

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Official Organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International



PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

The May Plenum of the
E.C.C.I.

Diehard Incendiaries

Work in the Trade Unions

The Revolution in China
and the Tasks of the C.I.

30th June, 1927

Vol iv No. 10.

3d.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

English Edition Published at 16 King Street, London, WC2

C O N T E N T S

THE MAY PLENUM OF THE E.C.C.I. Editorial	186	WORK IN THE TRADE UNIONS O. Piatnitsky ...	194
DIEHARD INCENDIARIES	191	THE REVOLUTION IN CHINA AND THE TASKS OF THE C.I. J. Stalin	200

The May Plenum of the E.C.C.I.

THE May Plenum of the E.C.C.I. occurred at a time when the international situation was one of the utmost gravity. The *coup d'état* of Chiang Kai Shek and the acts of provocation against the U.S.S.R., which are closely connected with it—the attack on the Soviet Embassy in Peking, on the Trade Delegation in London, and, finally, the breaking off of diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and England—everything pointed towards a close approach of the danger of war. The work of the Plenum was guided by these signs, these facts decided its character.

The May Plenum occupied itself only with three questions: war and the danger of war, the situation in England and the Chinese revolution. After careful and thorough discussion of these questions in special Commissions the Plenum came to unanimous decisions, which affirmed the correctness of the policy of the Comintern in the past, and at the same time contained concrete directions how to carry out that policy in the future, having regard to the sharpening of the struggle between the imperialist world on the one side and the international proletariat, the U.S.S.R. and revolutionary China on the other.

The conclusions of the May Plenum at the end of its sitting, with regard to war and the war danger, can be summed up in the following manner:

“The new phase of imperialist policy is characterised by the preparations of capitalism to turn from small to large wars.”

“All contradictions among the capitalist States fall into the background before the principal contradiction, which is dividing the whole world into two camps. In one camp we have the Soviet Union and revolutionary China, in the other camp the whole capitalist world. China and the Soviet Union are the two focal points of the entire international situation.”

On the coming war danger the Plenum declared:

“The factor which at the present moment is most threatening to peace is England. The new factor characterising the international situation is that of England having again achieved hegemony in European policy.”

The Plenum emphasised the fact that the approaching war against China and the Soviet Union differed from the imperialist war of 1914 in certain particulars.

“Such a war is a peculiar one because it is openly a class war. Here the imperialists are not fighting against each other with the help of their respective populations, but the imperialists are sending out a punitive expedition to overthrow the workers and peasants.”

It follows from that that the most important slogan of the present anti-war campaign should not be the abstract one of “war against war,” but the concrete slogan, “Defend the Chinese and Russian Revolution.” “The attention of the masses must be concentrated on this slogan.” On the same subject the Plenum further pointed out that “the next war will be a mechanised war.”

“Every country will be turned into a mighty factory for turning out weapons of destruction.” “In consequence of this character of the war the importance of the working class and their organisations grows, particularly of the trade unions, without whose co-operation the war would be unthinkable. Their opposition to the war, together with the revolutionary fight of the army against the war, would be fatal for the imperialist States.”

THE imperialists are quite clear on that point, so they are making strong efforts for the ideologic preparation of the working class masses for war. In this respect the Second International, the Amsterdam Trade Union Federation and the ultra-left deserters from the Comintern, by skilfully dividing up the work, render unique service. Since it is quite hopeless to lead the masses to war against revolutionary China under the banner of “Defend the Fatherland”—no reasonable man will believe that China threatens the British Isles with invasion—the bourgeoisie and their accomplices are compelled to draw upon such sophisms as, for example, “Defence of interests,” “Defend the flag,” “Protection of civilisation,” etc. In order however, to prepare ideologically for a campaign against the U.S.S.R. the Second International is conducting the

E.C.C.I. Plenum—continued

most vile propaganda against the "red imperialism" of the Soviet Union. At the same time, traitors from the ranks of German Social-Democracy are awakening illusions among the masses as to the future neutrality of Germany: they understand perfectly that in case of war the German chemical industry will most probably stand at the service of the States conducting the war against the U.S.S.R., that the German system of transport will assure a way for the transportation of munitions and weapons from England, Italy, etc. Similarly the ultra-left renegades are trying to disorganise the Soviet-Russian hinterland, in that they are attempting to slander and discredit the Soviet power and the leadership of the C.P. in the eyes of the working masses. They accuse them of "Kulak-isation," of "degeneration," of "national weakness of intellect," etc.

It follows that one of the most important moments in the defence of the Russian and the Chinese revolution is the fight against all these traitors and calumniators. In connection with that the Plenum emphasised, among other things, the necessity of the fight against the pacifist talk on disarmaments, and described it as "greatest hypocrisy and mockery." "We must make clear to the masses"—declared the Plenum—"that the only country which has in reality reduced its army to a minimum is the Soviet Union, that the Soviet Union is the only State which firmly supports peace, that all disarmament plans of the imperialist States are but treachery," intended to divert the attention of the working class from the tremendous war armaments of these States. In the fight against pacifism—the Plenum declared—we must take care to distinguish between the "vague, sentimental pacifism from which the working class is still suffering" and the "conscious treachery of the bourgeois pacifists, priests and other charlatans in which the Social-Democrats—as, for example, the I.L.P.—are included."

The Plenum further considered in a concrete manner the tactical problems of the fight against imperialist war. It summed up all that Lenin had taught on this question, which is still valid to-day. It considered minutely how this Leninist tactic is to be employed in the actual relations of this coming "open class war" which will differ considerably from the war of 1914, the war between imperialist States.

GREAT attention was particularly directed by the Plenum to the question of the General Strike in connection with war. The promises of the whining "heroes" of the Second International to "answer" a war with a General Strike are nothing but empty phrases or deliberate treachery. "The struggle against war is not a single act: it demands bloody sacrifices from the working class, a whole series of mass actions (demonstrations, strikes in munition factories, etc.), whose outcome is the victorious revolt of the proletariat. The Communist Parties must use every effort possible to enlarge such mass action, and must work firmly towards a General Strike. . . . We must not, however, lose sight of the fact that it depends on the revolutionary development of the situation, whether the slogan of the General Strike can be put forward as a slogan of

action." The defeatist slogan must also be adapted to the new character of the future war.

"If, in an ordinary imperialist war between two capitalist States the workers can fight for the overthrow of their own government, and not for the victory of one of the belligerent States, how much more must they fight in the imperialist and counter-revolutionary war against the Chinese revolution (to-day against Wuhan) or against the Soviet Union, for the working masses of China and the Soviet Union?"

The slogan of "fraternisation"—which is still valid to-day—will have to be adapted to the new conditions also. "This slogan . . . must be bound up, in an imperialist war against revolutionary China (now the Government in Wuhan) and the Soviet Union, with the appeal to the soldiers of the imperialist armies to go over, at a suitable moment, to the troops of the revolution."

THE Plenum similarly discussed the questions of the abolition of the existing armies, of the "people's militia," the "arming of the proletariat," "the workers' militia."

"In modern capitalist countries, in which the period of bourgeois revolution is finished, the Communist Parties must put forward, in conjunction with the demand for the abolition of the existing army, the slogan of 'Arming the Proletariat.' . . ."

"The slogan of the red army will become real after the seizure of political power by the proletariat. . . ."

"The slogan of a workers' militia is nowadays of propagandist importance. Its realisation presupposes the victory of the proletariat revolution in a number of the most important capitalist States. The Communist Parties, in their propaganda for this slogan must lay greatest emphasis on the demand for the disarming of the bourgeoisie, of the fascist organisations, the police, the gendarmerie.

"The slogan of a general militia must be put forward (a) in colonial countries; (b) in capitalist countries where, in consequence of the existence of feudalistic survivals, bourgeois-democratic revolutions are still possible, which . . . can change into socialist revolutions; (c) in a number of countries where the military caste are responsible for military *coups d'état*. . . .; (d) in capitalist countries . . . which are in a position of semi-colonial dependence on world capital, and particularly if there is present a powerful national-revolutionary movement against their oppression." Together with these slogans, Communists are obliged "to support the demands of the soldiers and sailors, as *e.g.*, elected officers, territorial system in relation to the administration of the military services, the right to vote, improvement in the material conditions of the soldiers, etc. The Communists must bring in all these slogans in connection with their general ones."

THE Plenum directed particular attention to illegal work in the forces and among the youth. Finally, the Plenum referred to a number of mistakes and defects of the Party in this particular sphere: The under-estimation of the war danger, as though the war were a matter of the more or less distant future; in several countries the inability to connect questions of

E.C.C.I. Plenum—continued

internal politics with international problems; in other countries, on the other hand, the under-estimation of imperialism in those lands; mistakes in the direction of a vulgar pacifism; false conclusions of a few comrades from the ideas of Lenin which he stated in the instructions to the delegates to the Hague, and which were interpreted by the comrades as renouncing the strike as a means of fighting against war.

As we see, the May Plenum of the E.C.C.I. in the true spirit of Leninism did not deal with the war danger abstractedly—"from the standpoint of eternity"—but throughout concretely, having regard to the concrete character of the coming war, the given historical situation of the different countries.

We take only two points from the resolution on England. The Plenum stated that:

"the intensification of the class struggle in England finds its expression in the accelerated differentiation within the working-class movement." On the one side "the leaders of the Labour Party and of the trade unions are openly coming nearer to the ruling class in all the burning questions of external and internal politics—the miners' struggle, the new trade union law, intervention in China, preparations for war against the U.S.S.R., peace in industry, Americanisation. . . . While the trade union bureaucrats and the leaders of the Labour Party work with capitalism for peace in industry, they are conducting a furious struggle against the Communist workers and the adherents of the Minority Movement and the left wing. . . . Although the I.L.P. tried, by using left wing phrases, to separate itself from the right wing reformists, it has in all practical questions openly supported the bureaucracy, the right wing."

On the other hand, there is noticeable a radicalisation of the working class masses.

"The feelings of the broad masses of the people find their expression in the constant decrease of votes given to the Government in bye-elections. . . . The development of the left wing within the Labour Party, the energetic echo which the conferences of the Minority Movement experience, the success of the Party and the Minority Movement in the trade union elections in the coal areas, all indicate the growth of the left movement among the working class."

The second point of the Plenum decision, dealing with the unity of the English workers with the proletariat of the Soviet Union and the Anglo-Russian Committee, deserves particular attention; the more because the representatives of the Russian opposition in the Plenum displayed the greatest demagoguery on these questions. On this question the Plenum came to an unequivocal and clear decision. Rejecting the slanderous opinions put forward by the Opposition on the so-called "opportunist" policy of the Comintern on this question, the Plenum declared:

"The Communist Party must, now as before, enlighten the workers on the significance and importance of unity between the workers of Great

Britain and the proletariat of the Soviet Union; that this unity, in face of the military policy of the British Government, is an absolute necessity. The Party must make clear to the workers that in consequence of the sabotage of the entire General Council, from Hicks and Purcell to Thomas, the Anglo-Russian Committee has not yet been able to accomplish its great task. . . . The Comintern fully and completely approves the explanation of the British Communist Party, which places the entire responsibility for the results of the last Berlin Conference on the General Council. The history of the activity of the Anglo-Russian Committee in the last year justifies the position of the British Communist Party, which explained to the workers that the General Council is responsible for the concessions of the Russian trade unions, and that these concessions are new indications of the fact that the Soviet trade union movement is honestly trying to obtain practical unity. At the same time, the Plenum approves the campaign of the Communist Party among the miners in favour of unity between British and Russian miners."

In the same fashion the Plenum discussed thoroughly the fighting measures to be taken against the ultimatum of the General Council to the Trades Councils (March 25th), according to which the Trades Councils are obliged to break off all connections with the Minority Movement.

THE Plenum devoted extraordinary attention to the Chinese question. It was considered in all its concrete form, in its complete actuality, parrying all attempts of the Opposition to drown it in a sea of abstract revolutionary phrases, behind which phrases was concealed an opportunist, out and out pessimistic and bankrupt content. The Plenum laid down, above all, "that recent events completely confirm the standpoint of the C.I. towards the Chinese revolution," and that in particular "the march of events has entirely borne out the prognosis of the seventh Enlarged Executive on the unavoidable separation of the bourgeoisie from the national united front and its going over to the side of the counter-revolution." The Plenum laid it down "that the breaking away of Chiang Kai Shek has created a new general political situation in China and a new grouping of the decisive class forces in the country," that it "signifies a temporary defeat of the Chinese revolution, a certain strengthening of the counter-revolutionary alliance." At the same time, however, the Plenum affirmed that "the tactic of a united front with the national bourgeoisie in the period of the revolution which has finished was quite correct," that the "bankrupts' opinion that the present crisis in the Chinese revolution is a decisive defeat . . . is false."

