

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 9 No. 51

17th September 1929

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliessfach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

Tenth Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

Full Report.

Continuation of the Discussion on the Reports of Comrades Kuusinen and Manuilsky.

Twelfth Session.

9th July 1929.

Comrade TANAKA (Japan):

Comrades,

The main feature of the third period exists also in the Japanese conditions. The instability of capitalist stabilisation, the growing acuteness of the class struggle, the revival of the revolutionary movement are incontestable facts. This confirms the correctness of the definition given by the VI. Congress of the C. I. At the present juncture, a characteristic feature of Japanese capitalism is concentration of capital and production, trustification, cartellisation, increased tendency towards state capitalism, rationalisation of industry at the expense of the workers. Although the productivity of labour is increasing as a result of greater exploitation and oppression of the workers, this greater productivity of labour is unable to find outlets and sources of raw material, which impedes the further development of Japanese capitalism. This is one side of the question. The other side is the adverse foreign trade balance of Japan. For instance, the deficit amounted between January and May 1929, to over 200 million Yen, which of course leads to a considerable depreciation of the Yen on the foreign money markets.

The capitalists who have obtained a state loan from the foreign powers to the amount of over 450 million Yen, are trying to get out of the situation which has been created by attracting foreign capital to enterprises in Manchuria and other regions under the influence of Japanese imperialism: participation of American capital in the South Manchuria Railway and investment of capital, together with the foreigners, in the Manchurian heavy industry, etc. The Japanese bourgeoisie is of course also introducing rationalisation into its industry, i. e. it increases the exploitation of the workers by lengthening the working day, reducing the wages, and by mass dismissals of

workers. Hence growing unemployment and lowering of the standard of living of the masses.

Moreover, in regard to agriculture the government is elaborating a bill providing for the control over all financial and economic organisations of agriculture. To put it briefly, agricultural co-operatives, banks, and other financial organisations will be entirely under the strict control of the Ministry of Agriculture. This means increased exploitation of the poorest section of the peasantry and the small farmers. Such a situation cannot of course widen the possibilities of the internal markets. On the contrary, it is narrowing them. Thus, Japanese capitalism is passing through a difficult period.

The Japanese bourgeoisie pursues an aggressive policy in its colonies, a policy of ruthless exploitation and oppression of the masses. The increased investments of capital in China, the construction of new enterprises and railways in Manchuria, penetration into Mongolia, etc., all this shows that Japan is pursuing an annexationist policy in China. Obviously, such an attitude is bound to be accompanied by an accentuation of conflicts between the imperialist powers for the division of China, namely, Great Britain, Japan, America. Japan's most formidable rival is America, with which Japan is contending for the construction of wireless stations and of the air fleet, as well as for a whole series of other concession-rights. To fight against America, Japan has made a secret treaty with Great Britain in spite of the differences which exist between her and that country. In this agreement, Japan has consented to the construction of a naval base of British imperialism in Singapore. On the understanding that the latter will "protect" the Caroline, Marshall and other islands of the Japanese colonies should the necessity arise. On the other hand, Great Britain has recognised the "special interests" of Japanese imperialism in Manchuria,

on the understanding that the latter must not interfere with Great Britain's proceeding in the south. It goes without saying, that the differences between Great Britain and Japan in regard to influence in China cannot be solved by such an agreement.

The seizure of Shantung by the Japanese imperialists had a twofold meaning: firstly, to divert attention from internal contradictions, and secondly, direct military action of conquest. Therefore, although all the armies are being evacuated now from Shantung, the Japanese imperialists are practically the rulers there, only by other methods.

Thus, the struggle between Japan, Great Britain and America for influence in China is becoming more and more acute, and the danger of a Japanese-America war which will be certainly part of another imperialist world war, is looming big.

In regard to war preparation the Japanese imperialists do not lag behind the other imperialist powers. The general test mobilisation of the country (which has been taking place from the end of June to the beginning of July) the test orders for war equipment and other material required for war to the economic organs, thorough stock-taking in the enterprises of all the branches of industry, on the one hand, and on the other hand, increase of armed forces in Manchuria, transference of the last army unit in Manchuria from Teirin to Chan Chun, elaboration of an annexationist plan in regard to North China and Mongolia in the event of war: etc., — all this is direct preparation for the forthcoming war, namely, for an imperialist war and, first and foremost, for war against the U. S. S. R. The grand naval manoeuvres in the Japanese Sea, as well as the army manoeuvres in the North are aimed at the U. S. S. R., as the chief enemy in the future war. Moreover, the consolidation of the armed forces on the Korean and North Chinese frontiers is also direct preparation for war against the Socialist workers country.

The growing capitalist contradiction were reflected in the reactionary policy of the government. Mass arrests of communists began on March 1928, and white terror is still raging. During the Coronation of the emperor in November 1928, several thousand revolutionary peasants and workers were arrested. Five of them were tortured to death.

During the 56th session of the Japanese Parliament, the only revolutionary deputy, comrade Yamamoto, fell victim of governmental repression on the day when parliament passed the Bill of death penalty for communists. Raids on the premises of revolutionary organisations, mass arrests of their active workers have become the order of the day in Japan. For instance, since March 1929, the premises of Left workers and peasants organisations have been searched several times by the police, and mass arrests have taken place: since April 16, 1929 about 2000 revolutionary workers and peasants have been arrested, and 260 of this number have been thrown into prison. The total number of people arrested on account of communism is about 900. The arrested comrades, including women and youths, are subjected to indescribable barbarous tortures. At present, no revolutionary workers and peasants meetings are allowed to be held in Japan. The revolutionary press is ruthlessly persecuted.

In spite of these brutal terrorist measures on the part of the government, the appalling living conditions of the working class as a result of capitalist rationalisation, are calling forth a Left orientation in the working class. Mass economic actions by workers are taking place throughout the country: the cotton operatives strike in Tokyo, Osaka and other towns (which affected 10,000 workers), the tramwaymen's strike and conflict in Tokyo and Yokohama and also Kobe, the conflict in the biggest electric enterprise "Tokyo-Dento" which employs over 15,000 workers. Thus, economic and political pressure on the working class compels the latter to defend its existence by fighting for it, and through this fight the working class is becoming more and more revolutionised.

On the other hand, the pauperisation of the small peasantry and small-holders is obvious. Owing to semi-feudal exploitation on the part of the big landlords and the exploitation of monopolist imperialism they are struggling for land. This struggle has been taking lately the form of a regular rebellion. The attempt to "save" these small lease holders by the redemption of peasant land, ended in fully exposing the class character of the government as defender of the interests of the bour-

geoisie and big landowners. Thus, agrarian conflicts are becoming more and more acute. The attempt made by the government to pacify the peasants has proved to be abortive. Moreover, the "regulation of the over-population of the country", the diminution of the great mass of urban and rural unemployed by means of their emigration to foreign countries does not take place now on as large a scale as before. Because "over-population" goes on too rapidly, while North and South America, the chief countries of Japanese immigration, are either not allowing immigration from Japan, or are limiting it as much as possible. Hence, the new policy of the Japanese bourgeoisie which amounts to the expulsion of Koreans from Korea and their substitution by Japanese. The same thing happens in Formosa.

This policy is of a twofold character, Firstly, as I have already said the preparation for war, and secondly, the enhancement of the exploitation of Koreans and suppression of the revolutionary movement in the colonies. We have witnessed lately the powerful development of the Trade Union movement and of peasant conflicts in Korea and Formosa: the Gensan dockers' strike, the peasant conflict in North Korea, the development of peasant conflicts in Formosa, etc. The participation of devoted Communists in these struggles and in their leadership is also becoming stronger. These are important factors in the struggle for the overthrow of Japanese imperialism. That is why the government, fearing this development of the workers and peasants movement, has established a Colonial Ministry for the suppression of this movement and for increased exploitation.

Under such conditions, the Japanese Communist Party has conducted and is conducting its work. Its political influence is certainly growing, in spite of brutal terrorism and the threat of death sentences. For instance, during the coronation in December 1928, street demonstrations were organised by our Party in various parts of the country. These demonstrations, which were held under the slogans "Down with the Mikado", "Long live the workers and peasants' government", were organised for the first time by our Party. In this connection, we must recall the assassination of the then general secretary of the Japanese Communist Party comrade Vatanaba, one of the founders of the Japanese Communist Party who was to lead this campaign against the emperor. On the day of comrades Vatanaba's and Yamamoto's funeral, workers and peasants demonstrations were organised in many Japanese towns. They took place under the slogan "defence of the Communist Party", "Immediate release of political prisoners," etc., in some places (for instance in the Nagano district) the police erected barricades to defend the police stations from the attacks of the demonstrators who were demanding the release of their comrades.

During the May Day demonstration of 1929, the slogan was raised "Long live the Communist Party of Japan!" in spite of threats, arrests and tortures. There were sanguinary collisions between demonstrators and police in many places, but the bourgeois newspapers did not mention them.

In regard to a legal "proletarian" party, one can say that our Party has already overcome this wrong interpretation of what a proletarian party should be. At present the idea of the necessity to form a Communist Party prevails not only in the narrow circles of class conscious workers, but, also, (although potentially) among the mass of the workers.

On the 4th of April 1929, a conference of law court officials was called to discuss methods and means to suppress Communist activity. At this conference, the Attorney General, Koyama, made the following statement:

"... We witness now a revival of the Communist Party. Although we arrested and threw into prison over 600 Communists last year, the activity of the Communist Party, far from ceasing, is extending. It therefore behoves us, in regard to the labour movement, to concentrate our attention first and foremost on the activity of the Communist Party..."

Thus, the Communist Party of Japan has become an important factor in the political life of the country. This statement of the Attorney General, Koyama, shows that our Party is developing its work and is in close contact with the masses in the enterprises.

In regard to trade union work, progress has been made. There has been, for instance, a campaign to organise a delegate conference of factory workers, etc. But there are also many shortcomings: inability to co-ordinate spontaneous economic struggles, and inadequate preparation for these struggles.

The Party has made a big stride in regard to international education. Since March, it has been carrying on propaganda in connection with August 1st, and the necessity of participating in this campaign by means of demonstrations and strikes or other mass actions. It has also conducted a campaign for active participation in the conference of the Pacific Trade Union Secretariat and in the II. Congress of the League Against Imperialism, etc.

I want to say now a few words about the role of social democracy in Japan. In our country, the social-democrats have become quite openly an appendage of the bourgeoisie. They do not conceal any longer their hostility to the Communist Party. While the Right social-democrats openly declare their readiness to defend "His Majesty" the Emperor, the "Left", are concealing the real character of the Mikado, whereas the Communist Party is carrying on an energetic struggle for the abolition of the monarchy. The Right social-democrats are openly betraying the workers during industrial struggles and are delivering them over to the bourgeoisie. Although the "Left" social-democrats indulge in revolutionary phraseology, they play in reality a similar role as the Right. Thus, "Left" social-democrats are becoming more and more counter-revolutionary.

