

Internal Bulletin #5

Communist League of America

-Issued by the National Committee-
June 1934

FOR MEMBERS ONLY

Price 5¢

CONTENTS

1. TO THE GREEK SECTION
From the International Secretariat
2. DECLARATION BY VITTE
3. LETTER TO THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
By Gourov
4. TO THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
From the Greek Section
5. TO THE LEADERSHIP OF THE GREEK COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION
OF BOLSHEVIK-LENINISTS (ARCHIO-MARKISTS)
From the International Secretariat
6. TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE GREEK SECTION OF THE LEAGUE
OF COMMUNISTS-INTERNATIONALISTS (BOLSHEVIK-LENINISTS)
By G. Gourov

TO THE GREEK SECTION

From the International Secretariat

Copy to all sections

Dear comrades:

The attitude of comrade Vitte compels us to address this letter to you and all the sections:

For some weeks we have been faced with the fact that comrade Vitte, behind the back of the I.S. and the leadership of the French League, has carried on a systematic campaign against these bodies.

The fact that Vitte has become the real inspirer and the leader of a faction in the Ligue (Jewish group--Giacomi etc.) which we have already characterized in our resolution of September 13, and what concerns the Jewish group in many later documents, demands that this question be decided in a decisive manner.

Since his arrival in Paris comrade Vitte has lent himself to activity among alien groups in the ranks of the Ligue, but not in the sense of strengthening their activity. The aim of this activity, which was completely outside the control of the I.S. was to systematically "prepare" and turn these comrades against the leadership of the Ligue and certain members of the Plenum, preparing by that his future action in the Ligue.

The attitude of comrade Vitte, in the interests of this very action was subordinated in a control commission constituted about six months ago by the E.C. of the Ligue ad hoc and in the second control commission created by the Ligue after the non-functioning of the first, exclusively in order to examine the slanders propagated against several comrades by enemies of the Ligue and introduced into the very ranks of the Ligue. For this Commission, three comrades who were well aware of the dishonesty of the insinuations were chosen. Comrade Vitte who placed at the head of the Commission, not only did not blame the acts of the slandered comrades, but officially took upon himself the responsibility for these acts as a member of the Plenum.

The control commission which was established, however, revealed itself ignorant of its tasks and incapable of handling them. In the course of several months it did not meet once. It did not begin any investigation into the slanders and insinuations. The Parisian organization elected a second control commission with comrade Vitte still at the head of it. This commission brought about no change.

In face of the manifest neglect of the temporary control commission, the Plenum, the highest body of the Bolshevik-Leninists, passed a categorical resolution on the subject of the slanders. The control commission which in fact no longer existed, was also formally liquidated.

However, after the members of the Commission and particularly comrade Vitte showed that they were involved in a struggle against the Ligue and against the Plenum (I.S.) an attempt was made to resuscitate the already liquidated control commission, in order in its name to sanction the slanders condemned by them previously, against their present political adversaries.

Following this arbitrary factional activity of a part of the second control commission, such as it was, the leadership of the Ligue was obliged to dissolve it. The Plenum approved this decision completely.

The Plenum can only condemn indignantly and with repugnance this inadmissible and unworthy manner of acting. The organization has never been able to prevent comrade Vitte from formulating openly his thoughts and criticisms. It was in the Plenum of 20/8 that for the first time the fact of the elimin-

ation of the permanent functions (imperatively dictated by the financial situation) gave Vitte the pretext to raise the absurd accusation "that they want to eliminate the Greek section from the Plenum and that there is no democracy in the I.O.", accusations for which he has never given the least proof and which sound especially strange in the mouth of a member of the leading body of the I.O. who should himself carry the responsibility.

On the 13th of September the Plenum adopted the resolution on the Ligue. The immediate urgency of this resolution provoked by the attitude of Giacomi, of the Jewish group, etc..... threatening the very existence of the Ligue. Comrade Vitte was absent from France. After his return to Paris comrade Vitte did not come to the Plenum as was his duty in order to express his point of view, but he went to his local group in the Ligue where he not only took a position against the Plenum, but declared that this "résolution is illegal".! ?

Several days later, on 23/9, in the general membership of the Ligue in Paris, comrade Vitte expressed the opinion that the expelled comrades should take part in the meeting in order to defend "their point of view" (Giacomi) and voted for the following resolution:

"The general membership meeting of September 23, after learning of the resolutions of the I.S. and the E.C. expelling the comrades 15 days before our national conference;

"After having discussed the reasons for these expulsions, rejects the resolutions and declares that they are not motivated, that they are bureaucratic measures, tending only to harm the discussion for the National conference and to disorganize the Ligue.

"The general membership meeting of the P.D. declared the decision of the E.C. unexcusable and decides that Giacomi will participate in the meetings of his group, in the meetings of the Paris District and the District Committee."

Comrade Vitte declared consequently that he participated in the meetings as a Ligue member and not as a member of the Plenum.

Next day comrade Vitte participated (here already in his capacity as a member of the Plenum) in the meeting of the Italian section. He launched attacks against the Plenum and defended Giacomi declaring in this meeting among other things: "For three years in the French organization, everything was like a family, in a rotten and corrupt circle" on a reply that Giacomi had admitted "that he had left a Stalinist cesspool in order to fall into another" and so on.

Comrade Vitte could not find a single word to separate himself from these unheard of accusations, but on the contrary he continued to defend Giacomi.

Comrade Vitte undertook all these actions in the name of his conception of "democracy" which he has the audacity to call Bolshevik. Such a conception has nothing to do with the democratic centralism of a Bolshevik party, but can lead only to the disorganization and the disintegration of any revolutionary organization.

