

# The **RED FLAG**

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

Number Two. Vol. I.

One Penny.

June 1933

## **ALL EYES ON AUSTRIA!**

### **Vital Decision Approaching**

The full consequences of the victory of Fascism in Germany have yet to be felt: so far among the workers of this country there seems to be only the first beginnings of awareness of all that is involved. And throughout Europe the working class, damped down by the Reformists and befogged by the Communist leaders, stands irresolute whilst Fascism advances towards power in yet another country—Austria. Is it understood how much rests upon the victory or defeat of the Austrian workers? The coming of Fascism to power in Austria would clinch Hitler's victory in Germany and open Central Europe to Fascism. A proletarian success in Austria would be a powerful blow at the Hitler regime and provide a base for the effective rebuilding of the German working class movement. But for this victory, correct leadership and policy are necessary: the lessons of the German debacle need to be understood by the international working class.

It will be recalled by many workers that for years "Socialist Vienna" has been the proud boast of Social Democracy. The achievements of the Social Democratic municipality have been proclaimed on countless occasions from the pages of the I.L.P. and Labour Press in Britain. What an argument against the Communists!—at least so they said. But how much is left of the peaceful advance of Socialism in Vienna? It seems that questions are to be decided, not after all as we were led to believe, by the municipal majority, but by armed Fascist bands.

Forty-three years ago the authorities in Vienna banned the first May Day demonstration. But in spite of their ban the workers, led by the Socialists, crowded the main streets. And at the close of that day one of the Socialist leaders said: "This is the grand rehearsal. As for the actual performance it will be played for us some time, perhaps not far distant."

Forty-three years ago! And on May 1st, 1933, the authorities again banned the demonstration, a ban tamely accepted by the Social Democrats. And this in the face of the growing strength of Fascism! Can this be the final curtain? Perhaps the leaders of Austrian Social Democracy are inclined to think so: we are not. The catastrophe can be averted—that performance may even yet be staged with a grandeur that will radically change the whole European situation.

#### **SOCIALISTS AND THE AUSTRIAN COMMUNISTS.**

On May 1st, the workers showed unmistakably their will to fight. This is a

powerful fact upon which to build in Austria. But the Austrian Social Democrats, like their fellows in all countries, at every step aid the Fascists to power. They are engaged in repeating, almost word for word, the arguments of the German Social Democrats. They support the present Government of Dollfuss just as the German Social Democrats supported the Governments of Brüning, of Von Papen, and of Schleicher. They explain, "Dollfuss is better than Fascism" and rely on Dollfuss to save them from Fascism! But Dollfuss, like Hindenburg, will first disarm the workers and then hand them over to the Fascist jailer. The Government of Dollfuss exists just because neither the workers nor the Fascists are yet able to take over power. But while the Fascists grow in strength the workers are weakened by the cowardly policy of their leaders.

But, many of our readers will ask, what of the Austrian Communist Party? Here, as in other countries, the ruinous policy of Stalin has played havoc. Its influence is small, its membership numbers a few hundred. It is tied hand and foot by the ghastly policy carried out in Germany. It lacks even the organisational strength of the German Communist Party and is carrying out the same wretched and confused version of the united front, is blindly labelling the Dollfuss Government "Fascist" and the Social Democrats, "social-Fascists." Only a drastic change of policy and of leadership could enable this tiny section to play an important role in the struggle.

For a full analysis of the position in Austria, we refer our readers to the article on page two by Leon Trotsky. He declares: "The initiative for revolutionary action can come at present only from the Austrian proletariat." To understand the present position and then to render aid to the Austrian workers should be the immediate work of the world working class movement.

#### **ENGLAND AND THE UNITED FRONT.**

In this country, too, the effects of the Comintern's policy over a number of years have weakened and isolated the revolutionary movement. And in its present position it needs more than ever complete clarity on each step taken. To reach the wide masses of workers organised under the banner of reformism the Communist Party needs to apply correctly the tactic of the united front. It is only by the wise and determined use of the united front policy that the Party can break down its isolation and win a foothold in the trade unions and the fac-

tories. But it is on this very important matter that there is the utmost confusion.

