it wasn't, for there is no sustained campaign going on.

The C.P.G.B., the I.L.P., the AntiFascists generally, have no policy to offer the workers movement in the fight against fascism save, as we have said, the policy of "antifascism". This was shown at the conference of London Labour on Fascism held a few weeks after the Hyde Park demonstration. This conference represented the labour movement in the Capital City of the British Empire. The

delegates came from the trade unions, the co-operative guilds and the local labour parties. Here was an opportunity to win the key section of the British working class movement to a forward policy. The opportunity was lost.

A third of the conference were against the policy of the Labour and trade Union leadership as set out in the official resolution. At least another third could have been won, given a serious, reasoned statement of what had to be done. No matter how determined the platform had been to stifle discussion they could not have stood against the will of conference had it been organised and led. The platform, actually, lost control of the conference within half an hour of its opening. They regained it as the conference went on, and secured a two thirds majority for their resolution, not through their strength but through the follies and stupidities of the "left" and because, as the conference went on, it was revealed that the loud critics of the leaders had no programme themselves. Seventeen out of nineteen speakers were from the left, from the Socialist League, the C. P. G. B., the I. L. P., or the supporters of these bodies. From the seventeen came not one definite proposal, - not one! No one out of the whole conference had a policy to put before it. The Daily Worker and the New Leader were on sale at the Conference but a careful examination of their columns revealed no signs of a policy on which the fight at the conference could be based. The present parties which claim the right to the revolutionary heritage are bankrupt, of ideas as well as of following; as bankrupt as the reformism they denounce.

<> <> <>

That the disease of "Left wing Communism" is now almost incurable can be seen in the recent Borough Council Elections. We will refrain from comment upon the results achieved by the C. P. and the I. L. P. save to point to Poplar where two I. L. P. Councillors, much-boasted leaders of the "AntiFascist" struggle in the East End district, were swept out by the Labour candidates and received a hundred or so votes in an area almost entirely proletarian. This is, in itself, a striking commentary upon the whole policy of the "Anti-Fascists" and of the Lefts generally.

The Communist Party decided - what a falling off is here! - to withdraw their candidates in some areas and, in general, to support Labour, attaching to this support some vague conditions, of which little or nothing was heard as the elections proceeded. But they kept their candidates in many Boroughs. Which meant that they benefitted not at all from the change in tactics; the old policy asserted itself sufficiently strongly to make useless the withdrawals. For unless it be national and general, support for the Labour Party, as a step towards unity and the winning of the Labour workers, is useless.

This change in policy, partial though it be, nevertheless is further confession that our much-abused

continued on page 14.

TROTSKY ON BRITAIN. EXTRACT NUMBER I.

THE GENERAL ELECTION of 1931

A LETTER TO AN ENGLISH COMRADE.

Dear Comrade:

One of my English friends wrote to me on the 9th of October, prior to the parliamentary elections, about the fast growth of the Communist Party, and of a certain approach of the rank and file members in the I. L. P. towards Communism. My correspondent speaks also of a regrowth of the Minority Movement in the trade unions and the growing leadership of the same Minority in the sporadic strike movements. These isolated instances in the background of the world crisis and the national crisis which England is going through allows us to accept the idea that in the last two years there has been a strengthening of the Communist Party. The elections brought an absolute disillusionment in this respect. Of the many hundreds of thousands of votes which the Labourites lost, the Party at best swung to its support 20,000, which is, in consideration of the increased total number of voters, an invalid conjunctural fluctuation, and not by any means a serious political conquest. Where is the influence of the Party among the unemployed? Among the coal miners? Among the young generation of workers who, for the first time, voted? Actually, the election results are a horrible condemnation of the policies of the Party and the Comintern.

I have observed very little the tactics of the British Party during the last year and I do not want to give judgment about what it learned, or whether it really learned anything. However, it is clear to me that independent from its recent and latest errors, the Communist Party is paying by its impotence of the past year, for the shameful and criminal politics of the Comintern, bound up with the Anglo-Russian Committee and later with the "Third Period". These errors were ruinous especially for England.

TRADITIONS OF THE ENGLISH PROLETARIAT

It surprises one anew, what a terrible load of humiliation, conservatism, bigotry, conciliation, respect to the sumptuous, to titles, to riches, to the Crown, drags in its thoughts the English working class which is at the same time capable of grand revolutionary insurrections (Chartism, pre-war movements of 1911, movements following the war, the strike movements of 1926).

The English proletariat, the oldest, with the most traditions, is, in its thinking methods, most empirical, carries in its chest two souls, and turns, as it were, with two faces to historical events. The contemptible mercenary and servile bureaucrats of the Trade Unions and the Labour party give expression to all that is rotten, humiliating, serf-like and feudal in the British working class. Against this, the tasks of the Communist Party consist in giving expression to the potential revolutionary

qualities of the British working class, which is very great and capable of developing immense explosive powers. But in the very critical period of British history, 1925-1927, all the policies of the British Communist Party and the Comintern consisted in the slave-like assimilation of the Trade Union leadership, its idealization, blotting out its treason, and fastening the confidence of the working class to it. The young British Communist Party was because of this deeply demoralised. The whole authority of the October Revolution, U. S. S. R., Bolshevism, was in this year attached to the support and solidification of the conservative and servile tendencies of the British working class.

THE LABOURITES USE THE STALINITES

After the Labourites had utilized the Stalinites to the end and kicked them aside, the chapter of Trade Unionism was mechanically substituted under the caption of the ultra-Left Jump to the glory of the "Third Period". The slogan of "Class against Class" was now issued, interpreted as a slogan of the struggle of a handful of Communists against the "social fascist" proletariat. When yesterday Purcell and Cook were friends and trustworthy allies of the Soviet Union, today the workers who voted for Purcell and Cook transformed themselves into class enemies. This is the political orbit of the British Communist Party, or, rather, of the Communist International. Can we expect another surer way to trample the prestige of Communism and to undermine the confidence of the Party by the awakening workers?