It seems inconceivable that comrade Vitte appeals to democracy in his activity. But on his side comrade Vitte should have applied "democracy" in his own section. In any case one of the fundamental principles of democracy is to subordinate oneself to the decisions of the majority. The Plenum (I.S.) good or bad is composed of representatives of the principle sections, and consequently represent the point of view of the majority of our international organization. Remaining in the minority in the Plenum, V. had the right to make his viewpoint known to the leaderships of all the sections, in order thus to prepare for the future international conference, for the new enlarged Plenum, a change in the composition of the I.S. or of its policy. Such conduct would be quite compatible with the principles of democratic centralism. Instead of that comrade

Vitte addressed himself to the local groups of the Ligue (Paris) with an appeal not to execute the decisions of the center elected democratically. Such a manner of acting is at the same time a blow at democracy and a misconception of centralism. In other words the conduct of comrade Vitte is incompatible with the Bolshevik principles of organizations.

At the meeting of the Plenum, V pretended that we wanted to eliminate the Greek section by identifying himself with it "I am the Greek section". These words alone are enough to characterize the political and organizational methods that he wants to introduce in our organization. While V manifestly estimates its possibilities, its forces, objectively misconstruing the state of things; by underestimating it, as we hope the independence of judgement of the Greek section and the ideologic connections of the Greek section with the I.O. Even if he could succeed on the basis of the principle "I am the Greek section" a bonapartist and non-Marxist principle, temporarily tearing away the Greek section, this action could not help but cause a profound ferment in the ranks of the section. The workers would like to know why and how they have been separated from the International Opposition which until now has given them fundamental ideas and political directives. In previous years many splits have taken place in the Greek section. Moreover it appears quite probable to us that one of the important causes of split was the principle: "I am the section." There can be no doubt that the ideas of Marxism-Leninism as opposed to the methods of V. will produce a new differentiation in the Greek section. Around V. will remain only an infinitesimal purely national sect which like Landau and Co. will lead a hopeless life while great perspectives open before us at present.

In analysing the history of the V. conflict with our international organization, the following facts can be established: V. is obviously accustomed to commanding his national section, by reducing the elements of democracy to a minimum. It is with these habits that he was called upon for leading work. The circumstances have rapidly shown that his national experience is absolutely insufficient for the tasks of an independent international leadership. In itself this is not an irreparable misfortune. The I.S., as a whole is composed of young militants who are compelled to learn from experience. The condition necessary for such an apprenticeship is collective, friendly work. But comrade V. has carried a ready-made principle with him: "I am the I.S." When he clashed with a natural resistance, he set himself the task of possessing the I.S. in its entirety with the help of behind-the-scenes organizational acts. Thus he has systematically, behind the backs of the I.S. and the Executive Committee of the Ligue, begun to aggravate all kinds of grievance (e.g. the Jewish group, Giacomi, etc.) to compromise the I.S. not at all deterred by intentional misinformation, etc.....

In this work V. united around himself the most undisciplined and unprincipled elements who basically have nothing in common with Bolshevik-Leninist ideas and have remained in our ranks only because their disorganizing and in very great measure demoralizing work has too long remained unpunished. Even during his short trip to London V. attempted to turn the British section against our international organization and its leading center. To this end he declared especially to the British comrades that the proposal to enter the I.L.P. came from isolated persons and not from the entire Plenum. However, the Plenum with the active participation of comrade V. passed a resolution on this question unanimously. Comrade Vitte could not help but recall this decision, for he took it on himself to carry it out; that is to defend it before the English comrades. This example together with the examples cited above give us a sufficient picture of the methods comrade V. has recourse to.

To what end? He declares that no political differences divide him from the Left Opposition. We have heard those declarations dozens of times from the mouths of Rosmer, Landau, Frey, Mill, etc. They were all in agreement with the "ideas" of the Left Opposition provided that did not bind them to carry

them out in practice nor to a consistent policy, nor in sincere collective work, nor in revolutionary discipline. An attitude of this kind towards the ideas of the Left Opposition is characterized not as Bolshevik-Leninist but as petty bourgeois "fellow-travellers". The presence of such elements in our organization was inevitable for a certain time. The best of them will be changed a little by their education in the proletarian milieu the worst will be expelled, but it is absolutely obvious that the petty bourgeois fellow-travellers, impregnated with the thought "I am the organization" have no place in the leading body of our international organization.

Comrade Vitte who cites on all occasions his previous activities is quite new in the Left Opposition. He has hardly participated in the work of our organization. He has hardly had the opportunity to show that he has really grasped the ideas and methods of Bolshevism. We believe that he has still much to learn in this field. That is why we believe that it is absolutely out of place for comrade Vitte to set himself up as an implacable judge towards all and sundry and even pretends to the personal division of our entire organization.

Comrade Vitte has carried on extensive agitation against the Plenum, accusing it of inability to function, etc... We are not at all inclined to close our eyes to the faults and inadequacies of our work. We are trying to do everything that will improve the work of the I.S. in all fields. However, we ask the comrades not to forget that there is not a single appointed militant in the Plenum who can consecrate all his time to the affairs of the I.S. We have none who can do the technical work of copying or mimeographing the documents.

However, despite all the great inadequacies of our work V. less than anyone has the right to make reproaches to us. Up till September V. has been the permanent appointee for several months and in the opinion of all the comrades, it was precisely in this period that the I.S. was practically non-existent; letters unanswered, the majority of sections complaining for lack of directives. We cannot consider as a justification the fact that comrade V. has devoted all his time to behind-the-scenes "activity".

Several times the Plenum communicated to comrade V. recalling his tasks to him and proposing to him to take his opposition into legal channels. V. did not reply to these appeals and reminders of the comrades except by renewing his disorganizing work. Such a situation cannot be tolerated any longer. The Plenum cannot tolerate as one of its members an individual who systematically and consciously violates discipline and appeals for violation from the subordinate organizations.

The Plenum states: further collaboration with comrade V. is impermissible, to charge c. V. with responsibility for this condition: to appeal to our Greek section to replace c. V. with another comrade who really finds himself on the basis of the organizational principles of Bolshevism.

Paris, September 29, 1933

DECLARATION BY VITTE

on the "Resolution of the I.S. on the crisis in the ranks of the French League and the International change in orientation".

I learned that the I.S. in its session of September 13 passed a resolution on the situation in the French League. Since I was not in France and consequently unable to attend this session, I feel obliged to define my position on the question under discussion and the resolution passed. To avoid all confusion and to place the responsibility, I request the I.S. to transmit this declaration to the sections, as it has done with the resolutions.