Thus, all social-democrats, from the Right to the "Left", are defending not the interests of the workers, but those of the bourgeoisie with whom they are making common cause against the Communist Party and the Comintern. Therefore, energetic struggle against them is one of the most important tasks of our Party.

The main defects of our Party are: firstly, its political influence on the masses is still inadequately consolidated organisationally owing to the brutal white terror and the Party's inexperience in underground work; secondly, we have as yet no definite programme in regard to the agrarian and peasant question; thirdly, inadequate leadership in industrial struggles, and inadequate preparation for them.

The main tasks confronting the Communist Party of Japan are: organisational consolidation of its political influence; special formation and consolidation of factory nuclei in the enterprises, conduct and leadership of economic struggles in enterprises, systematic planned out preparation for the struggles, immediate elaboration of an agrarian programme, leadership on the peasant war against the landowners, training of new cadres, struggle against all reformists, especially against the "Left" social-democrats, consolidation of international relations (especially close contact with the Communist Parties of China, Indonesia, India, Formosa and Korea).

All these tasks must be closely linked up with the struggle against imperialist war and war against the U. S. S. R., as well as with the struggle for the overthrow of the Japanese bourgeois-feudal regime.

If we do justice to all these tasks under the leadership of the C. I., we will be victors in the forthcoming class struggles for the overthrow of Japanese imperialism.

Comrade LOT-IN (Y. C. L. China):

Comrades, I want to draw your attention to the agricultural crisis in many colonial countries this year, and especially to the great famine in China. Famine in colonial countries is not an infrequent phenomenon. It happens almost every year. But this year, it is worse than ever before. The reason of this is clear to all of us. Under imperialism, the bankruptcy of the colonial peasants in particular causes this uninterrupted agricultural crisis. In China the famine area increases year by year without being able to be recovered. But what will be the consequence of this crisis? On the one hand, it drives the peasants away from their native lands to privation, while on the other hand, usury capital develops and the great reserves army of the proletariat thus created will further worsen the living condition of the colonial proletariat. Any attempt of the native bourgeoisie to utilise it for capitalist development

will be easily hampered by the imperialists. Only the imperialists will utilise it to conquer the native industry. This in fact is how the imperialists create agricultural crisis in colonial countries and in turn utilise it. We must point this out in order to fight against any rudiment of de-colonisation theory in our ranks, and to complete the picture of the devastating effect of imperialism in the Third Period.

I will now deal with the English question. The English question, comrades, is of great importance, especially after the Labour Party came into power. The importance of the Labour Government is world-wide. In England, we can see clearly that the radicalisation of the proletariat necessitates a god leadership of the Party. In the General Election it became obvious that the Party was very weak in carrying out the election campaign. During the discussions here the English comrades have been trying to cover up their weaknesses by saying that in the General Election, we polled so small a vote not because the English Party has not been carrying out the line of the C. I., but because of certain secondary reasons such as the lack of a daily paper, and so on. But not one of the English comrades spoke a word about their mistakes, the delay in carrying out the C. I. line and the wavering even in the election campaign. Therefore, we can say that the English comrades still lack the courage and the spirit of self-criticism.

We have talked for a long time about the fight against the Left elements of the social-democrats in all countries and of the fight against Cook and Maxton in England as our greatest enemies. The danger of Cook and Maxton is still greater after the General Election, after the coming to power of the Labour Party. How does the English Party fight against them? In the literature that I have been able to get hold of of the British Party for the General Election, there is no word against Cook and Maxton; and Comrade Campbell in his speech, when he enumerated the tasks of the C. P. G. B., after the General Election, also did not say one word to the effect that the C. P. must fight more seriously against the I. L. P. Comrade Bell said that the political line of the English Party is correct, but that there are only a number of shortcomings. I must say, that the examples which I have already given, and also the speech of Comrade Campbell, who said that the greatest danger in England is still the Left danger, all these show that in the C. P. G. B. there is something more than shortcomings.

I want to say to the British comrades that we are very anxious to see a strong Communist Party in Great Britain, that the Chinese Revolution, the Indian Revolution and the revolutionary movement of the whole world will meet with more difficulties unless we have a strong Party in Great Britain.

Now I come to the question of India. The Indian revolution at the present time is characterised by the spontaneity of its development, which is quite similar to the Chinese Revolution in 1925. For example, in Bombay before the strike there were only a few hundred members in the trade unions, but after the strike they increased to several tens of thousands. Comrades, the situation which now faces us in India is different from the situation formerly in China, in that the native bourgeoisie already became counter-revolutionary; it is absolutely necessary to have a strong leadership of the proletariat in the Indian revolution. Therefore I think it is necessary to point out in the resolution of the Plenum and also in our later work some of the more detailed tactical questions and tasks confronting our Indian comrades. I think that the experiences of the Chinese Party should be of help to our Indian Party at the present time. I want to mention some of the important experiences of the Chinese Revolution which are very useful for India to-day.

The first one is to establish strong lower organisations such as factory nuclei of the Party, and the trade unions in the factories in order to build up a strong Party and a strong revolutionary trade union movement. In this way we will have a much stronger revolutionary movement in India, ensuring the leadership of the proletariat, and it will be much more difficult for the reactionary forces to destroy such a movement than it was in China.

Secondly there is the question of the united front. In order to carry out the united front we must have a clear class basis for our united front, and the work must be done from

below. It must not be done as it was in China. The greatest fault of united front tactics in China is that we frequently forget the above-mentioned principles in practical work.

We can witness now in India the introduction of some sort of arbitration for the settlement of strikes. Sometimes a strike breaks out and the Government or reformists come in with arbitration. This will be very injurious to our movement; it will weaken the fighting spirit of the proletariat, weaken our leadership, and facilitate the transforming of a revolutionary situation into terrorist regime as now in China. In China we have made the greatest mistake of not fighting, but even helping the arbitration in Canton and Wuhan. In India it is necessary to fight decisively against any forms of arbitration whether it is introduced by the government or by the reformists.

The experience of the Chinese Revolution shows the great role of the Y. C. L. in the revolution. In India, the Y. C. L. organisation is very small and weak. It is absolutely necessary to set before our Indian Party the task of establishing a strong mass Y. C. L.

I will conclude by saying a few words about China. Our Party has come out of its difficult situation and gradually stabilised, and is resuming the leadership of the working mass. The most dangerous situation in the Party was in March this year, when the Shanghai Committee of the Party carried on a factional struggle against the C. C. Such a factional struggle, of course, is very dangerous for an illegal Party. Fortunately the C. C. was able to put a clear and rapid end to the struggle, and the C. C. of the Y. C. L. played a very big part in this work.

After the counter-revolution, our Party fought seriously against the pessimistic elements and waverers and vacillators. We are continuing to clear away all those vacillations in our Party, especially at present, when the revolution is reviving with rapid tempo in China. In this year there were many workers, tens of thousands, involved in the strikes, and there were also wide demonstrations in many important towns on May 1st, and especially during the anniversary of May 30th in Shanghai. Workers and students even destroyed the office of the organ of the Kuomintang and another reactionary daily newspaper. These are the symptoms of the growth of the revolutionary movement. The Party, though stabilised, is still lagging behind the radicalisation of the workers. The cause of this is that we have still so many vacillations in the Party, especially the Right danger, not yet cleared up, and that we lack new methods and forms of mass work. But one of the most important causes is the weakness of the trade union movement, for which we still have no real definite tactic, as pointed out correctly by Comrade Piatnitsky. I hope that in the second point of our agenda, we shall treat this question and give a good solution to it. The C. I. and its Sections must pay more attention to the Chinese Revolution, which is not only not defeated as hoped by Trotsky, but is growing again with rapid tempo, and will be one of the great driving forces for the victory of the international proletarian revolution in the nearest future.

Comrade DI-VITTORIO (Communist Fraction of the International Peasant Council):

In the present situation, in addition to the classic contradiction of the capitalist regime which consists in the unequal development of agriculture and industry, we have a very serious contradiction within agriculture itself. The mechanisation of agriculture and the technical progress which has been accomplished in the agricultural field have affected merely the capitalist section of agriculture; this has involved a progressive impoverishment of the poor and middle peasant elements. This contradiction contributes to the acceleration of the process of class differentiation in the rural districts and makes class conflicts more acute.

On the other hand, the industrialisation of the capitalist section of agriculture involves an ever-increasing influence of finance capital in agriculture. Finance capital in agriculture favours the solidarity of interests between the agrarian bourgeoisie and the industrial bourgeoisie and facilitates the formation of a political bloc of the whole bourgeoisie under the hegemony of finance capital. The agricultural, financial, tariff, credit policy, etc., as well as the policy of prices of the ca-

pitalist states and of the bourgeoisie in this period, aims always at mitigating the conflicts of interest which may arise between the industrial bourgeoisie and the agricultural bourgeoisie, and aims at strengthening more and more the solidarity of interests of the whole bourgeoisie at the expense of the working class and the labouring peasantry.

The sharpness of the agricultural crisis is determined not only by the relative over-production of American and European capitalist agriculture, but also by the under-consumption of the working masses in almost all countries.

In concluding with this point it can be ascertained that the period of relative stabilisation of capitalism and the rise of industrialisation, not only have brought no relief to the poor and middle peasantry, but have made their situation still worse. Consequently, the attempts of capitalism to solve these contradictions have succeeded only in accentuating them still more and in increasing the poverty of the toiling peasantry and accelerating the process of class differentiation. The movements and uprisings of the labouring peasants against the agricultural bourgeoisie and against the whole capitalist regime are growing more and more frequent. The poor peasantry is struggling against excessive taxes and against expropriation of their land by capitalism. We recall the uprising of the Greek peasants against taxation, the frequent local revolts of the peasantry in Italy against the authorities and against the fascist regime of famine and terror; the peasant movements in West Ukraine oppressed by Polish fascism; the mass participation of the Polish peasants in the May First demonstrations; the growth of the revolutionary peasant movement in France, in the United States and in a number of other countries; and the heroic struggle of the peasant masses of Mexico in which peasants like Comrade Rodriguez gave their lives in the struggle as true revolutionary fighters, etc.

All these facts prove, comrades, that the capitalist regime in this period of relative stabilisation, subjects the working class as well as the poor and middle peasant elements to the same regime of increasing exploitation, systematic robbery and political oppression. Consequently, the radicalisation to be observed among the working class on a world scale is accompanied by an increasing radicalisation of the labouring peasantry. But the radicalisation of the labouring peasantry does not mean that the labouring peasants are automatically approaching the working class and its revolutionary vanguard.

