

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. VI. No. 23.

Workers' Library Publishers,
35 East 125th St., New York.

TEN CENTS

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| The Competition of the Masses for the Revolution | 909 |
| From Trade Unionism to Social-Fascism. <i>By A. Smoliansky</i> | 912 |
| The Rising Revolutionary Wave in China | 916 |
| The Policy of the Labourists and the Sharpening of Imperialist Contradictions. <i>By G.</i> ... | 924 |
| Collective Progress and the Lone Heroes. <i>By Bela Kun</i> | 931 |
| The Tenth Plenum and the Swedish Communist Party | 938 |
| Open Letter to the Members of the Swedish Communist Party | 939 |
| The Struggle Against the Right Danger in the Communist Party of Canada. <i>By John Porter</i> | 944 |
| Resolution of the Political-Secretariat of August 30 | 954 |

The Competition of the Masses for the Revolution

IT is only very seldom that historical science can lay down with any exactitude the starting point of great historical events, and particularly of great mass movements. If seven towns have each claimed the honour of being the birthplace of Homer, the great Greek poet, the number of factory and working-class organisations which have laid claim to the honour of taking the initiative in the international revolutionary competition, is very much greater. Who took the initiative in extending the Socialist competition of the Soviet Union to a world scale? It is impossible to say, although the revolutionary competition between the workers of the Soviet Union and the workers in capitalist countries is still only in its first stage. It cannot be said, even now, whether the metal workers of the *Profintern* factory in Briansk, or the workers of the Opel factory, whether Hamburg or Leningrad workers, Swedish or Swiss workers, can lay claim to the honour of having

started this great new competition. One thing is certain—and it is the most important thing: the initiative came from the heart of the masses themselves, and it is equally certain that every revolutionary workers' organisation should devote the greatest attention to this initiative, if it is anxious to carry out Lenin's advice: "Pay more attention to simple, but living facts . . . which, drawn from life, are tested by life." These words should be kept constantly before all of us, before our writers, agitators, propagandists, organisers, etc. . . ."

What is the meaning of this revolutionary competition between the emancipated proletariat of the Soviet State and the oppressed workers of capitalist countries? the doubters may ask, for they always shake their heads sceptically at every new phenomenon. The proletariat of the Soviet Union is building up socialism, the workers of the capitalist countries are groaning under the terrible weight of imperialist capital:

then what can be the subject of the competition, when the working-class of two or more countries live under such fundamentally different conditions? Lenin gave the answer to this question in the following words :—

“If Socialism is to be won, if Socialism is to be fought for and called into being, the proletariat must carry out a twofold task, or rather the two sides of one task. First of all, by the reckless heroism of its revolutionary struggle against capital, the proletariat must carry along with itself the whole mass of workers and of the exploited, must organise them and lead them to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and completely suppress any attempt at resistance on the part of the bourgeoisie. The proletariat, secondly, must lead the workers and the exploited, as well as the petty bourgeoisie, in the work of building up the new economic order, by creating new social relations, a new labour discipline, a new organisation of labour which shall put into practical operation both the latest results of science and capitalist technique and the mass co-ordination of the workers, conscious of their goal, who are building up large scale socialist production.”

LENIN : THE GREAT INITIATIVE

The proletariat of the Soviet Union is carrying out the second task in the strength and great heroism of its daily work. The working class of the Soviet Union is creating the new social relations, the new organisation of labour by its socialist competition; it is reaching and surpassing the level of capitalist technique, and is building up Socialism. The first of the twofold tasks of the international working-class faces the proletariat of the capitalist countries, which must, “by the reckless heroism of its revolutionary struggle against capital, carry along with itself the whole mass of workers and of the exploited, must organise them and lead them to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.” The subject of the competition is therefore quite clear and simple: who will accomplish better their side of the twofold task of the proletariat, the workers of the Soviet Union or the workers of the capitalist countries? Who will better organise the mass co-ordination of conscious workers for the realisation of these tasks? This is the question for everybody who wants to take

part in, or help to organise the revolutionary competition. This revolutionary competition is the present form, corresponding to the reconstruction period in the Soviet Union and the third period in the post-war crisis of capitalism, of co-operation between the workers of the Soviet Union and the workers of the capitalist world.

Corresponding to the present period of the international revolution, this co-operation must have as its main object to defend the Soviet Union against imperialist war, to assure to the proletariat and peasantry of the Soviet Union the possibility of carrying out the great five-years' plan of socialist construction. In this sense the socialist competition is a continuation of 1st August, the day of struggle against imperialist war, and for the defence of the Soviet Union. The chief object of the revolutionary competition in capitalist countries is to draw new and much wider sections of workers into the daily activities of anti-war work than was done on 1st August. We must draw into this revolutionary competition not only the actively militant members of the working-class, not only those who sympathise with the Communists, but the greatest possible mass of non-party and social democratic workers, whose class consciousness will not allow them to follow obediently along the path of social fascism and social imperialism trodden by Messrs. Müller and Hilferding, Otto Bauer and Julius Deutsch, MacDonald and Thomas. This is the reason that makes this socialist competition a new form of the application of the united front tactic. The international revolutionary competition must be the starting point for establishing and building firmly among the masses new united front bodies, working in the struggle for the everyday demands of the working-class, working against fascism, against imperialist war, for the defence of the Soviet Union, etc. If the class conscious workers of the Soviet Union are drawing the backward sections of the masses into the work of creating the new labour discipline and the new organisation of labour, the class-conscious workers in capitalist countries must draw even the most backward sections of the working-class into the united front of the proletarian revolution.

The basic form of the international revolutionary competition is, therefore, the com-

petition, from factory to factory, between the workers in the factories of the Soviet Union and those of capitalist countries. The initiative came from the mass of workers themselves. It is therefore the duty of every party group, every Young Communist group, every member of the red Trade Unions or of the Trade Union minority opposition in the reformist unions, to leave no stone unturned to strengthen this mass initiative and to spread it even to those factories where Communist influence is very weak or entirely lacking. It is the duty of the Communist and revolutionary workers' Press to record each smallest indication of mass initiative in the direction of revolutionary competition, and not only to register the living face of mass initiative which, "drawn from life is tested by life," but to further it as part of the whole class struggle, to value it as an example of revolutionary work. The fulfilment of the Tenth Plenum decisions would be not only defective, but utterly lacking, if the Communist Party were not to display and develop this mass initiative towards revolutionary competition among the vital industries—particularly the industries vital for war (munitions, chemicals, mining, electro-technical works, transport, etc.).

The five-year plan of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, encircled as it is by the imperialist powers, implies the strengthening of the defensive capacity of the only socialist country. Against the background of imperialist armies preparing for war, this revolutionary competition means that the defensive capacity of the revolutionary proletariat against imperialist war is greatly strengthened.

The competition of the masses, the organisation of this competition, is not the only task. The sections of the Communist International must also be drawn into competition with the largest section, the oldest branch of the C.I., the C.P. of the Soviet Union. The C.P.S.U., the organiser of insurrection, of victory, of socialist construction, of the remodelling of a great part of humanity over one-sixth of the earth's surface, is exerting all its efforts to carry out the great task which confronts it. It is putting Lenin's slogan "Every factory must be a strong fortress," into effect with the utmost consistency; it is firmly rooted, not only in the most advanced sections of the proletariat, but also among the backward masses who still have

as it were, one foot resting on the remains of the old economic forms. The Leninist Young Communist League is showing the boldest initiative in the struggle against these remains of the old capitalist forms of existence in the factories and in daily life. These two bodies, and with them the trade unions, the co-operatives and other social organisations are, in their respective spheres, and under the leadership of the Party, the organisers of the working masses. The international revolutionary competition must also embrace all. Party and Youth organisations, all the red trade unions and trade union oppositions in the reformist unions. For the Communist workers of capitalist countries, the content of this work of competition must be the strengthening of their work among and their influence over the masses; the winning of new members for the Party, for the Youth League, for the Red Trade Unions and the Trade Union Minority Movements, the winning of thousands of new subscribers to the Communist Press, bringing thousands under the influence of the Communist Parties, the Red Trade Unions, the Minority Movements. At the same time, the workers of the Soviet Union who have been drawn into the international revolutionary competition, must exert all their efforts to carry through as quickly and as smoothly as possible, the five-years' plan, to create new forms of the way of living, to carry out the cultural revolution, to reach and to surpass, in their "backward country" the level of capitalist technique, to create a new and higher type of the social organisation of labour than that attained by capitalism. "This," Lenin said, "is the essential thing, this is the source of strength and the pledge of the victory of Communism."

Although the socialist competition is a result of mass initiative, although it really does spring from the heart of the organised and unorganised masses, the Communist Parties must still organise this competition systematically, and energetically, paying the greatest attention to any and every indication of mass initiative. They must take local conditions into consideration, they must formulate the slogans that come from the masses, but not neglect to put forward their own slogans for socialist competition. Every act that shows a tendency towards bureaucracy in the competition is

calculated to do the very reverse of organising the competition. The creative energy of the masses must be stimulated and not on any account led into bureaucratic channels. The Communist Parties, the Young Communist Leagues, the Red Trade Unions and Trade Union oppositions, the Communist fractions in factory committees, must all make it the chief object of their plans for organising the international revolutionary competition to establish the closest possible connections between the workers and workers' organisations in capitalist countries and in the Soviet Unions, both by the interchange of letters and by the living tie of mutual workers' delegations. The conditions and stipulations of this revolutionary competition must be systematically announced and explained, as widely as possible, in the Communist Press, both local and provincial, and in factory papers. No sort of Communist conceit, of political bravado, must be placed in the way of the smallest indication of mass initiative. Attention to the least such indication—this is the slogan for every Communist worker whose task it is to organise the socialist competition.

In this sense the international revolutionary competition will give a strong impulse to the work of the C.I. sections in carrying on the Tenth Plenum decisions. The chief and basic form of this competition is that between

factories; this means that the Communist Parties must pay the greatest attention to the factories, particularly to the large factories which, in modern conditions are almost all, without exception, vital for war purposes. To win over these large factories is to win over the decisive sections of the proletariat, from which the ranks of the Party must be recruited and renewed. These new elements in the Party will change the old methods of work, will do away with the old social democratic customs and traditions, the stereotyped routine of party life. By this revolutionary activity in the factories, by drawing new masses into the Party and strengthening its ranks, we must work out the new type of revolutionary Bolshevik Party, which shall be really Bolshevik, and really capable of making full use of the new revolutionary advance of the working masses, of winning leadership in the most important factories, of becoming the leader and organiser of the revolutionary struggle and the final victory.

Before the Twelfth Anniversary of the October Revolution, the Communist Parties must organise the international revolutionary competition in such a way that it will forge new weapons in the fight for and triumph of the world October.

From Trade Unionism to Social-Fascism

By C. Smoliansky

FROM Swansea and Hamburg to the Prague meeting of the Executive of the Amsterdam International and the Trades Union Congress in Belfast—such was the path towards the fascisation of the international reformist trade union movement during last year. Until recently the reformist trade union movement in Germany was the model for fascisation; but now we have the completion of the circle in the British Trades Union Congress. In the course of the last five or six years the trade union bureaucrats have been seeking the path to the consolidation of the British Empire and the stabilisation of British capitalism. Some of them — the

Thomases, the Clynes and the Cramps—have planted their feet directly and openly on the path of British imperialism. The ideal of this "elder" group of trade union imperialists is a Pan-British "workers'" international, to pour the young, fresh blood of the proletariat into the weakening body of British imperialism. Others—the Purcells, the Cooks and the Citrines—also went towards the same end, but by other paths. Like the others, equally protecting the interests of British imperialism, equally hating the colonial proletariat which is tearing asunder the foundations of the British workers' aristocracy, equally stupid and limited "labour lieutenants" of British

imperialism, they went towards the same end from "red" Scarborough and the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The only difference is in the social conditions which called into existence and inspired these two categories of leaders, equally hostile to the proletarian revolution.

Post-war Britain has experienced tremendous changes in the social structure of the working class. The old traditional branches of industry, which had been the backbone of British imperialism, had irretrievably lost their world position. The workers in these monopoly industries—and especially the miners—had gradually passed over from the extreme conservative wing of trade unionism, where they had stood for many decades during the period of British industrial monopoly, on to the left flank, into the ranks of the opposition. The new branches of industry—chemicals, aeroplane construction, motor construction, electrical engineering—were only just coming into existence. New strata of the workers' aristocracy were only in the process of developing. The "younger generation" of trade union officials tried to save their positions in the trade union bureaucracy, adapting themselves to leftward moving strata of the workers. Hence their "leftness." Hence their "radical" phraseology, in harmony with the deepening process of radicalisation taking place in the proletariat in those branches of industry.

But "the river of life does not flow backward." As time went on, so the process of "polarisation" developed more and more within the British working class movement. The havoc wrought by the general strike and the miners' lock-out did not put a stop to the leftward movement of the British proletariat, though it gave it peculiar, complicated forms. The leftward movement developed along the line of differentiation between the branches of industry. And when the hopeless position of the old, traditional workers' aristocracy had become apparent, the new "left" generation of the trade union bureaucracy quickly found their way over to their older comrades. And just as in the nineties of last century the "new trade unionism" brought into existence a type of leader more hateful, corrupt and treacherous than even the most conservative representatives of the classical "old trade unionism," so

now in the epoch after the general strike the contemptible "lefts" play the rôle of sharpshooters in the fascisation of the British trade union movement.

The fifty-first congress of the British trade unions, at Belfast, brought nothing new in principle in this connection. In Britain the whole of last year was spent in propaganda for "industrial peace." Everything "new" that could have been said on this subject had already been said. Ben Tillett's revelations that "capitalist rationalisation is inevitable," that it is impossible to resist it, that the trade unions are "an integral part of the organisation of industry," are only the necessary repetitions of what is being preached every day throughout the Amsterdam International by the knights of "economic democracy." "The worker is more interested in the prosperity of industry," declared Ben Tillett, "than the shareholder, the director, or the manager. His stake in industry is his livelihood and the lives of his wife and family. It is his duty to see that his industry is properly run and that industry as a whole is efficient." "The working class is a part of the capitalist system . . . the well-being or ruin of this system means the well-being or ruin of the working class itself"—these were the exact words used a year before Ben Tillett by Karl Zwing, the theoretician of "economic democracy" in Germany and the historian of the reformist trade union movement. The Belfast Congress, therefore, did not mark a stage. But its historical significance lies in the fact that it *accumulated* within itself all the "experience" already gained in the fascisation of the British trade unions. The process of fusion between the British trade unions and the bourgeois government was completed. The Labour Party and the trade unions divided up between themselves the work of safeguarding British imperialism. The Belfast Congress proclaimed that it would not put obstacles in the way of the Government, which was "sympathetic to the trade unions." The period when the trade unions were only *servants* of capitalist stabilisation has long gone by. Now the position is that capitalist rationalisation and the consolidation of British imperialism are being brought about by the "young," "muscular" hands of the representatives of the British workers' aristocracy. "Mr. Ben

Tillett is an excellent British imperialist," declares the arch-reactionary *Morning Post*. The British trade union leaders, with a praiseworthy lack of inertia and an energy of which they could not have been suspected, are putting through the programme of fascisation of the trade union movement which has been laid down on an international basis by the Executive of the Amsterdam International. As applied to the British movement this programme is: to cement the empire on the basis of a "pan-British workers' international" for the greatest possible exploitation of the colonial proletariat by British imperialism. "Industrial peace" on a pan-British scale! Fusion—even as far as the "free" trade union press! Henceforth the *Daily Herald* belongs to a capitalist newspaper trust, which takes upon itself the work of "developing" this "workers'" paper. In domestic Britain, where the press is far more "free" than in the country of the proletarian dictatorship, the General Council will henceforward — in its own words—be "free" to control the political direction of the newspaper trust which is to publish and manage the *Daily Herald*, the trust which is known for its yellow anti-Soviet *People* and *John Bull*.

Such was this first British trade union congress under the new "Labour" Government. It fenced itself off with high palings from the British proletariat. The voice of the rationalised miners and textile workers was heard only in a few—but clear and vigorous—declarations from the revolutionary opposition, which managed in spite of all obstacles to find its way to the congress. The trade union bureaucracy strangled these demonstrations with no less brutality and cynicism than the social-fascist leaders of the A.D.G.B. use in trade union congresses in Germany.

But nevertheless the voice was heard even beyond the walls of the congress. Almost at the same time as the congress, the Sixth Annual Conference of the National Minority Movement was held. In spite of the jubilant talk of the reformists about the "liquidation" of Communist influence after the elections, in spite of the pessimistic forecasts of some of our Right opportunists, who, like the whole trade union bureaucracy, tend to regard the present stage of the working class movement in Britain as a stage of unin-

terrupted retreat and depression of the proletariat, the Minority Movement conference achieved quite significant and symptomatic success. Even apart from the fact that the number of delegates at the conference was not less than the year before, that over 700 delegates participated, it is necessary to note the indications of the undoubtedly higher qualitative level of this year's conference. The number of delegates elected directly at factories and pits was this time higher than at any previous conference. A number of unions were represented nationally: the Furnishing Trades workers (numbering some 70,000), and the new revolutionary unions of the Scottish miners and of the clothing trade workers. A most important sign was the presence of delegates from the Lancashire textile area, which had just passed through a heavy struggle with the employers. This was all the more important because until recently the Minority Movement had not been firmly rooted among the textile workers.

At this conference the revolutionary advance guard of the British proletariat brought forward a full and correct appraisal of the activities of the trade union bureaucracy and the "Labour" imperialist MacDonald Government. The conference definitely declared its hostility to the arbitration fraud, with the help of which the triple union of the textile employers, the MacDonald Government and the trade union bureaucracy had been able to beat down the locked-out textile workers. The conference exposed the aggressive imperialist policy and provocative rôle of the "Labour" Government in India and Palestine. The conference worked out a detailed practical programme of struggle against capitalist rationalisation, and called on the Lancashire textile workers to continue their fight. At the same time the conference subjected all the defects and weaknesses of the National Minority Movement to a severe revolutionary self-criticism. These defects were most clearly seen in connection with the new upward tendency in the working class and with the developing economic battles. And the most important defect was the "trailing along behind events," the *holding back* from the developing class battles. The textile movement had caught both the Minority Movement and the Communist Party unawares. And though the Party had cor-

rected its mistake and had shown considerable activity *during* the struggle, setting up committees of action and of aid for the locked-out textile workers, the Minority Movement had dragged along absolutely at the tail of the fight—in *all* its stages. It is characteristic that the Minority Movement's paper paid literally no attention to the lock-out, except for a few notes in small type on the third page? But this textile movement was the clearest indication on the present condition of the working class movement in Britain. The textile workers are among the most backward, thanks to the predominance of women's labour and the high pay of certain grades (for example, the spinners). And just for that reason the stubbornness shown by the textile workers during the last year is an indication of the deep changes now in process within the British working class as a result of the decline of British capitalism.