The Plenum declared that "the chief cause of the treachery of the bourgeoisie and their military leader, Chiang Kai Shek, lay on the one hand in the development of the mass movement in the working class and peasantry, as well as in the successes of the Communists; on the other hand, in the growing pressure of the united

E.C.C.I. Plenum—continued

strength of international imperialism." In connection with these results of the movement, which brought about that breaking away, the Plenum declared that "the temporary defeat of the revolution accompanied by its transference to a higher stage of development and the beginning of a more intense mobilisation of the masses."

The essential characteristic of the new phase of development in the Chinese revolution was formulated by the Plenum as follows:

"The agricultural revolution (in the end the confiscation and nationalisation of the land) is the essential social-economic content of the new stage of the Chinese revolution. Most important at present is the revolutionary 'plebeian' solution of the agricultural question from below, by the dozens and hundreds of millions of the peasants themselves, of which movement the Communist Party must place itself at the head, and which it must lead."

The Plenum decided that the principal task of the C.P. of China at present is to spread and to lead the peasant agricultural revolution from below, and at the same time emphasised that "the Communist Party within the Government must also influence Government policy in the direction of precipitating the agricultural revolution," and towards the change of the Government "into an organ of revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry." Only on the basis of such a policy from above and below is the formation of really reliable troops and the organisation of the whole army on firm revolutionary principles possible.

THE Plenum emphasised, however, that the C.P. of China can only fulfil this task "if it . . . keeps its own revolutionary character, distinct from the political character of even the most radical petty-bourgeois revolutionary."

The Plenum referred to the fact that the Communist Party "must not renounce its right of criticising the vacillations of the revolutionary petty-bourgeois democracy," and stressed the point that "there was to be observed in the Communist Party of China a great deal of hesitation on this point." The Party had not always criticised with sufficient firmness the leadership of the Kuomintang, and within the Party there is occasionally noticeable a certain fear of the growth of the mass movement, particularly the movement among the peasants in favour of the appropriation of the land, the dispossession of the landed gentry, landowners, etc. But the Plenum expressed

"its firm conviction that the young Communist Party of China, which is rapidly growing and has already given examples of revolutionary heroism, will quickly correct these mistakes, which are explained by the extreme complexity of events and by the youth of the Communist movement in China."

The May Plenum of the E.C.C.I. thus justified the line of policy of the Chinese C.P., in the same way that the seventh Plenum had done: warning it against right wing deviations, "it refuses in the most decided manner

the demand for their secession from the Kuomintang, or the adoption of a position which if accepted in principle would lead to such a secession. . . . The Plenum is of the opinion that a policy which underestimates the Kuomintang, regarding it as a peculiar form of the revolutionary movement, would in actual fact mean the handing over of the banner of the Kuomintang to the right wing." The Plenum is further of the opinion "that such a juxtaposition of the tasks of the national revolution and the tasks of the proletarian class struggle, which we can record both of the ultra-left groups in Europe as well as of the Social-Democrats, is nothing less than a renunciation of the leadership of the proletariat in the democratic Chinese revolution, than a renunciation in favour of a so-called 'proletarian' exclusiveness, which politically is a species of opportunism, and makes the proletariat an appendage of the democratic camp."

A MOST emphatic condemnation was expressed for the refusal to participate energetically in the "provisional revolutionary government of Hankow," as also against "a sceptical attitude which formally is very 'radical-revolutionary,' but in reality repeats the mistakes of the Russian Mensheviks of 1905."

The Plenum, in opposition to this extreme leftism, which in essence, however, follows the Menshevik tactic, put forward the tactic of changing the Kuomintang into a mass organisation: "The inclusion of the broad masses in the Kuomintang, the election of the leading bodies by these masses and the formation of a basis of the eligibility of these organisations—this is the particular form of contact between the working masses and the revolutionary State power which corresponds to the present stage of the Chinese revolution." "The Hankow Government," said the Plenum, "which is a government of the left section of the Kuomintang, is therefore not yet a dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, but it is on the way to becoming such, and in the event of a victorious progress of the class struggle of the proletariat in shaking off their radical-bourgeois companions, and after overcoming a number of acts of treachery, will inevitably develop in the direction of such a dictatorship."

The May Plenum of the E.C.C.I. foresees, as did the seventh Plenum, that in the future, with the progress of the agricultural revolution there will inevitably appear vacillations within the heterogeneous petty-bourgeois masses, new divisions in the revolutionary front, new treachery. In order that these unavoidable betrayals should not be fatal to the revolution, and to create sufficient guarantees against their consequences, the Plenum recommends the Chinese Communist Party, firstly, to spread with all their strength the agrarian and the working-class movements; secondly, to employ all means to change the Kuomintang into a revolutionary mass organisation; thirdly, to criticise the mistakes and hesitation of the leaders of the Kuomintang; and, fourthly—what is of special importance—to increase tenfold the energy employed in changing the national army into a true revolutionary force:

"The E.C.C.I. is of the opinion that at present the question of the reorganisation of the army,

E.C.C.I. Plenum—continued

the formation of troops devoted absolutely to the revolution, the contact between the army and the organisations of the workers and peasants, the securing of cadres in the army, the transformation of the army from a mercenary into a regular army of the revolution, etc., is of burning importance. Particular attention must be given to the formation of absolutely reliable troops composed of revolutionary workers and peasants, to the influence of the Communists and of the trustworthy 'left' members of the Kuomintang in the army, which must be cleansed of all counter-revolutionary elements, and to the formation of a Workers' Guard."

RECOMMENDING to the C.P. of China to participate energetically in the Hankow Government and to hold it to its course of changing into an organ of the revolutionary-democratic workers' and peasants' dictatorship, the Plenum also declared, with reference to the tremendous difficulties which the Hankow Government had, and still has, to overcome, that: "under these difficult circumstances the Hankow Government should rely principally on a policy of 'tacking' and manœuvring against foreign imperialism. The E.C.C.I. is against the idea of excluding in principle the 'Brest Litovsk' tactic of 'tacking' and manœuvring, by referring to the unproletarian character of the State power."

In so far as the C.P. of China takes over, and must take over, the responsibility for the Hankow Government, of which it is a component part, it must also bear the responsibility for the tactical manœuvres of the same.

Finally, the Plenum declared emphatically that:

"It would be useless at the present moment to put forward the slogan of delegate councils of workers and peasants. This slogan (in the district under the government of Hankow) would mean nothing more than the slogan of the proclamation of 'all power to the councils.' It would mean a double government, the road to ruin for the Hankow Government, the immediate passing over to a proletarian dictatorship in the form of councils, omitting the stage of the Kuomintang form of mass organisation and State power. In the further development of the revolution, when the democratic revolution begins to change in a Socialist direction, it will be necessary to form workers', peasants' and soldiers' councils."

THE May Plenum of the E.C.C.I. was a Plenum of war; it closed the ranks of the Comintern, in a situation of imminent war, for the difficult struggles ahead. On that account the work of the Plenum was done with great enthusiasm and in complete unanimity. In the commissions problems were thoroughly discussed, critical statements, coming from various quarters, were listened to attentively and patiently; these criticisms were, however, always objective, founded upon essentially Leninist lines, and so the decisions were come to unanimously.

In violent contrast to this unanimity of the Plenum is the attitude of the representatives of the opposition in the C.P. of the Soviet Union, *i.e.*, of comrades Trotsky and Vujovitch, whose speeches and numerous theses, articles and declarations, which were manufactured by the absent comrades Zinoviev and Radek, greatly hindered the work of the Plenum.

In a situation of acknowledged gravity, at a moment when all the forces of imperialism are opening fire on the Comintern, on the Soviet Union, and on revolutionary China, these comrades have not made a single effort to offer even one practical piece of advice, even one practical reference to ways and means of meeting the furious attacks of world imperialism against these citadels of revolution. Instead of that they have made "fraction" capital out of the difficulties of the Chinese revolution, of the Soviet Union, of the C.P.S.U., of the Comintern, they have made malicious and embittered attacks from the beginning on the leadership of the Comintern and its sections, to discredit it, to make unheard of slanderous complaints, and, in addition, demanded in the name of "freedom of criticism" the widest possible circulation of their mutinous speeches. In its essence their whole method of procedure implied an essential deviation from Leninism to Trotskyism in its worst form.

As in the world war of 1914, comrade Trotsky denied the revolutionary slogans of Lenin, which could, and finally did, change the imperialist war into a civil war, and in their place put revolutionary phrases only; so this time again he and his adherents have not been able to bring forward even one slogan which could mobilise the masses against the threatened intervention. The one thing which they demanded in connection with the war danger was the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and this—this one demand—coincides with what the Conservative British Government has been impatiently awaiting, and what will be striven for by the English reformists and traitors to the working class—for they are clear on the point that by such a dissolution the preparations for a war offensive against the U.S.S.R. will be made much easier.

Trotsky and his adherents proposed in place of the plan of winning over of the masses, which at present, in face of the danger of war, is of particular practical importance, a plan resembling that of the anarcho-syndicalists, and just at a time when all honest anarcho-syndicalist elements in sympathy with the Communist movement have already been assimilated by it, and who retain only the worst elements, "who with the foulest means fight side by side with the worst White Guards against the Comintern and the Soviet Union."

In place of the plan for consolidating the forces of the Comintern, which in view of the imminent war is of particular importance, they proposed a complete political and organisational alliance with the renegades of the Maslov-Ruth Fischer group, expelled from the Communist Party, and demanded their immediate reinstatement in the Comintern, and this demand is proposed at a time when these renegades are preparing the issue of an anti-Communist journal and the establishment of a counter-revolutionary fourth international.

E.C.C.I. Plenum—continued

INSTEAD of the Comintern tactic with regard to the accomplished stages of the Chinese revolution, they proposed one which would lead to the secession of the proletariat from the national revolutionary movement, and the renunciation of the leadership of the proletariat, and the surrender of all positions of power to the capitalist bourgeoisie. For the future they demand a tactic of double government, in the district controlled by the Hankow Government, which will take the form of Soviets, also the immediate adoption of a plan for the fall of the left Kuomintang government.

"This is nothing less than the repetition of the old Trotskyist attitude, an omission of the petty-bourgeois-peasant stage of revolution, that is an attitude which comrade Trotsky, in harmony with the Mensheviks, represented as against Lenin."

If this ultra-left attitude is compared with Trotsky's utterances, that the Chinese revolution and the Comintern had suffered nothing but defeats in the course of recent years, and had achieved no successes, it becomes evident that behind the ultra-left phrases of Trotsky and his disciples there is concealed a profound pessimism, a bankruptcy and a desertion from the revolution.

At a moment of war danger comrade Trotsky diverts attention from it, and puts forward the slogan, "The Greatest Danger is the Party Regime." For the struggle against this regime Trotsky demands, just as he did after the split of 1903 in common with the Mensheviks, an unlimited freedom to criticise, even if this finds expression in throwing mud at the Comintern. The Comintern is conducting a so-called "ignominious policy," which has helped towards the victory of the Chinese Cavaignac—Chiang Kai Shek—even though it aims at accusing the Soviet power of a national conservative narrow-mindedness—an accusation which harmonises completely with the Social-Democratic cry

of "red imperialism of the Soviet Union." In demanding now, at a moment of war danger, the opening up of a wide discussion, they refer to the discussion during the Peace of Brest, but conceal, however, that Lenin was then against the discussion, and that it was only made possible because the C.C. of the C.P.R. was split on that question into two equal parts, whereas to-day the opposition of the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern is only represented by a small, diminishing number of Party comrades.

Instead of the slogan "We must now fight the imperialist offensive to the finish," Trotsky put forward, "We will fight this plan to an end," that is, against Party and Comintern.

THE whole Plenum unanimously condemned these comrades as politically bankrupt and as deserters. It declared that their behaviour is incompatible with their position as members and candidates of the E.C.C.I., and instructed the Presidium, together with the International Control Commission, to exclude comrades Trotsky and Vujovitch formally from the E.C.C.I. if this fight is not discontinued. At the same time, it recommended the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. to "take the strongest measures to protect the C.P.S.U. from the fractional struggle of comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev."