The Moscow bureaucracy of the C. I. at every step runs against a blind alley with its nose, commands a turn either to the Left or to the Right. That is not difficult. All these Kuusinen, Manuilskys, Losovskys, etc., are apparatus men, free not only of serious Marxian training and revolutionary horizon, but also - and this is the important thing - from every control of the masses. Its politics has a pure chancery character. A tactical turn is for them only a new circular. The C. C. of the British Communist Party, according to its strength, carries out the orders. But all of these circulars, through the corresponding politics, transport themselves into the consciousness of the workers. The bureaucratic bankrupts believe that one can mechanically fasten our leadership, on to the working class: on the one side with the aid of cash and repression, on the other side with the help of abrupt leaps, the blotting out of traces, with lies and calumnies. But this is totally untrue.

The English workers think slowly, since their consciousness is filled with the rubbish of centuries. But they think. Single articles, appeals, slogans, generally pass them by unnoticed. However, whole

periods of politics (Anglo-Russian Committee, "Third Period") in no respect pass without a trace, at least, with the most progressive, militant, critical and revolutionary section of the working class. When one imagines the education of the revolutionary consciousness as the cutting of threads on a screw, one must say that the leadership of the Comintern, at each time, does not employ the proper tool nor proper calibre, and not in the direction necessary, thereby breaking the grooves, crumbling and demolishing. Without the smallest exaggeration one can confirm that from 1923, (for England especially from 1925) had the Comintern not existed, we would have today in England an incomparably more important revolutionary party. The last elections illustrate with power that frightful conviction.

TASKS OF THE BRITISH LEFT OPPOSITION

Here begins the task of the Left Opposition. The English Communists, among whom are naturally many devoted, honest, self-sacrificing revolutionaries, cannot but be discouraged with the results of a decade of activity, and that in the exclusively opportune conditions. Pessimism and indifference can also take hold of very good revolutionaries when they do not understand the causes of their own weaknesses, nor find the way out. Criticism, i.e., in the light of Marxism that openly illuminates the path of the Party, its zig-zags, its errors, the theoretical roots of these errors - that is the foremost and necessary condition for the regeneration of the Party. It is especially necessary, when this has not been done, to begin the publication of the most important documents of the International Left Opposition concerning the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee. This is the point of departure for the English Left wing.

The Left Opposition in England, just as Communism generally, has the right to count upon a promising future: British capitalism falls from great historical heights to an abyss - that is clear to all. One can, with assuredness, say that the recent elections represent the last gigantic rise of the natural 'grandeur' of the British bourgeoisie. However, it is the rise of a dying lamp. For these elections, official English politics will in the coming period pay heavily.

The bankruptcy of the great national heroes of the three parties, just as the bankruptcy of British capitalism, are absolutely inevitable. Despite all obstacles from the C. I., the mole of the British revolution borrows much too good its earthly path. One has every right to hope that these elections are the last rise of reliance of the millions of workers on the capitalists, lords, intellectuals, educated and rich persons, those united with MacDonald and the Sunday Pudding. These gentlemen will find no secret. The real secret is this: the Proletarian Revolution. Just as the actual elections prepare the smash of conservative and servile soul of the

English proletariat, it will be followed by the powerful blossom of their revolutionary soul.

Yet, immediately the victory of the conservatives brings heavy trials for the English proletariat and the deepening of international dangers. Especially does this endanger the U. S. S. R. Here we can see what little aid was brought to the U. S. S. R. through the uninterrupted cry for her "defence". For a period of two or three years, one expected this defence from Purcell, Hicks, Citrine and later this defence was taken up by the Communist Party against the "social-fascist" proletariat. And, now, it has in the defence of the U. S. S. R. all in all received 70,000 votes. All that the Left Opposition demanded, the rupture of the shameful block with Purcell, was charged by Stalin as a refusal to defend the U. S. S. R. from British imperialism. Now we can draw the balance: Nobody has given such service to the expiring British Imperialism as the Stalin school. Of course, the chief of this school earned two orders of the Garter.

The British Left Opposition must begin systematic work. You must establish our staff-centre though a small one. You must build your own publication, even on a modest scale... It is necessary to have a steady, uninterrupted activity, analysis, critique and propaganda. It is necessary to educate our cadres, although in the first stages few. The fundamental power of history is in our favour. When, in England, more so than elsewhere, Communism in a short time can conquer the consciousness of the wide masses, so can conquer, in the same short time, within the Communist movement, the supremacy of the ideas of the Left Opposition, that is, the ideas of Marx and Lenin. I sincerely wish our British friends success on this path.

With best Communist greetings,
Yours,

L. TROTSKY.

Kadikoy, November 10th, 1931

**You Should Read:
Forward Against Fascism
and
The Immediate Programme**
PRICE ONE PENNY.

BACK NUMBERS OF THE RED FLAG ARE
OBTAINABLE PRICE THREE-HALFPENCE
Post free.

Order all literature from :

H. DEWAR,

25/3, Robinson Road,

London, S. W. 17.

THE FRENCH LEAGUE & THE SOCIALIST PARTY

THE crisis of the democratic state of the bourgeoisie necessarily also signifies a crisis of the social democratic party. This interdependence must be pondered and thoroughly analyzed. The passage of the bourgeoisie from the parliamentary to the Bonapartist regime does not yet finally exclude the social democracy from the legal combination of forces upon which the government of capital reposes. As is known, Schleicher, in his time, sought the support of the trade unions. Through the medium of his Marquet, Doumergue naturally negotiates with Jouhaux and Co. Langeron, white baton in hand, indicates the road to both Fascists and Socialists. To the extent that the socialist party is aware of the dependence of the Bonapartist equilibrium upon its own existence, it too still relies, so far as its leadership goes, upon this equilibrium, it pronounces itself against revolutionary fighting methods, it stigmatizes Marxism with the sobriquet of "Blanquism", it preaches the almost Tolstoian doctrine of "Resist not evil with violence". Only, this policy is just as unstable as the Bonapartist regime itself, with whose aid the bourgeoisie seeks to ward off more radical solutions.