During the lock-out of the Lancashire textile workers an almost complete absence of connections between the Minority Movement and the textile proletariat made itself felt. The Communist Party was compelled to take into its own hands the organisation of the struggle. But even the Communist Party had been unable to foresee the fight and organise the textile workers' resistance to the employers' attack. In Britain now a series of new economic battles lie ahead, in heavy industry and among the textile and railway workers. In view of the existence of the MacDonald Government these economic battles assume a fundamental political character. And if the National Minority Movement is not able to reorganise itself in good time, to get into the factories, to establish new sections of the revolutionary Minority Movement, to ally itself with the masses and prepare them for the struggle—in spite of and against the trade union bureaucracy—it will once more find itself separated from the masses at the time of the fight, and the trade union bureaucracy will once more succeed in harnessing these masses to the yoke of capitalist rationalisation, with the aid of the arbitration fraud.

The most important problems under the present conditions of fascisation of the British trade unions are the fight against arbitration, against the traditional legalism of the British workers, against their respectful attitude to the British bourgeois government; and the link-

ing up of the economic fights in the imperialist centre with the class battles in the British colonies. The heavy defeat of the Lancashire textile workers lies, not in the fact of their having been temporarily compelled to agree to a reduction of wages, but in the fact that they left the field of battle with a complete lack of understanding of the crafty machinery used by the triple alliance of the MacDonald Government, the trade unions and the employers. That is why the British revolutionary advance guard of the trade unions, and the Communist Party, must intensify their exposure of the arbitration fraud before the masses, and must with all their energy make their way into the factories and workshops, establishing there their industrial sections; that is why they must take all measures for the preparation and leadership of the economic battles that are developing, in the first place, among the textile workers, the miners, and the workers in heavy industry. Here lies the key to the winning over of the masses, and the cause of the bankruptcy of MacDonald and the trade union bureaucracy. It is essential to put an end to all wavering and hesitation in connection with the new tactics in economic struggles. To turn to the strike-breaking trade union leaders with a "demand" for action (as actually occurred in the case of even the new Clothing Workers' Union) should once and for all be condemned as opportunist trade union legalism. And similarly in connection with Cook. We cannot just passively console ourselves with the fact that after the general strike the trade union bureaucracy have not succeeded in destroying the Minority Movement. The fact that hundreds of thousands of workers are represented at the Minority Movement conference will only have real revolutionary significance if the representation is really from below, directly from the masses. Finally, the Minority Movement must put more energy than it has shown in the past into the task of establishing contact with the trade unions in the British colonies, helping the colonial workers in their economic struggle, in the building up of new trade unions and the exposure of the imperialist activities in the colonies of the General Council and the Labour Party. This is, in concrete terms, the essence of the Tenth Plenum decisions in their application to Britain.

The Rising Revolutionary Wave in China

THE economic situation in China remains in the throes of a crisis. It is true that the cotton industry shows a certain liveliness, and that the foreign trade turnover registers a slight increase. In this connection, the share of the U.S.A. in China's foreign trade continues to rise; in the first quarter of 1929 China's exports to the U.S.A. were 45.5 million American dollars, compared with 37 million American dollars in the first quarter of the preceding year, and the imports from the U.S.A. were 42 million as compared with 34.4 million American dollars. But the increasing foreign trade turnover bears an unhealthy character, being mainly due to imports of food and foreign manufactured products for general consumption. Certain progress is being made in the preparation of the country for motor transport development, by the construction of motor roads in areas where market relations are developing.

The liveliness in the cotton industry and the slight increase in foreign trade present a picture of partial economic revival, taking place under conditions of a relative lull in the civil wars, and noticeable against the background of the preceding economic chaos. But industry as a whole continues to experience a heavy depression. Heavy industry is in a particularly depressed state, and the available data paint a not less gloomy picture of other industries. Thus the Tientsin flour-milling industry has fallen into a state of severe depression, resulting in the closing down of almost all the mills. Chinese cigarette factories, unable to withstand the competition of foreign products, are reducing production, although not long ago this branch of industry was one of the most healthy and showed rapid development. An indication of the stagnation in the leather industry is the fact that the largest leather works in Shanghai have recently closed down. The crisis in the silk industry is also becoming more severe.

Side by side with this industrial stagnation, the general economic situation is worsening in consequence of the disorganisation on the railways and the complete financial chaos.

The fall in the world price of silver also exerts an unfavourable influence on China's economic position. The average value of the Shanghai silver Tael on the New York exchange was 64 cents in 1928, while in February, 1929, it was 62 cents, in April 61, in May 59 and in June 57. This fall has a serious effect on China's whole economic life. But beyond question the most important factor in the general position of China's national economy is the crisis in agriculture, which plays a dominating rôle in Chinese economy. The breaking up by international imperialism of China's old agricultural production, tea and silk, the spoliation and pillaging of the peasants by the landlords, militarists and money-lenders, and the abandonment of the irrigation system, have produced a condition of chronic agricultural crisis, which naturally reacts on the general position of China's economy.

As is known the failure of last year's harvest in several provinces doomed to starvation and extinction tens of millions of the peasants. Early in July of this year the Chinese Ambassador in the United States issued an appeal for help, stating officially in the press that 37 million people in China were starving. The American Colonel Rankner, who passed through the Kiangsi province at the end of June, states that "between Ping-liang and Lang-chow it was difficult to get along the roads. Thousands of people were lying on the road in a dying condition. The drivers had to protect the pack-horses from the attacks of the starving people, who tried to pillage the food they were carrying."

It is true that the information with regard to this year's harvest shows a more favourable position. But, however favourable the harvest prospects may be, the results of last year's famine must be felt for a long time to come. Ruin and death among the peasants, reduction in the area under cultivation, and a sharp fall in the purchasing power of the population: these factors cannot but have a disastrous effect on the already serious economic position in China. The increase of food imports into China is a clear indication of the

crisis in agriculture. Thus, during the single month of May 400,000 barrels of flour were imported into Tientsin. At the present time China is one of the chief buyers of American flour: in the first half of 1929 one million barrels of American flour were imported, as against half-a-million barrels for the whole of 1927.

The Chinese reaction has not only failed to mitigate the general economic crisis, but on the contrary all its activities have merely deepened the crisis. Everyone remembers the widely proclaimed promises of the Nanking Government to abolish "likin" (inter-provincial tariffs), with the object of facilitating the development of internal trade. In fact, the Nanking Government has carried out its promises: "likin" has been abolished—but in its place they have introduced a new "tax on consumption" which is considerably higher than the former "likin" tariffs. The Chambers of Commerce in all parts of the country are now insistently demanding the abolition of "the tax on consumption, which is more than twice as heavy as the former likin." This increased taxation will undoubtedly lead to still further disintegration in internal trade.

The pitiful attempts to put the finances in order have also met with complete failure. The Chinese bankers are crying out against the financial chaos, and are demanding control over the military expenditure of the Nanking Government. The Nanking minister Sun-Tse-Weng (who succeeded in resigning three times during the last twelve months) also speaks of the "hopeless position of the finances." We quote, almost in full, his August declaration, in which he not only gives a deadly characterisation of the financial position, but also shows up the efforts to reduce military expenditure.

"During the last year the finances of the whole country have fallen into a most hopeless state. The people are groaning under the immense burden. Everyone had hoped that, following on the unification of the country, the military expenditure would have been reduced and brought into the regular budget. If no guarantes can be given, if even after the conference for the reorganisation of the army the military expenditure still remains unlimited, and the estimates without exact definition—in such a case our Government's ability

to obtain financial credits must be reduced to zero, and the financial burdens resting on our people will increase without limit. Life, already extremely difficult, will become impossible. In the spring of this year the conference on the reorganisation of the army adopted a resolution, setting a limit of 16 million dollars monthly for military expenditure. Such an immense figure for military expenditure is too heavy a burden for the nation. And now the recent conference has found that after the reduction of the army the monthly figure of military expenditure is considerably higher. I think that if the former resolution setting the 16 million dollar limit has not been able to be enforced, there is no hope whatever of establishing a proper budget system in our country's finances. . . . At the fifth session of the Executive, at the Third Congress of the Kuomintang, and at the spring conference for the reorganisation of the army, I put forward exact and detailed figures showing the desperate state of our finances. . . . I am not afraid to meet difficulties, but every man's courage has its limits, just as his responsibility to his country has its limits. For that reason I consider it preferable to resign now, rather than continue to bear this responsibility in the future. . . ." (From the *Ishibao Peking* of August 8, 1929.)

This declaration paints a clear enough picture of the financial position. The internal loan that has now been floated will certainly yield no substantial results, firstly, because the sum involved is small, and, secondly, because such amounts as are raised will be entirely absorbed in military expenditure.

The attempts made by the reaction to "settle" the agricultural problem have been equally unsuccessful. An attempt was made last year to weaken the peasant movement by a 25 per cent. reduction of rents in the Chekiang province; and a commission was set up, under the presidency of Chu-Chang-Ming, to work out agrarian reforms. The main work done by this commission was to review the land taxes, but the draft laws it put forward have not yet been definitely formulated and the new taxation rates have not yet been fixed. As for the experiment in Chekiang province, the reduction of rents was very soon annulled, and the June session of the Kuomintang

Executive decided to postpone all such measures for four years. Both of these incidents show the complete bankruptcy of the Nanking Government in the question of agrarian reform.

On the question of meeting the economic crisis, the Chinese counter-revolution had great hopes of assistance from foreign capital. But here also their reckoning met with a very small measure of fulfilment. The imperialists continued to strengthen their position in China. In this connection the international conference of Chambers of Commerce, which was held in July of this year in Amsterdam, was extremely significant. The Chinese delegation raised in a sharp form the questions of credits and the abolition of extra-territoriality. The reply to these questions was given by Lamont, of the Morgan concern, on behalf of the United States. This authoritative spokesman of American finance capital, turning to the Chinese delegation, rapped out a couple of sentences to the effect that China's credit was extremely low, that it was difficult to count on any further financing of China, and that any talk of abolishing extra-territoriality would only prejudice the position. This answer was a double blow to the Chinese delegation: it dashed their hopes of getting any substantial foreign credits, and at the same time showed that the imperialist powers were not prepared to agree to the abolition of extra-territoriality.

The Nanking counter-revolution has therefore met with failure in every direction. It has not only failed to solve, but has not even mitigated any one of the contradictions which are giving birth to the Chinese revolution. The country has not been unified. As before, the different provinces are ruled by different militarists as their own properties. The economic dismemberment of China continues to nourish Chinese militarism. The half-hearted attempts to settle the agricultural problems have completely failed. No substantial results of any kind have been achieved in the direction of curtailing the privileges of the imperialist powers. The reaction has not thrown off, but has only consolidated, the rule of foreign capital. Involved in a series of contradictions which are daily becoming more dangerous, the Nanking bourgeois-landlord *bloc* has only succeeded in intensifying the

general economic and political crisis in China.

The position is made more dangerous by the interminable dissensions between the various military groups which cover up the rivalries of the imperialist powers and the struggle between different strata in the ruling classes. The war now being prepared by the Nanking Government against the Northern militarist groups, headed by Feng-Yu-Hsieng and Yang-Tsi-Chiang, will have a still more disastrous effect on the whole of China's economic and political life. But the menace of this war becomes greater every day.

By its seizure of the Far Eastern Railway, the Nanking Government sought relief in open provocation against the U.S.S.R., hoping to be of service to foreign capital and to win its favour. But here also Nanking's plans have been upset. The Soviet Government's firm policy defeated the designs of the international imperialists. The Chinese armies thrown into this adventure made more difficult the position which was already critical; and at the same time, the conflict over the Far Eastern Railway sharpened the contradictions between the imperialist powers. The Far Eastern Railway became an "apple of discord" among them as soon as it had been seized by Nanking. Japan rightly saw in the proposals for the so-called "internationalisation" of the railway an attack by American capital on Japan's existing interests in Manchuria. On the other hand, the Far Eastern Railway conflict accelerated the war preparations among the different militarist groups, under conditions unfavourable for Nanking. The Mukden clique, which had previously supported Nanking against Feng-Yu-Hsieng, now, as a result of the unsatisfactory position in which they had been put by the Soviet-Chinese conflict, are going further away from Nanking and nearer to Feng. The attitude taken up by Yang-Tsi-Chiang, and therefore by his closest ally Feng-Yu-Hsieng, is very illuminating. According to the *Shanghai Mingoshibao* of July 24, 1929, the Central Political Council had decided to appoint Yang-Tsi-Chiang to command the defence of the north-western frontier. In answer to Chiang-Kai-Shek's telegram, Yang replied: "In consequence of the sharpening of diplomatic relations between China and Russia it has at last been necessary

to consider the defence of the north-western frontier. I personally feel myself too weak and unfit to fill this post. I suggest that the incident that has occurred could best be settled by diplomatic means. If, nevertheless, you consider it necessary to charge someone with the duty of commanding the defence of the north-western frontier, I beg you to find some other person more fitted for the post."

Realising the difficulties of its position, Nanking is attempting by every possible means to postpone the threatening internal war between the militarists. It attempted to buy off the Tsi-Chiang group by handing over to them the government of the Kwantung province. To the Kwangsi group it allotted the Kwangsi province. And in order to postpone the break with Chang-Hsui-Liang, Nanking agreed to the breaking up of its Kuomintang committees in three Manchurian provinces. Feng-Yu-Hsieng and Yang-Tsi-Chiang were to be bribed by the presentation to their protégés of a number of government portfolios. It is possible that as a result of this policy of giving up ground, Nanking may be able for some time to avoid the calamity of internal warfare. But even in this case the economic crisis will not show any improvement: it will become more and more serious, more and more strangling, until the new revolutionary upheaval.

* * *

It is true that an economic crisis does not always and automatically produce a political upheaval. Lenin has shown us that "Without a general basis in agrarian crisis and industrial depression no deep political crisis is possible: this cannot be disputed. But even when this general basis is present, it is still not possible for us to draw any conclusion as to whether the depression will for some time hold back the mass struggle of the workers in general, or whether, at a *certain stage of development*, that same depression will draw new masses and fresh forces into the political struggle. There is only one way to decide such a question: to follow attentively the pulse-beats of the whole political life of the country, and, in particular, the condition of the movement and tendencies among the wide proletarian masses."

Following Lenin's advice, we turn to an analysis of the movement among the masses.

Here we meet with an uninterrupted growth of the strike movement among the working class. According to statistics published by the Social-Investigation Bureau of the Kuomintang, in Shanghai alone during the first nine months of 1928 there were 175 strikes, involving 233,430 workers. It is certainly difficult to believe that the Kuomintang will have exaggerated the actual figures. Moreover, from the same source we find that in Shanghai there were twenty strikes in October, twenty-two in November, and sixteen in December. And it is clear that the strike wave was not confined to Shanghai. If we count only the strikes at big enterprises, we find that during 1928 there were at least sixteen such large strikes in Hong Kong, and in Manchuria nine, while there were many others in Tientsin, Uchang and other industrial centres. The total number of workers involved in strikes during 1928, on a very rough and certainly incomplete reckoning, was certainly over 400,000. In this connection China came second only to India, where more than half-a-million workers were involved in strikes and 31,500,000 working days were lost. But China was not behind France, the United States, or other industrially developed countries, where there was a considerable development of the strike wave during 1928.

Four hundred thousand strikers—for China this is a highly significant figure. It shows the immense swing forward in the working class movement, especially if we take into account the appalling devastation of the movement following on the recent defeat of the revolution. It is characteristic of the elemental nature of the strike movement that the strikes during 1927 and the first half of 1928 took place, in the majority of cases, without any clear formulation of demands by the strikers. This extraordinary situation, in which strikes break out without any clear formulation of demands by the strikers, is without precedent in other countries. It is a special characteristic of the Chinese movement, and is to be explained by the bloody terror exercised by the reaction now raging. It is a fact that if any worker or Communist at a strike meeting put forward any concrete demands, this would be enough to ensure his immediate arrest and execution.

The triumphant reaction suppresses every sign of revolt among the working masses with the most inhuman cruelty. It hopes by the physical extermination of the best sons of the working class to put an end, once and for all, to the danger of new revolutionary upheavals. But in spite of all the Government's activities, in spite of the repressive measures of the victorious reaction, the working class movement shows uninterrupted growth. In spite of the raging terror, the strike wave continues to rise. The double exploitation of the Chinese workers—by the capitalists and through the imperialist domination of the country—is driving them along the road of struggle against their oppressors. The loss of all the gains won at the time of the last revolutionary struggle, the lowering of wages while prices of all consumption goods are rising, and the inhuman treatment of the workers by the factory managers, are all factors arousing discontent among the workers and leading to ever more prolonged, larger and more bitter economic battles.

We have no statistical data showing the strike movement in China during 1929, but judging from newspaper reports, the wave of elemental strikes in the industrial districts of China not only shows no sign of diminishing, but even shows a tendency to rise still further. And this wave is spread over a wide area, involving workers in different districts and in various industries. For example, during 1929 there have been strikes of dock workers at Shanghai, Tientsin and Hong Kong; railway workers have struck; tramwaymen at Tientsin and Shanghai; and at various centres, there have been strikes of electricians, of miners, textile workers, seamen and employees of stores. In Shanghai alone the number of strikers has varied between 10,000 and 60,000 each month. In these disputes the Chinese proletariat is showing ever greater stubbornness and an ever higher degree of class-consciousness. In many cases neither the treachery of the Kuomintang trade union bureaucrats nor the intervention of police and military have had any effect on the strikers.