On March 8th, the appeal of the Comintern for a united front approach to the reformist organisations was published in this country. The Comintern, in taking this step, refused to approach the Socialist International, but told its sections to approach the different reformist national sections. This suggested approach to the reformist organisations was a complete denial of the previous Comintern policy and produced complete bewilderment among the Party membership. In our statement, made at the time, we pointed out that a change made in this way, from the top, without discussion or understanding among the members was not a real or effective change, in fact it was a "half-turn" that called for considerable criticism. Our words have since been borne out; for in the May Day manifesto of the Comintern, the members are told that the united front with the leaders is not permissible and the old policy of "unity from below" is again set forward. Such sudden changes, made from above, produce confusion among the members likely to have fatal results.

#### **"NO CRITICISM."**

There is one section of the March 8th manifesto which calls for special notice. We refer to the offer of the Comintern to suspend criticism of the reformists during the period of the united front action. In the blind panic that followed the German catastrophe, the C.I., swept over to offering terms to the reformists which cannot be justified under any conditions. The offer to suspend criticism is in direct opposition to the united front policy laid down by Lenin in 1921. This document, published in English by the C.P.G.B., declares, that it is

"A primary and fundamental condition, of general application to the Communist Parties of all countries that every Communist Party which enters into any agreement with the parties of the Second or Two-and-a-half International should retain absolute independence and complete autonomy for the expression of its views and for the criticism of its opponents. The rejection of this condition is not permissible under any circumstances."

That which was not permissible in the days of Lenin's leadership is to-day the policy of the Communist International.

The slogan of the united front needs to be fully understood by the whole Party and advanced seriously as the way forward for the small revolutionary movement of this country. Its successful application demands that it be directed not only to the national reformist sections but also to the International itself: that the right of criticism be preserved, that the reformist workers be won to its support, and that the full right of freedom and discussion be restored inside the Communist Party.

# IT IS NOW THE TURN OF AUSTRIA!

## Social Democracy and Fascism in the Austrian Crisis by LEON TROTSKY

The situation in Austria is not qualitatively different from the situation in Germany, but only lags behind it in its development. After the political life in Austria had fallen under the press of the Fascist overturn in Germany, the culmination in Austria is drawing closer not by days, but by hours.

Austria is passing through a period that is analogous to the period of Bruening-Papen-Schleicher in Germany, or to the period of Held in Bavaria, that is, the period of semi-Bonapartist dictatorship, which maintains itself by the mutual neutralisation of the proletarian and Fascist camps. For Austria too we prefer the term *Bonapartism* (in contradistinction to all other purely descriptive and absolutely meaningless formulations such as clerical-Fascism, legitimistic Fascism, etc., etc.), as a very clear characterisation of the feature of a government that veers in between two irreconcilable camps; a government that is forced to an ever increasing degree to supplant by military and police apparatus the social support that is ebbing away from under its feet.\* There is expressed in the tendency toward Bonapartism the urge of the possessing classes to escape an open break with legality, a long period of civil war and the bloody Fascist dictatorship by means of military and police measures that are screened by the paragraphs kept in reserve in democratic constitutions.

There obtain historical epochs when the social foundation of the government "above all classes" grows at the expense of the extreme wings—during these periods Bonapartism can place its seal upon an entire historical epoch. But the Austrian "Bonapartism" of to-day like the German of yesterday, can have only an episodic character, filling in the short interval between the democratic regime and the regime of Fascism.

It is true that the "Bonapartists" in Austria have a much wider parliamentary base and that the Fascists are much weaker than was the case in Germany. But, in the first place, the Christian Socialists are melting away while the Nazis are growing apace; secondly, behind the backs of the Nazis stands Fascist Germany. The question is settled by dynamics. Theoretical analysis, as well as the fresh experience in Germany equally bespeak the fact that the Viennese police and bureaucratic dictatorship cannot long maintain itself. Matters are rapidly coming to a head. The power must be taken either by the Fascists or by the workers.