In its commissions, the Plenum allowed comradely, objective criticism of defects and mistakes from all members of the E.C.C.I., indeed, it demanded such criticism and listened willingly to it; but the Plenum rejected, unanimously and angrily, the malevolent and inimical criticism of the Opposition, which essentially departs from the principles of Leninism, and shows solidarity with the renegades Maslov and Ruth Fischer. The Plenum proved that in the present hour of danger the Comintern can and will defend the Soviet Republic and revolutionary China, maintaining an iron discipline in its ranks, as a true Leninist weapon of world revolution.

Diehard Incendiaries

THE prospects of world war loomed clearer and clearer after the bandit raid on the Soviet Embassy in Peking and a similar bandit raid on the Trade Delegation in London. Then came the rupture of diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the U.S.S.R. and finally the foul shooting of comrade Voikov in the back in Warsaw.

All this happened outside the U.S.S.R. On Soviet territory, however, hired murders are more and more frequently committing terrorist acts or attempts on Soviet leaders or against State institutions and enterprises.

The British spy, Sydney Reilly, comes to the U.S.S.R. in 1925 with instructions from Winston Churchill for the organisation of terrorist acts. At the end of 1926, there is an attempt on the life of comrades Chubar and Petrovsky. On March 12, 1927, the assassination of comrade Bukharin was attempted in the Bolshoi Theatre, Moscow. On May 10th, the arrest took place of a group connected with the head of the

consular section of the British Mission. This group had planned to blow up the Kremlin and the Bolshoi Theatre.

On the night of June 3rd preparations for the blowing up of a house in the vicinity of the O.G.P.U. (State Political Dept.) were just discovered in the nick of time. On the same day that comrade Voikov was murdered a railway "accident" was organised in Minsk which cost the life of the State Political Dept representative, comrade Opansky. On the same day two bombs were thrown in the Communist Party Club in Leningrad. At the same time cases of incendiarism were discovered in factories, military stores, etc., in various parts of the country.

SUCH are the facts enumerated in the Soviet Government communiqué and all the threads of these vile deeds meet in London, where the General Staff of the world incendiaries, the diehard Tory Government, has its headquarters.

The menace of war is rapidly drawing nearer. The

Diehard Incendiaries—continued

May Plenum of the E.C.C.I. correctly pointed out that from the sphere of small wars we had entered the phase of big wars, and that the coming war will no longer be a war between the imperialist Powers, but a war of the imperialists against the U.S.S.R. and revolutionary China, a "heavy class war," a primitive expedition of the imperialist robbers against millions and millions of workers and peasants. The international working class and the broad masses of the people must get a clear understanding as to how this open class war is being prepared and what forms it will at first assume.

As the coming war will be quite obviously of a counter-revolutionary nature, and the people, still having live memories of the horrors of 1914, are thirsting for peace, it is already clear that this war will be developed in ways differing in many respects from the 1914 methods. All parliamentary parties, from the extreme right to the Social-Democrats, are now preparing for war with revolting energy, but in order for this war to receive **open approval** in the capitalist countries, these countries will have to be confronted with an accomplished fact, and by a number of diabolical manoeuvres be spontaneously dragged into the war. The British diehard wild-men have understood this very well, and are acting accordingly.

THE very setting in which the rupture of diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the U.S.S.R. took place is extremely significant in this respect. As is known, on the eve of the break, representatives of British industry, in particular, McKenna, the representative of the Big Five banks (Midlands, Barclays, Lloyds, Westminster and National Provincial), agreed to grant a credit of £10,000,000 to the U.S.S.R. This agreement was wrecked by the raid on Arcos, and the break of diplomatic relations that followed.

Why had these British industrial circles intended opening credits for the U.S.S.R.? They detest the Soviet Republic and desire its downfall, just as much as the Tory diehards do. But for them the downfall of the Soviet regime is a matter of the future; the current vital interests of British industry demand the development of economic relations with the U.S.S.R. For this reason they undertook this step. It represented a link in their broadly-conceived plan of restoring the economic power of British capitalism, which of late has been losing position after position.

And it was precisely this plan that the diehards hastened to wreck in order to clear the path for war even at the cost of undermining British industry in the near future. The liberal economist, Keynes, in his latest book "The Economic Consequences of Mr. Churchill," has very convincingly proved that the economic policy of the present Conservative Government is directed against the interests of British industry in restoring the gold standard (parity of the pound sterling), the Government and its organ, the Bank of England, in the words of the author, studied the interests of finance capital working outside England, to the detriment of the interests of British industry. The financial policy of the Government, he says, not only does not help the fight against unemployment, but actually helps it to grow. These words of the British liberal economist are

now also being uttered quite openly by the representatives of British industrial capital.

IN October, 1924, the condition of the British Empire was very favourable for the victory of the Conservatives at the elections, and for their coming into power. Within the country a sharp conflict was brewing in the mining industry. In India, Egypt, Bengal in particular, there was extreme unrest, and terroristic activities were beginning.

In China, Feng Yu Hsiang's coup d'état at Peking dealt a severe blow to England. Under such conditions, in 1924, it was not difficult for the Conservatives, by means of a forged Zinoviev letter, to create an atmosphere of panic in the country, and thereby rally the entire bourgeois mass for a struggle against the "Bolshevik danger." After the defeat of the miners, the situation changed. A **direct** red danger in England disappeared, but the diehards continued with ever-increasing insistence to carry out their policy.

This brought a certain change in the situation in England. The industrialists were dissatisfied that the Conservative Government was basing its hopes **exclusively** on a risky external war and on an equally risky internal war against the trade unions. They were not pleased that Messrs. Churchill and Birkenhead, and the director of the Bank of England, Sir Montagu Norman, took their interests very little into consideration. They were discontented at the Government's systematically limiting the currency circulation in England, and cutting down industrial and commercial credits, while wholly co-ordinating its activities with the most rapacious international banking group—the Schroeder concern, which were endeavouring to depreciate British factories and mines in order to conquer them later.

As we see, the British Conservatives in order to fulfil their thieving imperialist plans, and to create an appropriate war atmosphere, look away from the deteriorated position of British industry and trade, thus endangering the stabilisation of British capitalism. It is precisely for this reason that their policy is beginning to create increasing discontent not only among the working masses, but also among considerable strata of the petty bourgeoisie and even among a considerable stratum of the big bourgeoisie, namely the industrial sections.

IT is extremely significant that on June 8th, the Co-operative Congress at Cheltenham by a majority of 3,202,000 against 95,000 passed a resolution sending friendly greetings to the Soviet co-operatives, and called upon all organisations of the co-operative movement to secure the complete resumption of peaceful relations with the U.S.S.R. Still more significant is the fact that taking the sum total results of all bye-elections, even bourgeois writers have come to the conclusion that the Baldwin Government now disposes of only one-third of the votes in the country.

This shows that even the British bourgeoisie is beginning to be frightened at the reckless policy of the Conservative Government. But the diehards do not take this into consideration. They flout the will of the country. Relying on the blessed tradition of parliamentarism, which enables them to rule the roost until the next election so long as they have a safe majority in the House, they will continue on their path, all the time

Diehard Incendiaries—continued

confronting the country with accomplished facts, although it is obviously turning its back on them.

If the British Conservative bandits do not hesitate to jeopardise industry at home, in order to ignite the fire of world war, so much the less are they afraid of doing this in the vassal countries depending upon British imperialism.

IT is known that Czecho-Slovakia and Yugo-Slavia were prepared to establish normal diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R., and that this was scotched owing to the rupture of Anglo-Soviet diplomatic relations. In Poland, however, where the mere demonstrative example of Great Britain is insufficient, provocative assassination in the back is the method used. The Fascist Government of Pilsudski was the creature of British imperialism. This government, from the very first day of its existence, took up a hostile attitude towards the U.S.S.R. and took under its wing all the white guards who were forging trumps against the Soviet Republic.

Pilsudski, however, having come to power, could not fail to take into account that the British diehards only wanted Poland as a weapon for their imperialist aims. Once in power, Pilsudski could not so easily and hurriedly untie the furies of war and make a leap into the unknown, leaving the onus on other people's hands, as the diehards intend doing. The Pilsudski Fascist Government was also bound to take into consideration the necessity for the financial recuperation of Poland and the creation of a market for Polish industry.

Thus at the same time as American bankers were preparing to grant Poland credits for 60,000,000 dollars, at the same time as comrade Voikov was conducting negotiations with Poland for the conclusion of a guarantee pact, a treacherous bullet felled comrade Voikov at a signal from London.

Thus the British Shylock presents Poland with the Bill for payment. And the British diehards brushing away with contempt the "public opinion" of Poland, which so unanimously expressed its indignation at the vile murder of comrade Voikov, seek to drive her into war with a whip.

After the world war, which shook European economy to its very foundations, the restoration of this economy has gradually been restored in two antagonistic forms: in the U.S.S.R. it was Socialist State economy that became stabilised, while in Western European countries the partial stabilisation of capitalism was taking place. Only in Great Britain was a steady decline of the economic situation to be observed, and in order to restore the might of the British Empire, mainly on the basis of colonial plunder, the British diehards decided to kindle once more the flame of world war, and start a crusade against the most dangerous enemies of the British Empire—the U.S.S.R. and revolutionary China.

In order to prepare this war they first got together an anti-Soviet and anti-Chinese bloc throughout the whole world. When, however, the coup of Chiang Kai Shek inspired the British Government with the premature hope that things were finished in China, and the encirclement of Soviet Russia accomplished, it broke off diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. and began more decisive action.

TO confront those countries that hesitated with an accomplished fact, to draw them spontaneously into a war on the U.S.S.R., in order to compel the European countries to drift into a new world, the British diehards have tried in every manner to destroy the economic stabilisation in Europe. Subsidising, bribing and organising White Guard bandits they are feverishly instigating White Terror in the U.S.S.R., simultaneously preparing for a blockade of the Soviet Republic, reckoning thus to sow panic there, to introduce disintegration in the economic life of the country, to wreck socialist construction, to flood the country with their bands and bring about revolts and risings.

At the same time they are sacrificing the interests of capitalist industry and trade, not only in the European countries dependent on England, but in England itself, in order to break the economic ties of these interests with the U.S.S.R., in order to egg them on against the U.S.S.R., in order, by snatching the bread from their mouths, to whet still more their appetites for Soviet booty, remembering that dogs should not be fed when being taken to the hunt.

SUCH is the ever more obvious British method of preparation for the new criminal war. But these aggressive plans of the British diehards have not caught the Soviet Republic unawares. The Soviet Republic has already proved that it does not fear a blockade, for it is the **only** country in Europe, which, since the war, has restored its economy on new bases without the aid of credits from without.

A blockade, of course, could slow down the tempo of socialist construction, but cannot smash it. The Soviet Republic regards without fear the attempts to disorganise the State by means of bandit incursions and incitations to revolt, for there is **not a single regime** in the world which is so deeply rooted amongst the masses of the people, which has such a firm social basis beneath its feet as the Soviet regime. The workers of the Soviet Republic have already replied to the rupture of diplomatic relations by the decision to increase the productivity of their labour, to increase the defensive capacity of the Republic, and to contribute from their wages money for the building of new air squadrons to be christened "The Break," "Our Answer to Chamberlain," etc. Let the bourgeois governments of Europe point out if they can, where the workers have shown such a response to their own preparations for war and white terror. The workers of the Soviet Republic having got down to the work of socialist construction, had returned their swords to the sheaths, but these swords have not rusted and the white guard rabble will feel their edge if they raise their heads again.

THE Soviet Republic is not frightened by the criminal plans of the British "diehard" Government for another reason: the Soviet regime does not stand alone. If British imperialism does succeed in driving into a war those whom it treats as its vassals, those whom it wants to utilise for its own gain, those victims and weapons of British imperialism will soon learn that the Leninist slogan of transforming the imperialist war into a revolutionary struggle, is not a mere empty sound.

Work in the Trade Unions

O. Piatnitsky

(This article is a continuation of the articles on "Achievements and Immediate Tasks in Organisation" and "Achievements and Tasks in Factory and Trade Union Work" in our issues of May 30th and June 15th.)