Under the pressure of this elemental movement among the workers the Kuomintang has been obliged to undertake certain manoeuvres in its dealings with the working class. In

addition to the prohibitive measures and police action it has been using, it is now more and more attempting to get hold of the leadership in these economic battles, with the object of betraying the interests of the workers at the first opportunity. In most cases the strikes arise and are carried on on a large scale, with the active participation of masses of workers. The Kuomintang trade union bureaucrats try to intervene after the struggle has actually broken out, with the purpose of breaking down and paralysing the militancy of the masses on strike. This was the case in the recent strike of sailors on one of the Jardine Company's steamers; and also in the tramway workers' strike at Tientsin, where a strike broke out as the result of a collision between tramway workers and foreign (Belgian) managers. The Kuomintang trade union leaders first tried the transfer of the affair to the courts, and when the workers, dissatisfied with the result, renewed the strike, they attempted to persuade the strikers that a private conflict between two or three individuals should not cause a strike in the whole enterprise.

But the workers are not slow in recognising the true value of these Kuomintang intermediaries. This can be illustrated from the recent strike of postal workers in Shantung, the cause of which was the workers' resentment at the harsh and high-handed actions of two inspectors. The Kuomintang trade union took the lead in the strike, and put forward a number of demands, including the dismissal of these inspectors, the enlargement of the postal staff delivering express correspondence, the introduction of an eight-hour working day, improved treatment of the workers, etc. (*Singwengbao* of July 9). But soon the strike showed an altogether different development. The original demands were put in the second rank, and in their place the workers put forward new, anti-Kuomintang demands. As a result, the postal manager despatched a panic telegram to the Minister of Ways and Communications, telling him that "the position has become extremely serious, as the workers are blindly obeying the Communist agitators and their illegally-organised Union, which refuses to comply with the established regulations and law" (*Singwengbao* of July 14).

The fact that the workers' movement is going on over the heads of the Kuomintang leadership is shown also by the example of the strike wave at Tsingtao in July of this year, when the strike involved at one time five Japanese textile factories, one timber works and one match factory, and when the Kuomintang trade union leaders found themselves absolutely powerless to control the movement, which was on a larger scale and conducted more stubbornly than any strike for a long time past.

The newspaper *Tientsinshibao* of July 8-11 notes with some concern the strength of the workers' fight. Dealing with the agitation among the workers employed at the Tangshan wagon-building works of the Pekin-Mukden railway, one of the most important coal and textile centres of China, it says: "From the time of the conflict between the Tangshan Kuomintang organisation and the local Chamber of Commerce the authority of the trade unions and of the Kuomintang has fallen very low among the workers, for although this incident had no direct bearing on the workers, the reputation of the trade unions was very much undermined by the fact that they had actually helped the merchants. . . . Open distrust of the trade union leaders began to show itself in the circulation of leaflets among the workers demanding the reorganisation of the unions, and even more extreme publications calling on the workers to overthrow the trade unions and fight for their liberation with their own forces. The general purport of one of these leaflets, signed by three workers of the Pekin-Mukden railway, was summed up as follows:—'Comrades! our present trade union is in no way a workers' union, the dues collected from us are not being used for our needs and are not collected by the union for our sake. Comrades, wake up! Don't allow this fraud to go on! Organise your own union!'"

The general strike which took place in the Chinese factories at Usi in July of this year shows the processes at work among the proletariat. The newspaper *Singwengbao* of July 12, enumerating the blunders made by various Kuomintang Party and trade union officials, speaks of the "seriousness" of the position created by the fact that the working masses "have fallen completely under the influence of

the Communists, and, refusing to submit to the Kuomintang trade unions, have set up purely Communist trade unions, whose activity continues unrestrained in spite of repression and the numerous arrests of agitators and reactionary (the Kuomintang term for Communist!) elements."

Similar class-consciousness was shown by the strikers at the Hausin textile factory, who demanded the reorganisation of the trade union, the ejection from it of "the hired agents of capital," and the formation of an independent workers' union. The Chinese press of the last few weeks publishes innumerable examples of the same type. But it would be premature to draw the conclusion, from these items of news, that the Kuomintang trade union organisations have lost all authority among the workers, that they are no longer mass organisations. This is certainly not the case. The fact that under present conditions it is impossible for any class trade union organisation to exist openly in China, makes it possible for the Kuomintang trade union bureaucracy to maintain its influence over certain sections of the working class, to intervene in disputes, and in a number of cases to bring them to an end by means of arbitration.

This situation confronts the Chinese Communist Party with serious tasks in the Kuomintang and yellow trade unions, which in many areas have succeeded in becoming mass organisations. The recent Tenth Plenum of E.C.C.I. laid great emphasis on the necessity to strengthen Communist activity within every kind of yellow and reformist mass organisation; it formulated the task of winning over and revolutionising the mass membership of the reformist trade unions in complete conformity with Lenin's teachings in this connection:—

"In order to be able to help the masses and to win their sympathy, to win the interest and support of the masses, it is necessary not to be afraid of the difficulties, not to be afraid of the chicanery, obstruction, insults and persecution from the leaders (who, having become opportunists and social-chauvinists, in the majority of cases are directly or indirectly associated with the bourgeoisie and the police), and necessarily to work there where the masses are."

For the Chinese Communist Party this task is all the more pressing. Up to the present the Chinese Communists have spent much time in considering the question of work in the Kuomintang and yellow organisations, instead of undertaking this absolutely necessary practical activity for winning over the masses. The Chinese Party must make a sharp change in the work of Communists in these mass trade union organisations. In view of the absence of reformist traditions in China, and also the absence of a strong trade union apparatus, the winning of the masses in the yellow and Kuomintang unions during the present surge of the strike wave in China is a much easier task than in the reformist unions of the older capitalist countries. In this connection the Tenth Plenum's lead to all sections of the Comintern should be applied by the Chinese Party with the greatest determination.

On the other hand, we must be on our guard against the communications published in the Kuomintang press, which sees in every strike, however clearly elemental it may be, Communist instigation at work. Unfortunately, the weakness of the red trade unions makes it impossible for them to take the lead in every strike battle. The leadership and organisation of economic conflicts is a task which the Chinese Communists are far from having completed. The Chinese Party must follow the directives of the Tenth Plenum in this connection, and take the lead in the class struggles of the proletariat. But it cannot do this unless it immediately takes steps to revitalise the red trade unions and turn them into mass organisations.

The developing situation in China opens up increasingly favourable perspectives for the Communist advance guard of the Chinese proletariat. The Kuomintang trade union bureaucrats, who assert that they are "the only defenders of the proletariat," in the fire of class struggle are being exposed more and more in the eyes of the proletarian masses as the open servants of foreign and native capital. And if the Chinese Communist Party, by the setting up of factory committees and the organisation of wide committees of action, spreads its influence among the unorganised workers, and if it puts new life into the red trade unions, if it makes a sharp change in its

work in the yellow mass organisations, and if it resolutely carries through the fight for independent leadership of the class conflicts now developing, then we do not doubt that it will succeed in mobilising under its standard wide masses of the workers, and will finally destroy whatever influence the Kuomintang trade union bureaucrats still possess.

This process will be accelerated in so far as the rising economic strike struggle is transformed into a political struggle of the Chinese proletariat. The police aid given by the Nanking Government to the capitalist employers forces the workers from the very outset to direct their blows simultaneously against both the employers and the Kuomintang counter-revolution. The police interference and suppression of the strikes at the Usi flour-mills, of the carpenters' strike at Tsieshan, of the engineers' strike at the Canton motor company's work, and in many other cases, must of necessity lead to armed conflicts and growing mass revolt against the Kuomintang counter-revolution. Strikes for purely political demands are becoming more frequent. Thus the journal *Tientsinshibao* (July, 1929) reports that "more than 2,000 workers at the Kailan pits are out on strike, demanding the release of their comrades who have been arrested on the charge of being suspected of Communism. . . . On account of the arrests of miners all the workers at five Kailan pits came out. . . . The authorities refused to give way. . . . The situation remains serious." The same number reports "a strike at the Djao pit, where the workers have demanded the dismissal of an engineer who had forbidden any demonstration on the first of May. . . . The workers became even more determined after the trade union had offered to mediate. The workers cried out: Away with all negotiators and conciliators!" The same paper writes of disorders among the workers at the Tanshan wagon-building works in connection with the arrests of workers suspected of Communism. Although the present strike wave consists in the main of economic struggles, during the strikes the workers are turning more and more from economic to political demands.

Some idea of these political conflicts can be gained from the street demonstrations, which are becoming more and more frequent in China at the present time. Thus on the 30th

of May, the fourth anniversary of the Shanghai incident, in spite of all preventive measures taken by the Chinese and British police, the dock workers and seamen, textile workers, the employees of many stores, postal workers and others struck work in Shanghai, following the lead of the Communist Party. That day, too, a demonstration of 30,000 Shanghai workers and students sacked the editorial offices of two Kuomintang papers, held up the tramway and omnibus traffic in several streets, and at several points made organised efforts to build barricades. This demonstration, directed against the imperialists and their tool, the Kuomintang, quite clearly showed the spirit of the workers, who have to a considerable degree surmounted the state of depression which characterised the first few months of the Chinese reaction. We have also reports of a whole number of street demonstrations at Shanghai, Canton, Wuchang, Tientsin, and Peking, which took place in the course of July and on International Red Day. The slogans in all these demonstrations were: revolutionary struggle against international imperialism, the overthrow of the Kuomintang reactionary government, and defence of the Soviet Union. And at the very moment of the seizure of the Far Eastern Railway, at the moment of the Chinese military debauch, the Nanking rulers encountered a heavy blow in the rear from the working class in the industrial centres, making considerably more difficult the already pitiful position of the Nanking counter-revolution.

The facts we have quoted are enough to show the growth and upward surge of the workers' movement in China. This movement has entered the period of distinct revival. Although the present struggle of the Chinese working class is developing under terribly difficult conditions, yet from month to month ever new sections of the Chinese proletariat are getting over the period of depression and once more preparing themselves to enter the struggle for liberation. And the fact that the economic struggle of the Chinese proletariat is being exceedingly rapidly transformed into a political struggle shows that it is necessary for the Communist Party to prepare for a general political strike—that fighting task which the Tenth Plenum imposed on all sections of the Comintern, involving the co-or-

dination of all the separate struggles of various sections of the working class.

The crisis is approaching in China, and now the successful further development of the liberation struggle to a great extent depends on the Chinese Communist Party itself. In the process of the conflicts that are developing it must once again become a real mass party, it must once again win over to its side the majority of the working class. It will be the more successful in carrying out this task in so far as it decisively rids itself of the right opportunist danger in its ranks, in so far as it rids itself of legalist tendencies and tendencies to trail along behind the Kuomintang. In particular, those opportunist elements within the Party who think that it is necessary "to bring pressure to bear on the leaders of the Kuomintang trade unions, to force them to carry out our requirements," must be resolutely attacked. The Party will be able to lead the present upward surge only if it does not tolerate any opportunist waverings within its own ranks.

To complete the picture it must also be noted that, corresponding with the upward movement in the working class, there is also a growing peasant revolt. This can be illustrated from recent events such as the Mahomedan peasant rising in Kwangsi, which was on an unprecedented scale; the revived activity of the "red lances," of the "small knives" and the "large knives" and of other semi-mystical organisations of the Chinese countryside. In connection with these, too, there is a certain development of the "partisan" movement. In particular, the heroic sections of the Mao-Tse-Dna and the Dju-Dai have not only succeeded in keeping their cadres intact, but in spite of all the measures taken against them by the reactionary authorities have achieved certain successes in the Fukien province. Peasant risings occurred in March of this year at Ningbo, in the Chekiang province, involving some 70,000 peasants. As a result of a peasant revolt in April of this year in the Finchung district (in Kwantung) Soviets were established in seven villages. Finally, only recently a serious peasant rising developed in the immediate neighbourhood of Shanghai itself.

It is true that, from all the facts cited about the workers' and peasants' movement, we can-

not yet draw the conclusion that we are already faced in China with the powerful surge of a revolutionary wave. But all these facts show that the conditions for such a development are now being created with ever-increasing rapidity. The Chinese proletariat, which, in spite of its youth, has passed through the hard schooling of the class struggle, is once more drawn into decisive battles. In the most bitter

and resolute battles against both foreign capital and its native agents the working class of China will retain and strengthen its leading rôle in the revolutionary movement.

The Chinese Communist Party—destined to lead the toiling masses—will rally them under its militant standard, and fearlessly lead them forward to meet the approaching revolutionary storm.

The Policy of the Labourists and the Sharpening of Imperialist Contradictions

THE last session of the League of Nations Council took place immediately after the Hague Conference, and it is of considerable interest to examine the great political game that was played at the Council meeting, in order to elucidate the characteristics of the present stage of the struggle between the chief imperialist Powers. A noteworthy feature of the last two months has been the fact that all the most important problems of post-war imperialism, all the serious contradictions between the various capitalist States, all the "sick questions" which have overshadowed international politics since Versailles, have reminded us of their existence with renewed sharpness and violence.

We must give the British Labourist Government its due. In its foreign policy, the last stage of which we examine below, the MacDonald Government has helped to no small extent in producing a definite "liveliness" in the arena of imperialist struggle.

To form a proper estimate of the Labourists' policy it is very important to bear in mind that the activity which they have shown in international politics is at the present moment one of the most important features in the propaganda of the Parties of the Second International. The policy of the British Government, laid down for it by the actual interests of British capitalism, for which it is vital to effect a change in the balance of world forces obtaining prior to 1929, is skilfully represented by the reformists along pseudo-pacifist lines. A correct evaluation of the real essence of the British Cabinet's recent international activities, an exposure of the

purely imperialist tasks which the MacDonald Government has set itself to carry out—this is at the moment one of the most important pieces of work facing the Communist Parties.

Even before the "Labour" Government came to power, the theoreticians and leaders of the Second International were carrying on an advertising campaign for the future Labourist Government. We recall that Kautsky's New Year article—"Great Experience"—published simultaneously in *Vorwaerts* and in the *Arbeiter Zeitung*, was entirely devoted to the perspectives opened up by the possible advent to power of the British "reconcilers." Kautsky tried in advance to portray the future foreign policy of the Labourists as one of the most important achievements of the Second International. And he showed clearly that propaganda based on the policy of the Labourists should make it possible to strengthen the influence of reformism on the working masses. And now in fact Social-Fascism is putting Kautsky's strategic plan into operation in a very sharply-defined form. The social-democratic newspapers discourse on the theme of the "leading rôle" of the Labourists, painting in the most glaring colours each separate step taken by MacDonald in his foreign policy.

We noted above that the present British Government had helped to no small extent to ensure that the most serious international contradictions have acquired a specially sharp and menacing character. The MacDonald Government is beyond question playing a "leading rôle" in opening up the path for the

further advance towards the struggle of the greatest imperialist robber States. But it is absolutely essential that experienced politicians should put a "peace-making" countenance on this policy of the Labourists.

The tasks facing the Labour Government have been most clearly formulated by Snowden, who makes less use of pacifist declamation than his colleagues in the Cabinet. In an interview with an American journal Snowden said, "An end must be put to the endless retreats of the Conservative Party in foreign policy, and their manifestations of weakness. Energy must be brought back into British policy, and a break must be made with the former weakness; British policy must be once again put on a firm footing." These words contain a whole programme of imperialist expansion and imperialist activity.

We can leave to Snowden's conscience his assertions about the firmness of their foreign policy. This certainly is not the question. In any case, the British Conservatives were not particularly noticeable for their indecision. On the contrary, their line was always an exceedingly active one, especially when there was any question of a change in the immediate balance of political forces. But Snowden was certainly not thinking of any particular measures or of the psychological characteristics of the Conservative Party. His words referred to the general foreign policy of British imperialism during the preceding year. British imperialism in its old age was undoubtedly facing a most serious crisis at the time when the Labourists came to power. And Snowden's declaration means precisely that the Government of the "Labour" Party sees its task as the strengthening of declining British imperialism and the finding of resources for its further struggle for existence.

The MacDonald Cabinet's activity in foreign policy shows that the Labourists have decided to undertake with the utmost zeal the carrying out of the tasks formulated by Snowden. The first stage in this policy, up to the recent session of the Council of the League of Nations, consisted of a series of manoeuvres in foreign policy, aimed at relieving as far as possible the international political pressure on Britain, especially in connection with the deepening conflict with the United States. Having achieved certain partial successes in this sphere, the

MacDonald Government, in full accordance with the interests of British big capital, will evidently turn to such an organisational reconstruction of British industry as will facilitate the further struggle for markets.

Britain has undoubtedly entered the stage prophetically described by Engels in the last chapter of his book *The Condition of the Working-Class in England*. The British bourgeoisie is unable to retain its hold over its former markets; and, to quote Engels, "If any country is adapted to holding a monopoly of manufacture, it is America." If the United States succeeds in further strengthening its position in the world market, complete stagnation will threaten British industry, already suffering from heavy unemployment; as Engels foretold, whole sections of workers will become "superfluous," and the proletariat will have no other course open but "to starve or to rebel."

The Labourists, in full conformity with their "historical mission," are displaying the most energetic activity in order to postpone for as long a time as possible the appearance of this final crisis for British capitalism.

In forming a judgment of the MacDonald Cabinet's foreign policy it is necessary to bear in mind all the factors which we have briefly indicated above. A correct appreciation of MacDonald and Company's so-called pacifist policy can only be gained by linking up the separate activities of the Labourists in the sphere of foreign politics with the general tasks facing British capitalism at the present time.

What are the essential features in the foreign policy developed by the Labourists in the course of the last few months? The first point to be noted is the discussion with the United States on naval disarmament. An analysis of the conversations and of the attitude of both parties would take us too far; for the purpose of this article it is enough to point out that the content of the proposed agreement between MacDonald and Hoover undoubtedly amounts to capitulation by Britain. This capitulation is shown, in the first place, by the very acceptance of the principle of parity of the American and British navies in all classes of ships without exception. Further, the compromise arrived at will in fact lead to the relative strengthening of the United States navy in comparison with the British navy; it is in any case significant that the

agreement makes it possible for the United States to carry out completely its recent programme of building fifteen of the most powerful cruisers. The haste with which MacDonald is conducting the negotiations, his optimistic declarations in advance, several times refuted by Washington, show that the British Government is in sore need of achieving the earliest possible agreement and is ready to pay a high enough price for it. The reason for this lies in the fact that it is only after a compromise has been reached with the United States, only after some *temporary* halt has been made in the naval rivalry with its trans-oceanic competitor, that Britain will be able to begin the most urgent task of rationalising industry and strengthening her economic position on the markets of various countries—and thus to prepare for the decisive struggle with the United States.