The essence of the democratic state consists, as is known, in that everybody has the right to say and to write what he will, but that in all important questions the final word rests with the big property owners. This result is attained by means of a complex system of partial concessions ("reforms"), illusion, corruption, deceit and intimidation. When the economic possibility of partial concessions ("reforms") has been exhausted, the social democracy ceases to be the "main political support of the bourgeoisie". This means: capital can then no longer rest upon a domesticated "public opinion"; it requires a (Bonapartist) state apparatus independent of the masses.

Paralleling this shift in the state system, important shifts take place within the social democracy. With the decline of the epoch of reformism (especially during the post-war decade), the internal regime of the social democracy is a reproduction of the regime of bourgeois democracy: every party member can say and think what he will; but the decisions are made by the summits of the apparatus closely bound up with the state. To the extent that the bourgeoisie loses the possibility of ruling with the support of the public opinion of the exploited, the social democratic leaders lose the possibility of directing the public opinion of their own party. But the reformist leaders, unlike the leaders of the bourgeoisie, have no coercive apparatus at their disposal. To the extent therefore that parliamentary democracy is exhausted, the internal democracy of the socialist party, contrariwise, becomes more and more of a reality.

The crisis of the democratic state and the crisis of the social democratic party develop in parallel,

but opposite directions. Whereas the state marches towards Fascism across the bonapartist stage, the socialist party approaches a life and death struggle with Fascism a "loyal", quasi-parliamentary opposition to the Bonapartist state. An understanding of this dialectic of the reciprocal relations between bourgeois state and social democracy is an indisputable prerequisite for the correct revolutionary policy: this is just the question on which the Stalinists broke their necks.

In the Bonapartist stage through which France is at present passing, the leaders of the social democratic party are endeavouring with all their might to remain within the limits of (Bonapartist!) legality. They do not give up the hope that an improvement of the economic conjuncture and other favourable circumstances will lead to the restoration of the parliamentary state. Just the same, the experience of Italy, Germany, and Austria compels them to count upon the other, less alluring perspective against which they would like to insure themselves. They are afraid of detaching themselves from the masses who demand a fight against Fascism and await guidance. Thus the socialist apparatus gets caught in a vice of a violent contradiction. On the one hand, it proceeds in its struggle against the radicalization of the masses to the downright preaching of Tolstoianism: "Violence only begets violence; against brass knuckles and revolvers we must oppose . . . wisdom and prudence." On the other hand, it talks about dictatorship of the proletariat, general strike, etc., and betakes itself to the road of the united front policy. In the apparatus itself a stratification takes place at the same time. The "Left wingers" acquire an ever greater popularity. The official leaders are compelled to rest their Right arm on Doumergue ("legality" at all costs!) and their Left on Marceau Pivert, Just, etc. But the objective situation is not likely to preserve such an equilibrium. Let us repeat: THE PRESENT CONDITION OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY IS STILL MORE UNSTABLE THAN THE PREVENTATIVE-BONAPARTIST STATE REGIME.

There can be no more devastating mistake in politics than to operate with ready-made conceptions which relate to the yesterday and to yesterday's relationship of forces. When, for example, the leadership of the socialist party reduces its task to the demand for parliamentary elections, it is transferring politics from the realm of reality to the realm of shadows. "Parliament", "government", "elections" to-day no longer have any of the content they possessed before the capitulation of the parliamentary regime on February 6. Elections by themselves cannot produce a shift in the centre of gravity of power; for this is required a Leftward shift of the masses, capable of completely abrogating and effacing the results of the rightward shift of February 6.

But a mistake of exactly the same kind is made by those comrades who, in appraising the socialist party, themselves operate with the ready-made formulæ of yesterday: "reformism", "Second International", "political support of the bourgeoisie". Are these definitions correct? Yes and no. More no than yes. The old definition of the social democracy corresponds still less to the facts than the definition of the present state as a "parliamentary democratic republic". It would be false to contend that there is "nothing" left of parliamentarism in France. Under certain conditions even a temporary relapse into parliamentarism is possible (just as a man in death agony usually still retains a glimmer of consciousness). However, the general evolution as a whole is already proceeding AWAY FROM parliamentarism. Were we to give a definition of the present French state that more closely approximates reality, we should have to say: "preventive-Bonapartist regime, garbed in the desolated form of the parliamentary state, and veering between the not yet strong enough camp of the Fascist regime and the insufficiently conscious camp of the proletarian state" Only such a DIALECTICAL definition can offer the basis for a correct policy.

But the same laws of dialectical thinking hold also for the socialist party which, as has already been said, shares the fate of the democratic state, only in the reverse direction. To which should be added, that to a substantial degree, thanks to the experience of Germany and Austria, the evolution of the socialist party even outstrips the evolution of the state to a certain extent: thus the split with the Neos preceded the coup d'etat of February 6 by several months. Naturally it would be a crude mistake to assert that "nothing" has remained of reformism and patriotism in the party since this split. But it is no less a mistake to talk about it as the SOCIAL DEMOCRACY in the old sense of the word. The impossibility of employing henceforward a simple, customary, fixed definition, is precisely the flawless expression of the fact that what we have here is a CENTRIST party, which, by virtue of a long protracted evolution of the country, still unites extreme polar contradictions. One must be a hopeless scholastic not to discern what is going on in reality under the label: Second International. Only a dialectical definition of the socialist party, that is, primarily, the concrete evaluation of its internal dynamics, can permit the Bolshevik-Leninists to outline the correct perspective and to adopt an active and not a waiting position.