1. In point 1 of your resolution you consider it necessary to propose to the Italian section to replace its representative in the I.S. because of his criticism of the last Plenum and of his objections to our participations in the con-

ference of the Left Socialist parties. I find the argumentation on which you base your proposition inconsistent. Comrade Giacomi participated in the last Plenum after having been elected delegate by his section. If in his criticism of that which concerns the Plenum, comrade Giacomi had developed conceptions contrary to those of his section, it is the Italian section which, after his report, ought to make measures and disciplinary measures against him. In the first place, the fact that all the comrades who signed the I.S. resolution had voted to transform this Plenum into the I.S., and in this way had elected comrade Giacomi into the I.S., proves that these comrades did not consider the criticism made by comrade Giacomi in the Plenum to be incompatible with his membership in the I.S. The second motivation of your proposal, on the criticisms and objections of comrade Giacomi to our participation in the conference of left socialist parties, can not justify such a proposal either. Then, in the Plenum resolution, it is clearly stated that such a turn can not be definitely concluded until after thorough discussions, and that this resolution merely opens these discussions, more precisely: "It is necessary that this turn of historic importance be preceded by ample discussion to clarify thoroughly all the questions bound up with it and develop the tasks which flow from it." The same caution that the international organization showed towards all the organizations and comrades who were opposed to the change of our orientation in Germany, it is today necessary to show toward all those who hesitates or have objections on the question of the new international orientation. It never occurred to us to demand the replacement of the German member of the Plenum for his opposition to the creation of the second party in Germany. Quite the contrary, we tried during the long discussions we had with the German comrades, to show them the greatest consideration. The same attitude ought to be shown today toward comrade Giacomi. If this comrade, on the basis of our participation and our activity in the conference of left socialist parties, expressed fears about the dangers which could follow our action with these elements, our duty is to discuss with him and to convince him, but in no case to make hasty resolutions and to treat him as you have in your resolution.

2. In point 2 of your resolution you take up the causes of the bad situation in the French League. You say on this subject: "It goes without saying the causes of this situation are manifold." Nevertheless you do not mention these manifold causes, which would have been a positive contribution toward the amelioration of the situation in the French League. For my part, I hope to be in a position to formulate for you in several days, in writing, my estimation of the means of his rehabilitation. You say only: "But the principle cause consists in the fact that several national groups, in part emigres, lend a life independent of the League, voluntarily isolation themselves, and finally influencing the organization not in the sense of the great new tasks of the League, but in the sense of their prejudices and methods of an isolated and unprincipled circle." This assertion seems to me entirely unfounded. On the contrary, I believe the I.S. should grasp and weigh the considerable importance of the role of foreign laborers who, because of their living conditions and their active participation in the class struggle, constitute a revolutionary element of the first water in France. This question deserves to be thoroughly gone into and taken up by the French organization and the international leadership, and, considering that recently I have been closely concerned with this question, I hope to be able to give you a detailed analysis of it in a short time. I can only regret deeply the unfortunate explanation you have given of the causes of the crisis in the French organization. Concretely as to the foreign comrades who are members of our French organization, I believe most of them are advanced militants, convinced and consistent internationalists. The only criticism that can be made in this province is that this work and its importance have been nearly always neglected by the leadership of the organization. If this work had been better organized, the French League would have had a chance to develop genuinely international activity. Considering that many foreign comrades on several occasions have left France for their homes, and vice versa, the League could play an important role in stimulating and training militancy and forming organizations in a number of countries.

3. You consider it necessary to propose the expulsion of the Jewish members of the Paris district, and you explain the expulsion as follows: "The Jewish members find themselves in the category, that for the past three years has been systematically conducting a struggle against the League and its methods, a struggle the more bitter in that it was never directed by clearly stated principles." I also was of the opinion, basing it on information and documents dating from the acute epoch of conflict the League went through two years ago, that this group, in trying to conduct an independent life on the basis of its activity in the province of foreign language work, found itself out of harmony with our organizational principles. In basing myself on these conclusions, during a certain period I was at odds with these comrades in the Paris district. It was precisely this struggle and the need to prove through my own experience the negative qualities of this group in order more effectively to combat them, that brought me to diametrically opposite conclusions. That is to say that the Jewish comrades of the Paris district are oppositionists, confirmed in our ideas in every field. They have a rare internationalist education and are active and militant in all branches of activity of the organization. Especially in the field of the communist movement among the Jews, which is so important in France, they enjoy a considerable prestige. There are among them comrades who are politically and in the field of trade union activity some of the best qualified members of the French organization. The fact that Mill and Senine were formerly among the leaders of this group proves nothing against the qualities of the devoted militants among the present Jewish members of the French League. Just as we can not seriously accuse the German Opposition of responsibility for the attitude of Uhrbahns and the capitulation of Wels and Co., neither can we utilize the capitulation of Mill and Senine against those who have remained faithful to our principles and worked actively to spread them. Nor is it true that these comrades have not a clear position. To all important questions they bring, as League members, political contributions that are noteworthy. And it is worth remarking that many of these contributions are more or less openly adopted by the present leaders of the League. They take part regularly in their political groups and their positions and remarks are often adopted by all the comrades (that is to say, by several non-Jewish comrades). This is natural because in their daily activities they think not as members of a separate Jewish political group, but as members of the French League. Under these conditions, to demand the expulsion of these militants means to violate the principles on which the creation of the Third International was based and our International Opposition was formed. You write in your document: "At present the Jewish group, instead of helping the Left Opposition confronted with the enormous tasks, are doing a work of sabotage and slander. Their representatives speak of a so-called orientation toward the social democracy, systematically insult the leading bodies of the League and of the I.L.O. in the presence of adversaries of the League. In a word, it is evident that their presence in the League is dictated simply by the hope of destroying its existing cadres with the concurrence of those who work against the League." This statement does not at all correspond to the facts. During recent weeks and even during the work of the last Plenum I have had occasion to hear from those members responsible for the conduct of the French League, plenty of eulogies on the loyal attitude and sincere cooperation of these comrades during this last period. By impressions and I think also the impression of the majority of the comrades of the Paris district, is that these comrades have a deep-seated desire to work for the benefit of the organization. But these comrades, like the majority of the Paris district and like nearly all the workers of that district, have a critical attitude toward the policies, the organizational methods, and the militant qualities of certain comrades in the leadership of the League. To expel them for this seems to me a deed incompatible with our principles.