Britain's retreating attitude in the negotiations with the United States stands out in contrast with her aggressive attitude on the continent of Europe. A good deal has already been written about the tactics of the British delegation at the Hague. The activities of the British delegates at Geneva were a following up of the policy begun at the Hague.

The great ceremonial speech made by MacDonald at the session of the League of Nations served as a prelude. In essence, this speech contained only two definite points: the announcement of the successful progress of Anglo-American negotiations, and the declaration that the British Government was prepared to sign the clause relating to the settlement of international disputes by compulsory arbitration before the Hague Tribunal. The significance of MacDonald's speech lies in the fact that it was a warning that Britain, after relieving the tension in her relations with the United States, is determined to take into her own hands the leading strings of European politics.

Henderson, formerly President of the Second International and now British Minister of Foreign Affairs, gave a detailed exposition, in his speech, of the British imperialist programme. He raised five most important issues. Dealing with the forthcoming evacuation of the Rhineland, he emphasised that in this matter Britain and France must act jointly and concurrently, thus linking up the further year for the evacuation with British tactics. Then Henderson

turned to the question of international arbitration, utilising this theme to cover up the aggressive aims of the British Government. On the question of disarmament Henderson made a few general declarations, which were later deciphered by the British delegate Robert Cecil in the third commission of the League of Nations.

On the question of disarmament the British Cabinet has adopted an exceedingly interesting line of tactics. The Labourists are demanding the speeding up of disarmament negotiations—naturally without stating the problem in its full range—and at the same time they are sharpening all those issues, such as land reserves and submarines, the solution of which is known to be *impossible*. It is perfectly clear that the Labourists regard the question of disarmament as an important weapon in their anti-French policy, and, in general, as a tool through which they can bring pressure to bear on European States, and by that means strengthen Britain's position on the Continent. Henderson proposed that a convention should be worked out and signed as soon as possible, pledging financial aid to States menaced by military aggression. As is well known, among States so menaced, the League of Nations counts the States bordering on the Soviet Union. But it is interesting that Henderson, after putting forward the proposal for such a convention, went on to turn down the French proposals designed to increase the independence and the material resources of the League of Nations; it is clear that the decisive factor in the adoption of this attitude was the consideration that France, as before, still exerts a preponderating influence on the work of the League apparatus.

Finally, Henderson put forward the sensational idea of adapting the Statutes of the League of Nations to the Kellogg Pact. He pointed out with hypocritical uneasiness that certain paragraphs in the League of Nations Statutes made provision for war in certain cases, while the Kellogg Pact altogether "renounced war as an instrument of international politics." It is true that Henderson confined himself to introducing a draft resolution of a purely *declaratory* character. But this proposal of Henderson's like his earlier one dealing with financial aid, gave effect at the same time to two tactical lines in which the Labourists are interested. The very fact that he put these forward could serve as

excellent material for pacifist demagogy and agitation. And, moreover, as already indicated above, both proposals serve to bring a certain pressure to bear on the apparatus of the League of Nations, and constitute a threat to the whole system of decisions and agreements on which the continental hegemony of France depends, and in general, also show that Britain is determined from henceforth to dominate the League of Nations.

It is easy to see that all the political proposals made by the British delegates at Geneva indicate firstly a preoccupation with affairs in Europe, and secondly, an anti-French tendency. It is not necessary to explain these tendencies, which had already found expression at the Hague, as a crumbling away of the Entente. The Entente still continues to exist, and the Labourists will undoubtedly try to revive it at the time when it corresponds with the immediate aims of British policy. But at the present moment the bailiffs of British imperialism consider it their first duty to strengthen the British position on the European continent, and it is absolutely natural that in such circumstances British policy should come into collision with French interests.

The British Government's true aims and plans on the Continent of Europe become even more clear when we take into account the Geneva discussions on economic questions. But in order to get a full understanding of the situation which came to the surface at Geneva, before turning to these economic questions we must say a few words about the most important counter-measures taken by France to meet the British attack.

And in the first place, undoubtedly, we must note Briand's idea of a Pan-Europe. As early as July of this year, in anticipation of the impending theatrical display of MacDonald, Briand announced that he too had new political tricks on hand. At the League of Nations session Briand summoned the European delegates, and put before them his scheme of a Pan-Europe. It is not necessary to discuss the possibility of this proposal; Briand himself will certainly not have given it a thought. In putting forward his obviously fantastic idea of setting up some sort of "federative relationships" between the European States, Briand was pursuing two principal aims. On the one hand—on similar lines to

Henderson with his proposals—Briand gave it to be understood that France has her own "working hypothesis," by means of which she can strengthen her own influence in the League of Nations, and through the League, in Europe. On the other hand, in putting forward his Pan-Europe plan, Briand in fact developed one serious practical proposal. The essence of this proposal lay in the idea of creating in the League of Nations a central staff for fighting the revolutionary movement. In this connection Briand had in view not only the further strengthening of the anti-Soviet bloc, but also joint action by the Governments of Europe in the fight against separate sections of the Comintern. Even before Briand's announcement at the League of Nations, his friend and ally, the French journalist Sauerwein, in an article published in several European journals, had devoted particular attention to the importance of setting up a single army for the struggle against the disturbers of peace and the enemies of Pan-Europe. It is not difficult to see that Sauerwein had in view the creation of military forces for intervention in the U.S.S.R. Briand did not state the question in such a concrete form; but there can be no doubt that he saw in his Pan-Europe an alliance of the capitalist States directed against the Socialist Soviet Union.

The powers treated Briand's proposal with considerable reserve. As for the Labourists, they, while raising no objection to the use of the League of Nations for the purpose of the European reaction and particularly for aggression against the U.S.S.R., opposed the acceptance of those portions of Briand's plan whose purpose it was to facilitate the maintenance of the present relation of forces in Europe, which is favourable for France. The British delegation, in opposition to the Briand proposal, insisted on their own proposals, which are obviously directed towards the strengthening of the *British* position in the European market.

Here we come to an extremely interesting and important line in the foreign policy of the Labourists. The Labourist President of the Board of Trade, Graham, put forward for consideration two principal economic measures. First, he pointed out the desirability of agreements between the concerns and trusts of the various countries, and secondly, he put forward a scheme for the adoption of a two-years'

customs holiday, under which no European State could raise its customs tariffs for a period of two years. British industry, as is known, is backward in the concentration of various sections of industry and also in its participation in international cartels and understandings. Such agreements, it is true, in no way serve to organise the international market, and do not terminate the sharpening struggle for markets, but nevertheless participation in these agreements is one of the means by which international competition is conducted. Graham's proposal indicates that the Labourist Government is determined also in this sphere to clear the path for British big capital. As for the customs "holiday," this proposal of Graham's expresses British industry's interest in facilitating its access to the various European markets.

Apart from these two economic measures, the reference of the coal problem to a commission of the League of Nations also deserves attention. In this question the Labourist support of the idea of regulating coal prices links up with certain internal political measures of the MacDonald Government. It is self-evident that the Labourist Government has not stirred a finger to raise in concrete form the question of nationalisation of the coal industry. Instead of that, the Labourists have energetically set themselves to encourage the formation of a British syndicate for the sale of coal. Definite progress in this sphere is already to be noted. The mineowners, both in their own interests and to make it easier for the Labour Government to refuse to take any compulsory measures in relation to the British coal industry, have formed a coal-selling syndicate. In the near future it is expected that the last two of the coal-exporting districts (Durham and Northumberland) will join this association. It is quite natural that Graham, knowing of the formation of the coal syndicate, should hasten at Geneva to clear the way for its appearance on the international arena. These steps taken by Graham are, also, a kind of generalisation of Snowden's concrete achievements at the Hague, which as is known secured an increase in the British share of coal imports into Italy.

We have given somewhat detailed consideration to the Labourist exertions to save the coal industry—which, by the way, has again begun to yield a profit on the basis of increased exploita-

tion of the miners—for the reason that in this sphere the real content of the Labourist policy and its contradiction to the lying pre-election slogans stands out with particular clearness.

The MacDonald Government's foreign policy receives its necessary completion in internal policy not only in connection with protecting the interests of the mineowners. The Labourists' open and sincere service of the interests of British big capital takes particularly clear and precise forms just in the sphere of internal policy.

As for coal, Graham's efforts at the League of Nations are closely connected not only with the Labourist policy of concentration for the coal industry in the interests of the employers, but also with the treacherous policy of the "Labour" Party in direct relation to the British miners' struggle. With the help of the Labourist Government, the reformists have made it possible for the coal magnates to refuse the proposed national agreement on wages, and the employers have now begun a series of separate attacks on different groups of miners. The method of local agreements; with their extremely harmful effect on the welfare of the miners, has been widely extended under the MacDonald Government. The class struggle in the British mining industry is assuming specially sharp forms, and the miners are in the position of a fighting advance guard of the British working-class. It is therefore easy to understand why MacDonald's social-imperialist Government, in absolute contradiction to its demagogic pre-election slogans, is carrying out an attack, jointly with the coal barons, on the mining proletariat.

The treacherous policy of MacDonald, Thomas & Co., is not without system. Alongside of the pressure on the miners, alongside of the open aid for the most reactionary group of the British bourgeoisie—the mineowners—the Government of the "Labour" Party has organised an attack on the working-class in another important branch of British industry—the textile industry. The lock-out of cotton workers, declared soon after the Labourists came to power, was fully supported by the MacDonald Government. In spite of the militant tendencies among the workers, who at a number of points came into conflict with the police, the reformist trade unions agreed to

arbitration, and MacDonald issued a special statement in support of this treacherous step, inspiring the arbitration court, headed by a Conservative to take a decision favouring the exploiters. As a result, half-a-million British textile workers suffered a considerable reduction in wages.

The MacDonald Government, therefore, is able to register "victory after victory" on two fronts. On the one hand, the Labourists at the Hague and Geneva recorded diplomatic and financial successes in the interests of the country; and on the other hand, together with the employers, they are directing blow after blow on the British working-class.

We showed above that the MacDonald Government is carrying out a series of manoeuvres in its foreign policy, intended to facilitate that rationalisation of British industry without which the British bourgeoisie will be unable to continue its struggle for markets against its competitors. It is a very significant coincidence that just at the time of MacDonald and Henderson making their diplomatic sallies, the Trades Union Congress was in session at Belfast. At the time when the members of the Labourist Government were clearing the road for British capital's attack on the international arena, the trade union leaders, headed by Ben Tillett, were preparing the ground for the further attacks of the British bourgeoisie on the home political front. As is known, Ben Tillett's speech was enthusiastically received by the whole British bourgeois Press, including the extreme Conservative organs. Ben Tillett preached an enthusiastic sermon in favour of capitalist rationalisation, and called on the workers not to resist it. The trade union leaders showed their solidarity with the cotton employers who had reduced wages, and prepared the ground for the maintenance of the present low wages on the railways; they let it be understood that they intended to fight for the shortening of the working day.

In general, social-fascism has never come out so openly with treacherous slogans for subordinating the workers' interests to the interests of the employers as at Belfast; it has never so openly supported the bourgeoisie's attacks on the proletariat, and has never so openly suppressed all efforts to introduce the minimum

measures necessary for the defence of the proletariat against the employers.

Moreover, the Belfast Congress controlled by the trade union agents of British capital, showed the complete readiness of the British reformists to support British imperialism's colonial policy, now directed by the Labourist Cabinet. From the first weeks of its existence the MacDonald Government showed that, as in other spheres of foreign policy, it was also attempting to find new means of strengthening British imperialism's position in connection with the oppression of the colonies. The treaty with Egypt, or rather, with the Egyptian big bourgeoisie, is a clear example of MacDonald's colonial policy. As is known, the Labourist Government has fully maintained British imperialism's reserved points, which are intended to keep for Britain all the vital commanding positions in Egypt. "The treaty in fact enslaves Egypt for twenty-five years, and legalises Britain's keeping in its own hands the actual rule over Egypt and the Sudan.

In India the MacDonald Government followed from the first the principle of "inheritance," i.e., the further carrying through of the tasks initiated by the former "hard-faced" Government. This is shown clearly enough in the two issues of the Meerut trial and the Simon Commission. The abominable trial of thirty-three workers at Meerut, supplemented by an open terror in the prison, shows that the Labourist Government will not shrink from the most extreme measures in suppressing the Indian workers' liberation movement. The Simon Commission's decisions have been published in a preliminary form, and show that through this Commission, on which Labourists are represented and whose report is being drawn up under the MacDonald Government, the Labourists intend to do everything possible to screw more tightly the press of colonial subjugation and British domination in India. The Commission's preliminary report is entirely devoted to showing that it is not desirable to introduce a single serious "reform" in India, let alone any more radical measures.

The recent events in Palestine have shown that the MacDonald Government will not shrink, and does not want to shrink, from the most abominable, inhuman and cruel methods of colonial expansion. The suppression of the Arab rising by the employment of all technical

means at the disposal of contemporary imperialism, the concentration of armies in Arabia, the association with French imperialism in the struggle against the national Arab movement—all these steps taken by the MacDonald Government show the wide imperialist vision of the Labourists.

It is not difficult to see that the Labourist Government, in its political aims and in the methods it uses to achieve them, in the tempo and insistence with which it puts into force its imperialist plans and its internal political attacks on the working-class, can be recognised as one of the most reactionary Governments of Europe. In the Labourist Government and its policy the countenance of hardened and decrepit British imperialism can be seen.

It can be said with absolute confidence that all talk about the reconciling of international contradictions, and the settling of any of the fundamental problems of post-war imperialism, will be refuted by the march of events. And concrete actions will expose the true imperialist character of the foreign policy of the Labourist Government, which at the present time appears as an exponent of the main principles of the Second International's policy in foreign affairs. The coming to power in Britain of the Labourists has not only not weakened the rôle of British imperialism as one of the chief reactionary forces in the world, but on the contrary, has widened the field of British imperialist activity. In spite of, or rather thanks to, its retreat before North American imperialism, and its outwardly pacifist form, the policy of the MacDonald Cabinet tends entirely in the direction of strengthening the foreign political position of

British finance capital, and will result in the sharpening of the struggle between the imperialist Powers.

The agreement between MacDonald and Hoover, the struggle between Britain and France to secure the dominant position on the European continent, the strengthening of Britain's colonial expansion under the Labourists (India, Egypt, Palestine), all these factors warn the world proletariat of the increasing danger of war and the sharpening of the crisis of capitalism. At the same time, the Labourist policy is a most powerful instrument for deceiving the working masses, inasmuch as his imperialist policy is clothed by MacDonald in pacifist garments. And the main aim of the Labourists' efforts is to strengthen British imperialism, the fate of which will have the most tremendous significance for the further development of the crisis of post-war capitalism, for the further move forward of the world revolutionary movement.

Because of these facts, the Parties of the Communist International are faced at the present time with the serious practical task of exposing in every possible way the true character of the British "Labour" Party's policy, and of energetic agitation and determined struggle against the lying social-fascist propaganda in favour of the Labourists. The carrying out of this task is an important condition for the further successful campaign against the preparation for new wars, for resistance to capital's attack on the working-class, and for the struggle of the revolutionary advance guard of the international proletariat for socialism.

G.

The ENGLISH EDITION of the *COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL*
is published twice monthly.

Subscription Rates 8s. per annum in England, \$2 per annum in U.S.A.
post free through any bookseller.

Collective Progress and the Lone Heroes

By Bela Kun

THE Russian Communist Party is working now at the realisation of the great plan for the Socialist reconstruction of the whole national economy. In the first year of the five-year period the working class and poor peasantry of the proletarian State have worked magnificently in the carrying out of this plan. The swirling torrent of time will make an anachronism of the sickle and hammer on the coat of arms of the Soviet Union. At the end of the five years' period, in the far-off, barren steppes—then the sweeping cornlands of Soviet farms and collective farms—the sickle will disappear into the past, displaced by a gigantic combined machine which reaps and thrashes at the same time. And instead of the symbolical, thousand-year-old hand-hammer, immense steam, hydraulic and electric hammers will in thundering tones proclaim the new system of Socialist production. In the process of realisation of the five-year plan the Russia of individualist peasantry will be transformed into the land of the tractor—and not of the imported tractor, but of the tractor built with Russia's own resources.

The mass efforts of the heroic period of the revolution—of the civil wars—mass efforts never before known, arousing the enthusiasm and admiration of the whole world, have now been left far behind. The new economic policy along the whole front has brought us into the period of *Socialist attack*. And the masses which are taking part in this attack are immeasurably more numerous than those which fought for the possibility of Socialist construction in the heroic battles against the internal and international counter-revolution.

The masses are *collectively*, in the real meaning of this word, bringing into existence the five-years' plan of Socialist construction, under the leadership of the Russian Communist Party. But they also worked it out collectively. Three revolutionary generations in the U.S.S.R. brought together their immense economic experience during the twelve years of the revolution. In the fac-

ories and workshops the former slaves of the bench had become the masters of the machine, and, filling it with new purpose, had torn off the chains of capitalism; vanquishing the international imperialist counter-revolution, they developed their own creative forces of production. Socialist emulation, "industrialisation days," the participation of millions in the financing of industrialisation through the three industrialisation loans already issued—all this is the product of the creative energy of the masses, together with the continuous working week and the seven-hour working day. The struggle for Socialism in the sphere of culture, which had to start, as Lenin put it, with "the fight against the louse," has now been raised to the level of a cultural revolution. The great beginnings of the collective application of forces in the heavy famine year, "Communist Saturdays," rose in the process of Socialist emulation to the stage of creative mass work in the continuous working week.

In the village, where village idiocy and the individualist peasant mentality were closely intertwined, in every distant corner of our immense country great agricultural enterprises, Soviet farms and collective farms, are coming into existence, on the foundation laid by the development of heavy industry and industrialisation. The Soviet farms are organising into an "independent" class millions of the formerly scattered agricultural workers. The peasant-proprietor is being transformed into a working member of a collective farm: new social categories, new social strata for the realisation of Socialism are coming into existence.