Without the revolutionary impulsion of the masses, which could shift the political centre of gravity sharply to the Left - or better yet: BEFORE such an impulsion - the state power must identify itself more openly and brutally with the military and police apparatus, Fascism must become stronger and more insolent. Parallel to this, the antagonisms within the socialist party must come to the fore, that is, the incompatibility of the Tolstoian

preaching of "Resist not evil with violence" with the revolutionary tasks dictated by the class foe. Simultaneous with the Bonapartization of the state and the approach of the Fascist danger, the party majority must inevitably become radicalized, the internal segregation, which is far from being completed, must enter a new phase.

The Bolshevik-Leninists are duty-bound to say all this openly. They have always rejected the theory of "social Fascism" and hooligan methods in polemic, in which theoretical impotence unites with lie and calumny. They have no cause to stand themselves on their heads and to call black white. We advocated the united front at a time when it was rejected both by the socialists and the Stalinists. That is just why we remain, even to day, with a critical realistic attitude towards the abstraction of "unity". In the history of the labour movement, demarcation is often the premise of unity. In order to take the first step towards the united front, the socialist party was compelled first to split away from the Neos. This ought not to be forgotten for an instant. The socialist party can take a leading part in a genuine mass and fighting united front only in the event that it sets out its tasks clearly and purges its ranks of the Right wing and masked opponents of revolutionary struggle. It is not a question here of any abstract "principle", but of an iron necessity resulting from the logic of the struggle. The problem is not one that can be solved by any diplomatic turn of the phrase, as Zyromski believes who endeavours to find the formula that will reconcile social patriotism with internationalism. The march of the class struggle, in its present stage, will pitilessly explode and tear down all tergiversation, deception and dissimulation. The workers in general and the socialists in particular need the truth, the naked truth, and nothing but the truth.

The Bolshevik-Leninists correctly formulated what is and what is to be. But they have not been able - it must be openly avowed - to fulfil the task which they set themselves a year ago: MORE DEEPLY TO PENETRATE THE RANKS OF THE SOCIALIST WORKERS, not in order to "lecture" down to them from above as learned specialists in strategy, but in order to learn together with the advanced workers, shoulder to shoulder, on the basis of actual mass experience, which will inevitably lead the French proletariat on the road of revolutionary struggle.

In order the better to illuminate the tasks lying before us on this field, one must, however, dwell upon the evolution of the so-called "communist" party.



The socialist party in France, we have written, is developing in a direction opposite to the state: whereas for parliamentarism has been substituted Bonapartism, which represents an unstable stage on the road to Fascism, the social democracy, on the contrary, has been moving towards a mortal conflict with Fascism. However, can one invest this

view, which at present has an enormous importance for French politics, with an absolute, and consequently an international significance?

No, the truth is always concrete. When we speak of the divergent paths of development of the social democracy and the bourgeois state under the conditions of the present social crisis, we have in mind only the general tendency of development and not a uniform and automatic process. For us, the solution of the political problem depends upon the degree of effective realization of the tendency itself. The theorem can also be advanced, which, let it be hoped, will not encounter any objections among us, namely: the destiny of the proletariat depends, in large measure, in our epoch, upon the resolute manner with which the social democracy will succeed in the brief interval which is vouchsafed it by the march of development, in breaking with the bourgeois state, in transforming itself and in preparing itself for the decisive struggle against Fascism. The very fact that the destiny of the proletariat can thus depend upon the destiny of the social democracy is the consequence of the bankruptcy of the Communist International as the leading party of the international proletariat and also of the unusual acuteness of the class struggle.

The tendency of Centrism to set back reformism, as well as the tendency of the radicalization of Centrism, cannot avoid an international character correlative to the world crisis of capitalism and the democratic state. But what is of decisive importance for practical and above all for organizational deductions, is the question of knowing HOW this tendency is refracted - at the GIVEN stage of development - in the social democratic party of a GIVEN country. The general line of development defined by us should only guide our analysis, but it should by no means presage our deductions from it.

In pre-Fascist Germany, the approach of the break between the bourgeois state and reformism found its expression in the constitution of the Left wing within the social democracy. But the power of the bureaucratic apparatus, given the complete disorientation of the masses, proved sufficient to cut off in advance the still feeble Left wing (Socialist Workers Party) and to keep the party on the rails of a conservative and expectant policy. At the same time, the German Communist party, under the spell of the drugs of the "third period" and "social Fascism", substituted "Amsterdamin" parades for the revolutionary mobilization of the masses, unrealizable under the actual relationship of forces without the policy of the united front. As a result, the powerful German proletariat proved incapable of offering the slightest resistance to the Fascist coup d'etat. The Stalinists declared: it is the fault of the social democracy! But by that alone, they recognized that all their pretensions of being the leaders of the German proletariat were nothing but empty braggadocio. This tremendous political lesson shows

us above all that, even in the country where the communist party was the most imposing - in the absolute as well as in the relative sense - it was incapable, at the decisive moment, of lifting even its little finger while the social democracy retained the possibility of barring the road by virtue of its conservative resistance. Let us bear that firmly in mind!

The same fundamental historical tendency has been refracted in France in an essentially different manner. Under the influence of specific national conditions as well as of international lessons, the internal crisis of the French social democracy has experienced a much deeper evolution than that of the German social democracy in the corresponding period. The socialist bureaucracy found itself forced to deliver a blow AT THE RIGHT. Instead of seeing a weak Left wing expelled, as was the case in Germany, we have witnessed the break with the consistent RIGHT wing (in its quality as an agency of the bourgeoisie), the Neos. The essential difference existing between the evolution of the German and the French social democracies could not better be underscored than by the symmetry of these two splits, in spite of the presence in both parties of common historical tendencies: the crisis of capitalism and of democracy, the crumbling of reformism and the break between the bourgeois state and social democracy.