THE Communist fractions in the trade unions are not only not receiving proper Party guidance, their methods of work are wrong. The Second International Organisational Conference analysed in detail the question of creating Communist fractions in the trade unions and of their methods of work. It analysed in detail the question of "trade union days" which were practised primarily in Germany. In Germany, for instance, the factory groups met once or twice a month, but the Communist fractions in the trade unions all met on a certain day in every week. (At present we have "trade union days" in Berlin once in three or four weeks, with the same agenda for all trade union fractions.) What did the Communist fractions do on their "trade union days"? They discussed the questions of "Ford or Marx," economic democracy, the general tariff policy, and various other "big" questions. Of course, our comrades must know these questions. But is it proper that Communist textile workers, miners, carpenters, in short, the Communists employed in various trades should discuss these questions separately? These questions concern *all* workers alike. Why can they not be discussed in the factory groups at the general Party meetings or by the Party committees?

Social-Democratic Workers

The Social-Democratic workers come to the factories and speak about economic democracy and about the general tariff policy of the A.D.G.B., and all members of the Communist Party must therefore know how to answer these questions. But regular "trade union days," when Party members get together in their Communist fractions, are injurious. They distract the factory groups, the Party aggregate meetings and the Party committees from the consideration of trade union questions, with the result that it is very often difficult to discern any difference between the Communists and reformists on trade union questions. Furthermore, they are a source of danger because the Communist fractions in the trade unions discuss at their periodical meetings big questions concerning the general policy of the trade unions, instead of getting together before the meetings, conferences and congresses of the trade unions and considering those questions which are on the agenda at such meetings and conferences, and defining Communist tactics for the said meetings and conferences. It is quite possible that this is the reason why the Communists do not attend trade union meetings and conferences regularly, as has been already indicated.

At the session of March 17th of the Presidium of the Ruhr district committee a comrade rightly remarked during the discussion on the causes of the poor participation of Communists in the work of the trade

unions: "The Communist fractions are still too much engaged in parliamentary work; their work has nothing to do with the practical side of trade unionism."

"Trade union days" must be discontinued, and in their place Communist fractions should meet on the eve of trade union meetings and conferences and discuss the questions which are on the agenda of those meetings and conferences, decide on the tactics of the fraction and what proposals to make and who should speak on behalf of the fraction. The fractions must also draw up their lists of candidates if elections are to take place. In short, the fractions must consider all questions connected with the trade union meetings and conferences.

The German Communists

The German Communists have already adopted this method in some places, but not everywhere by a long way. So we must admit here that the German comrades have not yet discarded their "trade union days." As far as the other sections are concerned, they have so far done very little in adopting correct methods of work. If the Communist fractions discussed on the eve of the sessions of some of the executives of their trade unions the questions on their agenda, and decided their attitude to those questions, preparing their own resolutions, they could become a powerful factor. Even if their proposals were rejected the Communists would gain an opportunity to agitate for their proposals in the factories.

It is absolutely necessary to make radical changes in trade union methods of work, without which it will be very difficult to make any progress. The central and district Party committees must establish their policy for trade union work, analyse the big trade union questions, and wherever necessary raise some of those questions for discussion in the Party organisation. Communists who work in the trade unions must fulfil the decisions of the Party organs in the trade unions.

The question of leading the Communist fractions in the trade unions is still far from being regulated, in spite of the fact that the First and Second International Organisational Conferences discussed these questions and adopted definite decisions for the guidance of Communist fractions.

The bureaux of the Communist fractions in the trade unions are not formed from among those comrades who actually work in the trade unions. The Party committees place at the head of the Communist fractions good Communists, who, however, do not fully understand trade union work, hence our Communist fractions are occupied with abstract questions, as they have no concrete material by which to solve every-day trade union problems. This situation still exists.

Of course, there are cases when comrades working in the trade unions do much harm to the Party. Our German comrades have supplied us with such examples. Thus, some Party members, working in the trade unions, refused to introduce the Party proposals concerning the election of delegates to the Workers' Con-

Work in Trade Unions—continued

gress at the sessions of their respective trade union managing boards. But the German and Czech comrades report that if the comrades who actually work in the trade unions are at the head of the fractions and lead them, we get good results. Of course, we will still have many difficulties with comrades elected to trade union executives, since they work mostly on their own without getting sufficient guidance from the Party committees. Owing to this fact they deviate in their trade union work, and often do not properly understand the Party decisions on trade union questions. From this, however, it does not follow that they must be removed from the leadership of the fractions. They know exactly how trade union questions are solved, they know on the basis of what material they could easily make their proposals to the trade union managing boards, and how to supply the groups and individual Communists deputed to do trade union work with the necessary material for speeches, etc. The Party committees must therefore take all precautions to ensure that the comrades who work in the trade union executives should have closer connection with the Party. The Party committees must bring pressure to bear on each one individually, so that they carry out the Party policy and instructions. It is no use having comrades on the executives if they do not carry out the Party decisions.

If the Communist Parties remove all Communists from their trade union posts because they do not comprehend the Party trade union policy (although the Party committees have done very little to guide them), and establish fraction executives of people not really active in the trade unions, the work of the fractions will not improve and there will be no progress made in our trade union work. Only those who refuse to carry out our Party policy in the trade unions after the Party committees have made every effort to make them do so should be removed from trade union posts.

Better Work

In those trade union organisations where Communists have a majority, they must prove that they *work better* than the reformist trade unions. The trade union organisations under the Communist leadership must work better and give more concrete material for the struggle against the reformists. This is absolutely essential, but so far this is not yet the case in Germany. I should like to quote from a report of the Trade Union Department of the C.C., C.P. of Germany:

“Only in ten instances were we able to organise unemployed demonstrations jointly with the local trade unions. This is a very serious state of affairs considering that 70 local trade unions are headed by Communists.”

This is how the Communist Party of Germany conducts an extensive campaign in favour of the unemployed. It is a fact that only ten trade union councils of those having Communist majorities participated in the demonstrations. The remaining sixty did not participate, and did not carry out the Party instructions.

The Railway Workers' Union in Gleiwitz elected a Social-Democratic president, although all other members of the board are Communists. In Dresden there were

seven Communists and five Social-Democrats elected in one factory committee. The Communists not only elected a Social-Democratic chairman of the factory committee, but of the four delegates elected to the committee of all Dresden enterprises, three were Social-Democrats and only one Communist. In Bauer the comrades of the trade union department of the Party committee report that a Social-Democrat was elected to the control council of the State mines, although the Communists have a majority in the Presidium of the joint committee of all State mines. I have heard of no instance in which the Social-Democrats would elect a Communist chairman or a member of the Presidium if they were in the majority. I purposely cited several examples so that the comrades may not think that they are merely chance cases. These phenomena, as well as the instances in which Party members refused to participate at the elections of officials in the trade unions and factory committees, are not exceptional cases. They prove that not all local organisations of the Communist Party in Germany understand how it is possible and necessary to utilise these basic positions for the extension of Party influence by means of energetic and skilful work.

Bad Fraction Work

Why do the fractions work badly? Trade union departments have been organised in all Communist Parties for the purpose of improving the leadership of the trade union fractions, but these departments try to perform the work which the fractions should do, instead of guiding, directing, controlling and instructing the fractions in their work. No matter how large the trade union department may be, it is unable to perform all the work directly. In many countries the industrial departments of the Central Committees are not even connected with the district trade union departments, and the latter have no contact with the local trade union departments. I have before me comrade Zwicker's instructors' report on his investigation of the town committees of the Ruhr. He investigated fifteen Communist trade union fractions in one town, and found that only three of them had close contact with the town trade union department. In all other instances there were either no connections whatever or those that existed were unsatisfactory. The trade union department of the Ruhr District Committee was not connected with all trade union departments of the town committees. Under such conditions the fractions received no instructions, and were left to their own fate. How can the trade union department of a town committee give material to the trade union fractions and establish a policy which the fractions must follow in their work, if it is badly connected with the district trade union department and receives no instructions from it?

The organisation department of the E.C.C.I. recently received a report from an instructor who visited the Ruhr district Party organisation in March, 1927. The instructor reports:

“Yesterday (20-3-27) a delegate conference of Ruhr miners was held in Bochum. Delegates were elected in 60 trade union branches by the committees of those branches. The election re-

Work in Trade Unions—continued

sults were as follows: Only about 10 Communists were elected out of a total of 500 delegates. It stands to reason that the conference attracted the attention of the whole 400,000 miners of the Ruhr district. However, the Ruhr district committee did not know how many or which Communists had been elected. It did not draft any directions for the Communist delegates. Moreover, some of the responsible members of the district committee did not know that such a conference was to take place. The conference discussed the acceptance or rejection of the wage scale proposed by the arbitration court. On learning about the opening of the conference the district committee decided to circulate 500 copies of the Party paper, specifying our demands concerning the questions involved. This was to be its entire activity but willy nilly we had to occupy ourselves with the conference."

A report from Upper Silesia says that the district committee learned about the elections in a big factory which employs 1,700 workers after the elections were over, in spite of the fact that the factory is only a few paces from the Party headquarters, and in spite of the fact that a member of the district committee and a member of the trade union department are working in that factory.

Need for Improvement

This state of affairs must be overcome. The bad work of the trade union departments is also one of the reasons why Communists work badly in the trade unions and have little influence in them. If the Communist Parties organise their work properly, the overwhelming majority of the Party members will do their work in the trade unions, and if the trade union departments of the E.C.'s support them in the work the Communists will be able to compete with the reformists, and the trade union membership will follow the Communists. But if the methods of trade union work are not changed workers will not follow the Communist Parties, and when it comes to elections they will vote for those who really work in the trade unions, *i.e.*, the reformists, as the workers do not see, or very rarely see, Communists' working in the trade unions. That is also why the workers follow the Social-Democrats in spite of the fact that the latter betray them every day.

In those countries where the class trade union movement is split up and there are red trade unions affiliated to the R.I.L.U. (France, Czecho-Slovakia, Holland), the Communists either do no work in the reformist trade unions whatever (France, Holland) or do so inadequately (Czecho-Slovakia). When the red trade unions were organised in France almost all Communists left the Amsterdam trade unions and joined the red unions. In Czecho-Slovakia, as I have already pointed out, 9,101, out of a total of 45,575, Party members belong to the Czech and German Amsterdam trade unions, which have a total membership of 574,006. The red trade unions, which embrace 201,035 members, have 35,653 Communists in their midst. Side by side with the Amsterdam and red trade unions there are in a number of

countries (Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, Holland, Poland, Belgium, Italy) Catholic and Christian trade unions, organising hundreds of thousands of workers. The Communist Parties, however, do not work in those unions whatever.

In Germany the Catholic and Christian trade unions have about 700,000 members. In Belgium the Christian trade unions had in 1925, 150,000 members, and 17 branches of the Dutch Catholic trade unions had at the beginning of 1927, 90,530 members. The Christian and Christian Socialist, Czech and German trade unions of Czecho-Slovakia have 134,054 members; add to these the National Socialist trade unions, with a membership of 307,296, there are only 821 Communists in all these non-class trade unions in Czecho-Slovakia, while in the other countries there are not even that many. Besides, the Catholic and other Christian parties have their own trade unions and also their youth, women and peasant organisations. They have their own daily papers with a large circulation, and they receive a tremendous number of votes during elections. The Catholic "Centre Party" of Germany received at the last parliamentary elections in December, 1924, 4,118,000 votes, many of which were workers' votes.

Countering the Right

The influence which the Christian, National Socialist and Catholic Parties have on the working men and women can be destroyed, or at least reduced, if the Communists would join their trade unions and carry on proper work in them, because the leaders of the Catholic and similar trade unions do not defend the interests of the trade union membership. In some organisations of the Catholic Centre in Germany the workers organised a workers' opposition. In the report of the Ruhr district organisation on March 17th, 1927, which I have already quoted before, we read the following:

"The comrades admit that the reports of the delegates of the Catholic Centre who returned from the U.S.S.R. had great success among the workers of their organisations. It has now become possible for the Communists to attend the meetings of the Catholic Centre and to address them."

The Communist Parties of those countries where there are non-class trade unions must begin at once systematic work in those unions, side by side with the more intensive activities in the Amsterdam trade unions.