The various elements of the agrarian bourgeoisie, which have a vast experience in demagogy and deception of the peasantry, are attempting to draw the peasants under their influence by new methods of work and new forms of organisation in order themselves to utilise these peasants and to turn their discontent against the working class, exploiting all factors of opposition between the rural districts and the towns. This means that in order to win the labouring peasants over to the revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Bloc, a systematic, tenacious and methodical activity is necessary on the part of all Communist Parties. In France, for example, where the labouring peasantry, disillusioned, is revolting against the old political parties that have deceived it and exploited it for dozens of years, we see that the bourgeoisie has established a new agrarian party with a very "democratic" demagogic label in order to attempt to draw back under its influence and the influence of capitalism the elements of the peasantry which are breaking away from them.

In Germany the nationalist and fascist parties have attained almost complete monopoly of the leadership of the peasants who want to struggle against the excessive taxes and against the robbery exercised by the imperialism which was victorious in the last war.

Since the VI. World Congress, the attitude of the Party to the peasant question has undergone a certain change. But this is not enough. For example, the experience of Italian fascism and Polish fascism, as far as the rural districts are concerned, has not yet been assimilated by our Communist Parties, and is not utilised in the propaganda and agitation in the rural districts against fascism, which is forever seeking its social basis primarily in the rural districts. In many countries fascism has succeeded in organising an important section of the peasant masses and mobilising them against the working class, that is to say, against Communism and against the proletarian revolution.

The experience of fascism in Italy and Poland could serve as excellent material for all Communist Parties for carrying on the struggle against fascism in the rural districts. I regret very much comrades, that at this Plenum the question has not been brought up, of continuing and intensifying the struggle against fascism on the basis of the international anti-fascist congress in Berlin.

I believe that this Plenum should also make a criticism of this congress and of the anti-fascist activity developed in the different countries, and issue directives to our Parties with a view to linking up the struggle for the immediate daily demands of the working masses with the struggle against war and for the defence of the Soviet Union, and with the struggle against fascism.

There is another question, comrades, which I wish to emphasise: the struggle against the Right danger in our Parties. It is not necessary to explain here the reasons why the Right danger has its basis largely among the peasantry. It is for this reason comrades, that we believe that in the struggle against the Right danger, the Communist Parties must pay particular attention to the peasantry, above all to see to it that the peasant movement which is under the influence of the Communist Parties and the Communist fractions, has a correct revolutionary line, a Bolshevik line. And then, in order to take the necessary measures to prevent the revolutionary peasant movement in the various countries from falling under the monopoly of Right elements, and in order to prevent our peasant organisation from being the object or the basis of speculation and struggle of the Right elements against the line of the Communist Parties and the Communist International.

I wish to quote an episode which is very characteristic and very important in connection with the Right danger in the peasant part of Communist activity. In Czechoslovakia a district conference of the Communist Party, at which a member of the Polit-Bureau was present, discussed the peasant work of the Party. The following demands were issued:

1. Confiscation of the land without compensation, and its distribution among the peasants (this is correct in itself but requires a more complete formulation).

2. Revision of the present method of application of the agrarian reform so that in the transitional period land may be sold cheaply to the workers with amortisation credits for 30 years! Not one word about the abolishment of taxes for poor peasants.

As for the agricultural labourers, this same district conference of the Party disposed of the question with a single phrase: wage increases along the whole line.

The rank and file organisations of our Czechoslovakian Party in this region were composed chiefly of rich and middle peasants. The situation reached such a point that when the Party was in control of the municipality in the village of Isa, at the meeting of peasants called to determine the amount of taxes that each one should pay, the rich and middle peasants in the Party adopted a method of distributing taxes whereby the poor had to pay the same proportion as the rich, and agricultural labourers also had to pay taxes.

This shows how real the right danger is in our Parties, particularly in the work among the peasants, and why a relentless fight must be carried on against opportunism and against all right elements in connection with the improvement of the social basis of our party organisations, particularly in the country.

In conclusion, comrades, we believe that the objective situation is absolutely favourable to the development of the revolutionary peasant movement in all countries. The experience acquired up to now by the Red Peasant International proves this in a clear and absolute manner. It suffices to quote one example: In France we had revolutionary organisations which for several years had been limited to a restricted circle. Four months of intense and methodical activity was sufficient to enable our organisation to win over hundreds of local peasant organisations which broke away from organisations led by the bourgeoisie and the social democracy. Undoubtedly we made enough mistakes in this work, but it is by the extent to which we develop our activity, by the extent to which we transform our organisations into true mass organisations, and bring

about a struggle of the poor peasants masses against the agrarian bourgeoisie and against the capitalist regime, that we shall correct our mistakes.

Comrade HORNER (Great Britain):

An interpretation has been put upon the action of the British Central Committee which seeks to convey that in certain organisational changes the Central Committee has been instigated by a desire to penalise certain members of the Political Bureau for the Political Line which they are alleged to have adopted in the past. We oppose very strongly the estimation which is placed upon the comrades who have been transferred. It is not accepted by the British Party that Comrade Murphy and Comrade Gallacher are the guardians of the Comintern line inside the British Party. The greatest opposition to the repetition of the general strike slogan which grew out of defeatism, came from Comrade Gallacher, and the deepest expression of the Right menace inside the British Party, expressed in liquidating tendencies, came from Comrade Murphy.

The steps which we have taken were taken after a thorough consideration of the experiences which we underwent in the recent General Election and after the examination of the objective situation which is now facing our Party. In the General Election we discovered that our headquarters was very, very heavy compared with the needs of a Party of our size, and that our district and local organisations were very weak. We discovered that our Party was in fact constipated, that whilst it had a capacity to generate political leads at the top, there was no driving power within the Party to force these leads down to the lower ranks of the Party and into the masses of the British working class. The shock of the results of the General Election forced the Central Committee to an appreciation of the serious difficulties which were facing us if we continued along the old line and the old methods as directed from headquarters in the past.

There has been a tendency inside our Central Committee, in answering the contention that rationalisation was impossible, to exaggerate the favourable aspects of rationalisation in Britain. Those comrades who have argued that British capitalism can be rationalised have been the comrades who have at the same time argued that rationalised industry in Britain will increase the contradictions of British capitalism and make more precarious its condition.

We have visualised the situation in which large masses of unemployed workers will be thrown on the streets, and we have never been able to agree that these unemployed workers can be segregated and isolated; we have always seen these unemployed workers being utilised by the employers to reduce the wage standards of those in work, with the assistance of the trade union bureaucracy. It is futile to believe that the unemployed workers who are the consequence of rationalisation in any country can be satisfied by social assistance, for if capitalism is to pay full compensation for the consequences and the savings of rationalising industry by social benefits to the unemployed, there is no advantage to capitalism in rationalising industry.

We see the situation in which the Labour Government will enter openly into collaboration with the employers, and, with the assistance of a broad trade union apparatus, they will openly proceed to rationalise British industry at the expense first of the unemployed, and by the utilisation of the unemployed against those retained in employment, reduce the whole working and living conditions of the British working class. This is proved by the revelations of the last few days in England, where the MacDonald Government has proposed to set up an inquiry in the iron and steel industry with a view to discovering what methods can be adopted to rationalise this industry as a preliminary to any consideration of the demands that the workers are seeking to satisfy. A similar situation exists in the cotton and woollen textile industries, whilst in the coal industry the Labour Party is itself laying it down as a condition before even a reduction in the hours can be obtained, that steps shall be taken inside the mining industry, by the introduction of intensification processes, to make the reduced working day possible and practicable for capitalist industry. Therefore, we have to prepare for a long series of local wage attacks, a series of national attacks in all

the big industries of the country, and we have realised that in these struggles, by deeds and not by words alone, our Party must win its spurs. In the local struggles, as in Dawdon, one of the first acts of the MacDonald Government was to send a representative from the Mines Department among the miners, and get their agreement to accept conditions which the men for a period of 15 weeks had refused to accept from the owners.

Our Party sees a long series of battles, battles which in the course of being carried out, must become battles against the Labour Government and social democracy; and we have seen the possibility of sections of the trade unions, not unorganised workers only or mainly, but local branches and districts of different reformist trade unions, being driven against their nationalist reformist apparatus against the bureaucracy, and against the Labour Government. We realise as the most fundamental task before us that further work must be done not particularly or primarily in the trade union branches, but in the factories, mills and mines. And our Party has not yet learned how to fight in the mills, mines and factories outside of the apparatus of the trade unions, among the workers themselves. This understanding of the situation, this appreciation of our weaknesses and of our difficulties, forces our C. C. to take drastic organisational steps inside our Party. For many years there has been talk inside the British Party of introducing new elements into the Centre of the Party, but the men who have been removed from the centre to make room for these new elements ever since the Party was founded, are very few. Since the formation of the Party most of those who were there at the beginning are there now; and when isolated individuals have been introduced into the C. C. apparatus, it has been done not at the expense of or the removal of someone else, but by adding the new elements to the number already existing; and in every case where new elements have been added to the C. C., their effect has in this way been neutralised. The C. C. decided to reduce headquarters by 50% and to use the other 50% of the more mature political leaders for personal leadership in the localities in the face of the new difficulties, and to introduce the new line by action and not purely by circulars to the members of the Party. The Political Secretariat will, I hope, give a very serious examination of the personalities affected by these changes. It will be very difficult to discover or to declare after an examination has been made, that a Left tendency has been sacrificed or defenders of the C. I. line removed. Our C. C. has been remarkable for its criss-cross voting. C. C. members vote now for the Left, tomorrow for the Centre and the next day for the Right. This appears generally throughout the C. C., and those removed are no less culpable in this respect.

We are faced at headquarters with a conception among the leaders that work in the district is a degradation if you have once occupied a position in the C. C.; that is something we are having to contest. We believe that this has had the effect of completely isolating some of our leadership.

These things have to be faced, and all I require to do is to give the Plenum an understanding that there are two sides to this question and our C. C. was not moved by pique or spleen, but was very determined to understand our weaknesses, and to overcome these weaknesses; it has taken such steps as are deemed necessary in this direction, in order to bring about a position in the Party which would give it a new lease of life and would build up the Party for the tremendous tasks which now face us.

Comrade BEWER (Org. Department of the E. C. C. I.):

The Communist Parties are confronted now with enormous difficulties which cannot be solved without relentless self-criticism on a large scale within the Parties. This must be said again and again because, with a few exceptions, self-criticism has not been practised to the extent that it should.