What ought to be done is to gauge, from the indicated angle, the internal situation in the socialist parties of all the capitalist countries passing through the various stages of the crisis. But this task goes beyond the framework of this article. Let us mention only Belgium, where the social democratic party, swathed throughout by a reactionary and corrupted bureaucracy - a parliamentary, municipal, trade union, co-operative, and banking bureaucracy - is at present engaged in struggle against its LEFT wing and trying not to remain behind its German prototype (Wels-Severing and Co.). It is clear that the same practical deductions cannot be drawn for France and for Belgium.

Yet it would be erroneous to think that the policy of the German and Belgian social democracies, on one side, and of the French social democracy, on the other, represent, once and for all, two incompatible types. In reality, these two types can and will more than once transform themselves into one another. One can support with certainty the idea that if, in its time, the German Communist party had pursued a correct policy of the united front, it would have given a powerful impulsion to the radicalization of the social democratic workers, and the whole political evolution of Germany would have acquired a revolutionary character. On the other hand, it cannot be considered excluded that the social democratic bureaucracy in France, with the active aid of the Stalinists, will isolate the Left wing and give the evolution of the party a retrogressive direction; it is not difficult to foresee its consequences in advance: prostration in the pro-

letariat and the victory of Fascism. As for Belgium where the social democracy retains virtually the monopoly, as a party, in the proletariat, one cannot, in general, imagine a victorious struggle against Fascism without a decisive regrouping of forces and tendencies within the ranks of the social democracy. A hand must be kept on the pulse of the labour movement and the necessary conclusions must be drawn each time.

What has been said suffices, in any case, for an understanding of the enormous importance that has been acquired, for the destiny of the proletariat - at least in Europe and for the coming historical period - by the internal evolution of the social democratic parties. By recalling to mind that in 1925 the Communist International declared in a special manifesto that the French Socialist party no longer existed at all, we will easily understand how great is the retreat made by the proletariat and above all by its vanguard during the years of the domination of the epigones!

It has already been said that with regard to Germany, the Communist International has acknowledged - after the fact, it is true, and in a negative form - that it was totally incapable of fighting against Fascism without the participation in the struggle of the social democracy. With regard to France, the Comintern found itself forced to make the same avowal, but in advance and in a positive form. So much the worse for the Comintern, but so much the better for the cause of the revolution.

In abandoning, without explanation, the theory of social-Fascism, the Stalinists have at the same time thrown overboard the revolutionary program. "Your conditions shall be ours," they have declared to the leaders of the S.F.I.O. (the French Socialist party). They have renounced all criticism of their ally. They are quite simply paying for this alliance at the cost of their program and their tactics. And yet, when it is a question of the defensive against the common mortal enemy - defensive, in which each of the allies pursues his vital interests - nobody needs to pay anybody for this alliance, and each has the right to remain what he is. The whole conduct of the Stalinists has such a character that they seem to want to whisper to the socialist leaders: "Demand still more, squeeze harder, don't stand on ceremony, help us rid ourselves as rapidly as possible of those coarse slogans which inconvenience our Moscow masters in the present international situation."

They have thrown overboard the slogan of the workers' militia. They have labelled "provocation" the struggle for the arming of the proletariat. Isn't it better to divide up the "spheres of influence" with the Fascists under the control of Messieurs les Prefets? This combination between wholes is by far most advantageous to the Fascists: while the workers, lulled by general phrases on the united front, will occupy themselves with parades. The Fascists will multiply their cadres and their arms supplies, will attract new contingents of masses and,

at the suitable hour chosen by them, will launch the offensive.

The united front, for the French Stalinists, has thus been a form of their capitulation to the social democracy. The slogans and the methods of the united front express the capitulation to the Bonapartist state which, in turn, blazes the trail for Fascism. By the intermediary of the united front, the two bureaucracies defend themselves not unsuccessfully against any interference by a "third force". That is the political situation of the French proletariat which can very speedily find itself faced by decisive events. This situation might be fatal were it not for the existence of the pressure of the masses and of the struggle of tendencies.

<> <> <>

He who asserts: the Second as well as the Third Internationals are condemned, the future belongs to the Fourth International - is expressing a thought whose correctness has been confirmed anew by the present situation in France. But this thought, correct in itself, does not disclose how, under what circumstances and within what intervals, the Fourth International will be constituted. It may be born - theoretically it is not excluded - out of the unification of the Second International with the Third, by means of a regrouping of the elements, by the purging and tempering of their ranks in the fire of the struggle. It may be formed also by means of the radicalization of the proletarian kernel of the socialist party and the decomposition of the Stalinist organisation. It may be constituted in the process of the struggle against Fascism and the victory gained over it. But it may also be formed considerably later, in a number of years, in the midst of the ruins and the accumulation of debris following upon the victory of Fascism and war. For all sorts of Bordiguists, all these variants, perspectives and stages have no importance. The sectarians live beyond time and space. They ignore the living historical process, which pays them back in the same coin. That is why their "balance"[†] is always the same: zero. The Marxists can have nothing in common with this caricature of politics.

It goes without saying that if there existed in France a strong organisation of Bolshevik-Leninists, it could and should have become, under present conditions, the independent axis around which the proletarian vanguard would crystallise. But the Ligue Communiste of France has not succeeded in becoming such an organisation. Without in any way shading off the faults of the leadership, it must be admitted that the fundamental reason for the slow development of the Ligue is conditioned by the march of the world labour movement which, for the last decade, has known nothing but defeats and setbacks. The IDEAS and the METHODS of the Bolshevik-Leninists are confirmed at each new stage of development. But can it be anticipated that the League, AS AN ORGANISATION, will show itself capable - in the interval which remains

[†] BILAN (Balance) is the theoretical organ, in French, of the Italian Bordiguist faction (Anti-parliamentarian).

until the approaching denouement - of occupying an influential, if not a leading place, in the labour movement? To answer this question today in the affirmative would mean either to set back in one's mind the denouement for several years, which is confuted by the whole situation, or just simply to hope for miracles. It is absolutely clear that the victory of Fascism would mark the crumbling up of all the labor organizations. A new historic chapter would open up in which the Bolshevik-Leninists would have to seek a new organizational form for themselves. The task of today should be formulated concretely in indissoluble connection with the character of the epoch in which we are living: how to prevent, with the greatest probability of success, the victory of Fascism, taking into account the existing groupings of the proletariat and the relationship of forces existing between these groupings? In particular: what place should be taken by the Ligue, a small organization which cannot lay claim to an independent role in the combat which is unfolding before us but which is armed with a correct doctrine and a precious political experience? what place should it occupy in order to impregnate the united front with a revolutionary content? To put this question clearly is, at bottom, to give the answer. The Ligue must immediately take its place **ON THE INSIDE OF THE UNITED FRONT**, in order to contribute actively to the revolutionary regrouping and to the concentration of this regrouping. It can occupy such a place under present conditions in no other way than by entering the socialist party.