Fascist Unions

I think it opportune to say a few words about the Fascist trade unions in Italy. In Italy the broad masses of workers are forced to join the Fascist trade unions, as trade union dues to these organisations are obligatory and are deducted from the workers' pay against their will; furthermore, there is no work to be got if the workers do not belong to the Fascist trade unions. The Communist Party of Italy must therefore do all in its power to strengthen its positions in the Fascist trade union organisations. It is pointed out with full justice that the Fascist trade unions are not democratic organisations; their secretaries are not elected but appointed

Work in Trade Unions—continued

by the Fascist authorities, general trade union membership meetings are not held, etc., nevertheless, the Communist Party can and should work in these organisations. Communists can say to the workers: "You workers belong to the Fascist trade unions; they deduct trade union dues from your pay, but they never take you into account, they decide all trade union questions without you; the Fascists speak on your behalf, they lengthen your working day and cut your wages, although you have not authorised them to do so—demand, therefore, that your trade unions should be organised democratically, demand that trade union meetings should be held, adopt resolutions demanding that trade union secretaries be elected, etc." The Italian workers are accustomed to democratic forms of trade union organisation. Here are hidden the opportunities which the Communist Party can and must utilise. This is one of the means which gives the Communist Party the opportunity to undermine the Fascist trade unions.

Dividing the Work

The question of dividing the work among the Party members, and particularly among the active Party members in the sections of the Communist International, is of vital importance. From the material which the organisation department received from the sections it is clear that the Party members are over-burdened, and that, therefore, the work of the comrades in some of the mass organisations is conducted badly. Party members must belong to numerous organisations in order to carry out the Party policy in them, and in order to lead those organisations along class lines. We have figures concerning Party membership in the various proletarian organisations only from Czecho-Slovakia, which, however, are also incomplete. Of the 92,691 Party members about which the C.C. of the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia has any statistical data we have the following figures:

In the trade unions	45,575
„ I.R.A.	23,670
„ Co-operatives	27,320
Working men's sport organisations	16,160
Atheist organisations	12,002
Poor peasant organisations	1,886
War invalid organisations	2,382
Tenant leagues	2,294
Fire brigades	6,394
Others	2,050

Overwork

All these organisations have their meetings and sessions, and in so far as the same Party members belong to several of them, they are over-burdened with meetings. This is particularly the case with the more active members. In the printed report of the Berlin Brandenburg District Committee covering the period from July 1st to December 31st, 1926, we find the following figures concerning the meetings and sessions of the Communist trade union fractions:

Central "trade union days"	146
Fraction meetings	40
Fraction executives	185
Craft fractions	213
District fraction meetings	352
Fraction trade union sections	39
Trade union department of the district committee	6
Secretaries of fraction executives, together with heads of trade union departments of local committees	6
Heads of trade union departments of ward (section) committees	3
Communist members of local trade union managing boards	3
Fractions of local trade union councils	4
Communist trade union officials	1
State employees	2
Communist railway workers	1
Miners (42 Communists were present)	2

These figures refer to the meetings and sessions of the Communist fractions in the trade unions, and many of those who participated at these meetings had to also attend the trade union meetings. Many Party members belonging to other organisations had to attend the meetings of the fractions and the general membership meetings of those organisations as well. This takes up all the Party members' free time.

Worst of All

Worst of all is the fact that this is approved by and embodied in the plans of the local organisations. These organisations think that if a Party member has less than 30 meetings a month, according to the plan, then it is not a Bolshevik plan. As a matter of fact, when a worker joins the Party, he must attend some meeting or other every day. He comes home late every evening and is not free even on Sunday. The Communist Parties erect a Chinese wall between themselves and the workers, as the latter, even if they do sympathise with the Party, do not want to take such burdens on themselves.

What should the Communist Parties do in order to improve the situation? They must establish such a system that the comrades should have some free time at their disposal, so that they may be able to read, etc. It stands to reason that all members, without exception, must belong to the trade unions and actively participate in their work, but as far as such organisations, as, for instance, the Red ex-Soldiers' League, is concerned, the Party must so organise its activities that only a part of the membership should work in them. The others may carry on their work in the co-operatives, sport organisations, etc. The work must be so distributed

*The Weekly Paper for All
Communists*

WORKERS' LIFE

*24, High Holborn, London,
W.C.1*

Work in Trade Unions—continued

that no individual comrade should have too many obligations. This is necessary in order to draw in greater numbers of Party members into the active work of the Party. The situation now is such that all Party members must belong to the mass organisations without their work being divided up and without receiving any instructions as to who should carry on continuous work in one organisation and who in the other. The result is that every comrade thinks that there are many Communists in every given organisation, and that there is no reason for him to attend meetings if they can do without him, and whenever the presence of the Party members at some organisation meeting is absolutely necessary we find that either no one or very few turn up, which prevents the adoption of necessary resolutions.

What is to be Done?

What, then, is to be done in order properly to organise Communist work in the trade unions?

In my opinion, the following measures must be put into effect:

1. All Communists must join the trade unions of their given trades and form fractions in them.

2. The Communist fractions must be under leadership of comrades who work in the trade union movement.

3. The Communist fractions in the trade unions must deal chiefly with those questions which concern their trade unions.

The meetings of the Communist fractions should, as a rule, be held before the meetings, conferences and congresses of their trade unions.

The local committees, district committees and central committees of the Communist Parties (through their trade union departments) decide on the policy which must be adopted by the Communist fractions at the meetings, sessions, conferences and congresses of trade unions; they must call together the Communist fraction executives and functionaries of the respective trade unions before the trade union congresses and conferences in order to discuss the most important questions and elaborate the necessary material on the basis of which the comrades should act at those sessions, conferences and congresses.

Special Meetings

4. Special meetings of the Communist trade union fractions called periodically and simultaneously (trade union days), with a uniform agenda to discuss questions of general interest to all trade unions and the entire Party, are inexpedient and injurious.

Such questions should be discussed at the Party organisations and committees (factory group meetings, local aggregate and district meetings, etc.), and only after these questions have been discussed by the central or district committees.

5. The local trade union organisations (trade union branches and Trades Councils) in which the Communists form the majority must become the basis for good trade union work in the given trade union throughout the district and the whole country. In order to be able to

perform the functions here enumerated it is necessary to establish good contact between the Communist fractions within each union.

The respective Party committees must devote serious attention and render the greatest possible support to the Communist fractions which have majorities in the trade union organs.

6. Firm contact must be established between the trade union department of the C.C. and the trade union departments of the district committees, and between the latter and the trade union departments of the town committees.

The trade union departments of the Party committees lead, control and direct the work of the fractions in the trade unions, without, however, themselves performing that work for them.

7. The factory groups must take every measure to win the trade union delegates in the enterprises regardless as to the tendency of the trade union (Amsterdam, Catholic, Christian, National Socialist, etc.) to which they belong. The Communists must actively perform the every-day detailed work of the trade union delegates in order to satisfy the demands of the workers; they must not restrict their activities to criticising the trade union bureaucracy.

Persistent Work

Only through sincere, persistent and skilful daily work can the Communist trade union delegates win the confidence of the workers in the factories. If we carry out correct trade union work in the factories the reformists will not be able to expel active Communists from the trade unions for their trade union work as they have done hitherto.

The groups, the Party committees and local committees must render energetic support to trade union Communist delegates.

8. The Communists must organise their fractions in the red trade unions not only in the managing boards and Presidiums, but in all branches of the organisation, just as in the other trade unions. Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 above apply also to the red trade unions.

READ

THE COMMUNIST

FOURPENCE

MONTHLY

Obtainable from the

COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP

16 KING STREET, LONDON, W.C.2

Work in Trade Unions—continued

9. In those countries where there are red trade unions (Czecho-Slovakia, France, Holland, etc.), and where Communist work in other trade union organisations (reformist, Christian, Catholic and National Socialists) is weak, it is necessary that the Party members should be shifted by the Party committees to the latter trade unions, even if they must withdraw them from the red trade unions.

10. The Communist Parties of the capitalist countries must recruit members not only for the red, but also for the reformist trade unions. The more members they have in the unions, the greater their influence in the respective unions.

11. The groups, locals, section and district committees must divide their work between the Party members in such a manner that some members should not be over-burdened while others are free altogether; the latter distribution of Party duties undoubtedly interferes with the proper organisation of Communist work in the mass organisations, including also the trade unions.

In taking the measures enumerated above, with the purpose of improving Communist work in the trade unions, the sections of the C.I. will be able to prevent the reformist trade union leaders from betraying the workers, including joint agreements with the employers, or during strikes, and in this manner they will free the working masses from the influence of the Social-Democratic, Catholic, Christian, National Socialist and Fascist parties.

The sections of the C.I. scored great successes in

1925 in transforming their organisations, which resembled Social-Democratic organisations, into capable fighting bodies. The first four months of 1927 have shown that the Communist Parties are proceeding along the same lines. If we remember that part of comrade Lenin's speech at the fourth Congress of the Comintern, in which he referred to the organisation resolution, written with his direct participation and adopted by the third Congress of the C.I.—comrade Lenin considered that resolution very important—it will become clear what achievements we already have in the sections of the C.I. in spite of the still prevailing shortcomings which I have pointed out in these articles. Comrade Lenin said that the foreign comrades must understand "what we wrote about the organisational structure of the Communist Parties and what the foreign comrades signed without reading and understanding. This must become their foremost task. This resolution must be carried into effect."

Comrade Lenin anticipated that this would not be an easy matter, and that successes in this sphere would not be attained all at once. He pointed this out in the same speech by saying: "This cannot be done overnight, that is impossible."

It cannot be maintained that all Communist Parties have already adopted Bolshevik methods of organisation, but beginning with the fifth Congress of the C.I. they have really been definitely engaged in bringing into effect those organisational principles about which Lenin spoke at the fourth congress.

We can now definitely say that the organisational principles of the Bolshevik Party, which was under Lenin's leadership, have been found absolutely applicable in all the Communist Parties in capitalist countries.

The Future of Indian Politics

M. N. ROY

PRICE 1s. 6d.
Post free for 1s. 8d.

Obtainable from the
Communist Bookshop
16 King Street
London WC2

An application of Marxist methods to the analysis of India to day. The first section is devoted to the "New Economic Policy of Imperialism"—the policy of alliance between the British exploiters and the Indian industrial capitalists. The second section is "The Politics of Compromise." The third might be said to deal with the question that is stirring now in the minds of all real Nationalists in India—CAN INDIA FOLLOW CHINA?

The Revolution in China and the Tasks of the C.I.

J. Stalin

COMRADES, I must apologise for coming late today to the Session of the Executive, and for that reason missing part of the speech which comrade Trotsky delivered. But I think that comrade Trotsky has given in the course of the last few days such a mass of literature, theses and letters to the Executive on the Chinese question that there is no possibility of a shortage of material on which to criticise the Opposition. Therefore, in my criticism of comrade Trotsky's errors I will take these documents as a basis, being certain that this criticism will be at the same time a criticism of the fundamentals of the speech made by comrade Trotsky to-day.

I will endeavour, as far as possible, to steer clear of the personal element in our polemics. The personal attacks on individual members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Soviet C.P. and of the Presidium of the Executive of the International are not worth considering. Evidently comrade Trotsky would like to appear as some kind of a hero at the Sessions of the Executive of the Comintern, in order to convert the work of the Executive in regard to the questions of the war peril, the Chinese revolution, etc., into work on the question of Trotskyism. I think that comrade Trotsky does not deserve so much attention. (A voice in the audience: "Hear, hear.") Particularly as he reminds one more of an actor than of a hero, and we must on no account confuse actors with heroes.

I need not say, of course, that there is nothing offensive to Bukharin or Stalin, if people like comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev, whom the Seventh Enlarged Executive found guilty of a Social-Democratic tendency, call the Bolsheviks names without any justification. On the contrary, I would feel deeply insulted if semi-Mensheviks of the type of comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev were to praise me instead of calling me names.

Opposition Fractions

Neither will I take up your time with discussing whether the Opposition has infringed by its present fractional actions the undertaking given by it on October 16th, 1926. Comrade Trotsky asserts that in accordance with the declaration of the Opposition, made on October 16th, 1926, he has the right to defend his views. This is, of course, true. But if comrade Trotsky thinks that by this the declaration can be disposed of, this is, of course, mere sophism. In the Opposition declaration of October 16th, it is not only asserted that the Opposition has the right to defend its views, but also that these views can only be defended within Party limits, that fractionalism must be discarded and liquidated; that the Opposition must "submit unconditionally" to the will of the Party and to the decisions of the Central Committee, that the Opposition must not only submit to these decisions, but must also "carry them out" conscientiously. Is it really necessary after this

to prove that the declaration of the Opposition of October 16th, 1926 has been infringed by it, and treated in a most flagrant manner as a scrap of paper?