### THE POSSIBILITY OF POSTPONEMENT.

We do not know what is going on backstage. But there cannot be any doubt that the governments of those countries which surround and oppress Austria have brought into action all the levers. Not a single one of these governments, not even Italy, has any interest in seeing the power in Austria pass into the hands of the Fascists. The leaders of the Austrian social democracy see, indubitably, in this situation the highest trump of the whole game; in their eyes the revolutionary activity of the Austrian proletariat must needs be supplanted by financial and other different sorts of pressure that can be brought by the nations of the former Entente. This reckoning is the most fallacious of all. The hostility on the part of the victor nations toward national socialism was one of the reasons for its explosive growth in Germany. The closer that the Austrian social democracy will link itself with the policies of France and of the Little Entente, whose task consists in keeping Austria in the state of "independence," i.e., isolation and impotence, the greater will be the rate at which Fascism will turn into

a party of national liberation in the eyes of petty bourgeois masses. Along this line, only the armed intervention of the Entente, i.e., outright occupation, could prevent Fascism from the conquest of power. But in this, the question of Austria merges with the question of Fascist Germany. If Hitler finds a *modus vivendi* with France—and there is hardly any reason to doubt it—then France will find a *modus vivendi* with Fascist Austria. In both cases, of course, on the bones of the proletariat, German and Austrian. To think that Fascist Austria would immediately destroy those barriers which separate it from Fascist Germany is to place much too great a significance upon "national" phrases and to undervalue the capacity of Fascism for wagging its tail before those who are stronger than it. It can be said with assurance that of all strategic calculations, the most ill-fated, degraded and ruinous for the proletariat is to bank upon the co-operation of the imperialist governments of the countries surrounding Austria.

Even if we were to allow that because of the traditional flabbiness of all Austrian parties as well as because of the influence of external and temporary causes (the pressure of France and of the little Entente; the apprehension of the Hitlerites to push matters to the end, just now)—allowing it, the culmination even in this case would turn out to be postponed by means of some kind of a motheaten Austrian Bonapartist compromise—and a postponement of this kind could have an extremely unreliable and a very temporary character. The process thus checked would burst out in the course of the next few months or even weeks with a redoubled force and at a tenfold tempo. To build its policies upon checks, masquerades, the plastering up of cracks, and petty political moratoriums would mean for the proletariat to extend more time for the still weak Austrian Fascism in which to achieve its murderous mission.

### "THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY."

Otto Bauer confines himself to vapid moralizations on the subject of the "superiorities" of bourgeois democracy over Fascist dictatorship. As if the struggle is taking place between two schools of state laws! Engels aptly remarked, that every state is reducible to armed detachments of men with the material appendages in the nature of jails, etc. At present, this "essence" of the state has been completely revealed in Austria. The political struggle which has developed in the course of a number of years upon the bases of democracy has been pushed flush up against the clashes between armed detachments. It is necessary to call this fact by its name, clearly and precisely, and to draw from it all the necessary practical conclusions.

Instead of this, the Austrian social democracy demands an admission on our part that the struggle is being carried on "for democracy." As if the question lies in this at present! It goes without saying that we are not ready to make any concessions whatsoever to the Austro-Marxists as regards the theoretical and historical appraisal of democracy. And in fact, if democracy was indeed raised above the social regime that engendered it; if it was indeed capable of reconstructing bourgeois society into socialistic society, then it should have revealed all its qualities first of all in Austria, where the constitution was created by the social democracy, where the proletariat comprises the decisive force in the nation, and the social democracy represents the decisive force in the proletariat. And concurrently, what Austria is living through demonstrates in action that democracy is flesh of the flesh of capitalism,

and decomposes with it. The Austrian crisis is the expression of the decay of democracy. The gentlemen of democracy need expect no other appraisal on our part.

However, we understand only too well, on the other hand, that theoretical diagnosis alone is altogether insufficient for the purpose of supplanting democracy with the Soviet regime. The matter touches the living consciousness of a class. If in the course of a joint struggle against Fascists the majority of the proletariat understands the need for Soviet dictatorship, there will be no stopping the Communists. But if, despite all the lessons it received, the majority of the workers, even after the smashing of the forces of counter-revolution, decides to repeat once more the experiment of formal democracy, then the Communists will be compelled to take to the same ground, in the guise of an opposition.