In regard to self-criticism we have now two "deviations". One of them is — fear, timidity. Nine-tenths of the Parties are afflicted by it. The other is — overdoing self-criticism. When I listen, for instance, to Comrades from the Y. C. I., I get the impression that they are overdoing self-criticism. It is a decidedly ruthless self-criticism. I say it without any exaggera-

tion. As to the practical results of this ruthless self-criticism, they are almost nil. The Chinese comrades, too, are criticising themselves to such an extent that they practically destroy the basis for their further work. Self-criticism must not be self-criticism for self-criticism's sake. Self-criticism must have a concrete basis. In every separate case, every critical remark, must be supplemented by a practical proposal how the existing defect can be remedied, how one can ascertain if defects have been remedied, if correct measures were resorted to in the given case and how one should act in the future. I think that the main point about self-criticism now is self-criticism of the cadres. All Communist Parties approach this question more or less chaotically. After the VI. Congress, we had in a number of big Communist Parties a more or less important leadership crisis, from Central Committees down to local committees. The German Communist Party had to criticise severely its C. C., and as a result of this criticism the Party had to remove from the C. C. and even from the Party several prominent workers already before the Congress, in connection with the Wittorf affair. (Interjection: This is not self-criticism.)

It is self-criticism of the cadres. The C. C. of the German Communist Party, in its efforts to run the Party on the line of the VI. Congress, came to the conclusion that this would be impossible without serious self-criticism of the composition of the C. C. and without its purification from opportunist elements with whom it was impossible to work on the line of the decisions of the VI. Congress. In most cases, self-criticism of the leading cadres in the Communist Parties took place during the Party Congresses held lately. At nearly all these congresses it was decided that a radical revision of the composition of the Central Committee is absolutely necessary, as well as purification of the Central Committees from opportunist elements. The most thorough purification took place, as everyone knows, in Czechoslovakia: at the Party Congress only one member of the former majority of the C. C., Comrade Zapotocky, was re-elected, all the others were thrown out.

In France, just as in the C. P. G., a serious renovation of the composition of the Polit-Bureau and Secretariat took place before the Party Congress. The Congress fully endorsed these changes. Wherever such self-criticism did not take place at the Party Congresses, or where no congresses were held, the question of changes in the leading organs of the C. C. is more or less acute at present. There was, for instance, no Congress in the Polish Party, but the last Plenum of the C. C. declared that the composition of the Polit-Bureau must be changed: two members of the Polit-Bureau of a Right and opportunist tendency have been removed. In Belgium, the composition of the C. C. was not renewed at the Party Congress; neither the Polit-Bureau nor the Secretariat were renewed, with the result that the present C. C. of the Belgian Party is not up to the mark. The Comintern will have seriously to consider changes in the composition of the Polit-Bureau and the Secretariat of the C. P. B. Neither did a serious renovation of the composition of the C. C. take place at the Congress of the British Party, — the Secretariat and Polit-Bureau were formed mainly from the ranks of former functionaries, with the result that there is now at the Plenum a general demand for the renovation of the composition of the leading organs.

The example of the Czech Party shows that wherever the necessary changes and renovations in the leading organs were slow in coming, the work of the Party was seriously disorganised and even paralysed. The example of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party is very instructive; all Parties and the E. C. C. I. must take into account its lessons in regard to the Communist Parties where no revision of the composition of the leading organs has as yet taken place.

This question is particularly acute when concrete measures are taken in regard to direct leadership of the mass campaigns of the Party. During the recent industrial struggles we had the same picture everywhere, in Germany, Czechoslovakia, France, and in other countries. The fundamental leading cadre directly responsible for the work in mass organisations and enterprises acted frequently as a serious obstacle, as the chief impediment in the application of the decisions of the VI. Congress of the Communist International. It is obvious that one cannot put into practice the decisions of the VI. Congress re the new tactical line if we have members in the bureaux or district committees who, in their factional struggle against the

line of the VI. Congress, go the length of carrying decisions against the dissemination of the Party organ (this happened in several places in the Ruhr district). It is impossible to put into practice the decisions of the VI. Congress re the new line if there are at the head of factory nuclei secretaries (as was the case in Darmstadt during the Ruhr lock-out) who, not only failed to carry out the instructions of the Party re formation of committees of action, but even spoke at the general meetings of the workers against proposals made by the Party re formation of such committees. It is obvious that the decisions of the VI. Congress cannot be carried out unless such leaders are removed and replaced by others. During the textile strike in Czechoslovakia, leading comrades of revolutionary trade unions and a number of leading comrades in the local Party organisations did regular blacklegging work together with the reformists, driving the workers back to work and sabotaging the strike by other means. Similar incidents took place in France during the miners' strike. In the St. Etienne district, for instance, several leading Party members did their best to sabotage the strike. The general meeting of the local Party organisation in St. Etienne decided to throw them out of the Party and the revolutionary trade unions for their strike-breaking work. This measure was greeted enthusiastically by the non-Party St. Etienne workers. The result was: a considerable number of new members in a short time for the Party organisation and hundreds of new members for the local organisation of the unitary miners' union. This is a vivid example of the necessity of renovating the leading cadres of the Communist Party. Lenin used to say that such renovation is the crux of the matter, and this is particularly the case in regard to the application of the new tactical line laid down by the VI. Congress. One cannot possibly make even an attempt to carry out this line if the question of strengthening and renovating the leading cadres is not seriously considered, if this question is not taken up by all the Parties as their main task at the present juncture.

The question of reviewing the cadres which are now at the disposal of the individual Parties, of ascertaining to what extent these cadres are prepared and capable of carrying through the new line, the question of ascertaining if they will be perhaps the means of encouraging opportunist and social-democratic traditions, etc., must be considered very seriously without further delay. The Executive Committee of the Comintern must raise this question in regard to the Central Committees of the Communist Parties. There are still Parties in which a verification of the composition of the C. C.'s in regard to their capacity to carry through the new line has not yet taken place. There are also many Communist Parties where no new workers have been drawn into leading work from the lower organisations, workers who have learned a lesson from the recent industrial and political struggles through participation in them. This does not mean that a general decision must be made re obligatory and immediate change in the personal composition of the C. C.'s re expulsion from the Polit-Bureaux of comrades who have not shown themselves capable of leading the Party on the line laid down by the VI. Congress. But it certainly means (I say it most emphatically) that it is essential to raise immediately the question of drawing into leading work — at first perhaps as instructors, as chiefs of departments of the C. C., as members of boards — new workers from the lower Party organisations who have proved their capacity to work in enterprises, to organise strikes, political demonstrations, etc. We must in future promote more such active workers to responsible posts in the C. C.'s of the Communist Parties. In this respect the main thing is to select leading cadres in Party committees which lead directly the work in factory nuclei, in enterprises. But in some cases, promotion of instructors and heads of departments from the ranks of the lower Party organisations might not be sufficient, as this proved, for instance, to be the case with the formation of the new C. C. of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia, and also in several other Communist Parties.

Where are the new workers to come from? This question is asked by many people. The answer is very simple. The new workers must be taken from the ranks of proletarians who distinguished themselves during the recent industrial and political struggles. People will say that these workers are not developed enough politically, that they do not possess the necessary experience. I think that we must put the question

thus: what is better — a leader who deliberately sabotages the decisions of his C. C., who does not scruple to speak against the instructions of his Party at meetings of non-Party workers, and makes use of organisational and political experience to sabotage the Party line, or a worker who has not been in the Party very long, but who has organised one or two good strikes, one or two good demonstrations. I think that the choice is simple and natural — for the less experienced and, politically, less developed worker, and against the experienced, politically developed old functionary. It goes without saying, that, simultaneously, Comrade Piatnitsky's proposal re strengthening educational work and training new cadres must be carried out to the full.

A few words about practical tasks with regard to the preparation and carrying through of political strikes. In a number of countries, this question must be very seriously considered. Let us take, for instance, France. According to the material of the French Communist Party, the ground is prepared (as recently shown) for spontaneous solidarity strikes. A worker is dismissed for revolutionary work — immediately a spontaneous strike with the demand of the reinstatement of this worker breaks out. In some cases these strikes involve thousands of workers; they are conducted stubbornly for many days, and in some cases for weeks. This is one of the primitive forms of the political strike. It is incumbent on the Parties to explain the meaning and importance of such strikes and to develop and extend their area, which must be considered an important tactical task. Local Party organisations must be given corresponding instructions.

Side by side with such solidarity strikes, one must consider the question of organising protest strikes against any political moves on the part of the government and the employers. Comrade Semard has given us interesting facts of such strikes which have taken place lately in France and were directed against the treachery of the reformist bureaucrats. This is another form of political strike. All these questions must be considered by the Parties, and whenever the organisation of such a political strike is suggested, measures should be taken to prevent this strike being isolated: every strike of this kind should call forth strikes in the adjoining enterprises or in enterprises belonging to the same branch of industry. Care should be taken to induce workers in corresponding enterprises to down tools, to organise demonstrations outside these enterprises and outside barracks of army units which might be called up to suppress the strike. In this connection, the youth plays a special role. Initiative groups of the working youth must be formed (under the leadership of the Y. C. L.) to initiate revolutionary actions, to fight legality traditions in the ranks of Communist Parties, as well as in the ranks of trade unions and other mass organisations which participate in these movements.

Finally, a few words about the Italian Party. Comrade Piatnitsky accused the Italian Party of not sending any information lately about its internal life and especially about the work of the Party in fascist trade unions. Comrade Ercoli declared that this accusation is unfounded, that there is much information in the apparatus of the E. C. C. I. about the internal life of the Italian Party. I have carefully examined this material and must say that it does not contain concrete data about the work of the Party in fascist trade unions; there are all sorts of material about the economic and political situation, the position and tasks of the Party, but there is nothing about the work done in the Fascist unions. In all this voluminous material I found only the following lines in regard to work in fascist trade unions: "Party members have not paid hitherto sufficient attention to work in the fascist trade unions. The line of the C. C. on this question is not yet known to the membership." It is obvious that since the line of the C. C. is not yet known to the members of the Party, no serious work can be done, no matter how correct the Party line is. Thus, it seems that the question of work in fascist trade unions is among the questions which have only been raised but not solved by any means. To know how to help the Italian Party in this work is a big and very difficult task, and one must certainly not harbour the illusion that mountains can be moved in this connection in a few days or even months.

I think that the E. C. C. I. should seriously discuss the situation in the C. P. of Italy in connection with what Com-

rade Molotov said re lack of determination, firmness, and perseverance in the C. P. I. in regard to the fulfilment of the tasks which are now confronting the Party. I will give you presently extracts from the resolution of the last Plenum of the C. C. of the Italian Party re struggle against the war danger. I will not say that this resolution is wrong in general, but it contains a whole series of characteristic points which, I think, should be made known to the Plenum. Firstly, this resolution, drawn up at the end of February 1929, raises the question of struggle against the danger of imperialist war as follows:

"side by side with the documents of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, the resolution of the C. C. of the Italian Communist Party of June 1927, must serve as a basis for the work of the Communist Party."

One is naturally inclined to ask if between June 1927 and February 1929 nothing has changed in the world including the Italian Communist Party.

(Ercoli: This is the resolution re the analysis of the Italian imperialism.)