Neither will I expatiate on the indecent and grossly scandalous distortions of the views of the Central Committee of the Soviet C.P. and of the Comintern on the Chinese question, made in numerous Opposition theses, articles and speeches. Comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev persist in asserting that the C.C. of the Soviet C.P. and the Comintern advocated and are still advocating the policy of "support" for the national bourgeoisie in China. It is hardly necessary to prove that this assertion of comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev is nothing but fiction, libel and a deliberate distortion of the truth. In reality the C.C. of the Soviet C.P. and the Comintern defended not only the policy of support of the national bourgeoisie, but the policy of utilising the national bourgeoisie, as long as the revolution in China was a revolution of the national united front of the entire population; this policy they later changed for the policy of an armed struggle against the national bourgeoisie when the revolution in China became an agrarian revolution and the national bourgeoisie began to desert it. To be convinced of that a review of such documents as the resolution of the Seventh Enlarged Plenum, the well-known Manifesto of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, Stalin's Theses for Propagandists, and finally, comrade Bukharin's Theses submitted a few days ago to the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Comintern will suffice. It is the Opposition's misfortune that it cannot do without slander and distortion.

Business in Hand

Now to the actual business in hand.

Comrade Trotsky's principal mistake consists in the fact that he does not understand the meaning and character of the Chinese revolution. The Comintern takes as its point of departure the fact that the predominant factors of oppression in China at the present time, which stimulate the agrarian revolution, are the survivals of feudalism. The Comintern starts from the fact that the survivals of feudalism in the Chinese countryside and together with them, the entire militarist bureaucratic super structure, the Tuchuns, governors, generals, Chang Tso Lins, etc., provide the basis for the present agrarian revolution.

Seventy per cent. of the peasant's income in many provinces belongs to the landlords and the gentry; the landlords, armed or unarmed, hold not only economic but also administrative and judicial power: in many provinces to this day there is still in vogue the mediæval custom of buying and selling women and children—these feudal survivals are the principal form of oppression in the Chinese provinces. It is precisely because the survivals of feudalism with all their military-bureaucratic super structure are the main form of oppression in China,

Revolution in China—continued

that China is now experiencing an agrarian revolution enormous in its breadth and power. What is an agrarian revolution? It is actually the basis and essence of a bourgeois democratic revolution. This is precisely the reason why the Comintern says that China is now going through a bourgeois democratic revolution.

But the bourgeois democratic revolution in China is directed not only against the survivals of feudalism. It is directed also against imperialism. Why? Because imperialism with all its financial and military strength in China is the force which supports, inspires, cultivates and preserves the feudal survivals with their bureaucratic militarist super structure. Because it is impossible to overcome feudalism in China without carrying on at the same time a revolutionary struggle against imperialism in China. If you want to destroy the survivals of feudalism in China you must necessarily raise your hand against imperialism and the imperialist groups in China. Without a decisive struggle against imperialism it is impossible to put an end to and wipe out the remnants of feudalism in China. It is precisely because of this that the Comintern says that the bourgeois democratic revolution in China is at the same time an anti-imperialist revolution.

In this manner, the present revolution in China is a combination of two streams of the revolutionary movement—the movement against the survivals of feudalism and the movement against imperialism.

Such is the point of departure of the Comintern policy (and consequently of the policy of the C.C. of the C.P. of the Soviet Union) on the question of the Chinese revolution.

Trotsky on China

What is comrade Trotsky's point of departure on the Chinese question? It is diametrically opposed to the point of view of the Comintern just outlined. Comrade Trotsky either does not recognise at all the survivals of feudalism in China, or he does not ascribe to them any decisive importance. Comrade Trotsky (and consequently the Opposition), under-estimating the power and significance of bureaucratic feudal oppression in China, supposes that the main reason of the Chinese nationalist revolution is the dependence of China on the imperialist countries in the question of tariffs. Allow me to refer to comrade Trotsky's theses, submitted to the C.C. of the Soviet C.P. and to the Executive Committee of the Comintern a few days ago. Comrade Trotsky's theses are entitled: "The Chinese Revolution and comrade Stalin's Theses." Here is what comrade Trotsky says:

"In essence comrade Bukharin's attempt to justify an opportunist compromising policy by referring to the predominating role in Chinese economics of the 'feudal survivals' has failed. Even if comrade Bukharin's evaluation of Chinese economics was based on an economic analysis and not on scholastic definitions, the 'feudal survivals' all the same could not justify a policy which clearly facilitated the April coup. The Chinese revolution has a national bourgeois character for the *fundamental reason* that the develop-

ment of the productive forces of Chinese capitalism has come up against the dependence of China on the imperialist countries in tariffs and customs duties". (our italics). (See Trotsky, "The Chinese Revolution and Stalin's Theses.")

Bukharin's Policy

A cursory review of this passage would make one think that comrade Trotsky is fighting, not against the line of the Comintern on the question of the character of the Chinese revolution, but against comrade Bukharin's "compromising policy." This, of course, would be wrong. As a matter of fact, this passage deals with a denial of the "predominant role" of the feudal survivals in China. In reality, it contends that the developing agrarian revolution in China should be proclaimed in the main, so to speak, anti-customs revolution. The prattle about the "compromising policy" of comrade Bukharin was necessary in order to conceal his own retreat from the Comintern policy. This—I say frankly—is the usual knavish method of comrade Trotsky.

According to comrade Trotsky the survivals of feudalism in China, with all their militarist bureaucratic super structure, do not constitute the fundamental driving force of the Chinese revolution at the present time, but merely a secondary unimportant factor which deserves only to be mentioned in quotation marks.

According to comrade Trotsky, it follows that the "main reason" for the national revolution in China is the customs dependence of China on the imperialists; that the revolution in China is in view of this primarily what might be termed an anti-customs revolution. Such is comrade Trotsky's point of view on the character of the Chinese revolution.

Allow me to observe that this point of view is the point of view of the State councillor of "His Highness" Chang Tso Lin.

If comrade Trotsky's point of view is correct, then it must be admitted that Chang Tso Lin and Chiang Kai Shek are right when they want neither an agrarian nor a workers' revolution, and merely aim at abolishing the unequal treaties and establishing tariff autonomy for China. Comrade Trotsky has descended to the point of view of the clerks of Chang Tso Lin and Chiang Kai Shek.

Feudal Survivals

The feudal survivals must be referred to in "quotes"; Bukharin, and hence the Comintern, is wrong in saying that the feudal survivals are of predominant significance at this stage of the revolution; the basis of the Chinese revolution is the customs dependence and not the struggle against the feudal survivors maintained by imperialism—but then what is there left of the agrarian revolution in China? Whence comes the agrarian revolution, with its demands for the confiscation and nationalisation of the landowners' land? On what basis do they, in this case, maintain that the Chinese revolution is a bourgeois democratic revolution? Is it not a fact that the agrarian revolution is the basis of a bourgeois democratic revolution? Could an agrarian revolution fall down from the skies? Is it not a fact that millions and tens of millions of peasants are involved in a

Revolution in China—continued

very great agrarian revolution in such provinces as Hunan, Hupeh, Honan, etc., where the peasants are establishing their own government, their own courts, their own defence, driving out the landlords and dealing with them "in a plebeian manner"? Where could such a powerful agrarian movement come from if the feudal militarist pressure is not the predominant form of oppression in China? How could this powerful movement of tens of millions of peasants assume also an anti-imperialist character if we hold that imperialism is not the main ally of the feudal militarist oppressors of the Chinese people? Is it not a fact that in Hunan alone over two and a half million peasants belong to the Peasant League? And how many belong to the Peasant League in Hupeh and Honan, and how many will join up in the very near future in the other Chinese provinces? And the "Red Spears," "the Leagues of the Tight Belts," etc., are they a fiction, and not a reality? Can it really be seriously maintained that the agrarian revolution of tens of millions of peasants, demanding the confiscation of the landowners' land, is directed, not against the actual and indubitable survivals of feudalism, but against imaginary survivals of feudalism referred to in quotation marks? Is it not clear that comrade Trotsky has tumbled down to the point of view of the clerks of "His Highness" Chang Tso Lin?

Two Lines

Thus we have two fundamental lines before us:

(a) The line of the Comintern which holds that the existence of feudal survivals in China is the predominant form of oppression, that the powerful agrarian movement is of decisive importance, that there is a connection between the feudal survivals and imperialism, that the Chinese revolution is of a bourgeois democratic character with its sharpest edge turned against imperialism.

(b) The line of comrade Trotsky which denies the predominant importance of the feudal militarist oppression, denies the decisive importance of the agrarian revolutionary movement in China and explains the anti-imperialist character of the Chinese revolution merely by the interests of Chinese capitalism demanding tariff independence for China.

Trotsky's fundamental error (and hence that of the Opposition) consists of an under-estimation of the agrarian revolution in China, a misconception of the bourgeois democratic character of this revolution, a denial of the pre-requisites of the millions strong agrarian movement in China, an under-estimation of the role of the peasantry in the Chinese revolution.

This error is not new for comrade Trotsky. It is the characteristic trait of comrade Trotsky's policy throughout the period of his struggle against Bolshevism. Under-estimation of the role of the peasantry in the bourgeois-democratic revolution is an error which has pursued comrade Trotsky ever since 1905; it became especially glaring before the February revolution of 1917, and has not left him up to the present day.

Allow me to refer to certain facts in the struggle of comrade Trotsky against Leninism; for instance on the eve of the February revolution of 1917, when we were marching towards a victorious bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia. Comrade Trotsky maintained then

that in so far as the differentiation among the peasantry had intensified, in so far as we had imperialism, and the proletariat was setting itself up against the bourgeois nation, the role of the peasantry would diminish and the agrarian revolution would not have the significance which was ascribed to it in 1905. What was comrade Lenin's reply? Permit me to give you a passage from Lenin's writings of 1915 on the role of the peasantry in the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia:

"Trotsky's original theory" (reference is made to Trotsky's "permanent" revolution) "takes from the Bolsheviks the call to the proletariat for a decisive revolutionary struggle, and the conquest of political power, and from the Mensheviks the 'denial' of the role of the peasantry. The peasantry, you see, has become disintegrated; its possible revolutionary role has diminished; a 'national' revolution in Russia is impossible; 'we live in an imperialist epoch' and 'imperialism sets up not the bourgeois regime against the old regime, but the proletariat against the bourgeois nation.'"

The "Bourgeois Nation"

Here is an entertaining example of "word play"—with imperialism. If in Russia the proletariat is already up against "the bourgeois nation" it follows that Russia is faced directly with the Socialist revolution! Then the slogan of "confiscation of large estates" (repeated by Trotsky in 1915 after the January Conference in 1912) is wrong, then it is necessary to speak not of a "revolutionary workers" but of a "workers' socialist government"! The extent to which Trotsky is confused is clear from his phrase that the determination of the proletariat will absorb the "non-proletarian (!) masses of people"! (No. 217). Trotsky did not think that if the proletariat will enthuse the non-proletarian masses of the villages for the confiscation of the feudal lands and will overthrow the monarchy, then this will be the culmination of the "national bourgeois revolution" in Russia and that this will be the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.

"The whole decade—a great decade—of 1905-1915, revealed the presence of two, and only two, class lines of the Russian revolution. The differentiation of the peasantry intensified the class struggle among the peasants, roused numerous political dormant elements, brought them closer to the urban proletariat (the Bolsheviks insisted since 1906 on its special organisation and introduced this demand in the resolution of the Stockholm Menshevik Congress). But the antagonism between the 'peasantry' and the Markovs, Romanovs and Khvostovs strengthened, grew and become more acute. This is such an elementary truth that even thousands of phrases in tens of Parisian articles by Trotsky could not 'repudiate' it. Trotsky is actually helping the Lib.-Lab. politicians of Russia, who in 'denying' the role of the peasantry, understand the undesirability to rouse the peasantry for the revolution. And therein lies the crux of the matter." (See Lenin, vol. XIII., pp. 213-4, Russian edition.)