To-day, at any rate, the overwhelming majority of Austrian workers follows the social democrats. This means that there cannot even be talk of revolutionary dictatorship as an actual task. What is on the agenda to-day is not the antithesis of bourgeois and Soviet democracy but the antithesis of bourgeois democracy and Fascism. We accuse the Austro-Marxists not of fighting for democracy but of not fighting for it.

Capitalism resorts to Fascism not out of caprice but because it is driven into an impasse. If social democracy is capable only of criticising, grumbling, curbing, threatening, and biding time but is incapable of taking into its hands the fate of society, when the matter touches the life and death of the nation and of its culture, then this party, which represents one half of the nation becomes itself the instrument of social decomposition and compels the exploiting classes to seek salvation from Fascism.

Applying the ancient juxtaposition of *Ermattungsstrategie* and *Niederwerfungsstrategie*, the strategy of exhaustion, and the strategy of assault, one is compelled to say that the strategy of exhaustion, which was applicable after a fashion in certain situations, is impossible of application to-day when there remains nothing for capitalism except strategy of assault. The reformist strategy is exhausting at present not the class enemy but its own camp. The policies of Otto Bauer and Co. lead fatally to the victory of the Fascists, imposing least sacrifices and difficulties upon them, and the greatest sacrifices and misfortunes upon the proletariat.

### THE AUSTRO-MARXISTS ARE

### CHLOROFORMING THE PROLETARIAT.

Despite the experience of Italy and Germany, the leaders of Austrian social-democracy do not understand the situation. In order to live and breathe, these people must fool themselves. This they cannot do otherwise than by fooling the proletariat.

Bauer places the blame for the defeat in Germany upon the Communists. We are not the ones to defend German Stalinists! But their chief crime consists in their having given the social democrats the possibility of preserving their influence upon the basic part of the German proletariat and of loading upon it the tactic of debasing and fatal capitulation, despite all the crimes and betrayals committed by the social democracy. In essence Bauer's policies are no different from the policies of Wels-Stampfer. But there is a distinction. Bauer will be unable to shift the responsibility upon the Austrian Stalinists who have managed to doom themselves to complete impotence. The Austrian social democracy is not only the leading party of the proletariat but it is the strongest, as regards the population, social democratic party in the world. The political responsibility lies upon the Austrian social democracy, solely and entirely. All the more fatal will prove to be the consequences of its present policies.

The Austro-Marxists say: If we are deprived of liberty, then we shall fight to "the end." By such subterfuge they want to "gain" time for their vacillations, when in reality they are losing the most precious time for the preparation of defense. After the enemy deprives them of liberty, it will be a hundred times more difficult to fight, for the liquidation of rights will be

accompanied by military and police destruction of the proletarian press and the proletarian apparatus. The enemy prepares and acts while the social democracy bides its time and whines. The Vorwaerts also repeated times innumerable: "Woe to Fascism, if it ventures against us!" The events have demonstrated the value of such rhetoric. The party which proved incapable of giving battle when it held in its hands almost impregnable positions and powerful resources will crumble into dust when it is completely expelled from the legal arena.

By their seemingly dreadful but in reality pathetic chorus of "if we are attacked," the Austro-Marxists reveal their genuine suffering, they still hope that they will be left in peace, that things, God help us, will not go beyond mutual threats and waving of fists. What this means is that they are chloroforming the proletariat to facilitate Fascist surgery. A genuine proletarian politician on the contrary would be duty bound to explain to the Austrian workers that their class enemy, himself, has been caught between the paws of history; that no other way out remains for him except to destroy proletarian organisations; that in this instance there is no escaping the mortal struggle; and that this struggle must be prepared for, in accordance with all the rules of revolutionary strategy and tactic.

#### THE GENERAL STRIKE.

Otto Bauer has been hinting that in the event of a direct attack on the part of the enemy, the workers will resort to a general strike. But this too is an empty threat. We have heard it more than once in Germany. The general strike cannot be produced out of one's vest pocket. The workers may be held to a general strike, but to do so one must fight and not play hide and seek with reality; a call to battle must be issued, one must organise for the struggle, arm for the struggle, widen and deepen the channel of struggle, not confining oneself to the legal forms of struggle, i.e., the framework dictated by the armed enemy. And first of all, the party itself must be permeated through and through with the idea that unless it engages in a decisive battle, it is lost.