4. Since you consider it correct to take up in this document the question of "personal attacks" on comrade M. of the leadership, and to draw once more the conclusion that several further expulsions are necessary and several threats to "whoever it may be", I should like to inform you definitely of my opinion on that question with full consciousness of the responsibilities involved and with all the authority of my militant past in the

communist movement: the fact that this question has been constantly cropping up for years past and this only in the French League and precisely in regard to M., is a sign that it deserves a more searching examination. We know that very often in the communist movement slanders are cast on the militants. Nevertheless this does not prevent the vanguard of the proletariat from orientating themselves frequently toward the militants who are most often slandered by their enemies. But the constant reappearance at different times within the organization of such a phenomenon may be an indication that it is not the slanderous nature of such an adversary, but a genuine cause that brings about this phenomenon. It becomes an imperative duty for each militant to examine this specific question and take a position based on his own experience. Since I have been in the French organization, I have had to face this question. So that, after having studied this phenomenon as closely as possible, very minutely and with the greatest attention, I have arrived at the conclusion that therein in the League a special case, the case of the member M., a case that consists in this--that the member consciously and systematically employs material means in the organization to set himself above all discipline, and actually not being disposed to respect any organizational rules but on the contrary having decided to make his own will law within the organization. This sets the question, then What should a militant do when he is convinced that such a case exists in the organization. For us the answer is clear: to hesitate to pose the question because of its nature or the consequences it may involve and to strive against this state of affairs which is contrary to our principles, means to lose the very face of a militant revolutionist. Is this an unprincipled struggle? Not at all. It is a political struggle having a particular angle. On the fundamental principles of Bolshevism, without the application of which it will never be possible to construct communist organizations and educate cadres, is the existence within the organizations of organizational rules permitting the selection of militants on the basis of activity, of devotion to the ideas and so forth of these militants. Only such a selection permits the establishment of a division of labor and a classification of forces which assures the greatest returns for our labors. Only on the basis of this selection can a nucleus be formed which, by its political position, by its directives, by its activity, by the militant qualities of its members, constitutes a center for the assimilation of new elements and the formation of new cadres. If a selection based on these principles does not function, no assimilation of experiences and no important progress can take place. And because we are an international organization, the nefarious characteristics that manifest themselves in a national organization, which plays an important role in the international organization, up to the moment when they are criticized, condemned and driven out, must appear in the activity of our international body with all the consequences that follow for the authority and the normal life of the international organization. This is why this question is not a matter of "personal complaints" but a political question with serious consequences not only for the life of the French League but also for our international organization. It will vanish only with the establishment of an effective communist control and discipline in the organization. You mention though not clearly that "comrade M. was officially instructed to continue his financial transactions for the benefit of the International Opposition" and arrive finally at the conclusion that considering that the "control commission named by the League to decide on the attacks made on this subject declare themselves unable to reach any conclusion, despite the urgency of the question." "The Plenum of August, at the demand of the executive committee of the League, considered it indispensable to intervene and put an end to the poisonous insinuations by a decision which has a double character. On the one hand they condemn the slanderers and on the other they invite comrade M. to dedicate all his efforts to political work and stop all specifically commercial activity." These are only appearances. The facts are entirely different: M, having suspicions that the control commission was leaning toward conclusions unfavorable to him, tried on various pretexts to disqualify and disprove it. At the same time he tried to get a certificate from the May Plenum. But supposing that the Plenum decided to give him this certificate subject to the right of control, he considered it correct at this commission

to renounce the political activity from which no one had ever tried to dissuade him. It is clear that the Plenum can not prevent any member from working exclusively in the material field. Comrade Doudain, one of the oldest and most active workers of the League, to whom you have also handed a notice of expulsion, only added to the demand of comrade M. a document addressed to the control commission, a procedure completely in line with the rules of a communist organization.

5. You have occupied yourselves at another point of your resolution with proposing measures concerning the National Conference of the French League, in order to "defend the revolutionary dignity of the organization...to the outer world", because the "national conference of the League will be observed and commented on with the greatest attention...also by our enemies." We have repeated a thousand times to those who say that our criticism of the International and matters concerning the situation in the U.S.S.R. only gives weapons to enemies-- that the role of genuine communists does not consist in shutting one's eyes and hiding facts, but in seeking the actual causes for a situation and trying to change the situation by accurate criticism. Then how is it possible that the National Conference has not the right to deliberate on all the questions of the French organization and form its own opinion on a question of the utmost importance for the development of this organization? Before an international commission or even the entire international organization takes up the question of the internal regime of the French League, it is the right and the duty of the lower organizations and even more of the National Conference of the French League to plumb thoroughly this question for themselves. This is democratic centralism. And the opposite method is foreign to democratic centralism.

6. I protest energetically against the totally unjustifiable measures of expulsion of opposition militants proposed by you and immediately put into effect by the leadership of the French League--measures dictated exclusively by an interest in preventing a sufficient political discussion at the National Conference of the French League, wholly inconsistent pretexts clumsily invented two weeks before the National Conference. The role of the international body does not consist in interfering unilaterally and partially in national organizations and attempting to invent profound and principled divergences in places where they do not exist--but on the contrary it consists in facilitating the expression of opposite opinions and genuine divergences in places where they do exist, through normal channels of discussion in the ranks and in the responsible local and national organisms. The best method for insuring the construction of an organization on a solid base, is to permit the rank and file to express its opinions and choose for itself the leadership it desires.