But the Communist Party, object certain comrades, is nevertheless more revolutionary. Assuming that we give up our organisational independence, can we adhere to the less revolutionary party?

This main objection - more exactly, the only one made by our opponents - rests upon political reminiscences and psychological appreciations, and not upon the living dynamics of development. The two parties represent CENTRIST organisations, with this difference: that the Centrism of the Stalinists is the product of the decomposition of Bolshevism, whereas the Centrism of the S.F.I.O. is born out of the decay of reformism. There exists another, no less essential difference between them. Stalinist Centrism, despite its convulsive zig-zags, represents a very STABLE political system which is indissolubly bound up with the position and the interests of the powerful bureaucratic stratum. The Centrism of the socialist party reflects the TRANSITIONAL state of the workers who are seeking a way out on the road of the revolution.

In the communist party, there are undoubtedly thousands of militant workers. But they are hopelessly confused. Yesterday, they were ready to fight on the barricades beside genuine Fascists against the Daladier government. Today, they capitulate silently to the slogans of the social democracy. The proletarian organisation of St. Denis, educated by the Stalinists, capitulates resignedly to P. U. P.-

ism †. Ten years of attempts and efforts aimed at regenerating the C.I. have yealded no results. The bureaucracy has shown itself powerful enough to carry out its devastating work to the very end.

In giving the united front a purely decorative character, in consecrating with the name of "Leninism" the renunciation of elementary revolutionary slogans, the Stalinists are retarding the revolutionary development of the socialist party. By that they continue to play their role as a brake, even now, after their acrobatic flip-flop. The internal regime of the party excludes, still more decisively to day than it did yesterday, any idea of possibility of its renaissance.

The French sections of the Second and Third Internationals cannot be compared in the same way as two pieces of cloth: which fabric is the best, which the best woven? Each party must be considered in its development, and the dynamics of their mutual relations in the present epoch must be taken into account. It is only thus that we shall find for our lever the most advantageous fulcrum.

The adherence of the Ligue to the socialist party can play a great political role. There are tens of thousands of revolutionary workers in France who belong to no party. Many of them have passed through the C.P., they it with indignation or else they have been expelled. They have retained their old opinion about the socialist party, that is, they turn their backs to it. They sympathize wholly or in part with the ideas of the Ligue, but they do not join it because they do not believe that a third party can develop under present conditions. These tens of thousands of revolutionary workers remain outside a party; and in the trade unions they remain outside of a faction.

To this must be added the hundreds and the thousands of revolutionary teachers, not only of the Federation Unitaire but also of the Syndicat National who could serve as a link between the proletariat and peasantry. They remain outside of a party, equally hostile to Stalinism and reformism. Yet, the struggle of the masses in the coming period will seek for itself, more than ever before, the bed of a party. The establishment of Soviets would not weaken but on the contrary would strengthen the role of the workers' parties, for the masses, united by millions in the Soviets, need leadership which only a party can give.

There is no need of idealizing the S.F.I.O., that is, to pass it off, with all its present contradictions, as the revolutionary party of the proletariat. But the internal contradictions of the party can and should be pointed out as a warranty of its further evolution and, consequently, as a fulcrum for the Marxian lever. The Ligue can and should show an example to these thousands and tens of thousands of revolutionary workers, teachers, etc., who run

† The P.U.P., or Party of Proletarian Unity, is a Right wing split-off from the communist party, semi-socialist in character, and electoralist in tendency.

the risk, under present conditions, of remaining outside the current of the struggle. In entering the socialist party, they will immensely reinforce the Left wing, they will fecundate the whole evolution of the party, they will constitute a powerful centre of attraction for the revolutionary elements in the "communist" party and will thus immeasurably facilitate the emergence of the proletariat on the road of revolution.

Without renouncing its past and its ideas, but also without any mental reservations from the days of circle existence, while saying what is, it is necessary to enter the socialist party: not for exhibitions, not for experiments, but for a serious revolutionary work under the banner of Marxism.

Paris, End of August, 1934.

V.

Spain--

The Liberals Capitulate, - the Workers Fight.

It is too soon to draw final conclusions about the Spanish struggle: the news is scant of necessary details and from no section of the Spanish Movement have we had, as yet, the full story of the strike and of the armed resistance. Whole towns and villages have been wrecked and laid waste; thousands of workers have been killed in the fighting and many hundreds executed after the fighting. Several thousand - conservative estimates place the figure at five thousand - Communists, Socialists and Anarchists are in prison camps and convict ships. No word as yet reached us from our Spanish section, the "Communist Left", which played an active part in the fighting especially in the Catalonian districts although press reports state that Andres Nin the veteran communist leader of our Spanish section, has escaped and is in hiding.

Previous revolts had been led by the Anarchists, usually on economic issues. This one was significant for the part played by the Spanish Socialists and for the extent to which it was based upon the demand of the provinces for self-government. It began as a resistance to the bonapartism of Lerroux and found its chief centres in the national risings in Catalonia and Basque. This fact is of the greatest importance but it must be born in mind that, in place of the anarchists, the leadership appeared to be in the hands of liberals and that authentic revolutionary leadership, sufficient to secure allegiance and respect, was lacking. As in Austria the heroic resistance to the Government was pre-eminantly Socialist.