It is quite possible that the Central Committee will actually issue a call for a general strike, after the "open," (that is to say, the decisive) blow had been dealt. But this would mean that after leaving the stage, one calls upon the masses to a naked protest, or manifestation of impotence. Just so did the liberal opposition call upon the people not to pay their taxes after the monarch had told it to go to hell. As a rule, nothing ever came of it. In all probability, the workers will not respond at all to the belated and hopeless appeal of a party already smashed.

But let us allow that the Fascists will give the social democracy time enough to call for a general strike at the last minute, and that the workers will respond solidly to the call. What then? What is the goal of the general strike? What must it achieve? In what forms must it develop? How should it defend itself against military and police repressions, and against the Fascist pogrom? Wiseacres will reply that it is impossible to answer such questions beforehand. That is the usual subterfuge of people who have nothing to say, who hope in their hearts to get along without fighting, and who consequently shy away in cowardice and superstition from questions of military resources and methods.

The general strike is only the mobilisation of revolutionary forces but still not war. To utilise the general strike successfully as a demonstration or a threat, i.e., to confine oneself only to the mobilisation of forces, without engaging in battle—that is possible only within strictly defined historical conditions; whenever matters touch an important but still a partial, task; when the enemy wavers and waits only for a push in order to retreat; when the possessing classes are still left with a wide field for retreat and manoeuvre. None of this obtains at present, at the time when all the contradictions have reached their highest intensity and when every serious conflict puts on the agenda the question of power and the perspective of civil war.

The general strike could prove to be a sufficient means for repelling the counter-revolutionary overturn only in the event that the enemy is unprepared and lacks sufficient forces

and experience (the Kapp Putsch). But even in the latter case, after having repelled the adventurist onset the general strike only restored fundamentally that situation which obtained on the eve of the conflict, and consequently gave the enemy opportunity to utilise the experience of his own defeat and to prepare better for a new attack. But the general strike turns out to be completely insufficient even for defensive purposes in the event that the enemy is powerful and experienced, all the more so if he leans upon the state apparatus, or even has at his disposal its benevolent "neutrality." No matter what the basic reason for the conflict may be, under the present conditions the general strike will close the ranks of bourgeois parties, the state apparatus and the Fascist bands, and in this united front of the bourgeoisie the preponderance will fall inevitably into the hands of the most extreme and determined elements, i.e., the Fascists. When face to face with the general strike, the counter-revolution will be compelled to stake all its forces on one card in order to break the ominous danger with a single blow. In so far as the general strike remains only a strike it inevitably under these conditions dooms itself to defeat. In order to snatch victory the strategy of the strike must grow into the strategy of the revolution, it must elevate itself to the level of resolute actions, replying with a double blow to every blow. In other words, under the present conditions the general strike cannot serve as a self-sufficient means for the defence of an impotent democracy but only as one of the weapons in the combined struggle of two camps. The strike must be accompanied with and supplemented by the arming of the workers, the disarming of Fascist bands, the removal of Bonapartists from power, and the seizure of the material apparatus of the state.

Once again we repeat if the establishment of a Soviet regime cannot be realised without the seizure of power by the Communist party—and we admit that this is altogether excluded by the unfavourable correlation of forces in the immediate future—then the restoration of democracy, even temporarily, is already unthinkable in Austria without the previous seizure of power by the social democracy. If the leading worker's party is not prepared to bring the struggle to its conclusion then the general strike by sharpening the situation can only hasten the crushing of the proletariat.

The Austro-philistine will catch up these words in order to immediately deduce reasons in favour of "moderation" and "cautiousness." For, is it permissible for a party to take upon itself the grandiose "risk" involved in the revolutionary methods of struggle? As if the Austrian proletariat has the freedom of choice! As if millions of workers can depart for their villas in Switzerland like Otto Braun! As if a class can dodge mortal danger without incurring any danger! As if the victims of Fascistised Europe, with its perspectives of new imperialist wars, will not surpass one hundredfold the sacrifices of all revolutions, past and future!