This peculiarity of comrade Trotsky's scheme consists in the fact that he sees the bourgeoisie, he sees the

Revolution in China—continued

proletariat, but does not see the peasantry, and does not understand its role in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. It is precisely this peculiarity of his which constitutes the fundamental error of the Opposition in the Chinese issue.

It is just this which constitutes the "semi-Menshevism" of comrade Trotsky and the Opposition in the question of the character of the Chinese revolution.

From this fundamental error follow the other errors of the Opposition, the confusion in the Opposition theses on the Chinese problem.

Let us take for instance, the question of Hankow. The orientation of the Comintern on the question of the revolutionary role of Hankow is well-known and clear. Since China is experiencing an agrarian revolution and the victory of the agrarian revolution is a victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution—a victory of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry—since Hankow is the centre of the revolutionary movement in China, it is necessary to support the Kuomintang in Hunan, it is necessary that the Communists form a part of that Kuomintang and its revolutionary government, on condition that the hegemony of the proletariat and its Party be secured both within and without the ranks of the Kuomintang. Is the present Hankow Government an organ of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry? No. So far it is not nor will it be so very soon. But it has all the chances of developing into such an organ in the further development of the revolution and the success of that revolution.

Such is the attitude of the Comintern.

Trotsky's Attitude

Quite different is comrade Trotsky's attitude. He holds that Hankow is a "fiction" and not the centre of the revolutionary movement. To the question what does the left Kuomintang now represent? comrade Trotsky replies: "So far nothing or next to nothing." (See Trotsky, "The Chinese Revolution and Stalin's Theses.") Granted that Hankow is a fiction. But if Hankow is a fiction why does not comrade Trotsky demand a decisive struggle against this fiction? Since when do Communists support a fiction, take part in fictions, assume leadership of fictions, etc.? Is it not a fact that Communists are obliged to combat fictions? Is it not a fact that to refuse to combat fictions is to deceive the proletariat and the peasantry? Why does not comrade Trotsky propose a struggle against this fiction, at least by the immediate withdrawal of the Communists from the Hankow Kuomintang and the Hankow Government? Why does comrade Trotsky propose to remain in that fiction and not withdraw from it? Where is the logic? Cannot this logical inconsistency be explained by the fact that comrade Trotsky in speaking about the Hankow fiction lost courage and dared not draw the logical conclusion in his theses?

Or let us take for instance comrade Zinoviev. In his theses circulated at the Plenum of the C.C. of the Soviet Union C.P. in April of this year, comrade Zinoviev called the Hankow Kuomintang a Kemalist government fighting against the workers and peasants, a government in which there is no and can be no place for

Communists. It would seem that from such a qualification of Hankow there could be only conclusion—a decisive struggle against Hankow, the overthrow of the Hankow government. But only ordinary people with ordinary common sense could think in that way. Comrade Zinoviev thinks otherwise. Calling the Hankow government a Kemalist government, he at the same time proposes to render energetic support to that government, not to withdraw from it, not to desert the Kuomintang, etc. He says:

"It is necessary to give energetically every possible assistance to Hankow and to organise there the counter-attack against the Cavaignacs. It will be necessary to concentrate our efforts in the near future on assisting in the organisation and solidification of Hankow." (See Zinoviev's theses.)

Hankow

Who can understand this? Comrade Trotsky says that Hankow is a fiction. Comrade Zinoviev on the contrary, maintains that Hankow is a Kemalist government. From this one should draw the conclusion either to combat the fiction or to fight for the overthrow of the Hankow government. But both comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev dodge the conclusion—a conclusion which logically follows from their suppositions and comrade Zinoviev goes even further and proposes "energetic and manifold assistance to Hankow." What does this mean? It means that the Opposition is confused in its own contradictions, it has lost the capacity to think logically and lost all perspectives.

Confusion in this view, the loss of any perspectives on the question of Hankow—such is the orientation of comrade Trotsky and the Opposition (if it is at all possible to designate confusion an orientation).

Or let us also take for instance the question of Soviets of workers' and peasant deputies in China. On the question of organising Soviets we have three resolutions of the Second Congress of the Comintern. They are: Lenin's Theses on the formation of non-proletarian peasant Soviets in the backward countries, Roy's theses on the formation of workers' and peasants' Soviets in such countries as China and India, and the special theses dealing with the question of "How and Under what Conditions can Soviets of Workers' Deputies be Formed?"

Lenin's Theses

Lenin's theses deal with the formation of "peasant," "people's" non-proletarian Soviets in such countries as Turkestan where there is no industrial proletariat or hardly any. There is not a word in Lenin's theses about the formation of Soviets of workers' deputies in such countries. According to Lenin's theses one of the necessary conditions for the development and the formation of "peasant," "people's" Soviets in backward countries is the direct support of the revolution in such countries by the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. It is clear that his theses do not refer to China or India, where there is a certain minimum of an industrial proletariat and where the creation of workers' Soviets under certain conditions is a pre-requisite for the formation of peasant Soviets, but to other countries, more backward ones, such as Persia, etc.

Revolution in China—continued

Comrade Roy's theses refer primarily to China and India, where there is an industrial proletariat. In these theses it is proposed to form under certain conditions, during the transition period from the bourgeois to the proletarian revolution, Soviets of workers' and peasant deputies. It is clear that these theses have a direct relation to China.

The special theses of the Second Congress entitled, "When and Under what Conditions can Soviets of Workers' Deputies be Created?" speak of the role of the Soviets of workers' deputies on the basis of the revolutionary experiences in Russia and Germany. These theses maintain that "Soviets without a proletarian revolution inevitably become a parody of Soviets." It is clear that we must take these theses into account in discussing the question of the immediate formation of Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies in China.

How do we stand with regard to the question of the immediate formation of Soviets of workers and peasants in China, if we take into consideration both the situation in China at the present time and the existence of the Kuomintang in Hankow as the centre of the revolutionary movement, and also the two theses mentioned of the Second Congress of the Comintern?

Hankow Soviets

To create Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies for instance, within the precincts of the Hankow government now, would mean to create a dual government, to issue the slogan of struggle for the overthrow of the left Kuomintang and the formation of a new, Soviet government in China. The Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies are organs of struggle for the overthrow of the existing government, and a dual government cannot but make the problem as to who should have all power more acute. Such was the situation in Russia in March-April-May-June, 1917. We had then in Russia the Provisional Government, which had only half the power in its hands; its power was the more real, however, since it still had the support of the armies. Side by side with it there were the Soviets of workers' and soldiers' deputies, which also had in their hands part of the government, although it was not as real as the Provisional Government. The Bolshevik slogan called for the overthrow of the Provisional Government and the transference of all power to the Soviets of workers' and soldiers' deputies. No Bolshevik thought then that it was necessary to join the Provisional Government; it is inadmissible to join a government if one wants to overthrow it. Can it be stated that the situation in Russia in March-June, 1927, was analogous to the present situation in China? No, it cannot. This cannot be maintained, not only because Russia was then on the threshold of a proletarian revolution, while China is now facing the bourgeois democratic revolution, but also because the Provisional Government of Russia was then a counter-revolutionary government, whilst the present Hankow Government is a revolutionary government in the bourgeois democratic meaning of that word.

What does the Opposition propose to us in this respect? It proposes the immediate creation of Soviets of workers, peasants' and soldiers' deputies in China as the centres of organisation of the revolutionary move-

ment. But Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies are not merely organisational centres of the revolutionary movement. They are first and foremost organs of insurrection against the powers that be, organs for the formation of a new revolutionary government. The Opposition does not understand that only as organs of insurrection, only as organs of a new government can the Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies be transformed into centres of the revolutionary movement. Without that the Soviets of workers' deputies become a fiction, an appendix of the existing government, as happened in Germany in 1918 and in Russia in July, 1917.

Dual Government

Does the Opposition understand that the creation of Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies now is tantamount to the creation of a dual government, shared by the Soviets and the Hankow Government, and necessarily and inevitably leads to the slogan calling for the overthrow of the Hankow Government? I doubt very much whether comrade Zinoviev understood this simple truth, but comrade Trotsky understand it full well, as he says plainly in his theses that: "The slogan of Soviets is identical to a call for the creation of real government organs during the transition regime of the dual government." (See Trotsky's Theses "The Chinese Revolution and Stalin's Theses.")

In this manner it appears that by creating Soviets in China we also create a "regime of dual government," we overthrow the Hankow Government to establish a new revolutionary government. Apparently comrade Trotsky takes as a model the events in the history of the Russian revolution in the period prior to October, 1917. Then we really had a dual government and we were really working to overthrow the Provisional Government. But as I already stated no one thought of joining the Provisional Government. Why does comrade Trotsky not propose the immediate withdrawal from the Kuomintang and the Hankow Government?

How is it possible to create Soviets, to create a regime of dual government and at the same time to form part of the same Hankow Government, which is to be overthrown? Comrade Trotsky's theses give no reply to this question. But comrade Trotsky has become hopelessly confused in the maze of his own contradictions. He confused the bourgeois democratic revolution with the proletarian revolution. He "forgot" that the bourgeois democratic revolution in China is not only not complete and not only has it not been victorious, but it is only in the first phase of its development. Comrade Trotsky does not understand that to refuse to support the Hankow Government now, by an immediate formation of Soviets, is identical with rendering direct and indisputable support to Chiang Kai Shek and Chang Tso Lin.

1905

They ask us: then how, in that case, are we to understand the formation of the Soviets of workers' deputies in 1905 in Russia—were we not then experiencing a bourgeois democratic revolution? But, first of all, there were only two Soviets then—in Leningrad and in Moscow, and the existence of two Soviets had not yet created the system of the Soviet power in Russia. Secondly, the Leningrad and Moscow Soviets were at that time organs of rebellion against the old, Tsarist

Revolution in China—continued

power, which again confirms that the Soviets must never be looked upon as merely organisational centres of the revolution, that the Soviets can be such centres only as organs of rebellion and organs of new power. Thirdly, the history of the workers' Soviets tells us that such Soviets can exist and develop only in the event of favourable conditions for the direct transition from the bourgeois democratic to the proletarian revolution; that is to say, if there are favourable conditions for the transition of bourgeois power to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Was it not because of this that the workers' Soviets in Leningrad and Moscow in 1905 came to grief, just like the workers' Soviets in Germany in 1918—because conditions were not favourable?

It is possible that in 1905 there would have been no Soviets in Russia, had there existed at that time in Russia a broad organisation similar to the present day left Kuomintang in China. But such an organisation could not exist then in Russia, for there were no elements of nationalist oppression in the ranks of the Russian workers and peasants; the Russians themselves oppressed other nationalities; and an organisation of the left Kuomintang type can only come into being in circumstances of national oppression, and combine in one broad organisation the revolutionary elements of the country. Only the blind can deny the role of organ of the revolutionary struggle to the left Kuomintang—the role of the organ of rebellion against feudal survivals and imperialism in China. But what follows from this? It follows that the left Kuomintang in China is playing approximately the same role in the present Chinese bourgeois democratic revolution as the Soviets in 1905 played in the Russian bourgeois democratic revolution. It would be quite another matter, were there no popular, revolutionary democratic organisation such as the left Kuomintang in China. But since there is such a specific revolutionary organisation, adapted to the peculiarities of Chinese conditions, and demonstrating its value for the further development of the bourgeois democratic revolution in China—it would be stupid and unwise to destroy this organisation, which it has taken years to build, at a moment when the bourgeois democratic revolution has only just begun, has not yet conquered and cannot be victorious for some time.

Future Developments

From this, several comrades draw the conclusion that the Kuomintang can also be used in the future (during the transition to the proletarian revolution) as a form of State organisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat; at the same time, they see in this the possibility of a peaceful transition from the bourgeois democratic to the proletarian revolution. A peaceful development of the revolution, generally speaking, is not impossible. We, in Russia, at the beginning of 1917, also talked about the possibility of the peaceful development of the revolution through the Soviets. But, firstly, the Kuomintang is not the Soviets, and even if it is adapted to the work of developing the bourgeois democratic revolution, this does not mean that it can be adapted to that of developing the proletarian revolution, because we know that the Soviet of workers' deputies constitutes the form best adapted to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Secondly, even with the Soviets in Russia in 1917, a peaceful transition to the proletarian revolution was not possible. Thirdly, there are so few proletarian centres in China, and the enemies of the Chinese revolution are so strong and manifold, that every step forward made by the revolution, and every attack on the part of the imperialists, is inevitably accompanied by new splits in the Kuomintang and a further strengthening of the Communist Party at the expense of the authority of the Kuomintang.