Quite so, but the world situation has changed since 1927, and it is obvious that practical tasks connected with the anti-war struggle must be linked up with this change in the world situation. It cannot be otherwise. And yet, in the resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. I. of February 1929, the resolution of 1927 is taken as the basis for the organisation of the struggle against the danger of imperialist war. I do not think that, politically, this is a correct way of raising the question. In the same resolution, practical questions are put as follows. To the question what practical tasks the Party is setting itself, the resolution says — agitation and propaganda and publication of a whole series of pamphlets. Then, in regard to the mode of work in the army, the resolution puts the question thus:

"To develop this work only within certain limits, taking into consideration its difficult character."

In our Bolshevik Party, we are in the habit of putting this question quite differently: considering that the said task is of enormous importance for the overcoming of the existing great difficulties, the work should be given as great an impetus as possible, in order to overcome all these difficulties. The resolution puts it quite differently: the task is important, but the work should be carried on only within certain limits, taking into consideration existing difficulties. Is this correct? I think that it is not.

(Ercoli: One must only undertake tasks which can be solved.)

Of course, one must always undertake tasks which can be solved. But the resolution says something different, it sets limits to the tasks in view of the difficulty of the work. This is something quite different. Evidently, this formulation is not accidental because a little further down the resolution contains the following statement:

"Parallel with the development of our organisational work, it will be possible to discuss the organisation of soldiers' groups."

The resolution subordinates this task to the task of the general consolidation of the whole organisational work of the Party. One cannot put the question in this manner. I could give you several analogous quotations from this resolution which follow the same line. My impression is that, owing to the desire to protect the organisation from police attacks, there is in the C. P. I. the danger of the whole Party work being placed on a wrong basis. Party organisation becomes an aim in itself, political tasks are subordinated to the safety of the organisation. I am afraid that this might lead to a relaxation of the political activity of the Party, and to an opportunist distortion of the line. This apprehension is confirmed especially by the reports of the representatives of the C. P. I. on the preparations of the Party for August 1st.

All these questions are such that they will have to be carefully discussed with the representatives of the C. P. of Italy on the basis of the availing material.

Comrade FLYG (Sweden):

Comrades, So far in the debate the Swedish Party has been the object of critical remarks. It stands to reason that our Party, as a consistent proletarian party that is constantly active, must have committed mistakes which should be criticised and put right. Before speaking about these mistakes, I should like to say a few words on the present strength and the present influence of our Party.

We now have a membership of over 18,000. If we think of it that after the fight against Höglund in 1924 we had about 7000 members, it means that we have gained 11,000 new members in the course of five years. This is unquestionably a rapid increase, and these figures should naturally suggest the question: in what manner have these members been won. We may state in this connection that our members have been won by energetic practical work and by constant intensification of the struggle against social democracy. Immediately after the termination of the fight against Höglund we organised an aggressive recruiting campaign which had a clear political content. There were numerous recruiting campaigns conducted in this manner, and they were always associated with some special action. Thus, the fight against the naval programme of the S. P. of Sweden was associated with the recruiting of members, as was also our countryside propaganda against the compulsory laws, our Sacco-Vanzetti campaign, the trade union conflicts, etc.

Furthermore, we should not forget the radicalisation process which is going on also among the masses of the workers in Sweden. Workers who used to be either hostile or indifferent to the Party are today listening to our side. A good instance of this was furnished by the election campaign of last year. The Party obtained the heaviest poll in this campaign than we have ever had — over 151,000 votes. This was an increase of 138.3% in our poll as compared with 1924. We had to face a united bloc of the Rights including the social democracy, which organised its entire press, all its speakers, and the whole of its apparatus for the fight against the Communists. Every elector was bombarded with propaganda about the "knavish communists". In spite of all this, we polled 151,000 votes. And we could record with satisfaction that our greatest increase took place partly in the towns and partly in the industrial localities where we had a good organisation.

The election campaign enabled us to ascertain serious defects in the Party, notably our feeble influence among the masses of the rural population, e. g. in Norrbotten. In that district there is a big proletarian rural population which supported the Rights and the social-democrats in the election. According to their social status these elements properly belong to us, nevertheless we failed to get in organisational touch with them, and to secure their backing for our programme of action. This defect must be eliminated.

Moreover, there are also industrial localities in which we have either failed to gain a foothold, or our influence is too slight. It is one of our chief tasks to form good organisations in all such localities. Bearing in mind that there are trade unions with more than 100,000 members which follow the slogans of our Party, and that we have polled 151,000 votes in last year's election, we should note a clear disproportion between our membership of 18,000 and the masses over which we have influence. The slogan raised by Comrade Manuilsky in his pamphlet "One Year after the VI. World Congress of the C. I. says: "Get into the factories! Every factory a citadel for the communists!" This slogan holds good also in Sweden.

It is also clear that if our Party has grown so strong, if we lay such stress upon the need for further growth, it is also one of our most urgent tasks to see to the ideological communist education and training of our members, to the creation of efficient cadres. The E. C. C. I., in its letter to us of May 2nd, pointed out that the greatest weakness of our Party consists in the lack of ideological clarity. This is quite correct, and we must exert all our efforts to obviate this grave defect. Nevertheless, a wrong picture is obtained of our Party if it is considered a monster of unclarity. The members of our Party are certainly, at least, at an equally high level as the comrades in the Parties of countries of a similar character to Sweden. Our comrades have not yet gone through the hard and highly instructive school of the open revolutionary struggle,

without which a Party can hardly become a bolshevist Party. Nevertheless, since 1924 we have grown in the ideological respect, even if we are not yet so strong as we should be in regard to the big tasks with which we are now confronted.

Some comrades say: the danger to our Party is in the newly won members; others say: the danger to our Party is in the old members which we have retained in the Party. Both these lines of argument are wrong. There can never be danger to a Party in having proletarian members as long as among no group of these members is a non-Communist line to be observed which leads away from the Comintern. No, the danger is in the fact that the C. C. of our Party does not seriously realise this quantitative growth and the necessity of achieving qualitative growth in equal measure. In common with all the Sections of the Comintern, our Party should concentrate upon winning the masses. This is achieved not only by the quantitatively strong Parties, but by Parties which are strong both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Now a few words about our mistakes. Comrade Manuilsky has spoken here about our parliamentary action on the question of disarmament. A few words on the situation in which our motion was introduced. The social-democratic group in Parliament had moved for a new "enquiry into our state of defence" for the purpose of investigating the "expediency and efficiency of Swedish militarism". The Rights and the Radicals urged the rejection of this motion. There was also extensive pacifist propaganda going on at the same time in the country under the leadership of the distinctly petty-bourgeois peace organisation. Our Parliamentary group was conscious of the fact that the Left Social-Democrats, the Social-democratic pacifists would take advantage of the situation to deliver speeches advocating disarmament in order to deceive the masses in the country. Our Party decided, therefore, to introduce the Disarmament Motion, in order to be able to expose before the working class the humbug contained in the declarations of the "left" social-democrats. Furthermore, our comrades in their speeches were to expound our principles on the question of disarmament. Our press was to manoeuvre so as to expose the situation and the underlying idea of our group when the Motion was made. With all this, it seems to me that there is no difference of opinion on the question whether the motion was a mistake or not. We are all agreed that it was a mistake to introduce the motion. Nevertheless the majority of the C. C. refuses to recognise this mistake as one of a pacifist-opportunist character. The members of the parliamentary group are no pacifists. A few days prior to our disarmament manoeuvre, our parliamentary group had quite distinctly opposed a motion by the social-democrats which asked for a subsidy to the pacifist peace organisations. If our group were pacifistically or opportunistically inclined, this deviation would have been revealed during the discussion on this question.

It was a further mistake that this action was not handled by our Press in the manner intended. The introduction of the motion was not commented upon in the manner anticipated by the group, while the character of the manoeuvre was not emphasised.

Another mistake mentioned by Comrade Manuilsky was the postponement of the May-Day demonstration in Stockholm. While Comrade Manuilsky showed a proper sense of proportion when dealing with this mistake, Comrade Ulbricht magnified it into a mortal sin. Allow me to say a word or two on the situation before dealing with this matter. There was extraordinarily inclement weather throughout the country, with snow and rainstorms. Telegrams were received from several provincial localities urging the postponement of the demonstration, because very slight attendance could be expected. The answer was that demonstrations should nevertheless be carried out. The same weather conditions prevailed in Stockholm, and the place of gathering as well as the streets leading to the place were almost empty. One worker after another came to the Headquarters of the Party organisation in Stockholm, urging the postponement of the demonstration for Sunday, 5th May. The secretary of the Stockholm Party organisation was at first undecided, but when everybody urged postponement, he gave in and he enquired by telephone at the social-democratic quarters whether they would go on with the de-

monstration or not. He declared afterwards that if the social-democrats had marched, the Communists would not have given up the march.

It is, therefore, untrue to say that "leading officials" of the Stockholm organisation had run to the social-democrats and bargained with them about postponing the demonstration. It is true that nobody turned up to speak at the place of assembly. The secretary of our Stockholm organisation declares that he made several attempts to secure a speaker, but everybody refused, because it was senseless. Those assembled were informed that the demonstrations were postponed for the 5th May. There was absolutely no understanding with the social-democrats in this matter.

Our Party Secretariat has not dealt with this question. The Secretariat has taken notice of the decision of the management of the Stockholm Party organisation on this question, in which the comrades expressed their dissatisfaction that no speaker had come to address the gathering. Moreover, the fact is that the official responsible for this case, one of our very best Party workers, is still at his post.

Comrade Ulbricht was also informed in my report that precisely the workers who, he thinks, would teach the C. C. what should be said in this question — that it was precisely these workers who had taken the initiative and demanded the postponement of the demonstration. Why? Because they wanted a mass demonstration, because they saw that the whole thing would end in a fiasco. I believe I may say that both these workers and the responsible official had a good intention. If the postponement of the demonstration was an opportunistic mistake, it was due in this case to the good intention of having a giant demonstration instead of a crowd of a few hundreds.

On Sunday, May 5th, over 25,000 workers marched under our banners. We were then able also to inform them about the Zörgiebel massacre in Berlin and to organise a mass protest.

Comrade Ulbricht is also indignant over the declaration by members of the C. C. that it was not right to hold open mass meetings against the splitting of the trade unions. To this Comrade Ulbricht replied: "It seems to me that in the Swedish C. C. there are also some people who may be described as bourgeois, who are probably more bourgeois than those workers who took part in such manifestations." Comrade Ulbricht, this is very serious language, particularly when it comes from such a prominent member of the Comintern. It happened, however, that those who expressed the ideas cited by Comrade Ulbricht were not members of the C. P., but two invited comrades: one worker and one trade union official. Their utterances were promptly and categorically repudiated by the comrades Linderot and Samuelson, and were not supported by any member of the C. C. However, I know these two comrades very well and I resent the attempt of describing them as bourgeois. This is a term of abuse, Comrade Ulbricht, and of such a kind as should not be used in a discussion at the Comintern Plenum.