But again as in Austria, the desperate and courageous resistance dashed itself vainly against the reefs of bonapartism and fascism, for the movement lacked marxist organisation and leadership.

It was indispensable that the struggle of the workers, peasants and republicans should be linked to the demand of the provinces for self-government. This was, however, of value only as a gathering point for the left, and a grave mistake was made in giving the Automatists the leadership. This experi-

ence should be of great service to the sections which made up the Workers' Alliances. These sections must now break with the Catalonian chatterers, carrying along with them the ardent young Catalonian guards.

The Spanish workers and the socialists have learnt to their cost that revolution is not simply a repetition of the republican struggles of 1848. This must be the last of the Liberal revolts on the backs of the proletariat and mark the beginning of systematic preparation for the proletarian revolution. It would be inexact, therefore, to say that nothing has been gained. The left-socialists have advanced beyond bourgeois-republican perspectives. But this will be in words only and will have tragic consequences unless systematic organisation of the means of struggle, the militia, and of the elements of workers' and peasants' power, Councils, is undertaken on a national scale. But only the revolutionary party can carry this through successfully.

This raises also for our Spanish comrades not only the struggle against the Fascist Leagues but more than that; the struggle against the State apparatus, the engine of all modern means of repression, aircraft, tanks, artillery, etc. Under these conditions victory is inseparable from the winning over of the army. In this also is needed the revolutionary party, since only such can carry on action within the army effectively.

The elements for the revolutionary party are dispersed throughout the Workers' Alliances in Spain. Our comrades of the Communist Left will have, as one of their main jobs, the creation of the revolutionary party.

By their magnificent courage the Catalonian and Spanish workers have given us a new example. They should now learn to forge the weapon of a brilliant revenge and assure the definite success of their class. Let us support them with complete solidarity. But let us not forget that the first necessity for advance along the road to victory is a realist analysis of the causes of the defeat.

WHY YOU SHOULD READ :

"THE STATE and REVOLUTION."

A book dealing with the state and revolution may seem to many to be altogether too abstract, too unrelated to the practical tasks confronting the workers of this country. It is necessary to recall to mind that the book "The State and Revolution" was written by Lenin in August-September of 1917, that is, on the eve of the conquest of power by the Russian workers. Lenin, therefore, far from regarding these questions as "abstract" and "unpractical" felt them to be so important that, in the midst of the ferment of a revolutionary situation, he found time to write this book. He well knew that the workers could conquer power only if led by a party that undertook its practical tasks upon the basis of a correct revolutionary theory. And the problem of the state was, and remains today, a fundamental one for the workers' movement.

In his book Lenin puts forward the Marxist theory of the state, surveying the teachings of Marx and Engels, particularly in relation to those aspects which had been distorted or purposely forgotten by the opportunists in the Labour movement throughout the world. Marx regarded the state as the product of the class struggle; as an organ of class domination, an organ of oppression and suppression of one class by another. Far from having existed from all eternity as an organ above classes and class interests the state arose out of the division of society into classes and the necessity for a special body to preserve "law and order" which in the final analysis resolves itself into preserving the domination of the ruling class. From this conception of the state as an organ of class rule comes the inevitable conclusion that the workers cannot break the power of the capitalist class without breaking up the state apparatus and establishing the state power of the proletariat.

It is in the interests of the capitalist class to preserve as long as possible the illusion of the state as an organ above classes. How important this is may be seen from the campaign of the National Party in 1931. The National Government was to be above parties, classes, and vested interests. It was to legislate neither in the particular interests of the capitalists or the particular interests of the workers. It was, in some miraculous fashion, going to represent the "nation", even although the "nation" was divided into two irreconcilable classes of exploiters and exploited. The ruling class is under no illusions with regard to "democracy". To them the "nation" means the owners of property in one form or another. So the National Government acted, and will continue to act, in the only way it could be expected to - in the interests of its class.

The Labour leaders in this country are, however, fully imbued with all these democratic illusions. They denounce, and more particularly since the

establishment of the Fascist dictatorship in Germany and Austria, "dictatorships" in general, whether "from the right or the left". It is this attitude of reverence before the fiction of capitalist democracy that Lenin so fiercely attacks in his book. The "dictatorship of capital" exists even under the cloak of the most "democratic" parliamentary form of government, which gives the workers only the right to choose which section of the exploiters shall represent their interests. Against this dictatorship of the bourgeoisie can only be opposed the rule of the workers.

"The substance of the teachings of Marx about the state is assimilated only by one who understands that the dictatorship of a SINGLE CLASS is necessary not only for any class society generally, not only for the proletariat which has overthrown the bourgeoisie, but for the entire HISTORIC PERIOD which separates capitalism from 'classless society', from Communism."

It must be made clear, however, that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" no longer implies the dictatorship of a minority of rich people over the lives and happiness of the great mass of the workers, but is in reality a tremendous extension of the democratic rights and privileges of the workers. There is no longer a dictatorship in the generally accepted sense of the word.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat resembles the dictatorship of other classes because it is evoked like all kinds of dictatorship by the necessity of violently repressing the resistance of the class which loses its political domination. The fundamental point which separates the dictatorship of the proletariat from that of other classes, of the dictatorship of the feudal elements in the middle ages, of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in all civilised capitalist countries, consists in that the dictatorship of the feudal elements and of the bourgeoisie is the violent crushing of the resistance of the great majority of the population, of the working class, while the dictatorship of the proletariat is the crushing, by force, of the resistance of the exploiters, that is to say of a tiny minority of the population, the land owners and capitalists".

For Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific socialism, the experiences of the Paris Commune of 1871 demonstrated clearly that the working class could not "simply lay hold of the ready made state machinery and wield it for its own purpose". The bureaucratic and military machinery, which has been built up, developed and firmly established solely as an instrument for the repression of the workers, cannot be adapted to the expression of the power of the workers, and cannot be utilised for the suppression of the exploiters. In its place must be put machinery of a more democratic character: capitalist-democracy must be transformed into

proletarian democracy.

Trotsky, in his History of the Russian Revolution, shows how the development of events confirmed the truth of this fundamental principle of Marxism

During the stormy months from February to October of 1917 the Mensheviks in Russia argued in much the same way as the Labour Leaders argue today, and even within the Bolshevik ranks there were some who had not fully assimilated the Marxist theory of the state, as the following quotation shows:

"The touch-stone of a revolutionary political leader is the question of the state. In their letter against the insurrection of October 11th., Zinoviev and Kamenev wrote: With the correct tactics we can win a third, yes and more than a third, of the seats in the Constituent Assembly..... the Constituent Assembly plus the Soviet, that is the combined type of state institution towards which we are travelling' The "correct tactics" meant a renunciation of the conquest of power by the proletariat the "combined type" of state meant a combination of the Constituent Assembly, in which the bourgeois parties would constitute two-thirds, with the Soviets, where the party of the proletariat was in command. This type of combined state subsequent

ly formed the basis of Hilferding's idea of including the Soviets in the Weimar Constitution.

General Lisingen, Commander of the Mark of Brandenburg, in forbidding the formation of Soviets on November 7th 1918 on the ground that "institutions of this kind conflict with the existing state order" showed at least a great deal more penetration than the Austro-Marxists and the German Independent Party The Constituent assembly entered upon a conflict with the Soviets and was dissolved. The hostile camps represented in the Constituent Assembly entered upon a civil war which lasted for years."

To those who are working in this country towards a Third Labour Government a correct understanding of nature of the state, is vitally necessary. From that understanding will flow the correct strategy and tactics in relation to the state and the revolutionary struggle of the British workers for power. A study of this book, The State and Revolution, is essential for every worker having the interest of his class at heart.

"State and Revolution" by Lenin is published by Martin Lawrence 33, Great James St, W. C. 1 Price 1/-

THE NEXT NUMBER OF THE RED FLAG

WILL contain important material on the key question of European politics - which way for France? Europe's oldest democracy faces the threat of Fascism. Bound up with the fight of the French workers is the fight of the world's workers against Fascist terror.

Our published material on Germany, warning of Hitler's threat to the workers and urging the necessary steps for working class resistance, was justified to the hilt by events. On Austria and on Spain we made important contributions to the realistic appraisal of the menacing situation and the way it could be met. Only revolutionary marxism can face honestly and squarely the problems of our epoch.

It is now the turn of France!

The most thorough analysis of the situation and the

clearest statement of policy for the French Socialist and Communist movement will be published in the forthcoming RED FLAG.

In view of the urgent character of the French question we are starting to work immediately on the setting - up of this material. Quick sales of the present number, prompt payment of accounts, and donations will make possible the immediate publication of the next number of the RED FLAG containing

WHITHER FRANCE?

the first real authentic revolutionary statement on the French situation.

Order your copy NOW. Per single copy two pence half-penny post free.
Per dozen 1/6 post free.

Trotsky's HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Price 10/6 post free.

Unabridged, containing full appendices - 1295 pages.

ORDER YOUR COPY FROM: H. DEWAR, FLAT 3 25, ROBINSON RD, LONDON S.W. 17.

abandonment of "communist-anarchism" was justified.

We read in the Daily Worker with astonishment that the workers at a demonstration were heartened by the news that the chairman of the Labour Party Executive was to speak. Why, before long the C.P.G.B. will be supporting a "third Labour Government", that "lesser evil" against which they pronounced so strongly. We wonder what kind of a Party Congress they will have this time?

The essential work is still to be done. The sands are running out. Every weakness, every mistake, every folly, committed by the revolutionaries today will be paid for by the workers in blood. Step by step we must win our place again within the ranks

of the mass workers' organisations: step by step group together the revolutionary elements and establish firm programmatic and practical unity. Step by step, with patience and with boldness we must re-create the revolutionary leadership of the British workers, turning our faces from "communist anarchism" and waging ceaseless war on the reformism and liberalism which today is rendering powerless the mighty forces of the working class. In this work the new RED FLAG will do its share to the utmost of its limited means. We look to all our readers to render to our paper active assistance.

R. G. November 3rd, 1934.

Where to get your RED FLAG:

LAHR'S BOOKSHOP,
68, RED LION STREET,
HOLBORN, W.C.1.

THE SOCIALIST BOOKSHOP,
34, ST. BRIDE STREET,
E.C.4.

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

G. ALDRED,
145, QUEEN ST.
GLASGOW.

H. STRAUSSBERG,
10, COPTIC ST., W. C. 2.
(Near British Museum).

F. MAITLAND,
11, WEST NICOLSON ST.
EDINBURGH.



SUBSCRIBE
to

The New International

A monthly review of Revolutionary Marxism

PUBLISHED BY THE NEW INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS ON BASIC ISSUES

L. D. Trotsky Contributes Article Each Issue

Subscription rates: 1 Dollar 75 cents, per year.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
STATION D, P. O. BOX 119.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Published for the Communist League of Great Britain by H. Dewar, 25/3, Robinson Rd. London S. W. 17.
Printed by W. Cullis 23, Gunter Grove, Chelsea. S. W. 10.

we
has
be
wh
asi
ma
The
dun
of b
tion
T
revo
org
is, a
shal
of a
the
tion
the
cont
purp
need
So
L
men
Leag
soci
At it
grou
carry
Com
freed
offic
redu
parlo
and
sonis
defe
Th
revol
belon
and
fresh
part
this
youth
socia
well
class
The
their
renew
to th
organ
Tw
—the
gener
advan
which
the L
winni
enabl
milita
explo
In
made
main,
clearl
succe
past.
of th
convi