#### TO-DAY, THE KEY TO THE SITUATION IS IN THE HANDS OF THE AUSTRIAN PROLETARIAT.

Otto Bauer welcomed with ecstatic amazement the fact that the German workers gave seven million votes to the social democracy in the election, despite the closing down of the newspapers, etc., etc. These people opine that the emotions and the thoughts of the proletariat are created by their piddling articles. They have conned Marx and the history of Europe but they have not the slightest inkling of what inexhaustible reservoirs of power, enthusiasm, perseverance and creativeness the proletariat is capable of unfolding whenever it is assured of a leadership which to any degree corresponds to the historical background.

Isn't it obvious right now that had there obtained a far-seeing revolutionary policy from above, the German workers would have long since overthrown all the barriers blocking their road to hegemony, and moreover that they could have done so with immeasurably and incomparably less sacrifices than the inevitable sacrifices of the Fascist regime? The same must also be said about the Austrian proletariat.

Of course, the policy of the united front is obligatory at present also for Austria. But the united front is no panacea; the crux of the

matter lies in the context of the policies, in the slogans and in the methods of mass actions. With the reservation of preserving complete freedom of mutual criticism—and this reservation is unalterable—the Communists must be prepared to make an alliance with social democracy for the sake of the most modest mass activities. But in so doing the Communists must give themselves a clear accounting of the tasks that are posed by the march of developments in order to disclose at every stage the incongruity between the political goal and the reformist methods.

The united front cannot merely signify a summation of social democratic and Communist workers for beyond the confines of the two parties and outside of the trade unions there still remain Catholic workers and unorganised workers. Not a single one of the old forms of organisation which are laden down with conservatism, inertia, and the heritage of old antagonisms, can suffice for the present tasks of the united front. A real mobilisation of the masses is unthinkable without the creation of elected organs which directly represent the trade, industrial and transport enterprises, corporations and factories, the unemployed and the contiguous layers of the population which gravitate toward the proletariat. In other words, the situation in Austria calls for workers' Soviets, not so much in name as in their nature. The duty of the Communists is to persistently bring forward this slogan in the process of the struggle.

The circumstance that Austria is separated governmentally from Germany and lags behind the latter in its internal evolution could play a decisive role in the salvation of Germany and of all Europe—under a bold and virile policy of the proletarian vanguard. Proletarian Austria would immediately become Piedmont for the entire German proletariat. The victory of the Austrian workers would provide the German workers with what they lack at present, with a material drill ground, a comprehensible plan of action and hope for victory. Once set in motion the German proletariat would immediately prove itself to be immeasurably more powerful than all its enemies taken together. Upon the parliamentary democratic plane, Hitler with his 44 per cent of human dust appears much more imposing than he would on the plane of the actual correlation of forces. The Austrian social democracy has behind it approximately the same percentage of votes. But whereas the Nazis lean upon the social by-products which play in the life of the country a secondary and to a major degree a parasitic role, there is behind the Austrian social democracy the flower of the nation. The actual relative weight of the Austrian social democracy exceeds over ten times the relative weight of all the German Fascists. This can be completely revealed only in action. The initiative for revolutionary action can come at present only from the Austrian proletariat. What is there necessary for it? Courage, courage, and once again, courage! The Austrian workers have nothing to lose but their chains. And by their initiative they can conquer Europe and the whole world!

Prinkipo, March 23, 1933—L. TROTSKY.

#### TO EVERY ONE OF OUR READERS.

We have in hand urgent and vital material by Comrade Trotsky, including an article on the crisis in the U.S.S.R. To print this and to proceed with the publication of the "Communist" and Trotsky's "Alarm Signal" we must have money.

We have no wealthy supporters; we have no advertisers; our paper is financed by the donations of members and friends, donations given often at great sacrifice. Help to put the views of the Left Opposition and Comrade Trotsky before the workers. Send a donation, or better still, sign on our monthly guarantee fund. Can you guarantee a sum every month. Any amount, large or small, a shilling or a pound.

There is another way in which you can help. Get readers! Buy two or three, six or a dozen, copies of the "Red Flag" and sell them to your work-mate, your fellow militant in the Union. Ask your newsagent to stock the paper!

Comrade reader, we appeal to you for your help.