A third critic of our Party is Comrade Khitarov. As a proof of the backwardness of our Party, he mentioned the fact that we formed joint fractions with the social-democrats on the communal councils. Had Comrade Khitarov asked for our explanations on this question, we should have told him that our C. C. had long since given instructions for the dissolution of these fractions. This has been particularly the case in Norbotten, where our Party was in a particular position on account of its strong influence. After the resolution on the communal question carried by our last meeting of the C. C., this fraction may be considered entirely a matter of the past.

Comrade Khitarov sees further a Right deviation in the fact that the majority of the C. C. have not realised that Sweden is an imperialist country. We readily admit that we lack clarity on this subject. There is keen competition and rivalry in Sweden between British and American imperialism. I am not quite sure at this moment which of these powers is wielding today the greatest influence on Swedish economy and politics. It is quite possible that the majority of the chief spokesman among the Swedish Rights, and consequently in the majority of the present government, are closely allied with British imperialism. Nevertheless I do believe that we should postpone our final judgement as to the imperialist degree of Swedish capitalism until we have properly investigated this

question. On these grounds I am against committing the Party to a definite but useless formula. Moreover, it is clear that Swedish capitalism is pursuing a very vigorous policy of expansion in its own interests, just as it has its own direct interests in the war preparations against the Soviet Union. No one is going to say that these war preparations will be less energetic through the eventual prevalence of either American or British influence upon Swedish capitalism. We fully realise that the war danger directly confronts also the Swedish working class, and we are going to apply all the means in our power to demonstrate this to the largest possible masses of Swedish workers on the 1st of August.

In common with the other Sections, our Party is approaching severe fights. The expulsion threats against our comrades in the trade unions, the open discussion in the bourgeois and social-democratic press about the adoption of special measures against our parliamentary group, the vicious press campaign against our Party in connection with the 1st of August, — all this shows that the Swedish bourgeoisie is preparing for an attack upon our Party. Our trade union and political successes have brought about a junction of the bourgeois and social-democratic forces for the purpose of offering united resistance. Under these circumstances we ought to make a thorough analysis of the present situation. I am fully in agreement with the survey given by Comrade Kuusinen in his draft theses. We should concretely elaborate this draft to correspond to the situation in Sweden. Furthermore, we should rectify all our past mistakes without regard to personalities or groups. The incipient formation of factions to be observed in our C. C. should be nipped in the bud. What Comrade Manuilsky has said in his above mentioned pamphlet on the question of factions holds good also for our Section:

“Individual groups, united by their common factional attitude, conceal the mistakes of their respective factions while exaggerating any mistakes committed by the other groups. The Communist Parties will grow only through honest Bolshevik self-criticism of our own mistakes.”

None of the two groups in our C. C. can boast of being more Communist and clear-sighted than the other. It is our duty to work together and with the aid of the Comintern, as well as the aid of the experiences of other Sections, for the formation of a strong Communist Party in Sweden.

Comrade HEINZ NEUMANN (Germany):

One of the foremost and cardinal questions of the international class struggle at the present moment is without any doubt the question of stabilisation. The world-wide struggle between ourselves and reformism at the present moment is at bottom the struggle between the continuation and frustration of capitalist stabilisation. It is therefore but natural that the question of stabilisation should be in the centre of discussion at this Plenum. This question, embracing as it does all the partial questions of our tactics and all the separate problems of our policy, is one of the chief issues in the struggle against the Rights and the conciliators in our discussion. I should like to emphasise that the question of capitalist stabilisation is no abstract question, but is most closely connected with the tactics of our Party, and with the problem of the character of the class fights in the present stage. The contradictions between ourselves and the conciliators existed already at the VI. World Congress.

It is wrong on the part of Comrade Ercoli to think that in the Italian Party the struggle against Serra had developed quite slowly from a struggle about “minor questions” to a struggle about the programme. On reading the memorandum drawn up by Serra, one must ask the question whether his views are at all conciliatory. What Serra writes about the Soviet Union, about the development of Russian agriculture, goes far beyond what is said by our German conciliators. It goes even far beyond what the Brandlerites are saying on this question. The answer given by the Italian comrades to Comrade Manuilsky's question as to what happened to Serra was thoroughly unsatisfactory. It is not enough to declare the need of carrying on an ideological fight against the conciliators; it must be declared that Serra has already over-

stepped the bounds which separate our Communist Party from the Social Democracy.

Comrades, I am now turning to another question, to the question of the appraisal of the stabilisation on the part of the Russian Opposition. Comrade Bukharin published in the last few weeks in the “Pravda” a series of interesting theoretical articles. In these articles Bukharin dealt, above all, with the question of the relation of monopoly capitalism to capitalist competition. I am quoting a passage in which Comrade Bukharin says literally the following:

“What is the meaning of State capitalism? State capitalism from the standpoint of competition implies the disappearance of competition within the capitalist countries and the greatest intensification of the competition among the capitalist countries. Yet the monopoly form of these “capitalism” leads also to fighting methods that are marked by tremendous pressure, to methods which lead in the long run to the methods of war.”

Comrades, this thesis is somewhat astonishing, the thesis about the disappearance of competition within the capitalist countries under simultaneous intensification of the competition among the capitalist countries. We were told by Lenin that without doubt in the age of imperialism the monopolist system would to a certain extent take the place of free competition as the dominant phenomenon of capitalist economy. Lenin, however, stated this question even in greater detail. Lenin said that monopoly capitalism did not imply the disappearance of competition, but rather the intensification of competition, the accentuation of all contradictions both within and among the capitalist countries. Lenin dealt with the question from its theoretical side, but it is also possible to deal with it from the standpoint of practical facts. Comrade Lapinsky has referred to some very interesting facts of American economy.

In the American economy there are some very interesting processes going on; there are developing quite new forms of competition within the capitalist State. There is developing a bitter rivalry among the various branches of production for the consumer's purse.

If we examine the question not only from the standpoint of the industry of consumption, but also include the industry of production, the inner rivalry, the inner capitalist struggle and competition becomes even stronger. Let us take only the struggle between the artificial silk and the textile industry in America, or let us take the tremendous struggle going on in Germany, with the support of the leading banks, between the German chemical industry and the mining industry of the Ruhr, a struggle for the liquefaction of coal; we see the efforts of the chemical industry to secure its own independent exploitation of its raw materials and to put the coal syndicate out of business. Is not this a competition fight, a fight in which the two largest banking groups, and also many of the bourgeois political parties in Parliament, are most closely interested? Finally, the struggle within the monopoly, the struggle about quotas, which is not only an international one. For instance, in the German heavy industries we see the struggle of the outsiders against the Trust, the struggle of Krupp against the German Steel Trust which finds its counterpart in the struggle between Ford and the large American automobile concerns on the other side of the ocean.

All this goes to show that Comrade Bukharin's idea is wrong both in theory and in reality. Yet this is not only of general economic importance, but it is also of tremendous importance to the development of the class struggle within the capitalist States. Comrade Bukharin does not see the intensification of the contradictions of capitalism within the individual national state structure, within the individual countries, he sees it only among the individual States. He drives these contradictions into the pores among the big capitalist States. I believe this conception to be wrong, for it is bound to lead to the one-sided orientation according to which the revolution can be victorious only in the event of war, but not upon the direct way of the intensification of the class struggle within the capitalist States.

The second question in Comrade Bukharin's article is the problem of technical progress, which has also played a certain role in the discussion with Comrade Varga here. Comrade Bukharin gets here into a remarkable position. He criticises

a new essay by Prof. Sombart who doubts the possibility of a further acceleration of technical progress in capitalism. Bukharin, the revolutionary Marxist, reproaches Sombart, the bourgeois professor, that he does not sufficiently recognise the technical progress. In polemising against Sombart he goes on to say:

“Where is the ground for assuming the necessity for a diminished pace of technical development?”

As against Sombart, who speaks about retarding the pace of technical development, Bukharin raises the idea that we have no ground to assume even a slackened pace in the technical progress. I believe he contradicts everything that was said by Marx about the development of capitalism in general, and particularly what was said by Lenin about the development of imperialism. (Hear, hear.) Comrade Kuusinen is right when he says that the technical progress is hemmed by capitalist competition. When Comrade Bukharin asks on these grounds why the technical progress cannot go on with unlimited acceleration, the answer is that the inner tendencies of capitalist economic development, the stagnation tendencies, the parasitic tendencies of capitalist development are a check and a hindrance to technical progress. Comrade Bukharin says the same things as have been said by the leading Rights of the Central Committee of the American Party. I recollect the utterances of Lovestone and Pepper in their theses in which they said: “In the United States there is going on a tremendous development of technical rationalisation which signifies a second technical revolution and may develop into a second industrial revolution.” Comrades, have we a right to speak of a “second industrial revolution?” As is generally known, the first industrial revolution in history led to the overthrow of feudalism and to the birth of the bourgeois society. Can we to-day, in the age of moribund capitalism, in the epoch of monopoly capitalism, expect such a “revolution” which would lead to a technical revolution *within the bounds* of capitalist economy? We must answer this question in the negative. Such an industrial revolution coupled with *unchecked* technical progress is unthinkable in a capitalist country with a capitalist system of economy; it can be thought of only in a country of socialist development. In such a country it is not only thinkable, but quite assured. Yet this only proper standpoint on the present development of technical progress is not only discarded, but even combated by Bukharin. On this very decisive question Bukharin forsakes the standpoint of Marxism and takes up the bourgeois-reformist standpoint of the “second industrial revolution” and of unlimited technical development, the “technological” standpoint which was criticised and repudiated by Marx with particular sharpness (e. g., in the Preface to the “Critique of Political Economy”).

Thirdly, on the question of the appraisal of world economy. Comrade Bukharin writes the following on the market problem:

“To a certain extent the **problem of markets appears**, although the scramble for markets is still a burning practical question. The price set by the monopoly cartel becomes the dominant form of price.”

What is meant by the “disappearance of the problem of markets”? We know that the market relations are the foundation of capitalist economy. We know and Lenin has laid sharp stress on this point in his analysis of capitalism — that monopoly capitalism by no means implies the perfect organisation of the market. Not capitalism “regulates” the market anarchy, but rather the market anarchy “regulates” i. e. dominates, determines, and at the same time hinders the capitalist economy.

But, comrades, Bukharin’s conception leads also to other quite different consequences. Capitalism, as is known, is the most developed form of commodity production under which labour power itself becomes a commodity. Under capitalist conditions, the labour market is part of the general market. Consequently, together with the disappearance of the market problem in general should disappear also the problem of the labour market, in other words, the selling of labour power should “disappear to a certain degree”. This means that Bukharin’s theory of “organised capitalism” leads inevitably to the logical conclusion about the disappearance of labour power as a commodity, and consequently to the abolition of the law

of surplus value, to the elimination of the main pillar of Marxian economics. What remains is revisionism of the purest brand, Hilferding’s vulgar economics, “constructive socialism”.