The soul of this great, gigantic transformation is the Party. The All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik) knows how to keep its ranks steadfast, even without the purgatory of civil war. It knows how to preserve its proletarian class character and its Leninist purity. The self-criticism of the masses, the wide and uninterrupted spread of inner-Party proletarian democracy, the continuous renewal of its cadres by the election of the best from among

the many-million masses—all this gives it indefinable strength to vanquish all symptoms of degeneration appearing on the border-line between the Socialist and the capitalist elements in the economic system. Every kind of theoretical or practical derivation from Leninism, every part of the Party organism that is tainted with ignorant ideology, every manifestation of material corruption, is laid on the operation table of the Party, and passes under the operating knife of the working masses.

Mass thinking and mass work are being carried out on such a collective basis as has never before been dreamed of; they have created the five-years' plan of Socialist construction and are now working to bring it into existence. This plan demands the most extreme concentration of forces. But no other plan is possible. Those who cannot adapt themselves to this tempo will be left behind by developments. Those who cannot bring their individual strength into the collective thought and collective work of the thinking and creating masses will find themselves isolated and left to their own fate in the whirlpool of the mass movement.

II.

The Right elements in the Party have shown that they have been left behind. They are those who think that the Party should not march at the head of the masses who are demanding a quicker tempo in the construction of Socialism, a common tempo for industrialisation and the collectivisation of agriculture—at the head of the masses who are actually following this path—they are those who think that the Party should trail along at the tail of these masses. In the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the fight against the Right elements is being carried on with Bolshevik mercilessness. This is the main front in the inner-Party struggle. And this struggle is a mass struggle, in which the overwhelming majority of the Party membership is taking an active part.

But in the teeming activity of the masses the individualist, who is not caught up by the masses and does not draw the masses to himself, also becomes isolated. It is an old and tested truth that the fate of a looker-on meets those who do not take a direct part in the

struggle of the masses, whether as a leader or among the masses. Contact with the masses pours fresh strength into every person. But the looker-on is only stunned by the rush and the hurly-burly of the mass movement.

Examples of the waverings of the isolate onlookers are provided by the recent literary productions of comrades Shatskin and Sten in the columns of the Young Workers' *Pravda*. The authors of these articles imagine that they have found a fulcrum point, using which they can overturn, if not the whole world and even not the whole Russian Communist Party, at least its "inner-Party régime."

Both articles are the product of discontent with the inner-Party situation. It is an old truth, tested by experience, that discontent with the inner-Party régime, attacks on this régime, always mean the beginning of discontent with the political line of the Party and attacks on the general line of the Party. Both authors think their fulcrum point is on the left of the Party, and set out to overthrow the inner-Party situation "from the Left."

Shatskin asserts that the fight against the Right elements is being carried on in coalition with the "herd instincts" in the Party. He discovers a great political "morass," and claims that the aim of the party leadership is not the eradication in principle of the Right deviation, but mechanical submission by the Rights. Shatskin also charges the party leadership with substituting "personal intrigues and political chicanery for the ideological fight against the Rights." According to Shatskin, the atmosphere in the Party is such that the "model" Party member is the one that follows the herd. In his view "there are two possible lines of conduct in relation to this morass: resolute struggle against it, or peaceful acceptance of it and even a certain degree of alliance with it."

According to Shatskin, the Party leadership is following the second course—instead of fighting against the spirit of submission. Shatskin considers the Party masses as a "voting machine," mechanically voting for resolutions against the Rights. And in Shatskin's view, the "herd-member" of the Party is also the member who "not through fear of the consequences, but from a sense of duty, gives himself up to the revolution, the working class and the Party," the member who "has no

individual life" and "has entirely yielded himself up to collective work." Shatskin does not attribute much importance to the basic work, the drudgery and the fighting fronts: nor does he consider the absence of careerism of first importance. The only people whom he does not include in the conception of "herd-members" are those who, at any rate in some respects, correspond to the Nietzschean conception of the "super-man." Shatskin's "herd-member" of the Party is the Nietzschean "man of the herd" dressed up in some Marxist clothing. He opposes to this "herd-member" the "higher natures," who are above the common thought of the masses.

A resolution of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party and the C.C. of Komsomol declares that Comrade Shatskin "under cover of a fight against herd-membership of the Party is in fact making intolerable attacks on the revolutionary and disciplined members of the Party, and in the lordly tones of the intelligentsia is disparaging the idea of Party discipline." But apart from this, the most characteristic feature of Shatskin's article is the ignoring of the fact that the Party is carrying on an ideological and practical fight against the theoretical and practical manifestations of all deviations—a fight which, in the extent to which it is mobilising the Party masses and in the degree of its effectiveness, can hardly be paralleled even in the history of the Party, a fight which is forging Bolshevism in the struggle against Opportunism. The purpose of this struggle, it is true, is different from Shatskin's purpose. The Party is *not* carrying on the fight against those who "not through fear of the consequences, but from a sense of duty, give themselves up to the revolution, the working class and the Party, who entirely yield themselves up to collective work and seek neither position nor distinction." No, the Party is fighting against every kind of mental cowardice or retreat before the difficulties which come across the path of Socialist construction. The Party is fighting against careerism and corruption. The Party is fighting, and is mobilising the masses in the factories, and throwing into the scale the authority of these masses in the fight against all the perversions which make their appearance on the border-line between the capitalist and Socialist elements in the economic system.

The Party is carrying on a resolute struggle against all manifestations of ideological and material degeneration, wherever they appear. Not only is it now carrying out systematic and planned work for the cleansing of the Party, and drawing the whole Party membership into this work, but it is also carrying out complete changes in the leading cadres of whole Party organisations, and replacing these with healthy elements, and it is filling the higher posts in the Party and Soviet organisations with new working class elements direct from the bench. These facts show that the Russian Communist Party is waging a merciless fight against all ideological and material degeneration, against every kind of deviation from its class policy. But the Party is waging this fight in a Marxist manner, working on the basis of social categories and not of psychological and ethical categories which have nothing in common with a Marxist political standpoint—categories with the help of which Shatskin builds up his conception of the "herd-member." In the final reckoning, Shatskin's conception of the "herd-member" has no connection with any particular class or Party, but is simply the reincarnation of that abstract "herd-mindedness" against which, in the good old times, the radical-intelligentsia and anarchists in the ranks of the bohemians used to wage a terrible warfare, a war which, wherever they still survive, they are even now attempting to carry on.

III.

Comrade Sten's view of the Party is even more from the outside, he is even more isolated from the whirlpool of the mass movement. The object of his deliberations is not any psychological or ethical manifestation, but the ideological condition of the Party. Sten also shuts his eyes to the fact that a gigantic mass movement in the Soviet Union, under the leadership of the Party, is carrying into effect the Leninist programme of the Party. He does not want to understand that the realisation, and even the working out, of this programme would have been impossible without new theoretical generalisations which cannot be found in any book, without new strategical and tactical theses in connection with Socialist construction and the methods necessary in this class struggle. Sten sings

the praises of Marxist theory *in general*, but it never enters his head that without the concrete application of Marxist theory to the new sphere of action it is not possible to take a single successful step along the road of working out and putting into operation the five-year plan of Socialist construction, the plan of industrialisation and collective agriculture. Sten does not deny the successes of the Party along the path of Socialist construction, but he does not see that these successes are the result of the victorious enriching and further development of revolutionary theory. Absolutely without justification, Sten asserts that the importance which Lenin attached to theory is all too often forgotten in the Party. He discovers in the Party "a neglect of theory," symptoms of "fatty degeneration" in theoretical thought. According to Sten, theoretical thought is driven into "peaceful corners," the theoretical development of the Party is being replaced by "practical service to the interests of the moment."

There is no point in quoting further from Sten's powerful words. It is enough to say that, in his opinion, the Party is not in a position to adapt itself from day to day in the whirlpool of the international situation. Sten does not understand that the Soviet Union's successes in the sphere of international politics, on the basis of the international situation which has completely changed since Lenin's death, would have been impossible without new and important strategical generalisations based on the concrete facts of the international situation. Sten does not assert that the international policy of the Party and of the Communist International has been on wrong lines. But he considers that the theoretical thought of the Party is not keeping pace with international and even internal development. His article would lead the reader to suppose that the Party's policy is not a theoretically-founded Marxist, Bolshevik policy, carried out within the framework of a Bolshevik revolutionary plan, but a policy of pure empiricism, adapted "from case to case." Such a policy must of necessity be opportunist. Sten does not say this, as he does not want to identify himself with the views either of Trotsky or of Bukharin. But whether he likes it or not that is where he stands, because of his (like their) abstract approach to concrete

political questions. His is a view from above, but the "theoretical heights" from which he looks down are not the commanding heights of Marxist theory. Sten is also looking away from the collective and "herd" mind, towards some "higher natures" which will carry out the further development of theory. Over against the collective Party, with individuality regenerated in the collectivity of a Marxist-Leninist Party, he sets the individual, the "critically-minded personality." There is also in his article another underlying notion: the opposition of the younger generation against the older generation of Party members. This finds expression in his demand that each Young Communist should work out every important question on the basis of his own experience, and by this means convince himself of the correctness of the Party's general line. But why is it that only the Young Communist should do this? And why is personal experience set up in opposition to collective experience? What sort of Marxism is this which regards the individual, in opposition to the Marxist conception, not as an inalienable part of collective society, but as a kind of Communist Robinson Crusoe in the whirlpool of the mass movement and mass action? Is not this setting up of individual experience over against the experience of a collective Marxist Party an adulation of just that vulgar empiricism which Sten himself condemned a few lines higher up?

But Sten considers that the Young Communist must "arm himself theoretically, in order to safeguard himself from every kind of unexpected development which is always met by the creeping empiricist." To arm oneself theoretically is a necessary presupposition of Bolshevik policy, but its purpose is to lead the revolutionary struggle, not to insure oneself "against the unexpected." That is the kind of advice the hesitating sceptic gives to the youth who feels that he is not on firm ground. The confident tone in Sten's article only serves to conceal his doubt. The man who walks alone through the forest likes to whistle, in order to keep off the burdensome sense of loneliness.

It is not so long since Bukharin, approaching from another direction, tried to bring forward the slogan "doubt everything" in connection with the Party. In this way Bukharin

tried to sow doubt among the masses of the Party membership as to the possibility of carrying out the five-years' plan and as to the possible tempo of industrialisation, the possibility of the successful development of collective farming. What is Sten aiming at? I do not think that his aim was the same as Bukharin's. But in his capacity as an *abstract* theoretician Sten carefully avoids the concrete application of theory, the concretisation of truth, running away from the fact that reality is always concrete.

In the five-years' plan the Party has not only applied the Marxist-Leninist method, but has used the experience of collective work to enrich revolutionary theory—the experience accumulated and generalised by the working class and its Communist Party, in its fighting and in its work. These new theoretical generalisations, it may be, are not to Comrade Sten's liking; they are concrete, they are not literary subtleties, and they are already now being put into practice in concrete forms, in the fight for Socialist construction. The working class, which has to a considerable degree shaken off the ideological domination of capitalism, and the Communist Party leading the working class, are continuing not only to wage the class war but also to develop further revolutionary theory—Marxism and Leninism—in circumstances which are absolutely different from those of the period of capitalist oppression. As Lenin said, revolutionary theory was necessarily brought to the working class movement when the bourgeoisie held the working masses not only in economic but also in ideological slavery. This theory—the science of the liberation of the working class—is developed in the process of working class action on a collective basis; the Party collectively gives it concrete shape in living form, in the process of solving the new tasks put before it. In the further liberation struggle of the working class, in the building up of Socialism, Sten is looking for some "super-man," a learned theoretician, who could be brought in as against the collective Party, to introduce from outside the theory of the liberation struggle, the theory of Socialist construction. Sten does not observe the fundamentally changed position arising from the fact that Socialist theory and the elemental movement of the proletariat go hand in hand.

He does not appreciate the changed fact of the working class movement now *bringing to realisation* the theory of Socialism. The setting up of "individual" thinking as against collective theoretical thought, the setting up of individual experience as against collective experience, gives us strong ground for doubting the orthodoxy of Sten's Marxist philosophy.

IV.

A kink in organisational questions, as Lenin remarked, often serves as a cover for kinks, either developed or embryonic, in political questions. We should place the cases of Sten and Shatskin in the former category. In both cases, the organisational failings show themselves in an impermissible attitude to Party discipline. The super-man submits to no form of discipline. And he submits to no Party discipline. Discontent with the inner-Party régime is an expression of an impermissible attitude to Party discipline. As everyone knows, the inner-Party régime consists principally in the fact that the party leadership requires every member of the Party, without exception, to submit to Party decisions. And along with this it requires every member of the Party to *understand* the policy which is being carried out by the Party. Bolshevism and the Bolshevik Party always require this understanding and this discipline: failure to comprehend the Party's policy, and doubt about the correctness of this policy, just as much as a lack of discipline, have never been in the list of Party virtues. On the contrary, the principle of "free criticism" (a phrase which adequately describes Sten's view of the rôle of individual experience) has always been a Menshevist principle, a Menshevist requirement, always bitterly fought by Lenin. In "What is to be done?" Lenin says:—

"At first sight, it is difficult to imagine anything more curious than this solemn demand by one of the disputing parties for freedom of criticism. Is it possible that, in advanced parties, a single voice can be raised against that constitutional law which, in the majority of European countries, safeguards the freedom of science and of scientific investigation? Every man outside the dispute who has heard this slogan repeated at every turn, but has not yet grasped the essence of the controversy be-

tween the disputants, will say to himself—'There is something else behind it! This slogan is evidently one of those conventional phrases which, like clichés, have been sanctioned by usage and have become practically generic terms.'"

In the articles of both Sten and Shatskin there can be observed a longing for freedom of criticism. "Freedom of criticism" might make a breach in that Bolshevik Party discipline which is "fettering" the "higher natures" and—not in Lenin's view, but in Sten's—is hindering the "further development of theoretical thought." This freedom of criticism strives to break through the barriers of Party discipline, without taking account of the fact that, in spite of all verbal orthodoxy, this path may lead to stretching the "interpretation" of Marxism and Leninism. The basis of Party discipline, which seems so burdensome for Sten and Shatskin, is the correct revolutionary Bolshevik policy. This Bolshevik policy in all its concrete expressions is inseparably bound up with Marxism theory; with Leninism, and because of this, Party discipline is discipline on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory. It is inseparable from Leninism. A tolerant attitude to deviations of the Sten and Shatskin type is, in the final reckoning, nothing but a *Liberal* attitude to Marxism and Leninism, *i.e.*, a refusal to accept theoretical orthodoxy. Sten charges us with empiricism, a failure to appreciate theory: a charge that can be brought with greater force against him and his friends is the charge of failure to appreciate Marxist theory, and a liberal attitude towards it, which is covered up by the demand for "freedom of criticism."

V.

How many political deviations are developing in embryo behind those moral-psychological or abstract-theoretical considerations of a Party organisational character, which are always passing along the open bridge between Trotskyism and the right line represented by Bukharin? The leanings which can find expression in the above-mentioned articles and in certain others have not yet crystallised into a definite tendency within the Russian Communist Party. However, in the process of crystallisation there has developed what at first sight is the not very fundamental politi-

cal demand for the organisation of wide unions of the village poor.

The Russian Communist Party has rejected this demand, precisely at the time when it is throwing itself with the greatest energy into the organisation of the village poor, when it is subordinating to this aim its whole productive, credit and tax policy in agriculture and all forms of co-operation, and has sharpened the fight against the immediate enemies of the village poor—against the kulaks. Is there any contradiction between the Party's refusal of the "left" demand for the organisation of unions of the village poor, and the fact that the actual organisation of the village poor is one of the main strategic aims of the Party? It is not the Party's policy, but this "left" demand, which suffers from internal contradiction. This contradiction arises from a lack of comprehension of the powerful social and economic process which is going on before our eyes in the Soviet village. The internal contradictions of these "left" slogans recall the story of the Leningrad opposition's slogan. "A horse for the horseless peasant"—such was the slogan with which the Leningrad opposition called the attention of the Party to the kulak danger. This slogan would have expressed the whole strategy of the Party in its fight against the kulak danger and the capitalist elements in the economic system, from the standpoint of *individual peasant economy*. The political activity of the collective Party turned the strategy of the fight in another direction, and put forward, as the central point in its strategic plan, *collective farming*. The slogan, "A horse for the horseless peasant," apart from the question of its practicability, was an attempt to solve the problem of the class struggle not on the plane of Socialist construction, but by the method of raising the level of the individual peasant economy. It is something of the same type as Serra's idea, that the solution of the agricultural problem lies in the raising of all peasant farms up to the level of the kulak farms.

The Party's plan did not suffer from this opportunism: it linked up the fight against the kulaks with the problem of industrialisation and with the plan for the collectivisation of agriculture. The establishment of Soviet farms and the collectivisation of peasant farms are not facts of "purely economic" signifi-

cance: here lies the road to the Socialist organisation of the agricultural proletariat and semi-proletariat, the working peasants and village poor. To unite in a union the peasant poor, not belonging to the working class though closely connected with it, is not the method which will help the Party to guide the development of these strata in the struggle against their class enemies. The task of the Party is to bring the poor peasants forward from private farming to collective farming, and more or less quickly to assimilate them to the class which is *directly* interested in the eradication of private ownership of the means of production and of the land. These sections of the peasantry had not yet dropped down to the level of the proletariat, exploited and oppressed by capitalism; in the process of establishing collective farming they are brought into that class which is working under conditions of the complete elimination of class divisions, under Socialist conditions: they join up with the ruling class, the proletariat. In the process of the socialisation of agriculture they are set free from their petty-bourgeois social environment.

Thus the slogan of the formation of unions of the village poor is very far from being a "radical" slogan. It tends in the direction, not of the Socialist reconstruction of agriculture and of the village social system, but purely and exclusively towards raising the level of the individual peasant farm and the linking together of peasants who in the majority of cases are working their farms as individuals. The raising of the individual peasant economy will probably, in the course of the future, be a very important task of the Soviet Government and the Party, but it will not be the factor which determines the Party's general line and in accordance with which the tactics, methods and organisational forms of the fight against the kulaks must be framed. The *determining* task is the Socialist transformation of the village.