If I grasp the contents of your resolution, with this declaration I fall into the class of "whoever they may be" and am susceptible to the serious measures mentioned in your document. I am awaiting these measures with the calm that I have maintained throughout my life as a militant, when, in the presence of similar important cases in our movement, I arrived after a long and patient investigation at firm conclusions and I eased my conscience by formulating them to the body in which I have worked responsibly.

Dixi et salvavi animam meam.

LETTER TO THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT BY GOUROV

8/10/33

Dear Comrades,

On the eve of the conference of the Ligue I addressed a personal letter to comrade Vitte in which I have tried to restrain comrade Vitte from further movements on the path he is travelling, which can bring no good to the International Opposition, to the Greek section or to comrade Vitte personally. I have recalled to comrade Vitte that his splitting conspiracy in the Paris Ligue

would inevitably have an international repercussion and would reflect badly particularly on the Greek section.

If he engages in an open and sharp struggle, the two sections will inevitably defend their point of view before all the sections included. The manner of his advance will make it quite obvious to the overwhelming majority of the sections who have carried on the struggle against Landau, Mill, Well and others, that it is a reproduction of the struggle of these people only in a worse form, in the last analysis it will reduce itself so that comrade Vitte, after suffering a defeat in the Ligue and in our entire International organization, will inevitably endeavor to oppose the Greek section to our whole International organization. This attempt will inevitably lead, by the very logic of the situation, to the disintegration of the Greek section and to its transformation into a national section of Vitte's. This analysis, a perspective briefly formulated in my letter, is interpreted by Vitte in his answer as an attempt on my part "to eliminate" the Greek section. I do not think that Vitte understands the meaning of my letter. His interpretation is meant, not for me, nor for the international opposition generally, but for the Greek section. In other words Vitte is already completely taken up with counterposing the Greek section to the international opposition, does not hesitate to employ disloyal insinuations.

Although Vitte speaks of his Bolshevik "orthodoxy" in his letter, I personally, on the basis of all the experience with Vitte have come to the conclusion that although he has assimilated this or that theoretical or strategical formula of the L.O. he is very strange to the methods of Bolshevism. He has manifested this particularly in a letter written to me in which attributing to me the monstrous attempt "to eliminate" the Greek section he writes pathetically: "While the Left Opposition orients itself towards the left socialists we are intolerant and hostile towards the Bolshevik organization in Greece". In other words, Vitte develops Giacomi's theme: We are making a turn to the right, and that is why we are compelled to break with the real Bolsheviks.

I do not believe it would be worth the effort to take time out for this assertion, if behind it is not hidden the radically false understanding of our whole new orientation. Vitte probably believes that it means more conciliatory relations towards centrism, menshevism, etc. In reality this circumstance of the left socialist organizations approaching us obliges us to be doubly vigilant of the strictest principled tenacity and internal discipline; it is only on this condition that our less numerous cadres can have a healthy revolutionary influence on the left-centrist parties. Thus the new orientation demands closer cohesion of our own ranks and more intransigence towards vacillations of all kinds, of menshevik organization methods and personal intrigues and insinuations.

The response of comrade Vitte shows that my attempt to appeal to his revolutionary responsibility was a mistake. I am correcting this by bringing this whole episode officially to the knowledge of the I.S. as the leading body directing our international organization.

G.G.

TO THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT FROM THE
GREEK SECTION

On the Resolution of the Plenum of the Communist Opposition (BL) of the 20th August on the Subject of the I.S.

.....

October 15, 1933 the Political Bureau of the Communist Organization of Bolshevik Leninists (archeo-Marxists) in a joint session with the members of the Central Committee present in Athens, having deliberated on the decision of the August Plenum on the I.S. :

REGRETS its inability to approve the resolution adopted on the abolition of paid officials of the I.S. and the modification of functions of the I.S.

DECLARES that this act constitutes a retrogression of the International Organization which is thus deprived of a concrete organ made up of definite persons responsible to the International Opposition. The decision to abolish paid officials and the modification of the functions of the Plenum in the I.S. is contrary to the decision of the Pre-Conference which expressed a desire to form a political center for itself and not a "letter box" in the very accurate expression of the Swiss delegate. The present situation of the I.S. is a retrogression even compared to the period of the administrative I.S. made up of definite and responsible persons. We consider that a Plenum of which the members are constantly changing, of which the resolutions are made by new persons each time, does not permit the sections to find out who constitute the leading body, who is responsible, and how the body functions. One has the feeling that instead of a head the I.O. has a vacuum to guide it, which can not give it any political directives, if indeed the I.O. survives. All the more do we consider this change abominable because today, with the new orientation of the I.O., its relations with the socialist parties established, with experienced leaders, it would need a leading Center capable of swinging these organizations and leading the I.O. with assurance on the road most difficult, of the Fourth International. The I.O. takes a step backward by this change and, as proof of the victory of the "technical I.S." over the "political I.S." - the spirit that considers that the I.S. should be a research bureau and not a political secretariat. This is the spirit which, conquered at the Pre-Conference, had its revenge in August and indicated a lack of comprehension on the part of its instigators of the gravity of the present situation.

Between the two sessions of the Plenum who is going to lead the I.O.? Who will give directives, write letters? Undoubtedly there will be some one who will do it. The technical Secretariat foreshadowed by the Resolution of September 13th? Certainly not. Here then is the real meaning of the change. Between the two Plenums the occult forces that trampled the resolution of the Pre-Conference and to whom the existence of a permanent I.S. was an obstacle for their goal of lording it over the life of the I.O. The Plenum will be merely a mask to cover the Unknown, Invisible and Irresponsible Ones who for three years have been gnawing at the head of the I.O. Our Leadership protests and declares that it will demand a reckoning before the International conference from the comrades who voted for these resolutions and at the same time demand that this resolution be communicated to the other sections. From the moment that the I.S. is supposed to form its directing nucleus by the selection of militants, the sections should know the names of the comrades who have shown such a lack of understanding of the tasks of the period on which we have entered.

2. In recognition of the circumstances and persons involved we shall not accept as real the basis for the destruction of the leading committee of the I.S. Financial reasons are a pretext - this we are ready to prove if we are asked to.