Bukharin’s theory of ultra-monopoly leads to the most serious consequences for our practical politics. We say that the Third Period is the period in which the contradictions of the capitalist world are experiencing the greatest intensification, including also the fundamental contradiction between increased productive ability of industry and the limited capacity of the market. Does not this fundamental contradiction belong to the “problem of the market”? Far from “disappearing”, it reaches the highest pitch. It is precisely the unsolvable problem of the market, which is the expression of the even profounder world-historic contradiction between the social forces of production and the capitalist private property in the means of production, this very market problem constitutes one of the basic principles of our revolutionary policy in the Third Period. If one says that the problem of the market is disappearing, one falsifies our Leninist perspective of the class struggle.

In this connection I might allude to an interesting remark made by Lenin already on Bukharin’s first essay, “Economics of the Transformation Period”. In the Lenin Institute there is a copy which was read and copiously annotated by Lenin. In his book Bukharin wrote about imperialism:

“Finance capital **has destroyed** the anarchy of production within the big capitalist countries.”

Lenin underscored the word “destroyed” and wrote in the margin: “has not destroyed”. This little dispute whether “it has destroyed” or it “has not destroyed”, this little dispute of the past is assuming new forms to-day. Comrade Bukharin says: “destroyed”, consequently there is “organised” capitalism, “firm and strong stabilisation”, which means “wrong ultra-left tactics” of all the Communist Parties, “disruptive activity in the Comintern by the Russian Party leadership”.

Seeing that Bukharin is fundamentally deviating from our line we have been combating his vacillations already before and during the VI. World Congress — the Comintern must take a definite position on this question and repudiate his opportunistic standpoint in the most emphatic manner. Incidentally we find a remarkable connection between the conception of the outspoken opportunists and conciliators on questions relating to the Soviet Union and their appraisal of the development of the capitalist world. On the question of the Soviet Union they maintain the standpoint of the crudest pessimism, whereas they are inclined to see technical and other marvels in the capitalist development. They have already gone so far as to see the quite imminent overcoming of the internal contradictions. **The theorists of “degradation” in the Soviet Union are at the same time stabilisation-Communists in regard to Western Europe and America. (Manuilsky: “Very true!”)**

Naturally, the questions of the Soviet Union cannot be separated from the questions of the struggle of the Communist International. When Brandler and Thalheimer are making merry over our discussion, when they say that as soon as an opposition bubbles up in the Russian Party, there is sure to be discovered some Right or Left deviations in Germany as well, we can only laugh at their bourgeois-Menshevist lack of understanding for the international connection of the proletarian class struggle. We know that every important tendency in the proletarian party that is in power, that all vacillations and deviations taken place in this party are bound to cause similar phenomena in the other Parties of the Communist International. This connection we have seen in the debate with the Trotskyists, and we see it again to-day. It is not an organisational connection, but a political one which arises from the common conditions of the international struggle and from the common political position of all Parties of the Communist International, of the C. P. S. U., as well as of the parties of the capitalist countries, on such questions.

I shall now deal with some statements made by Comrade Varga in his report. The thesis raised here by Varga on the reparations question is even more dangerous than his theory about stable wages and the absolute decrease in the number of the workers.

On the reparations question Comrade Varga said nothing more nor less than that the Young Plan signifies the result of the Paris Reparations Conference, the attempt to compose the

differences among the capitalist Powers. I take it that Comrade Varga is not speaking of an attempt which has failed, but he apparently thinks that the attempt has been successful. It is no use trying to shield behind the word "attempt". When Comrade Varga was assailed, he generalised his theory; he said that not only the Young Plan, but every compromise was an attempt of this kind. This is a thesis which should cause us a little astonishment. Let us take, for instance, the League of Nations. Is it possible to prevent war by means of the League of Nations? Lenin said in the Theses of the Second World Congress that the League of Nations was the war organisation of imperialism, and we believe also that the Young Plan does not mean the bridging of the imperialist contradictions, but rather their tremendous intensification. The World Reparations Bank signifies an extraordinary intensification of the Anglo-American differences, and not only on the question of German reparations, but also on a world scale. Also the significance of the Treaty of Versailles is still in evidence. The theory advanced by individual comrades, the theory of the "self-liquidation" of the Versailles Treaty, is wrong. The Versailles contradictions are still in existence, as well as the contradictions between Germany and the different victor nations. It was not accidental that at the very moment of acceptance of the Young Plan there was a considerable breach in an imperialist coalition which was still fairly strong a year ago, in the Anglo-French coalition. The Young Plan bristles with contradictions, it reveals a fresh cleavage among the imperialist powers, while at the same time the question arises whether Germany will be able to bear the burden of the Young Plan. Here again Comrade Varga says the opposite to what is said by our Party and what has been shown by the German working class in its practical resentment of the new burdens of reparations. Comrade Varga maintains the standpoint that the Young Plan should bring relief in the burdens of reparations. He said we did not know whether anyone would pay; he even said that there was no one in this hall whose mind was quite clear on this question. Comrade Varga takes refuge behind a speculative theory of conception, so to speak. But this attempt has failed. It is clear that the Young Plan means a tremendous intensification of the class fights. The burden of reparations in its new form is of international significance to the German Revolution.

Comrade Varga has said that Germany will not be able to pay unless she newly captures one-eighth of the world market. But how will Germany capture one-eighth of the world market? The problem of the market has not yet disappeared. This is the meaning of the relentless offensive of the employers against the workers, of the tremendous attack of the social-fascist government upon the working class. We see the cutting of wages, the iron wall of the employers against every penny increase in the wages and against any shortening of the working hours. The burden of reparations is the dynamite, the explosive which will release the revolutionary struggle in Germany and will lead in its further development to a directly revolutionary situation. And for this very reason it ought to be recognised that the Young Plan implies tremendous new burdens.

There is a substantial difference whether Germany will directly pay the reparations to the foreign governments or the system of mobilisation will put the German reparations in the hands of hundreds of thousands of small creditors. Comrade Varga himself said that under these circumstances the reparations can be annulled only by a State bankruptcy. We shall do everything to bring about this "State bankruptcy". It is clear that the only method for the annulment of the reparations under the present circumstances can be that the proletariat should lead to bankruptcy not only the State finances, but the bourgeois State and its authority itself. This is the sense of our positive slogan on the reparations question: "Revolutionary annulment of debts through the proletarian dictatorship".

Some comrades ask why the May fights have been appraised so highly, seeing that they did not possess in the remotest degree the scope and significance of the events in Bombay, nor even of the events which took place during the general strike in England. To answer this question it should be pointed out that the May fights were connected with the general situation in Germany as the result of the yoke of reparations; they should be considered in connection with the Ruhr fights in which a quarter of a million workers were engaged in struggle; they should be considered in connection with the economic fights and the whole course of development of the class struggle in the last year. Among the large masses of the workers the tendency

is growing for political actions, for revolutionary fights. Among the largest masses of the workers there is going on a profound process of shaking off illusions about the Social-Democracy. The Social-Democracy in the Government is carrying on different politics to-day from what it could in 1918.

It is always asked by the opportunistic opponents of our ideas, what is the difference between the Zörgiebel and the Noske regime? Zörgiebel shoots down the workers, and so did Noske, and he did it even a good deal worse. Our answer is that the Social Democrats in the Government in 1919 did equally shoot down the workers, but at the same time they gave the workers, at least in appearance, the overthrow of the Kaiser's empire, the 8-hour day, universal suffrage, unemployment benefit, and so on. We know that these gains were not won for the workers by the Social Democrats, but by the fight of the workers themselves; nevertheless, in the consciousness of the large masses the social democracy was credited with these gains. These were the circumstances under which Noske did the shooting; but Zörgiebel is shooting, and Severing will shoot to-morrow, under quite different conditions. They will shoot while at the same time doing away with universal suffrage and the 8-hour day, while imposing the 10 and 12-hour day, while doing away with the social-political gains, and so on. The difference between 1918 and to-day is that the millions of the workers can see things quite clearly and that they are shaking off the illusions concerning the Social Democracy. They believe no longer in the struggle of the Social Democracy and of the trade union bureaucracy for higher wages, etc., and for this reason, the workers are turning against the Social Democracy.

A good deal was spoken here about Fascism and social-Fascism. While Italy is the classic country of Fascism, Germany is the classic country of social-Fascism. There is no country in the world where social-Fascism has already found such completion, such thorough formation, also ideologically, as it has in Germany. What is one of the most decisive levers for the acceleration of the social-fascist tendency? It is the part taken by the Social Democracy in the Government. Germany is the country in which the social democracy has been longest in the government, and where this participation in the government, this fusion with the machinery of the state, has assumed a much sharper and more concrete form than in any other country, such as the appointment of dozens of social-democrats to the positions of chiefs of police, the appointment of hundreds of social-democrats to arbitration boards, the appointment of social-democrats to ministerial positions, the fusion of tens of thousands of social-democratic functionaries with the apparatus of the state, — all this implies the coalescence of the social-democratic party apparatus with the state machine and the police machine, which has accelerated the development of social-fascism.

This question will be of tremendous importance to our English comrades. In England also we have a social-democratic Government. There is hardly any serious difference between the Coalition Government in Germany and the MacDonald Government in Great Britain. The English social democracy will perhaps acquire in the course of months the amount of counter-revolutionary experience which was acquired by the German social democracy in the course of years. It will make use of these experiences against the British proletariat. There is no doubt whatever that if the Labour Government will stay long in power, it will shoot down the workers no less than the German social democracy has done. There is a double reason which makes it necessary for the C. P. G. B. to study carefully the development of social-fascism in Germany. The British Party is confronted with a severe test, because England is the leader of the anti-Soviet coalition. It is for this reason that we watch with the utmost attention, as well as with a certain anxiety, all the vacillations of an opportunistic character that have lately been quite frequently observed in the Party leadership of Great Britain. We are convinced that if in Great Britain a Bolshevik, firm leadership will be formed which will stand unconditionally upon the decisions of the Comintern, of the VI. World Congress and of this Plenum, not only upon questions of the present, but also in the appraisal of the recent past, these grave dangers will be overcome. The British Party bears the responsibility not only for its own country. Each one of its mistakes has an effect upon our Parties in China, India, has an effect in the colonies. Today, when the last card of the British bourgeoisie, the Labour

Government card, is being played, when no one else can help the bourgeoisie, the working masses in Great Britain are playing a tremendous role in the furtherance and development of the colonial revolution. It is at this moment of social-fascist development that the Left social democracy plays a far greater role than before. At this moment when the social democracy keeps silent while Zörgiebel shoots down workers, the Left social democracy is of tremendous importance to the advocacy of "peace". At the moment when MacDonald will shoot, when MacDonald will hang colonial revolutionaries, it will be the time for the Cooks and the other Left tendencies in the British social democracy. At that moment it will be necessary for the Communist Party to have a quite clear line that does not deviate a hair's breadth from the revolutionary tactics of the Communist International.