This single example, up to now the only *political* expression of the leanings of Shatskin, Sten and other comrades, serves to show that the fulcrum point conceived by them as

lying on the "left" of the Party line, would in fact incline the political axis of the Party towards the *right*. For that reason the Party, in its struggle against the right, must certainly turn its attention towards these "left" leanings, and carry on a fight against them before they crystallise in a definite tendency.

VI.

"The infantile disease of left-wing Communism" finds different expression in different situations and under different circumstances. Sometimes it is the product of real revolutionary impatience, and finds expression in acts which threaten to isolate the advance guard from the masses, as Lenin has pointed out. But that same "infantile disease" may find expression in passivity, itself indicating separation from the masses, a purely propagandist attitude, and abstract theorising. The attitude taken up by Sten and Shatskin is not a strengthening of the attack against the rights, but a standing aside from the battle against them which is being carried on under the Party's leadership, a departure to "individualist heights," an abandonment of the concrete truths of Marxist theory in favour of the inaccessible fortress of "abstract" truth.

The Russian Communist Party has not for a moment weakened its fight against the rights, in the process of criticising this "left" deviation. The main front is and will remain the front in the struggle against the rights; of the two fronts in the struggle maintained by Bolshevism practically throughout the whole period of its existence, the most dangerous and vital point is now undoubtedly the right front.

But this does not by any means imply that a left deviation which is an *echo* of the right danger does not deserve attention and does not require to be dealt with. The ideological campaign of the Russian Communist Party against these "left" inclinations serves as a warning to other sections of the Comintern that while they are concentrating their attention on the right, they must also keep a vigilant watch on the tendencies of the "left."

The Tenth Plenum and the Swedish Communist Party

Against Sabotage of the Decisions of E.C.C.I.

THE document issued by the E.C.C.I., "An open letter to all members of the Swedish Communist Party," is of great international importance. The Swedish question at the Tenth Plenum played no minor rôle. No one denied the great achievements of the Swedish Party during the last few years in the work of increasing its mass influence, the uninterrupted growth of its recruiting work, its skilful, well-thought-out approach to its trade union work. But at the same time not a single voice was raised in the Communist International in favour of modifying the criticism of those opportunist errors which had been made by a number of leading comrades in the Swedish Party. The delegates of the majority of the Central Committee, headed by Comrades Samuelson and Flig, were completely isolated at the Plenum. The Communist International could not do otherwise than support the healthy Bolshevik criticism of opportunist errors which had been put forward by the minority of the Central Committee at the last June session of the Central Committee of the Swedish Party. The efforts made by certain comrades to minimise the importance of these errors, to represent the fight as a fight bearing a personal character, were extremely wrong and harmful. It is a characteristic of opportunism that it is always afraid to engage in a battle on the basis of principle, it avoids such a battle, and tries to smother questions of principle under a covering of personal issues, petty relics of Parliamentary manoeuvres. The whole history of Bolshevism and its irreconcilable struggle against the Mensheviks is full of such examples. Everyone who has had practical experience of the work of the Comintern during the ten years of its existence knows very well this old method of the opportunists—to submerge the substantial questions of principle under a cloud of minor questions, and every imaginable kind of accusation, tending to drag the inner-Party struggle for a correct Bolshevik line right off the political rails. The greatest

danger for the Swedish Communist Party would be if the opportunist elements succeeded in turning aside the inner-Party discussion about the correct line, and bringing it on to trifling issues, thereby concealing from the workers the importance of the questions raised in the open letter of E.C.C.I., on the solution of which questions the fate of the Swedish Communist Party depends. It is just this that constitutes the opportunist position in Sweden. It does not come out openly against the line of the E.C.C.I. letter; it will accept it in words, merely attacking it under the guise of corrections, additions, "facts," etc.; it will go against it every day in the practical application of this political line.

The opportunists know the immense moral influence exercised by the Communist International among the foremost ranks of the Swedish workers, they know the trust and confidence of the whole world proletariat in the Comintern, and for that reason they will not decide to come out with an open attack. They will enter Troy in the Trojan horse of external loyalty to the Comintern, in order that they may the more easily sabotage its decisions. The Communist workers of Sweden should be ready to expose this intolerable manoeuvre from its very inception, to resist every effort to leave things as before in the Swedish Party. How real the danger is is shown by an editorial article in the central organ of the party, *Folkets Dagblad*, of September 7th, under the title of "Lying information," for which Comrade Kilhöm is responsible, though he had signed the open letter of E.C.C.I. on behalf of the majority of the Central Committee. It is impossible to describe this article in any other way than as an attack on the Communist International and its open letter. While not denying the right of any member of the Swedish Party to correct any inaccuracies of fact which had crept into the speeches of certain leading comrades, we are, nevertheless, unable to avoid remarking that the whole attitude of this article shows clearly how the

comrades who were responsible for opportunist errors are preparing to slip past the line of the open letter. Externally, solidarity with the letter, and signing it at the session of the political secretariat; but in practice, war against it. The Swedish workers know, from the experience of the Swedish Party itself, where such a policy leads. The person who is obstinate about confessing his opportunist errors, who attempts to draw the Party's attention away from them by references to lying information, who attempts to give the workers the impression that the whole criticism in the open letter is based on the Comintern's lack of information about the affairs of the Swedish Party, that person already begins to deviate from the line of the Comintern, and already opposes to it another line which repeats the history of many other deviations. Such an article can have no other objective significance, if the Central Committee does not immediately set itself to correct its consequences and to pull up its author. The majority of the Central Committee of the Swedish Party

is faced with the dilemma : either honourably, in a Bolshevik way, together with the Party and with its active help and under its control, to correct the opportunist errors which it has made, to straighten the Party's political line—or to get on to the dangerous path of the published article "Lying information," whose author is trying to draw the Party into a fight with the Communist International. There is no third alternative. The Executive Committee of the Communist International does not doubt that the Swedish Party masses will judge the publication of this article as an unpleasant manoeuvre to create a diversion, and will demand from the majority of the Central Committee a definite repudiation of it and of its author.

We would remind the opportunist twisters who are preparing for an attack on the world staff of the organised Communist movement that in such attacks many persons have broken for ever their political spine. Let those who have ears hear the warning voice of revolutionary reason.

Open Letter to the Members of the Swedish Communist Party

Comrades,—The Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., having considered the situation within the Swedish Communist Party, directed the presidium of the E.C.C.I. to address the following open letter to all Swedish Communists :—

The Swedish Communist Party is one of those sections of the Communist International whose influence over the proletarian masses has continuously increased, despite the partial and relative stabilisation of capitalism. In the last five years, the C.P. of Sweden has almost tripled the number of its adherents, the membership having grown from 7,000 to 18,000. At the last parliamentary elections the Party received 150,000 votes ; by systematic and unflagging work it has consolidated its influence in the trade unions, the recent strikes and disputes in the mining and paper industries proved that your Party is well on the way to attaining the leadership of the Swedish working-class movement. Its successes are incontestable and every member of the Swedish Communist

Party can be justifiably proud of them. These successes of our Swedish comrades will also enrich the experience of the other sections of the C.I.

But, apart from these successes, some serious opportunist errors have been revealed in the leadership of the Party. If these errors are not corrected and eliminated in good time by the efforts of the whole Party membership, they threaten to arrest the growth of the Communist Party's influence, and to weaken its capacity for struggle. The fact that all the members of the Party did not reply immediately to the opportunist mistakes of the leadership, cannot be altogether explained away on the ground that the Party was not fully enough informed of the disagreements which exist among the Party leaders. The reason for this lies also in the fact that the great majority of the Party have not yet reached a clear understanding of the political line of the C.I., that the leadership of the Party has not made clear to the whole Party the basis

of the decisions taken by the Ninth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., and the Sixth World Congress of the C.I.

The spirit of "provincialism" which still exists, that is to say, the fact that a certain proportion of the Party membership stands aside from the fundamental tasks of the world Communist movement and consequently exerts a certain backward pressure on that movement, has prevented the Party membership from correcting the mistakes of the Party. If these vestiges of provincialism are to be eliminated, if the political line of the C.I. is to be clearly understood and assimilated, the Communist workers of Sweden must take careful account of the changes which have taken place in the last few years in the relationship of class forces both in Sweden and on an international scale.

The present world situation is characterised by a tremendous accentuation of all the contradictions of capitalism. Because of this accentuation of contradictions, capitalist stabilisation is breaking down more and more under the blows of the world revolutionary working class movement, of the insurrections in the colonies and above all, of the success won by the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. in the building up of socialism. The war of 1914-1918, during which the capitalist contradictions accumulated before 1914 burst with such violence, will pale in comparison with the terrible events towards which the capitalist world is moving.

The fierce struggle for outlets will inevitably lead to an armed struggle for the repartition of the world. All the capitalist States, great and small, are part of the system of world imperialism, bound to it by the formation of international trusts and combines and bound therefore, to an aggressive imperialist policy. We refer to concerns like the Swedish Kreuger concern, which works on American capital and controls 75 per cent. of the world production of matches. It penetrates into the most distant corners of the globe, fights against the organisation into a monopoly of the world production of ores, and is a striking proof of the imperialist character of Swedish capitalism. Modern Sweden is not a small patriarchal State, somewhat in the position of a semi-colonial country; it is a young imperialist State fighting greedily for its place among the other imperialist States, sailing in the track of world imperialist policy,

which is aiming, under the protection of the great Powers, at a bloc of the Baltic States against the U.S.S.R. Following the example of the imperialist robbers, it is subsidising the political reaction in Roumania, Yugo-Slavia, Poland, Esthonia, Lithuania, using the Kreuger concern as its intermediary. The pacifist deception of the masses is carried on by spreading the idea that in the next war Sweden will, in some way or another, remain neutral. Now, the whole development of Swedish capitalism has taken place on the basis of its integration in the world imperialist system, and this will lead Sweden unavoidably into active participation in future wars.

This intensification of external contradictions is closely bound up with the intensification of the internal contradictions of capitalism. In order to maintain its capacity to compete on the world market and to reduce costs of production, the bourgeoisie is lowering the standard of life of the working-class. Capitalist rationalisation carried out in the countries possessing capital is the most pitiless form of the bourgeoisie's attack on the workers. It means innumerable evils and sufferings for the proletariat; lengthening of the working day, lower wages, mass unemployment. This oppression in the economic system is accompanied by a ferocious political reaction exercised against the working-class. These new methods are applied equally in Sweden. Every day hundreds of thousands of Swedish workers feel the pressure of capital organised in trusts, a pressure whose intensity has never been so great as at the present time. As elsewhere, this pressure gives rise to the counter-offensive of the workers, who are unwilling to allow themselves to be pushed, without resistance, into the abyss of poverty and wretchedness. This results in widespread class conflicts. The class front becomes more sharply defined. On one side stands the triple alliance of the capitalist State, the employers' organisations and the reformist bureaucracy; on the other, the militant forces of the proletarian masses, growing more and more radical, and led by the Communist Party.

The strikes which broke out this year in Sweden indicate the imminence of widespread class conflicts between these opposing forces and open a new stage in the development of the revolutionary working-class movement. The approach of this acute situation speeds up the

development towards fascism of the Swedish bourgeoisie and the transformation of Swedish social democracy into social fascism. The policy of mondism, of compulsory arbitration by means of which social democracy hopes to stifle all strikes, its policy of excluding revolutionary elements from the trade unions which is but the complement of the methods of repression exercised by the State in its development towards fascism, all these new factors are radically changing the old pre-war ideas of the rôle of social democracy as a party of the workers. Whoever does not realise these changes will never be able to adopt a correct revolutionary attitude in this new period of the world working-class movement, will never be able to lead the workers in the coming class battles.

The first thing for the Communist workers of Sweden to do is to get clear about these changes : they must understand that the third period in the development of post-war capitalism and the world working-class movement, is not in the least similar to the epoch of relative calm which existed before the war of 1914.

The old "Swedish idyll" of petty bourgeois well-being, an illusion on the strength of which social democracy is trying to attract the workers at the present time, is now part of the realm of legends. Wretchedness, hunger and unemployment are knocking on the door of the workers' house. A bitter and implacable struggle, demanding great sacrifices, is the lot which awaits the working-class. The Communist vanguard will not succeed in its struggle against social fascism for winning over the working-masses on the basis of a "workers' majority" on parliamentary and municipal bodies, but on the basis of civil war against the hangers-on of capital organised in trusts.

These same changes also determine the problems which face the Communists and which were outlined by the Sixth World Congress and the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. Our policy of "class against class" is a programme of revolutionary struggle in all spheres. This policy, in so far as it concerns the struggle against war, is based on the principle that "the enemy is in our own country." This revolutionary policy is incompatible with any attempt or desire to mitigate the imperialist nature of the Swedish capitalist State, and the imperialist

aggressiveness of the Swedish bourgeoisie. This policy is thoroughly hostile to all manifestations of provincialism and of national exclusiveness which, in Sweden, is frequently hidden behind theories concerning the "peculiar and specific traits" of Swedish capitalism. The policy of class against class means, in addition, a struggle to the death against the agents of trustified capital, the Swedish social democracy. At the present time, to imagine that social democracy is a part of the working class movement is tantamount to inviting the proletariat to form a "workers' majority" in Parliament and in the municipalities, to inviting class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. The policy of the C.I. means the struggle for the autonomous leadership of the working-class movement apart from and against social democracy, the struggle against trade union legalism, autonomous activity based on the tactics of the united front from below, the tactics employed, for example, in the May Day demonstrations. This policy is opposed to all hesitation and tardiness, to all "democratic" and pacifist agreement with social democracy. It means that to win the majority of the working masses, different methods must be used from those of the social democrats. Not only on questions of propaganda and anti-war agitation, not only in "loyal" discussions with social democracy, but in the bitter class battles, in which the treachery of the social democracy grows clearer with every day, and in which we, the Communists, will learn how to win over to our side the majority of the working class.

Not by capitulating to the reformist trade union bureaucracy will the Communists be able to maintain and strengthen their position in the trade unions, but by resisting with the utmost energy the measures of repression used by the higher social democratic ranks in the trade unions. The policy of class against class means also a consistent and implacable struggle against those right wing tendencies which arise, under the capitalist attack and the attack, at the moment even more vigorous, of social democracy in certain weak sections of the Communist Party. This policy is incompatible with the absence of principle, characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie, with the desire to hide opportunist errors and with any show of tolerance towards these facts. Without an energetic and con-

sistent struggle against right wing opportunist deviations, your Party will never become a Communist Party ready for the fight and ready to lead the workers on to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

If in the light of the C.I. policy, we examine the line followed by the leadership of your Party, it will be seen that that line deviates from the line of the Communist International on certain most important questions. The present majority of the Central Committee have not understood the basis of this policy; they have accepted it formally, in words, while in reality they have acted against the opposition and against the Swedish Y.C.L. who have been compelled to expose the mistakes of the leadership to the Party membership. The policy of the C.I. requires the Swedish C.P. to conduct an energetic and unflinching struggle against Swedish imperialism. The majority of the C.C. have weakened this struggle by making certain reservations as to the "dependent character" of Swedish capitalism. The policy of the C.I. requires the Party to explain to the Swedish workers that in the next war the Swedish bourgeoisie will not observe neutrality, that it is an already active factor in imperialist policy and is preparing for war, that the Swedish Communist parliamentary fraction's proposals in the *Riksdag*, on the questions of disarmament and war were of an opportunist character, and will spread pacifist illusions among the masses. These illusions are particularly dangerous in a country like Sweden, whose neutrality during the last war still exercises some influence, weakening the vigilance of the working class with regard to the war danger.

Following the policy of the C.I., the Swedish comrades should have made use of the parliamentary tribune to expose the fascist rôle of the Swedish bourgeoisie and of its agents, the Swedish social democracy. The Communist fraction in Parliament, while taking up a correct attitude on certain important questions, was mistaken in making, on some occasions, "practical proposals" which, in fact, would lead to the position of the left social democrats. The policy of class against class requires the transformation of the 1st May demonstrations into an active struggle of the Swedish working-class, not only against the Swedish bourgeoisie, but also against Swedish social fascism. The leaders of

the Stockholm organisation, led by Heinar Olsen, countermanded the directions for the 1st May demonstration after an agreement with the social democrats, thus distorting, in an opportunist manner, the militant significance of 1st May, a significance which is at its highest when class contradictions are sharpened and intensified to a great degree. While the blood of the Berlin workers was flowing, the social fascist Zörgiebel having given the order to fire, while the armed bands of Polish social fascists were killing the Polish workers demonstrating in the streets, the leaders of the Stockholm Party organisation, in accordance with the agreement reached with the social democrats, did not even organise a meeting for the workers who had gathered together for the May Day demonstration. The policy of the president of the Stockholm committee was nothing but the continuation of the old and inadmissible policy of blocs with the social democrats, condemned by the overwhelming majority of the Party. The policy of the C.I. requires that the leadership of the Swedish Communist Party should fight mercilessly against such concrete manifestations of right wing deviation, should ruthlessly expose all these opportunist errors. In point of fact, the leaders of your Party systematically overlooked these mistakes and cultivated, within the Party, a spirit of conciliation towards them, trying to justify them in the eyes of the Party. The majority of your C.C. did not condemn these mistakes at the June Plenum; on the contrary, they defended them against the correct criticism of the minority of the C.C., and of the delegates of the C.I., denouncing the minority of the C.C. to the Party as stirring up trouble and as acting in a fractional way. When these mistakes had been subjected to the rigorous criticism of the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., Comrade Flig, president of the Political Bureau of the Party, defended the conduct of the Stockholm committee and the disarmament proposals of the parliamentary fraction, using arguments typical of "left" social democracy. One part of the Swedish delegation, representing the majority of the C.C., gave proof of an attitude of extreme tolerance towards these mistakes; hence the necessity for the present letter. Instead of directly and resolutely condemning the opportunist vacillations of the Party, as Bolsheviks should, they

openly defended its opportunist mistakes or replied with evasive answers which meant nothing and which only make it more difficult to correct the Party line and to overcome its mistakes. The fact that the majority of your C.C. defend these opportunist mistakes indicates a very grave danger. Any mistake can be corrected, but to defend opportunist errors is an attitude which holds the serious risk of degenerating into opportunist deviation, and prevents the development of the Party into a Bolshevik Party. In itself, this atmosphere of conciliation towards opportunism creates fruitful soil for the tendency of capitulation to the measures of repression adopted by the social fascist trade union bureaucracy, and helps to spread points of view similar to those held by Grimloud, who believes in the necessity of supporting capitalist rationalisation, etc.