3. The change in the I.S. attack on the Greek section which, having no means to support a representative on its own resources will be forced out from International leadership. If you take into consideration the fact that of the six sections forming the Plenum, the four (French, German, Russian, Italian), have their base in Paris, and Belgium is only a few hours from Paris, it is easy to see that it is Greece that will be eliminated from the Plenum. It is clear enough in the proposition of Verecken:

"The sections that for financial reasons can not take part in the work will be required to take a position by mail principle on the questions and possibilities."

Thus the Greek section is deprived of the right to put its experience of 13 years at the service of the I.O., the years during which it struggled to establish the present archeo Marxist organization.

4. Besides we consider that the I.S. should be removed from Paris in order not to mix in the conflicts of the French section. This fear expressed by comrade Verecken himself at the Pre-conference has been unfortunately realized. The P.B. considers it a mistake on the part of the I.S. that it put aside the question of M. without passing any resolutions. Neither insinuations nor slanders could arise if comrade M. would give what he gives directly to the leadership of the organization who knowing the actual indispensable requirements would make use of the financial assistance of comrade M. and give an account to the controlling body. Since this is not done we find ourselves in the presence of results well known to the French section. We do not consider that the Plenum has settled the question in the cadres of the communist organization. It is inconceivable to us how a communist can give financial aid except to the leadership of his organization. It is also inconceivable that the leaders should not give an accounting to the congress or the conferences. All the merits of comrade M. for his financial aid are drowned in the bad way in which this aid is given.

We consider that the Plenum commits an error in taking such an active part in the quarrels of the French section, and express the opinion that the I.S. transformed in the spirit of the decision of the Pre-conference should be transferred to Belgium and there set itself to the task of preparing the so long postponed International Conference.

By order of the P.B. the International Secretariat.

TO THE LEADERSHIP OF THE GREEK COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION OF BOLSHEVIK-LENINISTS (ARCHAEO-MARXISTS)

From the International Secretariat

Attention, all members of the organization.

Comrades, we have just received from you the following documents:

1. Letter from your National Youth Committee
2. Letter from the minority Spartakos Group and your letter accompanying it.
3. Your resolution of October 15 on Vitte's declaration on the question of the crisis in the ranks of the French League.
4. Your resolution on the new orientation of the I.O. and explanatory letter.
5. Resolution on the I.S.

We shall try to bring to the attention of all the sections as soon as possible this last resolution and the other documents related to it. As for points 1 and 2, as well as that which concerns our new orientation and the question of a new party in Greece, we are writing you separately. Here we wish especially to take up with you the questions which according to what you write us in which you oppose the I.S. and to the decisions made by the Plenum of August 20 on this subject. And we shall follow the same order of your exposition in doing so.

1. You begin by regretting "not being able to approve a resolution adopted on the abolition of functionaries of the I.S. and the modification of the functions of the I.S."

That is to say, you begin by opposing on the one hand a state of affairs imposed by the situation in which our organization now finds itself, and on the other hand a fact which does not exist.

a. Abolition of I.S. functionaries

Are we against paid functionaries? We earnestly regret not being able to have paid officials--that is to say functionaries, for our organization. Our aversion to "bureaucrats" does not mean that we can dispense with "functionaries". Unfortunately our organization does not yet have sufficient resources to support "paid officials". The August Plenum declared that while the I.S. had "paid officials", they could not afford to mail letters, to carry on current activities, to assure the regular publication of the International Bulletin, and so forth. In deciding to abolish the "paid officials", the August Plenum decided to devote the resources of the I.S. first of all to its organization and to assure its continuity by a sensible division of labor, strictly controlled, among the members of the Plenum itself. Thus, the Belgian comrades were put in charge of the International Bulletin and the other publications of the I.S., while the resident members of the Plenum (Paris), who constitute the present I.S., were intrusted with all the current activities (see the decision of the Plenum and of the I.S. previously sent). It is not a question now of taking stock of our new I.S. organization but it is a fact that it is the only one possible in the present state of our international organization. Those who at the August Plenum (Vitte and Giacomi) supported the transfer of the I.S. to Brussels and the reduction of functionaries to a single one, did not know how to suggest any tenable method for the practical realization of such a proposal. In fact this proposition, if it had been accepted, would have meant the virtual liquidation of the I.S., which would have found itself unable to exist and to work, especially to work as it should in the present period.

b. Modification of the functions of the I.S.

The August Plenum absolutely has not changed the "functions of the I.S.". It is false to assert that the changes in composition decided upon were a "backward step", a "victory of the spirit of the technical I.S. over the political I.S.". It was the opposite which was decided. The I.S., composed of direct representatives of the national sections themselves, directly controlled by the Plenum and by all the sections of the International Organization, correspond to the maturity of our International Organization, and to the tasks which fall upon it is the present epoch. The initiative for a new conference of the "four" for the middle of November, for our participation in the Youth Congress, the editing of the Bulletin, of the material for discussion on the elaboration of the program, and so forth, are all matters which we believe are out of the "technical" field. The I.S. in its present form is a politically responsible body, working under the immediate and direct control of different sections.

2. Consequently all your deductions are absolutely arbitrary, according to which "between the Plenums" there would be no international leadership.

a. Those who would dictate "between two Plenums" would be "the occult forces that trampled under foot the resolution of the Pre-conference and to whom the existence of the permanent I.S. is an obstacle in the way of their goal of lording it over the I.O.";

b. "The Plenum would only be a mask to cover the unknown invisible and irresponsible ones who for three years gnawed at the head of the I.O.", and so on.

It is necessary to pause a little over these arbitrary deductions that throw sufficient light on your state of confusion.

The primary quality of the Bolsheviks is frankness and clarity. But it is in vain that we study the various assertions in your documents. What are the "occult forces" in question? Is it true that there are invisible, irresponsible unknowns who for three years gnawed at the head of the I.O.? But how could you forget that "during three years" among these invisible unknown irresponsibles who have attacked the I.O., was--this is not unimportant--a member of your leadership, with whom you still maintain solidarity?