## Andrews Answered

"Although "Trotskyism," so-called, has been declared "liquidated" upon innumerable occasions, Heckert in the "Daily Worker" (May 4th, 1933), and Andrews in the May issue of the "Communist Review" devote considerable space to a polemic against Trotsky. Since both these hacks employ the same underhand methods, and use similar "arguments," we will concentrate our attention on replying to Andrews, who has some reputation in the British Party.

Andrews' attack is based upon the hope that his readers will be unacquainted with the actual viewpoint of Comrade Trotsky. Selecting an article by Trotsky recently published in the "Manchester Guardian," he tries, by means of absolutely unscrupulous misrepresentation, to prove that Trotsky was, and is, a supporter of Social Democracy. In that article, Trotsky says that "Social Democracy, like Fascism, stands to defend the bourgeois regime against the proletarian revolution," and accuses the Social Democrats of summoning Hitler to power. Andrews calls this a "half-hearted and unwilling admission," given, moreover, at a "time when the facts have been plain to everybody." Let us see what Trotsky had to say in September, 1930, when the facts were not so plain, even to Mr. Andrews.

"There can be no doubt that, at the crucial moment, the leaders of the Social Democracy and a thin layer of labour aristocrats will prefer the triumph of Fascism to the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat" (The Turn in the C.I.).

In his next pamphlet on this question he wrote: "Social Democracy, this still powerful capitalist agency in the ranks of the proletariat. . . . The Social Democracy is an obstacle that must be swept away." (Germany, the Key to the International Situation. December, 1931).

And early in September, 1932 Trotsky again wrote: "There he stands, the snobbish, educated, petty-bourgeois, an utter coward, soaked from head to foot with distrust and contempt for the masses." These statements are neither "half-hearted" nor "unwilling," nor given at a "time when the facts have been plain to everybody."

Trotsky wrote that a United Front of defence between Social Democrats and Communists should have been based on the antagonism between the Social Democracy and Fascism. Andrews retorts angrily: "The Communist Party could not offer 'a defensive union' to such leaders." And in the very same paragraph he says:

"He (Trotsky) carefully omits all mention of the Communist Party's three offers of a united front to the Social Democratic leaders themselves, for the sake of an all-in General Strike which they immediately called for." We are lost in admiration of such extraordinary mental gymnastics!

The next move on the part of this contemptible twister, Andrews, is to attempt to link Trotsky's viewpoint with that of Ewer, who argued, in a disgraceful article in "Plebs," that Hitler gained power by constitutional means. In the very article which is the subject of Andrews' attack, Trotsky quotes Thaelmann, the leader of the Communist Party of Germany, who, before the Executive Committee of the Communist International in April, 1931, said:

"We are convinced that the 14th September, 1930, was Hitler's best day, and that now he cannot expect to do better, only worse. Our estimate of the development of that party has been confirmed by events. . . . To-day the Fascists have no reason to be pleased."

Needless to say, Andrews does not mention this quotation of Thaelmann by Trotsky. However, let us contrast the above statement with the following words of Trotsky: "After last year's (Sept. 1930) elections to the Reichstag the leadership of the German Communist Party declared that Fascism had reached its culminating point. At present, German Fascism represents an immeasurably greater political force than eight years ago. . . . Hitler wants to lull his antagonists with the long run perspective of the parliamentary growth of the Nazis in order to catch them napping and deal them a death blow at the right moment."

These two contrasted statements should be sufficient to show, not only how far removed are our theories from those of Social Democracy, but also how correct was Trotsky's analysis of the situation.

## WHAT IS HAPPENING IN SOVIET RUSSIA?

We shall publish in the next number of the *Red Flag* a new article by Leon Trotsky, "The Problems of the Soviet Regime." A mere recital of the headings of the four sections of this article indicates the interest it holds for all militant workers:

- (a) The Disappearance of the State.
- (b) The Political Regime of the Dictatorship and its Social Base.
- (c) The Official Explanations of the Bureaucratic Terror.
- (d) The Disappearance of Money and the Disappearance of the State.