The E.C.C.I. has frequently drawn the attention of the leaders of the Swedish C.P. to manifestations of opportunist tendencies in the work of the Party, and has suggested an energetic struggle against right wing opportunism. In its letters dated 10/10/28 and 2/5/29, the E.C.C.I. recommended the rallying of the whole Party to eliminate these opportunist tendencies. It did everything necessary to give the C.C. an opportunity of itself correcting these mistakes. But this led to no result. The first of the E.C.C.I. letters was not even made generally known to the Party. This fact obliges the E.C.C.I. to address itself openly to the whole Party to demand, with the active aid of the Party, that the C.C. should correct its policy, and correct the opportunist mistakes which have been made.

The whole Party, from top to bottom, must thoroughly discuss these questions of the political line of the Party and its organisational work, the present minority of the C.C. being given the fullest opportunity of defending their standpoint before the whole Party. In the discussion, all the questions at issue should be dealt with fully and from the standpoint of principle. The Party members must reject any opportunist attempts to get over questions of principle by raising secondary and less important questions, any attempt to stifle, by whatever manoeuvre, the expression of ideas held by the Communist workers of Sweden as to the policy of the C.I. and the deviations from

that policy committed by a certain section of the Swedish comrades. The discussion on the open letter of the E.C.C.I. should do much towards bringing to light the opportunist elements in the Party, towards strengthening its leading ranks and cleansing the Party from any alien and casual elements. Only such a discussion of principle will establish the true Leninist unity of the Swedish Party, which will energetically crush any attempt to break that unity. The E.C.C.I. recommends that the C.C. should convene a Party congress in four months' time. This congress should take stock of the political work carried out to correct the Party's policy. Together with this criticism of past errors, the Party should get down concretely to its tasks of the struggle against war, against capitalist nationalisation, social fascism, pacifist illusions both at the congress itself and throughout the discussion within the Party. Moreover, the Party should get down to the tasks drawn up by the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.: the Party's leadership of the Swedish working-class movement, the transformation of economic into political struggles, the problem of the mass political strike, strengthening the Party's footing in factories (this to be accomplished by the reorganisation of the Party on factory group lines), consolidation of the Party's influence in the trade unions and the formulation of concrete measures to put an end to the treacherous and splitting activities of the reformist bureaucracy. The fact that new sections of the proletariat, women and young workers, have been drawn into the class struggle because of rationalisation makes it incumbent upon the Swedish Communist Party to devote particular attention to work among women and young workers. Finally, the Congress should strengthen the leadership of your Party by the addition of the new militant workers who have shown their ability in the class struggles of these last years. It should give to every comrade who honestly desires it, the opportunity of correcting, in Bolshevik fashion, the mistakes that he has made, under the vigilant control of the Party and with his active assistance.

The Presidium of the E.C.C.I. expresses its firm conviction that, on the basis of such self-criticism, your Party will be able to march forward and to make its members more active. It believes that your Party which, in the past,

has always unanimously rejected any attempts to hinder the execution of the decisions of the C.I., will profit from the Bolshevik experience of Parties in other countries, resolutely to overcome the opportunism and the conciliation

towards opportunism which exist in the Party and will in the near future become one of the most advanced sections of the Communist International, one of the sections best prepared for the fight.

The Struggle against the Right Danger in the C.P. of Canada

The Dominion Problem

By John Porter

THERE is need for the Communist International to pay more attention to the Dominions than it has in the past. This need is demonstrated by the experiences of the Canadian Party during the last few years. Within the Dominion parties a great deal of misunderstanding exists as to the exact place of the Dominions in the system of world imperialism and, particularly, as to their relationships with the mother countries. The Colonial Thesis of the Sixth World Congress states that the Dominions are "a continuation of their (the mother countries') capitalist system"; . . . and further that "there can be no talk of a capitalist régime in this type of country." That this is borne out by fact can be seen from the following.

Until recent years, until the outbreak of the World War, Canada was a semi-colony of Great Britain; it supplied raw materials and foodstuffs to the metropolis, imported manufactures from Great Britain and the U.S.A. and possessed little native industry. The balance of foreign capital investments was overwhelmingly British (in 1914 there were \$2,500,000,000 of British capital invested as against \$700,000,000 of American capital). The Great War qualitatively changed these relationships. Due to the tremendous demand for commodities and war materials of all kinds, there began a period of intense industrialisation. The influx of British capital stopped; native Canadian capital began to penetrate production. The Canadian bourgeoisie began to export manufactured products to England.

Immediately following the war, a severe industrial and financial crisis affected Canada,

in common with the rest of the capitalist world. The Canadian bourgeoisie was able to liquidate this only by floating huge loans upon Wall Street. By 1920, American investments reached the huge sum of \$1,300,000,000, while British investments rarely held their own. The development of Canadian industry, with the help of Wall Street, placed Canada as a competitor in the world race for markets. From an exporter of agricultural products and an importer of machinery and manufactured goods, Canadian industry, besides fulfilling many of the needs of the home market, became an exporter of industrial commodities in excess of agricultural products. Foreign trade increased by leaps and bounds; the Dominion bourgeoisie became a competitor to the mother country upon the world arena. This industrial development was duplicated in agriculture. Canada, during the last two years, has become the world's largest wheat exporter; the introduction of machinery in agriculture is proceeding more rapidly in Canada than in the U.S.A., and so is the class differentiation among the farmers.

This intense industrial development found its political expression in the demand of the Canadian bourgeoisie for a great measure of *constitutional* independence from the British Government. The struggle, which continued for several years up to 1927, finally ended in the concession by Britain of almost complete independence to the Canadian bourgeoisie. At no time was the policy of severance from the British Empire considered by the Canadian bourgeoisie; at no time were the demands of the Canadian (or the Australian or South

African) state resisted *in principle* by Great Britain. This can be explained by the fact that these countries are not colonies in the sense that India or Egypt are, but "developing imperialist nations," as the letter of the E.C.C.I. to the Canadian Party expresses it. The present status of Canada (as the foremost of the Dominions because of her higher industrial and imperialist character) is that of an economic partner of Great Britain, a partnership, however, that is not very peaceful, but marked by conflicts over tariffs, immigration and other sore points. Canada has independent treaties, reserves the right to declare war, etc. It can be laid down that whatever relations are maintained at the present time with Great Britain are relations in the interest of the Canadian bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, the geographical position of Canada places it in a unique position in the Anglo-American conflict. As a seeker of markets upon the international arena, as a developing imperialist country, it is inevitably drawn into the conflict between Great Britain and America. But the conflict as it is mirrored in Canada is not a struggle by the U.S.A. or Great Britain for the possession of a colony, but a struggle having the following manifestations:

(a) The Canadian bourgeoisie, having the balance of industrial and financial power within Canada, is endeavouring to preserve its home market both from American dumping and from the competition of Great Britain. This is indicated by the recent raising of the British Empire Preference Tariff against British commodities, and the struggle of Canadian heavy industry against American imports.

(b) The Canadian bourgeoisie, in its financial penetration of Latin America and its growing trade interests in the Pacific (Japan, China, etc.), comes into economic conflict with America and Britain in these areas.

(c) Canadian agriculture is penalised by the Hoover tariff policy, which is directed largely against the import of Canadian agricultural products.

"The Moot-Hawley Tariff Bill, which in its present form imposes duties calculated to penalise about \$100,000,000 of Canada's exports to the U.S., threatens to cause a substantial diminution of the latter and aggra-

vates the spread between them and Canadian imports from U.S. (*Economist*, September 7, 1929.)

(d) The Canadian bourgeoisie itself has a division of economic interests, sections of it finding common policy with American interests and other sections with Britain. For instance, the financial investments of the Canadian bourgeoisie in the U.S. "amount to \$875,000,000, or one-quarter of the total American investments in Canada." (*New York Times*.) This sections undoubtedly orientates towards American policy. Other sections are bound more closely with British interests, particularly those sections who benefit by inter-Empire Preference Schemes.

However, the myth that Canada is a "colony" of the United States is not borne out by fact, in spite of the tremendous investments of American capital within the country. The total foreign investments in 1929 amount to \$5,742,043,000, of which \$2,209,517,000 is British, the rest being almost purely American. *But the total national wealth of Canada is at least five times the total of all foreign investments.* From this short statement it can be seen that in spite of the growth of American investments (and the slow recovery of British in the last period), native accumulation has exceeded it. This has given rise to a firm bourgeoisie that is motivated, in spite of its disunited sections, in the general interests of all of its sections. This Liberal bourgeoisie draws now near to American politics, now to British. But at all times it seeks to use Canada's unique position in the Anglo-American conflict in the *general* interests of the entire Canadian ruling class. This should be borne in mind in connection with the discussion of the Party policies later in the article.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FALSE SLOGAN OF "CANADIAN INDEPENDENCE"

The slogan of "Canadian Independence," recently condemned by the E.C.C.I. as false and opportunist, was championed by Maurice Spector, formerly the theoretical leaders of the Canadian Party, and now a renegade Trotskyist. An example of his attitude towards the Canadian bourgeoisie (not to speak of his attitude to the colonial question!) can be seen by the following quotation from an article written by him in September, 1926:

"It does not matter to the workers whether the country in which they carry on their class struggle for social freedom is still a colony or has achieved complete sovereignty."

"Despite all statements to the contrary, Canada is still a colony of Great Britain, a part of the British Empire. . . ."

"That is why the Labour Party takes a position in favour of the complete self-determination of Canada, and why the left-wing of the Labour Party, headed by the Communists, takes a more specific position for the annullment of the British North America Act, the separation of Canada from the Empire, and Canadian Independence."

What did this mean, according to the Party? That we must struggle against colonial exploitation, regard the Canadian bourgeoisie as an oppressed colonial bourgeoisie, and support their fight for independence!

This was the policy of the Party until the Sixth Congress of the C.I. For years the Party ascribed to the Canadian ruling class a revolutionary rôle, and remained silent upon the question of the proletarian revolution! The basis of this theory was the conception of Canada as a colony.

After the Sixth Congress of the C.I. the Party changed its position. It denied the opportunist theory of Spector (in which it was assisted by his exit from revolutionary ranks as a counter-revolutionary Trotskyist) and said, in brief, the following:

"The slogan of Canadian Independence can only mean a proletarian revolution in Canada. The Canadian bourgeoisie is the oppressor of the Canadian proletariat, and must be overthrown as its main enemy. However, the position of Canada in the Anglo-American conflict makes it imperative that the slogan shall be retained as a means of rallying the masses against both Canadian, British and American imperialisms."

This formulation, however, was not yet clear enough.

This was discussed in the E.C.C.I. in the spring of this year, and the slogan declared incorrect. A letter to the Sixth Congress of the Party from the E.C.C.I. states the following:

"The slogan of 'Canadian Independence' in the present period can only confuse the demand for a 'Workers' and Farmers' Government,' and lead the working masses to believe that they are oppressed more by the British imperialists than by the Canadian bourgeoisie. . . The struggle for free and full independence of Canada, and the freedom of French-Canada on the basis of complete self-determination, can only be achieved through revolutionary struggle. Only through a government of workers and poor farmers can the Canadian proletariat achieve their real independence."

THE INNER-PARTY DISCUSSION

At the time of the receipt of the letter two distinct political groupings were forming in the Party. The Majority of the Central Committee, with the support of the language groups within the Party and their Right leaders, introduced a Political Draft Thesis that was a purely Right document. This Thesis, condemned by the C.I. letter to the Party convention, among other things, denied the leftward move of the masses, denied the independent rôle of the Party, demanded the building of a reformist Labour Party, conceived the main basis of trade union work to be the skilled workers of the A.F. and L., and entirely ignored the agrarian and French-Canadian problems. The Minority comrades fought this Right line, and approached nearer to the policies contained in the letter of the E.C.C.I. However, they, together with the majority of the C.C., defended the erroneous slogan of "Canadian Independence." It is significant that, until the receipt of the letter of the E.C.C.I. in June, no doubt was expressed with the Party as to the correctness of the slogan. All were united in accepting it. In addition to this major mistake, however, the Minority comrades made the following errors:

- (a) They based all possibilities for work upon the theory of an immediate crisis in Canadian economy.
- (b) These comrades failed to characterise the Labour Party as the third Party of the bourgeoisie, while at the same time they repudiated the opportunist policy of the Majority to continue building the Labour Party.

(c) These comrades did not correctly estimate social reformism within the so-called national unions of Canada that are organised in the All-Canadian Congress of Labour. This led to an under-estimation of the need for building revolutionary unions, and above all for the immediate organisation of a revolutionary trade union centre under Communist leadership.

The great task of the Minority comrades, however, was to struggle against the Right leadership of the Party, that had been entrenched for so many years. The social and national composition of the Party is bad. Almost 85 per cent. of the membership of the Party are Finnish and Ukrainian immigrant workers and farmers who are under the direct leadership of Right elements, and who persist in their federal structure within the Party organisation. Upon this *bloc* the Majority of the Central Committee based its "khvostist," apathetic, Right policy. The Minority comrades undertook to carry out the struggle against this Right grouping in accordance with the decisions of the Sixth Congress. The political confusion of the Majority comrades can be judged from their opinion about the chief dangers confronting the Party. They claimed that the fight on two fronts must be transformed in Canada into a fight on three fronts, adding to Trotskyism (Spector and his insignificant group) and the Right danger, a Left danger in the form of the Minority. In this manner they endeavoured to rally the politically weak membership against the "disrupters" of the Minority.

The political discussion that preceded the receipt of the letter was the best in Party history, but nevertheless it remained confined to a few members at the top, and did not penetrate the membership, or even the district conventions held before the National Convention. The discussion revealed the low political level of the membership, and showed the need for a thorough enlightenment campaign throughout the Party. It is safe to assume that the political fight carried on within the Party remained a vague, unreal thing to the majority of the membership. As an instance, the campaign within the Party against the attempts of Spector to split the Party in favour of Trotskyism was narrow and ineffective. The

majority of the membership were and are not clear as to the nature of this counter-revolutionary phenomenon. Much less did they really grasp the nature of the struggle against the Right leadership that was initiated by the Minority comrades.

THE LETTER OF THE E.C.C.I.

It was amidst such developments as this that the letter of the E.C.C.I. came to the Party Convention in June. It acted as a criterion which clearly divided those elements who really supported the line of the Sixth Congress from those who were openly or secretly resisting it.

The letter clearly characterised the slogan of "Canadian Independence" as false, and not the correct expression of the proletarian revolution in Canada. It characterised Canada as a "developing imperialist country," whose bourgeoisie is preparing for war against the Soviet Union, whose bourgeoisie will inevitably be drawn, by its imperialist contradictions, into the vortex of imperialist war. The letter stated:

"At the same time we must emphasise the fact that the main struggle in this connection is not the abstract slogan, 'struggle for independence,' but should be the struggle against being dragged by the Canadian bourgeoisie, or any section of it, into either of the imperialist camps in the coming war."

The Anglo-American conflict, into which the Canadian bourgeoisie is drawn by virtue of its very geographical and economic situation, is the actual imperialist contradiction in which Canada finds itself. The letter states:

"Canada is one of the principal theatres of the gigantic world conflict which is the central antagonism within the imperialist world."

The letter repudiated the thesis of the Majority which denied a leftward move of the Canadian workers, and stated:

"The workers of Canada, particularly in the unorganised industries employing youth and women, are reacting to rationalisation by a distinct wave of spontaneous strikes, constituting a leftward move of sections of the working class, possibly a prelude to a general movement. The Party has not taken cognizance of this to a sufficient ex-

tent; mention has been made in the sessions of the C.C. of the 'absence of any leftward movement.' This attitude finds its expression in a failure to take the leadership of these strikes, as in Hamilton."

"The present developments can only produce a further leftward trend on the part of the workers and a further move to the Right on the part of the trade union bureaucrats."

The Majority was deluded by the "prosperity" of Canada, and lulled into inactivity by the continuous song of "expansion" which is sung by the hirelings of the Canadian financiers. A theory that approached the "exceptionalism" of the American Party, badly formulated but nevertheless in evidence, was evolved by the Majority. On the other hand, the Minority comrades exaggerated the importance of an immediate economic crisis as a prerequisite for successful revolutionary work. The letter of the C.I. correctly formulated the question thus:

"The stabilisation process of Canadian capitalism is marked by an increasing rationalisation of industry, both in the so-called 'old' industries through the introduction of speed-up systems and the elimination of waste, and in the 'new' industries by means of a still greater intensification of labour and the introduction of modern machinery. The concentration of financial control through bank and corporation mergers is proceeding rapidly; financial consolidation of the producers of raw materials and the manufacturers is continuing. At the same time that this process paves the way for crises and a sharpening of the inner and external contradictions of Canadian capitalism, the immediate effects are: to increase by considerable numbers the employed proletarians, to absorb immigrants and dispossessed farmers and the superfluous workers of the 'old' industries into the newer industries, and thus to keep the reserve army of labour at a roughly normal level.

"In spite of these temporary phenomena, there are already indications of the coming crisis within Canadian economy, not to speak of international complications which will embroil the country. . . The Draft Thesis proposed by the Central Committee (the Majority Thesis—J.P.) failed to

do this, but over-stressed the 'prosperity' of Canada, not indicating the exact contradictions, and completely ignoring the question of crises."

The Majority completely ignored agriculture in Canada. In spite of the fact that 30 per cent. of the working population of Canada is employed in agriculture, not a sentence appears in the Majority Thesis upon this question. The Minority comrades paid no attention to this question, except in a formal and scholastic manner that failed to produce either tactics or a programme of struggle. The C.I. letter lays a Leninist basis for an agrarian programme, and places the immediate responsibility upon the Party of formulating the programme and of beginning work among the poor farmers. Among other things, the letter states:

"A process of increasing rationalisation is taking place in Canadian agriculture, similar to that which is going on in industry. . . . This will sharpen the class differentiation in the ranks of the farmers and throw into relief more clearly the class struggle among the agrarian population. . . The greater productive capacity of agriculture rendered possible by this development will bring nearer the possibility of an agrarian crisis. . . The outlook is undoubtedly one of severe chaos in the field of agrarian economy."