All that has been done (and not done) up to last

August by the international organization was done (or not done) directly through the agency of your organization, represented in the I.S. by comrade Vitte. If, as you now maintain, there are "occult forces", "irresponsibles", "unknowns" and so forth, who "for three years" did nothing but "gnaw at the head of the I.O.", it is necessary to say that you are assuming heavy responsibility for having permitted and covered up such crimes in the international organization for "the last three years". Aside from this, it is necessary that even accusations should retain a certain sense; if it is true that "occult forces" are trying to "lord it over" the I.O., in order to free the life of the I.O. from these supposed "invisibles", would there be a better solution than that adopted by the August Plenum which consists in making the I.S. strictly accountable--politically and materially--to the international organization? Is there a minimum of revolutionary morality in accusing, as you did, the nefarious nefarious role of the "occult forces" and expecting at the same time that they should continue by their means the existence of the "paid officials" of the I.S.? We hope you grasp the full absurdity of your position and that you will finally recognize that the solution given by the August Plenum is the only solution possible corresponding to the present stage of our international organization.

3. You say moreover that in the abolition of paid officials "financial reasons are a pretext" and that you are ready to prove it if we ask. Certainly, we ask you.

The budget of the I.S. will be submitted to the sections every month. Any comrade may check up on the resources and expenditures of the I.S. Each comrade must admit that there is no question of a "pretext". You know that until now the greatest efforts to sustain the I.S. have been made by the Russian organization and the French. These are still the two sections that carry most of the expenses, along with the Belgian organization. We are counting on your assistance in assuring our international body as soon as possible of the necessary means to reinstate the paid officials. Unfortunately in your letters and documents we find no indication on this subject.

4. Is the modification of the I.S. aimed at the Greek section? If the Greek organization desired or still wishes to maintain its own representative in the I.S., nothing stops them from doing so. The comrade delegated by the Greek organization could have been helped to "live" in Paris like other political emigres (Italian, German, etc.) who live there, that is to say by their own labors, without excluding direct assistance from the national and international organization. It must not be forgotten that, from comrade Gourov to the other members of the international organization, all were and remained ready to give their aid--limited though it might be--to assure to the Greek section permanence of its delegate in Paris

In any case, the Greek section is not at all "deprived of the right to put its thirteen years' experience at the service of the I.O.", etc, etc. They can do this just as any other section of our international organization does, from those in America to those in Spain, and as it has done in the past.

The real danger, on the contrary, of "pushing the Greek section out of the international leadership", is represented, in our opinion, by the attitude of comrade Vitte and even by your attitude when you take on yourselves responsibility for the deeds of comrade Vitte.

5. You consider the Plenum at fault for "taking an active part in the quarrels of the French section", and you express the opinion that the task of the I.S. is to "set to work to prepare the International Conference so often postponed". We do not see now to what extent the Greek organization through its representative in the I.S. itself carries the responsibility for this postponement. But we should state clearly that the principal error made by comrade Vitte was just that of mixing "in the quarrels" within the French section (as well as in the Italian), with a completely personal and factional motive. The Plenum is supposed to intervene in all questions involving the

inner life of our sections. As to the members of the I.S., living in Paris and participating in the life of the French League, apparently they can neither hide nor minimize their opinions about what takes place within this organization as well as in the other. But comrade Vitte does not work in this way. He has made himself the focal point and rallying place of all the discontented elements, without troubling himself as to their origins and political positions. He has thus made himself the messenger and principal attorney for all those elements that have risen up against the leadership of the French section and the international organization, using the same arguments and the same polemical methods as the Mills, the Gourgets, the Landaus and others of that ilk. Like us, you have been severe in the judgment you passed on Mill and the "Jewish" elements (Felix, Emile and others) who after having condemned and rejected the slanders they cast against the leadership of the French League and especially against comrade M., repeated and aggravated these slanders. Then how can we judge the attitude of those who, after having condemned Mill, Gourget, Felix and others and their predecessors, themselves became the source of the same slanders and the same accusations against the leadership of the French League? It is in fact the case of comrade Vitte, who suddenly finds himself the friend of the enemies he fought so bitterly yesterday.

There are no "taboos" in our organization. Every comrade, from the highest to the lowest of our militants, is susceptible to criticism and punishment if he deserves it. But what is unworthy is to hold against him those very slanders and accusations that yesterday you repudiated and deplored with justice.

Especially in the matter of comrade M., an international control commission has heard all the particulars of which he was accused and confirmed the same judgment as before against the accusers.

You will find attached here the conclusions adopted by the said control commission, giving an answer to all the questions. But let me get down the essentials.

6. Comrade Vitte,--and your leadership, in declaring solidarity with him--make reproaches to the leaders of the French League and the I.S., because of the "proceedings" used by them in solving the internal problems of the French League, and precisely the measures of expulsion taken against various elements in the French organization. It is sufficiently astonishing that your leadership, who in Greece defend the organizational methods of a very strict centralism, that your leadership that has always campaigned energetically against "factionalists", demands that the methods of "factionalists"--which they do not tolerate for an instant in Greece--should be established in other kindred organizations. Yes, comrades of the Greek organization: comrade Vitte made himself the patron and inspiration of French "factionalists" in Paris. If the Plenum and the French organization together had not taken the measures that have been taken, the French organization would have found itself paralyzed by its "factionalists" at an important turn of our international and national French politics. The expulsions announced were a necessary defense measure of the organization, for without organization no politics is possible. On the other hand, the expelled ones were heard by the National Conference of the French section, and the measures of the leadership were confirmed by the Conference.

But is it possible to defend good organizational procedure, communist methods of organization, if the politics one is defending is false and anti-communist? This what comrade Vitte did not understand, in making himself the instructor of the French "factionalists", he at the same time made himself their political "sponsor". The actual content of the struggle carried on against the French leadership by the "factionalist" elements who followed those who were expelled out of the organization, was defined by "Prometeo"--the organ of the Bordighists. This paper wrote that the struggle of these elements represented a "healthy reaction" (sic!) to the new orientation toward the 4th International. Then if it is a question of a reaction to the new orientation, it is an obvious thing; but it is also obvious to us that it is

a question of a reaction of the past, of a resistance of the retrogressive forces to our forward march. Comrade Vitte--your representative--instead of vigorously combatting these elements, gave them all his political support, even to the point of defending the right of these elements to besmirch whatever has been done toward the new orientation.