A Peaceful Road

I think that a peaceful road for the development of the Chinese revolution is out of the question. I think that Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies must of necessity be created in China during the transition period from the bourgeois democratic revolution to the proletarian. For without Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies such a transition is impossible. The agrarian movement over the whole of China must be allowed to unfold, the Hankow government must be consolidated and supported in its fight against the feudal-bureaucratic regime, the Hankow government must be helped to gain a victory over the counter-revolution; peasant leagues, workers' trade unions and other revolutionary organisations must be widely developed over the whole country, as a basis for the creation of Soviets; the Chinese Communist Party must be allowed to strengthen its influence among the peasantry and the army—and only after this will the creation of Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies become essential as organs of the struggle for a new government, as factors of dyarchy, as factors for the preparation of the transition from the bourgeois democratic to the proletarian revolution.

The creation of workers' Soviets in China is no empty phrase for empty "revolutionary" declamation. This question must not be regarded lightly, as comrade Trotsky does. The formation of workers' and peasants' Soviets means, above all, leaving the Kuomintang, for it is not possible to create Soviets and to advance the dyarchy, inciting the workers and peasants to create a new government, and, at the same time, remain in the ranks of the Kuomintang and its government. The creation of Soviets of workers' deputies means the substitution of the present bloc inside the Kuomintang for a bloc outside—a bloc analogous to that which the Bolsheviks had in October, 1917, with the left S.R.'s. Why? Because, if in the one case, in regard to the bourgeois democratic revolution, the question arises of the creation of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry (and the policy of the bloc inside the Kuomintang fully coincides with this), in the other, in regard to the formation of Soviets and the transition to the proletarian revolution, the question arises of the creation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of a Soviet government—and such a government can be prepared and created only with the leadership of one Party, of the Communist Party.

Workers and Soviets

Further, Soviets of workers' deputies imply certain obligations. At present in China, the workers get from 17s. to 32s. a month, live under impossible conditions, work excessively hard. This must and can be put an end to now, by increasing wages, introducing the 8-hour

Revolution in China—continued

day, improving the living conditions of the working class, and so on. But the workers will not stop at that, with their Soviets of workers' deputies. They will say to the Communists—and they will be right—"if we have Soviets, and Soviets are organs of power, then can we not draw closer to the bourgeoisie and expropriate just a little?" The Communists will be empty phrasemongers if they do not conform to the policy of expropriation of the bourgeoisie, as soon as they have Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies. Is it possible and necessary to advocate this policy now, in the present phase of the revolution? No, it is not necessary. Is it possible and necessary to refrain in the future from expropriation of the bourgeoisie, when the Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies exist? No. But to think that it is possible to maintain, in this event, the Communists as allies inside the Kuomintang, is to succumb to an illusion and to fail to understand the mechanics of the struggle of class forces in the period of transition from the bourgeois to the proletarian revolution.

That is the position as to the question of the formation of Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies in China.

As you see, it is not so simple as a few somewhat frivolous persons, like comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev, imagine.

Co-operation with Bourgeoisie

Is the co-operation of Marxists with the revolutionary bourgeoisie in one general revolutionary democratic party, or in one general revolutionary democratic government permissible from the point of view of principle? A few Oppositionists think it is not permissible. But the history of Marxism tells us that in specific circumstances, and for a definite period of time, such participation is fully permissible. I could refer to such a case as that of Marx in Germany in 1848, during the revolution against German absolutism, when Marx and his adherents entered into a bourgeois democratic alliance in the Rhine province, and the organ of that revolutionary democratic party was the "Neue Rheinische Zeitung," was edited by Marx. Whilst in this bourgeois democratic alliance and urging the revolutionary bourgeoisie forward, Marx and his adherents criticised in every possible way the half measures of their allies on the Right, just as the Communist Party in China, inside the Kuomintang, ought to criticise in every possible way the vacillations and half-measures of their allies among the left Kuomintang. It is well known that only in the spring of 1849 did Marx and his supporters leave this bourgeois democratic alliance and attempt the independent organisation of the working class with an entirely independent class policy.

As you see, Marx went even further than the Chinese Communist Party, which is included in the Kuomintang as an independent class Party of the proletariat. One can quarrel or not about the expediency of the entry of Marx and his adherents into this bourgeois democratic alliance in 1848. Rosa Luxemburg, for instance, thinks that Marx ought not to have entered that bourgeois democratic alliance. That is a question of tactics. But the principle is this, that Marx and Engels granted the possibility and expediency of enter-

ing into the composition of a bourgeois revolutionary party in the period of bourgeois democratic revolution, in given conditions and for a definite period of time—and there can be no doubt about this.

As for the participation of Marxists in a revolutionary democratic government and co-operation there with the revolutionary bourgeoisie, in given conditions and for a definite period of time—on this point we have indications from such Marxists as Marx and Engels. It is known that Engels in his pamphlet "Anarchists at Work" upheld such participation. It is also known that Lenin in 1905 declared such participation in a bourgeois democratic revolutionary government to be quite permissible.

Two Policies

Thus, we have two entirely different policies on the Chinese question, the Comintern policy and that of comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev.

The Comintern Policy. The feudal survivals and the bureaucratic militarist structure built up on them, supported in every way by the imperialists of all countries, constitute the basic fact, the real situation in present day China. China is experiencing at present an agrarian revolution, directed both against feudal survivals, and against imperialism. The agrarian revolution constitutes the foundation and content of the bourgeois democratic revolution in China. The Kuomintang in Hankow and the Hankow government are the centre of the bourgeois democratic revolutionary movement. Nanking and the Nanking government represents the centre of the national counter-revolution. The policy of support to the Hankow government is at the same time the policy of the development of the bourgeois democratic revolution with all the consequences resulting therefrom. From this follows the participation of Communists in the Hankow Kuomintang and the Hankow revolutionary government, a participation which does not exclude, but presupposes, incessant criticism by the Communists of the half-way measures and vacillations of their allies in the Kuomintang. This participation of the Communists should be utilised for the purpose of making the role of hegemony in the Chinese bourgeois democratic revolution easier for the proletariat and bringing nearer the moment of transition to the proletarian revolution. For the moment, the bourgeois democratic revolution moves onwards to the transition to the proletarian revolution—we must create Soviets of workers', peasants' and soldiers' deputies, as factors of dyarchy, as organs of the struggle for the new power, as organs of the new power, the power of the Soviets. Then the Communist alliance inside the Kuomintang must be replaced by a Communist alliance outside, and the Communist Party must become the only leader of the new revolution in China. To propose now, as comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev do, the immediate formation of Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies, and the immediate creation of a dyarchy—now, when the bourgeois democratic revolution is still in the early stages of its development, when the Kuomintang is the most suitable form of organisation for the national-democratic revolution in China—this would mean to disorganise the revolutionary movement, to weaken the Hankow Government, to facilitate its fall and to help Chang Tso Lin and Chiang Kai Shek.

Revolution in China—continued

The policy of comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev. The survivals of feudalism in China are an invention of comrade Bukharin. They either do not exist in China, or they are so inconsiderable that they can have no real, serious significance. The agrarian revolution, it seems, already exists in China. Where has it come from, the devil only knows. (Laughter.) But since this agrarian revolution exists, then, of course, it must be supported in one way or another. The main thing at present is not the agrarian revolution, but the revolution for independence of the Customs in China, the anti-customs revolution, so to speak. The Hankow government and the Hankow Kuomintang are either a "fiction" (Trotsky) or Kemalism (Zinoviev). On the one hand a dyarchy must be created for the overthrow of the Hankow Government by means of an immediate formation of Soviets (Trotsky). On the other, the Hankow Government must be strengthened, it must be assisted energetically and universally, also, it seems, by means of the immediate formation of Soviets (Zinoviev).

According to the rules, an immediate exit of the Communists from this "fiction," from the Hankow Government and the Hankow Kuomintang, is necessary. But, as it happens, it would be better for them to remain inside this very "fiction," i.e., in the Hankow Government and the Hankow Kuomintang. But why remain in the Hankow Government, if the Hankow Government is a "fiction"—this, it seems God alone knows. And whoever does not agree with this is a traitor.

Such is the so-called policy of comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev.

It would be difficult to imagine anything more inept and muddled than this so-called policy.

One gets the impression that we are dealing not with Marxists, but with literary men shut off from real life, or, better still, with "revolutionary" tourists who have been travelling round the various Sukhums and Kisslovodsk, had a look at the Seventh Enlarged Plenum of the Comintern, as it relates the fundamental

circumstances of the Chinese revolution, found out afterwards from the newspapers that in China some sort of revolution, half-agrarian, half-anti-custom is really taking place, and have decided that a pile of theses must be composed—one in April, another at the beginning of May, another at the end of May—and having been composed, that they must be thrown at the head of the Executive of the Comintern, supposing, apparently, that an excess of muddled, contradictory theses is the fundamental means of saving the Chinese revolution.

I will conclude, comrades. I should like, before concluding, to say a few words about the political meaning and significance of the fractional activities of comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev at the present moment. They complain that they are not given enough freedom for their unprecedented abuse of and unlicensed quarrellings with the C.C. of the C.P. Soviet Union, and the E.C.C.I. They complain of the Comintern and C.P. Soviet Union "regime." Actually they want freedom to disorganise the Comintern and the C.P. Soviet Union. Actually they want to bring the morals of Maslov and Co. into the Comintern, and the C.P. Soviet Union. I must say, comrades, that comrade Trotsky chose a too unfavourable moment for his attacks on the Party and the Comintern. I have just received news that the British Conservative Government has decided to break off relations with the U.S.S.R. Events are proving that there will now be a united attack against the Communists. This attack has already begun. Some threaten the Soviet Communist Party with war and intervention. Others threaten a split. Something is created in the nature of a united front from Chamberlain to Trotsky. Perhaps they want to frighten us with that. But it is hardly necessary to prove that Bolsheviki are not timid. The history of Bolshevism has known not a few fronts of this kind. The history of Bolshevism shows that such united fronts have always been broken by the revolutionary decisiveness and unexampled daring of the Bolsheviki. You need have no doubt that we shall again be successful in breaking this new front. (Applause.)

BUILDING UP SOCIALISM

By N. Bukharin

Obtainable from
The Communist Bookshop, 16 King Street,
Covent Garden, London, W.C.2

NIKOLAI BUKHARIN
is now acknowledged as
the most outstanding
theorist of the Communist
International. His latest
book, just published in a
shape uniform with our
"Lenin Library," deals
with the problem of how
to build up Socialism in
Russia in spite of all the
difficulties & dangers
that surround the
Soviet State.

Price 1s.
Post free
1/1½d.

IT CAN'T BE DONE—EXCEPT BY COMMUNISTS!

EVERY active member of the working class movement knows that it is part of his job to

read and sell

the books and pamphlets that matter most

ACTIVE workers always have too many jobs; in the unions, in their party organisations, in Co-operatives, in a dozen committees.

BUT reading these will help them to do better work; it is not just a question of learning abstract things, but of finding out how to avoid mistakes and get more results.

TRY to get hold of

LENIN

THE STATE AND REVOLUTION: Second Edition. 160 pages. 1s. 6d., post free 1s. 8d.

ON THE ROAD TO INSURRECTION: Tactics by Example. 1s. 6d., post free 1s. 8d.

IMPERIALISM: a new edition out May 20th, with a new preface. Lenin's masterpiece. 1s. 6d., post free 1s. 8d.; cloth, 3s.

TROTSKY

WHERE IS BRITAIN GOING? Second edition with new preface. 2s. 6d., post free 2s. 9d.

STALIN

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF LENINISM. By the leader of the Russian C.P. 1s. 6d.

BOLSHEVISM, SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED. 1s. 6d., post free 1s. 7½d.

BUKHARIN

BUILDING UP SOCIALISM: 1s.

J. T. Murphy

THE POLITICAL MEANING OF THE GREAT STRIKE: 1s. 6d., post free 1s. 8d.

SPECIAL cheap packets of useful literature are available for Communist Party Training Groups and Locals. What about an order for these?

REMEMBER! if we do not read and sell these things, we may do any amount of other work—but half of it will be wasted.

Get all your books from

THE COMMUNIST BOOKSHOP
16, King Street, Covent Garden, WC2