The following is the main task set by the letter for the Party in its future agrarian work:

"The formulation of a programme of immediate demands that will rally the poor farmers for the struggle against the rich farmers, and which will embody their immediate economic needs and sharpen the class differentiation already accentuated by capitalist development in agriculture."

This agrarian programme will also serve to:

"lead the poor farmers in a struggle against the rich farmers and their provincial governments, the banks, railroads, loan companies, and the whole system of capitalism."

In the trade union work of the Party, the letter noted the improvement in the industrial programme of the Party which was contained in the Thesis of the Minority comrades. It was clear, however, that these comrades also made the mistake, together with the Majority,

that is herewith criticised in the letter of the E.C.C.I.:

"In the changing of the old trade union programme of the Party into one calling for the separation of the Canadian unions from the A.F. of L., and for the creation of a unified trade union movement, serious Right mistakes have been made which weaken the influence of the Party among the workers. The estimation of the all-Canadian Congress of Labour by the Party and the maintenance, until recently, of the slogan 'Amalgamation of the Two Congresses' (Canadian and A.F. of L.), show that the Party leaned too much towards unity from the top rather than unity from below on the basis of definite issues or the interests of the workers when engaged in actual struggles. . . . The Party has not sufficiently exposed the leaders of the Canadian Congress."

The policy of Mondism and industrial peace adopted by the latter should have been sufficient to liquidate all illusions that these leaders can in any way play a progressive part. The wrong evaluation of that Congress was accompanied by a dangerous weakening of the work of the Party in the trade unions affiliated to the A.F. of L. still holding most important positions in many industries and uniting a majority of the organised workers.

"There is not an organised Minority Movement to link up our work in the trade union centres with our work in the new unions and with the organisation of the unorganised. . . . There is insufficient realisation of preliminary forms, such as factory or shop committees, for the organisation of the unorganised and the building of new unions."

Both groups in the Party prior to the Convention were guilty of these mistakes. While the Minority comrades endeavoured to correct them, however, the Right comrades maintained their passive, defeatist attitude and their opportunist conception of unity from above.

In the attitude of both groups towards the Labour Party, serious mistakes were evident. The Majority comrades wished to continue the policy, in essence, of building the Labour Party and endeavouring to turn it into an instrument of struggle against capitalism. The Minority comrades, while demanding the in-

dependent rôle of the Party, compromised by demanding the "increasing of our work within the Labour Party." (Thesis of Minority on Labour Party.)

The object of this was eventually to liquidate the latter, whereas, as a matter of fact, it had already been liquidated when the reformists began to leave the Labour Party with the object of splitting it and disrupting the "united front," contrary to the usual reformist policy of expelling the Communists from the the Labour Party. The letter of the E.C.C.I. emphasised the opportunism of the Party in the past on this question and stated that the old policy has led:

" . . . to a number of mistakes in the operation of Party policy, *e.g.*, the maintenance of the Labour Party as a screen for the Communists in the belief that the C.P. can only become a mass Party through the medium of a Labour Party. The C.P. can never give up its independent fight for the leadership of the working masses, its right of criticism within the trade unions or labour organisations. . . . The C.P. is still very weak and has yet to become a mass Party. This it can only do by penetrating deeper into the widest sections of the working class, by more and more emphasising the independent rôle of the Party, neither screening it behind the label of the Labour Party, nor following a sectarian line of isolation from the working masses."

"In the present period the task of the Party is not the building of a Labour Party. The major task is the building of a powerful C.P. If the foregoing measures are carried out, the problem of liquidating the Labour Party will be solved, and there will be no basis in future for such a party."

The serious shortcomings in the campaign against Trotskyism were noted by the letter of the E.C.C.I. That this danger is organically bound up with the Right danger in the Party is seen from the following clause:

"The struggle against Trotskyism, which has made its appearance in the Canadian Party, cannot be separated from the entire problems of correcting those Right tendencies which represent the greatest danger for the Party at the present time and of raising the ideological level of the Party. The C.P. will only be able successfully to over-

come the combined attack of the Trotskyist Specter and his opportunist allies by a systematic elimination of all Social-democratic Right wing tendencies still strong in our Party. That a leader of the Party and a member of the E.C.C.I. could for years harbour leanings towards Trotskyism (according to the admission of the C.C.) without the issue being raised sharply before the Party, is a sign of the weakness of the Party leadership."

The organisational situation of the Party received severe criticism. For years the Central Committee has allowed this situation to develop, and has assumed a passive attitude to the federations within the Party. Unless the Party can better its composition and rid itself of such social-democratic remnants as federalism, the Party will not be able to take advantage of the favourable situation for mass work. The letter states:

" . . . The Party is in no way prepared for the tremendous tasks and possibilities before it. It still remains largely an immigrant Party, only poorly connected with the basic sections of the working class. Although the overwhelming majority of the population is made up of Canadian and French-Canadian workers, 95 per cent. of the Party membership is confined to three language groups (Finnish, Ukrainian and Jewish). Such a national composition is a serious barrier between the Party and the masses. . . . "

The letter demanded an immediate remedying of this impossible situation. Upon this question the Majority of the C.C. remained silent. The Minority raised the question sharply. In connection with this, it is important to note that nothing has been done by our Party to extend itself among the most cruelly exploited section of the population, the French Canadians. The letter instructed the Party *immediately* to begin work among them. Without the support of this vast group of people and a special approach to them as a *national* group, the Party cannot hope to succeed.

THE CONVENTION OF THE PARTY

At the Convention of the Party in June, the E.C.C.I. letter proved to be the chief factor in clarifying the situation within the Party and in dividing the camp of the Majority into

those who refused to recognise the C.I. line, and those who formally accepted it, while repeating their Right errors and refusing to disassociate themselves from the open Right opponents of the letter. The composition of the Convention was not good; as in past years the majority of the delegates were Finnish and Ukrainian comrades, led by supporters of the policy of the Right. Fractionalism developed in which both groups participated. The letter of the C.I. was finally adopted, but a Central Committee was elected which consisted of a majority of those who had supported the line of the Majority. However, the chief benefit that the Convention gave to the Party's development was the exposure of the Right, which has led the Party for years. No political thesis was adopted at the Convention, nor any agrarian or French-Canadian programme. For this reason, it can be rightly stated that the political development of the Party and the real, vital struggle against the Right danger has only begun.

THE PLENUM OF THE C.C.

At the enlarged Plenum Session of the C.C. which was held shortly after the convention, an interesting and unique development took place. The Right deserted the leadership of the Party (Comrade MacDonald as secretary, M. Buhay as editor, etc.), and the majority of the Political Bureau of the Party was obtained by the minority of the Central Committee. In this regard, the Minority comrades committed the grave error of not exposing this anti-Communist act of the Right, but of acquiescing in it! Thus the situation exists where the leadership of the Political Bureau has the task of not only winning the as yet quiescent membership for the carrying out of the C.I. letter, but also the majority of the Central Committee. In doing this, it must carry on a struggle against federalism, against all such manifestations of anti-Party sentiments as the cowardly act of the Right leaders in deserting their posts instead of carrying out the line of the Comintern. This the present leaders, who have accepted the line of the C.I. letter, have until now failed to do. The E.C.C.I. has criticised this failure to fight the Right and demanded from the new comrades now in charge of the Party that they carry through an enlightenment campaign through-

out the membership for the line of the C.I. as the most effective means of fighting the Right dangers that are rampant in the Party's structure and leadership. The dangerous opinion shared by comrades now on the Political Bureau, to the effect that they must "orientate themselves away from a struggle against the Right leadership to a basis of actual leadership of the Party," completely ignores the basis of the Right danger in the Party's structure, as well as in the objective conditions in Canada, and must be uprooted. Only the thorough reorganisation of the Party, only its bolshevisation and the destroying of federalism, only the bettering of its composition by drawing in native workers (including the French-Canadians), can transform the present immigrant party into a party capable of actually leading struggles in the present period of radicalisation.

A NEW EXPRESSION OF THE RIGHT DANGER

After accepting the decision of the C.I. that the slogan of "Canadian Independence" is false, by stating (in the resolution upon the C.I. letter) that "we have corrected our erroneous slogan of Canadian Independence," sections of the present leadership of the Party show that they still have reservations upon this question. The following is a résumé of the opinion now held by these comrades on the progress of the proletarian revolution in Canada:

"The bourgeoisie is *hopelessly* disunited, sections of it finding common ground with British, others sections with the American bourgeoisie. There are no independent interests among the Canadian ruling class, and its government is not representative of the bourgeois interests as a whole. This disunity will have its culminating point in the outbreak of war between Great Britain and America, in which case the situation will be such that the Canadian bourgeoisie will be *unable* to rule because of the combination of social, economic, military and geographical factors within the country. Tremendous conflicts will arise, leading in all probability to civil war among the population. The situation will be favourable for the capture of power by the workers, providing that the subjective conditions are

forthcoming, the leadership of the masses by the Communist Party."

This is the *only* outlook for proletarian revolution in Canada that is proclaimed by the Party at the moment. It finds its basis in the following conception of Canada's world position and of the social relationships within Canada:

"To reduce all the elements in Canada's position to the *simple formula* of a proletarian revolution, means to over-estimate the strength of the Canadian bourgeoisie and completely to underestimate the contradictions in Canada. *Canada is not an imperialist power*, and is on the other hand a theatre of struggle between British and American imperialism. Thus the struggle against imperialism has a *different* form for the Canadian workers than for the British or American workers. *In Canada the central political slogan of the Party must do more than demand the defeat of the Canadian bourgeoisie and must prepare the workers for the struggle against the invasion of British or American imperialism in time of war.* Thus, the slogan of Canadian Independence is not wrong because it differentiated the position of Canada from the position in Britain or America, *but because it did not correctly differentiate.*"

It is evident from this that the present outlook of the Canadian Party fundamentally differs from the line laid down by the Comintern letter. Starting out from the assumption that Canada can only be looked upon as a theatre of struggle, and not as an imperialist country which takes an active part in imperialist schemes, they willy-nilly assign to Canada the part of a colony. The starting point for the whole theory is the Anglo-American conflict, in which Canada appears solely as a battleground of conflicting American and British interests; the independent interests of the Canadian bourgeoisie, its preparation for war against the U.S.S.R., the inner contradictions within Canadian economy, are entirely left out. From this, they develop their theory of a complex proletarian revolution, denying the "simple formula" of the proletarian revolution; in other words, they deny the *character* of the proletarian revolution in Canada. The theory of defence of Canada from invading British or American

imperialism is a logical consequence from this colonial theory of Canada, and in this sense approaches the opportunist policies of the renegade Spector.

But further than this, the view held by the Party of the coming revolutionary crisis abounds in opportunism. Arising from their view of a hopelessly disunited bourgeoisie, comes the theory that the Canadian bourgeoisie government does not and cannot rule except at the behest of one or another of the rival imperialist groups, thereby possessing a characteristic of an oppressed bourgeoisie. This flies in the face of both facts and theory. The fact is that a close examination of the policies of the Canadian bourgeoisie shows that they pursue an independent attitude of building up home industry and seeking markets, *against* the interests, at times, of both rival groups. At other times they form unity with one against another, and so on. The Canadian Government can be regarded as a government of the Canadian bourgeoisie in the full, developed sense. Theoretically their opinion is wrong because it presupposes the possibility of a bourgeoisie that *can* represent a really *united* capitalist class. The scholastic, schematic, hypothetical opinion regarding the situation within Canada in the event of an open outbreak of war between Britain and America is taken as a policy and spread broadcast among the Canadian workers. In the first place, everything is staked upon the actual declaration of war, in this definite manner, between Britain and America, thus precluding the outbreak of war in any other manner or in any other part of the world. Further, though this is never stated, the civil war that is visualised by these comrades as inevitable is not the civil war against capitalism, but a *civil war between sections of the bourgeoisie to decide which side they will support!* Surely a fine way to fight the war danger!

The war that is being prepared against the U.S.S.R. by the Canadian bourgeoisie is almost forgotten. The present line of the Party leads to a weakening of the preparation of the masses for the revolutionary defence of the U.S.S.R.

The fundamental error underlying all of this is the Right mistake of conceiving a revolutionary situation as possible in Canada *only*

in the event of war, the Anglo-American war in particular. This, needless to say, is absolutely a false theory, and entirely ignores the Leninist conception of the development of the proletarian revolution from any great political or economic crisis. It leads to the policy of looking only to the outer contradictions for revolutionary situations, and ignores the inner, sharpening contradictions within Canadian economy that were rightly noted by the letter of the E.C.C.I.

In short, this policy is a social-democratic, Right deviation, which denies the letter of the E.C.C.I. The policy of the Party must be brought into line with the letter, and these mistakes corrected by those comrades who supported it at the Party convention. The letter clearly states that Canada is not a colony, but a developing imperialist country within the world imperialist system. The letter does not minimise the Anglo-American conflict.

The letter of the E.C.C.I. admits that "Canada is at the present time an arena of struggle (but not only an arena of this struggle!—J.P.) between British and American imperialism." The letter of the E.C.C.I. also admits that the "Canadian bourgeoisie is not united," that one section is inclined towards British and the other towards American imperialism. The letter of the E.C.C.I. finally admits that the "imminence of war and the accentuation of the struggle between the two imperialist giants all over the Empire brings that antagonism within the ranks of the ruling class of Canada to its apogee. The country will be torn by antagonisms, without deciding as to whether American or British imperialism should be supported or to remain neutral." But at the same time the letter of the E.C.C.I., "based on the development of Canada into a capitalist country in the true sense of that word," emphasises that "the Canadian bourgeoisie is the chief enemy of the Canadian proletariat," that Canada is not a colony, because "contact between Canada and the British Empire is dictated, not by compulsory measures, but by the mutual interests of the exploiters," and that "the Canadian bourgeoisie will make use of the struggle between American and British imperialism for influence in Canada, and of the weakening of the British Empire for an ever

more energetic institution of its administrative autonomy."

The letter of the E.C.C.I. therefore opposed the false slogan of Canadian Independence. It stated clearly that the slogan was wrong because it concealed from the Canadian workers their real enemy, the Canadian bourgeoisie, and not because it "did not correctly differentiate," as these comrades maintain. The present outlook of the Canadian Party perpetuates the mistakes of the past. While the letter is formally accepted, it is quite clear that it is not understood. It is the task of the Party immediately to understand it, so that the struggle against the war danger shall not be clouded by such fatalist, opportunist scholasticisms as at present.

IMMEDIATE OUTLOOK FOR WORK

The situation is extremely favourable at the present time for the development of the Party. The leftward movement is continuing, as evidenced by the splendid demonstrations of the Canadian workers on Red Day and by the police terror now being directed against our

Party. The workers of the rationalising industries are moving, as well as the organised workers in the reactionary unions. The inner contradictions of Canadian economy are marked by a growing over-production crisis and a shrinking home-market. The outer contradictions are becoming aggravated as Canada is driven more and more into the imperialist arena as an exporter. The harvest failure this year, coupled with the mechanical revolution in agriculture, which is deepening class differentiation among the farmers and hastening their expropriation, at the same time brings Canadian economy into the growing world agrarian crisis. In this situation it is imperative that the Party carry out immediately the organisation and political measures of the E.C.C.I. letter in order that the Right elements in the Party shall be rooted out. A real leadership must be developed in the struggle, and the Canadian Party overcome the danger of "khvostism" by taking control of the desire of the masses for struggle and developing it into a mass revolutionary movement against the Canadian bourgeoisie.

Resolution of the Political-Secretariat of August 30th

Upon the Report of the full Meeting of the C.E.C. of the C.P. of Great Britain

HAVING become acquainted with the decisions of the last Plenum of the C.C. C.P.G.B., the Political-Secretariat approves of the criticism of the opportunist errors committed by the C.C. as well as the changes in the political and organisational line of the Party in accordance with the decisions of the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. which it has mapped out. The Political-Secretariat draws the attention of the C.E.C. of the C.P. of Great Britain to the necessity for rendering more concrete the decisions of the Tenth Plenum in the daily activity of the Party. The Political-Secretariat considers as absolutely correct the decision of the C.E.C. to concentrate now all Party forces on the widest campaign for the exposure of the pseudo-Labour and imperialist character of the MacDonald Government which has most strikingly demonstrated its treason to the interests of the working class: (1) in the treacherous rôle in the Lancashire lock-out; (2) in retaining the Anti-Trade Union Act which was carried after the suppression of the General Strike by the Conservative Government; (3) in the non-recognition of the U.S.S.R. despite the obligation that the British Labour Party undertook before the working class during the elections; (4) in the continuation of the Tory policy of oppression in relation to the colonies (the Meerut trial and shooting down strikers in India, the bloody slaughters of Arabian insurgents and inciting them against the Jews and vice versa in Palestine, the Egypt Treaty,

etc.), as well as the continuation of the imperialist policy of the Conservatives at The Hague Conference. The British Party must link up this main political task with a most active recruiting campaign for membership and for press subscribers in the factories. This campaign must be carried out with the most active participation of all Party committees, locals and nuclei of the M.M. and of the Left elements of the various working class organisations, and linked up with the task of bringing into existence as quickly as possible a Party daily paper. Only by realising this most vital and important task will the Party secure a wide possibility of mobilising the working masses for a struggle against the MacDonald Government, of concentrating all its efforts on the factories, and thus carrying into effect the resolution of the C.E.C. to bring about those changes outlined in the resolution. Therefore the creation of a daily not later than January 1st, 1930, must be placed as the central task of all Party organisations, and the entire C.P. of Great Britain.

Finally, pointing out the lack of self-criticism in the resolution of the C.E.C. in connection with the August 1st campaign against the menace of imperialist war, the Political-Secretariat proposes to the C.E.C. to take steps towards the wielding of the widest self-criticism in all Party organisations, ruthlessly disclosing all defects and shortcomings of the Party and mapping out practical ways and means for their elimination.

EDITORIAL NOTE: On page 884 of the issue of October 1st, an error appeared. The Resolution of the Aggregate Meeting of the London District was headed "Resolutions of the London District *Labour* Party . . ." The word "Labour" should not have appeared.