In this article Leon Trotsky poses the following questions and answers them:

"Why in 1917-21, when the old ruling classes still carried on armed struggle, when the imperialists of the entire world actively supported them, when the armed kulaks sabotaged the Army and the provisioning of the country, was it possible to discuss openly in the Party the sharp questions of the Brest-Litovsk peace, the methods of organising the Red Army, the composition of the C.C., the Trade Unions, the passage to the N.E.P., the national policy and the policy of the C.I., and why now, after the defeat of the exploiting classes, after the success of the industrialisation of a crushing majority of the peasantry—one is not able to allow the discussion of the questions of the rhythms of industrialisation and of collectivisation of relations between heavy industry and light, and the policy of the united front in Germany? Why would every Party member who requested the convocation of the regular Party Congress in accordance with its statutes, be immediately expelled and submitted to repression? Why would every Communist who expressed aloud a doubt on the infallibility of Stalin be immediately arrested? Whence comes this terrible, monstrous and intolerable tension of the political regime?"

You will want to read this article. Without it you cannot understand the present position in Russia. And in no other paper can you get these invaluable articles by Leon Trotsky. So help our paper to keep going, to enlarge and to appear more frequently. Send along that donation: remember—we get no regular amounts from anywhere except from our members. It's up to you, comrade!

### RAKOVSKY.

A *Reuter* communique states that Rakovsky is alive and is in the vicinity of Iakoutsk practising medicine. I have no confirmation of this news which is, however, probable enough. It is not necessary to say that Rakovsky was not banished by the G.P.U. to the region of Iakoutsk, the wildest and coldest part of Siberia, to practise medicine there—moreover, that, although a doctor, he has never practised medicine—but to submit him to even more rigorous conditions.

Rakovsky, by his great popularity, is dangerous, not for the Soviet regime, of which he was one of the most famous creators, but for Stalin, whose personal situation is completely compromised. Rakovsky will be 60 years old in August; his heart is very tired; doctors insisted on the necessity of a milder climate for him. Instead of that, Stalin sends him beyond the polar circle; if Rakovsky is not dead, Stalin by this measure condemns him to death. Prinkipo, 23rd March, 1933—L. TROTSKY

### NOTICE TO WORKERS' ORGANISATIONS.

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

### ROTHSTEIN?—

"Was Trotsky a Jingo?" asked R. M. Roebuck in 1925. (*Forward*, June 6th).

### —ROEBUCK?

"Rothstein had a son—a British subject—in the British Army." Bruce Lockheart in "*Memoirs of a British Agent*," page 202.

### "THE ALARM CRY."

The pamphlet announced in our last number on Russia has been held up through lack of funds. Although the cost of duplicating it is comparatively small, yet in our present position we must put our paper first. Those comrades who want a copy of this document could help us to get it out by sending cash with order in advance.

### HAVE YOU READ . . .

"A Conversation with a Social-Democratic Worker on the United Front of Defence"?

By

Leon Trotsky

We have duplicated this very important statement on the Communist attitude to the United Front against Fascism, and you can get a copy from us for—

Post 2½d. Free.

WHERE THE "RED FLAG" CAN BE OBTAINED.  
GREYFORM, 21 STEPHEN STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD.

HENDERSON'S, 66, CHARING CROSS ROAD, W.C.1  
LAHR'S, 68 RED LION STREET, HOLBORN.

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

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

"REVOLT" OFFICES, AMEN CORNER, off LUDGATE HILL.

THE NORTHERN PUBLISHING SOCIETY, 22 RUSSELL STREET, MANCHESTER.

### OUR LITERATURE

Trotsky's Preface to the Polish Edition of "Left Wing Communism".....	1d.
Conversation with a Socialist Worker. Trotsky.....	2d.
Problems of the Chinese Revolution. L. Trotsky and others (600 pages).....	5s.
Letter to a German Worker. L. Trotsky.....	1d.
The following to order.	
Soviet Economy in Danger. L. Trotsky.....	6d.
In Defence of the Russian Revolution .....	3d.
What Next in Germany .....	2s.
The Militant. Organ of the American Left Opposition.....	3d. weekly.

THE COMMUNIST MONTHLY THEORETICAL JOURNAL OF THE BRITISH SECTION, INTERNATIONAL LEFT OPPOSITION. THE NEXT NUMBER, OUT SHORTLY, WILL CONTAIN: "THE DECLARATION OF THE BOLSHEVIK-LENINISTS TO THE ANTI-FASCIST CONGRESS."

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

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