We ask you, dear comrades, to be consistent with yourselves: it is not possible to approve the new orientation, the results of the Paris Conference, that is to say the agreement of the "four", and, at the same time, espouse, as Vitte did in Paris, the cause of those who try to accuse of going toward the 2nd International and the $\frac{3}{4}$ and so forth. In what position will you find yourselves tomorrow if the organ "Spartakos" for example should reproduce in Greece the arguments of "Prometeo", Giacomi, and others according to whom our present orientation is nothing but an orientation toward the "2 $\frac{1}{2}$ International"? How can you combat our slanderers in Greece, if you cover and support them in France, as Vitte has done?

Every organizational problem is inseparable from the politics one supports. It is not possible to defend good organizational procedure if the politics is false. And comrade Vitte, blinded by his personal resentments, allows himself to be dragged into defending the methods of the French "factionalists" and consequently a policy inimical to our new orientation although he never misses an opportunity to state his agreement with it.

We earnestly hope you will discuss again and with your whole organization the different questions we have taken up here, and that with full knowledge of the facts you can be persuaded to reconsider your judgments in order to reestablish between your organization and the I.S., relations which will eventually permit us to resolve all our divergences to the advantage of your organization as well as that of the International Bolshevik-Leninists.

Seal of the I.S.

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE GREEK SECTION OF THE LEAGUE OF COMMUNIST-INTERNATIONALISTS (Bolshevik-Leninists) by G. Gourov

Dear Comrades:

The conflict which brought the Greek section in opposition to all other section of the League of Communists-Internationalists, has led with iron logic to a sharp internal struggle in the Greek section itself, because of the enormous importance of this question, I consider it my duty to present my point of view to you in full frankness.

From the very first I was struck by the fact that for the past several months your Central Committee had not replied to the letters of the International Secretariat, that it seemed to ignore all its requests for information and its proposals; in other words, that it behaved as if it had already broken de Jure with the International League. Needless to say I was overjoyed by the letter of the majority of your Central Committee of March 10th because I saw in it the desire of comrade VITTE, MANOS and others to reconstitute the international ties broken by them. To my great regret the contents of this letter are disappointing to the highest degree. The letter is written with unheard of animosity and extreme venom. The tone of the letter--poisoned through and through--would be understandable only in case the majority of your Central Committee decided to break with the International League of Bolshevik-Leninists. But I refuse to believe it. The attempt of the majority of the Central Committee in trying to make you believe that its blows are directed solely against the International Secretariat does not hold water. The International Secretariat is composed of the most important European sections. If the Greek section is not represented--what I personally regret very much--it is solely due to financial difficulties which do not permit your section to keep a representative abroad. We have an International Secretariat corresponding to our strength. The most important of our sections have in recent period scored great successes in a series of countries. Great perspectives open up before us. It is clear, of course,

that the International Secretariat does not claim infallibility, but there can be friendly criticism the aim of which is the amelioration of the common work and a hostile criticism tending to destroy the organization, against all our sections.

Where does this animosity come from? Originally, as we know, the conflict started within the International Secretariat and the French section. The march of events was not tardy in throwing light upon the conflict. Only after the French League purged itself of the decomposed elements did it become possible for it to develop widely its mass work. Its successes in this field are very important, its influence on large sections of advanced workers grows constantly. And on the contrary the groups which broke off under the influence of VITTE have already come to a split and continue to disintegrate. They do not carry on any political activity. Such are the facts. Against the facts abstract judgment is powerless.

And what about the International Secretariat? During a long period of time all sections without exception complained of the passivity of the Secretariat, which, despite the presence of a permanent secretary could not even cope with current correspondence. During the last months, despite the grave financial difficulties and the absence of a permanent secretary the work is being done systematically. The International Secretariat not only carries on a regular correspondence with all sections, but it has edited a series of issues of the "Bulletin", worked out a draft of theses on the question of war, edited a manifesto, organized a conference of international youth, etc. Such are the facts. If these facts are considered honestly without factional prejudice, without personal bitterness, one can not but recognize that the International Secretariat has made a considerable step forward during the last six months.

The fact that comrade VITTE took a wrong position inside the International Secretariat and the French League does not, it is clear, constitute a crime in itself. Who does not make mistakes in political work? But after a wrong position was refuted ~~proved~~ by definite and indisputable facts to insist on it any longer and try to carry it over to other sections means to put one's personal ambitions above the interests of revolution and socialism. This is altogether inadmissible. In such cases the rank and file militants must correct their leaders.

The second phase of the struggle has developed already inside the Greek section. In this it is much harder for me to give my opinion since I do not read Greek. But the majority of your Central Committee writes that in Greece it goes to the defense of the same "principles" that comrade Vitte practiced in the International Secretariat and in the French League. If this is so there can be no doubt for me that these are the same principles which have suffered shipwreck. Of course, I do not speak of the time when comrade Vitte was in accord with our international leadership on all fundamental questions and did not pretend to any personal policy apart from it. I speak of the recent period when comrade Vitte, starting with small and secondary questions, has set himself sharply in opposition to our general leadership and to all our most important sections. Here it is no longer a question of single mistakes but of the incorrect principled line of comrade Vitte. After the experience with the French League for any Marxist acquainted with the facts there cannot be the slightest doubt of it.

Trying to find an explanation for its hostile policy with regard to the International League the majority of your Central Committee refers to the split of 1903 between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. The odd group which detached itself from the French League under the leadership of comrade Vitte refers in its declaration (see "International" No. 12 of November 11, 1933) to the year 1903. Thus, we have here a system of a sort which cannot be called otherwise than a system of preventive splits, since those who refer to the year 1903 recognize by this very fact that it is a question of irreconcilable differences and that the only way out is by a split. Are the members of the Greek section in accord with this conclusion?