The May fights of Berlin are not only of importance to Germany, but also of international significance. It has been quite properly pointed out here by a number of comrades in the discussion that we proved by no means organisationally equal to our tasks. Nevertheless it is firmly established that the tactical line of the Party in the May fights was the correct one.

It was a turning-point such as we have not had for six years, since 1923/24. At this decisive moment our Party had to take a decision. Any mistake in one direction or another was likely to render this difficult situation fatal to our Party. One extreme step, and we should have called for the armed insurrection and for barricade fights in Germany. The armed insurrection would have meant the smashing of the proletarian vanguard, a decisive defeat to our Party. This was one side of the question. There was also another side. It would have been an even greater mistake, had we really shrunk back, had we applied the tactics of Brandler to give up the demonstration because it had been forbidden. We carried out the demonstration in spite of prohibition.

We have listened here to the speech of our Swedish comrade Flyg who told us that the Swedish comrades gave up their demonstrations on account of bad weather. In our country it was not a question of climatic conditions, but of bullets, nevertheless we did not give up. The success consists not in that we did not call for an armed insurrection, but in that we did not shrink back by a single step. Here was shown the positive result of the big discussion we had carried out in our Party. Upon the grounds of this discussion we were able to make a correct appraisal of the situation. In our years of fight against opportunism we had learned that to shrink back

at a moment when the masses were driving forward, might be fatal to a revolutionary Party.

The lesson may be drawn from these experiences by all the Parties that the inner Party fights are not fruitless, that there is no danger (as was thought by Comrade Ercoli at the VI. World Congress) that the discussion might lead to an unprincipled factional fight. Such a danger does not exist in a Bolshevik Party.

Let us assume that the May demonstration was not forbidden, but permitted. Do you believe that we would have then committed big mistakes, that we would have shown an organisational weakness? By no means. The May demonstration would have been carried out splendidly. The bands of music would have played splendidly, numerous illustrated placards would have been carried, the order would have been well maintained, and the demonstration would have passed off without any mistakes. Then came the "little" turn in history, the "little" switch which was caused by the intensification of the class contradictions. Such a turn may and will come tomorrow for the French Party, while in Germany it may and will lead tomorrow to further intensification, and the Party will have to remain steadfast. Comrades, we are going to experience the effect of this upward revolutionary trend in all countries. We entertain no illusions as to the form of this development, but it is ridiculous to talk about short, medium or long perspectives, when we are not dealing with any specific scheme, but with the perspective of war, and also of revolution. The advent of war does not necessarily have to wait until one country after another has joined a Coalition, and until the imperialist war preparations have been completed to the extent of 100% so to speak. The war may come sooner through a raid by Polish, Chinese, or other whiteguard officers. The revolutionary fight, the armed clash with the police came suddenly. This is the characteristic trait of the situation.

The task which confronts our Parties is to draw up our line of policy so that under all circumstances we might be equal to any sudden turn in the situation. The rise of the revolutionary tide will not come of its own accord; the Party must dominate, organise, and lead it. Under these conditions we march on from the mere leading of everyday struggles to the political mass strike, from mere partial demands to the struggle for our fundamental Communist slogans, from permitted to prohibited demonstrations. We march on from the defensive fights to the counter-attack, to the offensive, and on to the armed aggressive fight for Soviet rule. (Applause.)

Thirteenth Session.

10th July 1929 (morning).

Comrade FIMM:

Comrades, the past year has fully confirmed what the VI. Congress of the Comintern said about the growing importance of colonies as a factor in the universal crisis of the capitalist system, as a source of conflicts and wars between the imperialists, as the hearth of the mass revolutionary movement. This situation is created by the powerful growth of the productive apparatus of the capitalist countries which is getting more and more in contradiction to market possibilities. A frantic struggle is going on for outlets, sources of raw material, spheres for investment of capital, and redistribution of colonies. This struggle is particularly strong now between America and Great Britain. Throughout the East, America is taking up the offensive. If we take import of American goods into China, in 1913 it constituted 6%, and in 1926-27 — 16.4% of the whole import of foreign goods into China. This increase, naturally, took place at the expense of other imperialist powers. This is how the struggle for outlets developed. Along with it went the struggle for sources of raw material. This can be seen by the export of goods from China to America. In 1913, export constituted 9.3%, and in 1926-27 — 17.4% of the whole Chinese export. If we take the last years, we see that the United States of North America was the only country which increased its trade in China. In 1927, America which till then occupied third place in the general Chinese trade moved up to the first place, squeezing out Japan and Great Britain. In 1928,

it strengthened these positions, and according to preliminary figures, one can say, without risk of going wrong, that in 1929 America will play a still more important role in the foreign trade of China.

This economic advance of American capital in China does not only concern export and import, but also investments. The big American bank, Kuhn and Loeb, is negotiating now a railway loan of 400—500 million American dollars for China. This is certainly a big sum for China, if one takes into consideration that the whole existing network of railways in China (without the Chinese-Eastern Railway) is appraised at, approximately, this amount. Moreover, a group of American banks, with an insignificant participation of British capital, has acquired the electrical station in Shanghai for 100 million Chinese dollars. This station is not only one of the most powerful enterprises of the electrical industry throughout the world, it plays also a very important role in Chinese economics, especially in such an important industrial centre as Shanghai. Apart from this, American capital is putting up now in China aircraft and motorcar works, is building roads etc. Harriman, who failed with his concession in West Caucasia, is getting now a concession in China.

We see a similar picture in India, although the development there is slower. The import of American goods into India was 2.5% in 1913, and 6.8 per cent. in 1926-27. Export rose from 8 to 9% in 1913 to 11.2% in 1926-27. We have no exact

information about 1928-29, but if we are to believe the correspondence in various bourgeois newspapers we must come to the conclusion that in 1928 and especially in the first half of 1929, the Indian market was flooded with American goods. Moreover, very significant is the activity of American capital as represented by **General Motors** which has established in India motor-car works with a capital of 5 million dollars.

The situation is similar in other Eastern countries. In **Indonesia**, the Americans have succeeded in getting into their own hands the oil concession in **Sumatra** which was formerly in the hands of British capitalists.

In **Turkey**, **Ford** has received a concession to build in Constantinople (and the free zone) motor works which will employ 3,000 workers.

In **Hedjas**, **Gryne**, an American, has secured a concession for the sale of motors.

In **Persia**, American capital, together with German, is building the **Trans-Persian Railway**.

We see that all along the line, in absolutely all the Eastern countries, American capital is very busy, its activity being directed first and foremost against British influence. This economic aggression calls forth a corresponding foreign policy in the United States. In China, America was the first to recognise the **Nanking Government** and to agree to Customs autonomy. American "advisers" are to be found now in all the government organs of China. The American government has accepted India's protest against Great Britain signing the **Kellogg Pact** in its name. **Porter**, Chairman of the American Foreign Commission, is astonished that Britishers represent India in the **Opium Commission** of the League of Nations. Finally, America, mindful of the interests of Indian trade and industrial circles, is — demonstratively — not increasing the import duty on jute this year.

The United States pursues the same line in regard to other Eastern countries. Thus, over the head of Great Britain, America is proposing to the **Egyptian Government** to sign the **Kellogg Pact**. Americans look upon Egypt as an independent country, and do not think it necessary to come to a preliminary agreement with Great Britain. In this respect, the Americans are flirting — which is very significant — with nationalist elements, making use of them very cleverly in their own interest.

But what is the **British** attitude in the face of all these facts? Great Britain is, of course, resisting American aggression in every possible way. It is making use of formerly acquired positions, of its enormous colonial possessions, it is straining every nerve to defend, strengthen and even extend its spheres of influence. Great Britain is fully aware of the necessity of rationalising industry, in order to maintain and extend its colonial positions. But Great Britain can solve this problem only at the expense of the working class and by means of still greater exploitation of the colonies. This is to a certain extent a vicious circle. Great Britain must rationalise its industrial apparatus in order to maintain, consolidate and extend its influence in the colonies. On the other hand, the very rationalisation of the industrial apparatus which in many branches lags considerably behind the contemporary technical level, is possible for Great Britain only by means of greater pressure, still greater exploitation of its colonial possessions.

There is a whole series of facts on the strength of which we are justified in speaking of Great Britain's terrible pressure on the colonies. It is making exceptional efforts in regard to export of capital, the amount of which has almost reached pre-war level. It is bringing pressure to bear in regard to trade. Britain has gained certain positions lately in regard to trade with **China**, at the expense of **Japan**. Moreover, it is building new railways in **Egypt** and **Sudan** to serve the interests of British capital. 250 kilometres railways, of the proposed 1,500, are already laid. It is building an important strategical port (**Haifa**) in **Palestine**, which is connecting **Mosul** with **Bagdad**. It is laying the **Mosul-Haifa** oil-pipes. Finally, it is trying to come to an agreement with **Egypt** for the distribution of water and the construction of irrigation works for the irrigation of British plantations in **Sudan** at the expense of the **Egyptian** fellahs. As a result of this agreement, the distribution of water in **Egypt** itself, regulation of this exceptionally important economic factor, will be in British hands. Great Britain has dissolved the **Egyptian** Parliament, and is seeking the support of feudal-compradore elements.

In **India**, Great Britain is doing its utmost to extend the positions of its capital. It has started the construction of a new network of railways which will extend over 12,000 miles. It is also building railways on a large scale in **South**, **East** and **West Africa**.

To a careful observer, there are clear signs of **Anglo-American rivalry**. Secondly, attention should be drawn to the activity of the imperialist powers in connection with thorough preparations for new imperialist wars, and finally, it should be pointed out that the growing pressure on the colonies is increasing the economic and political dependence of colonial and semi-colonial countries.

It is from this point of view that one can say that the last year has shown the inconsistency of all talk about decolonisation. It has exposed the bourgeois character of this theory; the acute rivalry between the chief imperialist powers is showing up the nature of the colonial regime introduced by international imperialism. Foreign capital, far from ceding its positions to the native bourgeoisie, has increased and strengthened them at the expense of national capital.

I will give a few facts to illustrate this situation. If we take the **Chinese** coal industry, 54% of it belonged to foreign capital in 1923, whereas already 72% of it was controlled by foreign capital in 1928. In the **Chinese** textile industry, 13,000 looms belonged to the **Chinese** capital in 1922 and 8,000 to foreign capital. The latter has now just doubled this number — 16,000 looms. Let us take metallurgy in **China**, from 70% in 1923, foreign capital has increased its share to 90% in 1928. This is a picture of the extension of the positions of foreign capital in **China**. In **India**, there are signs of a very similar situation. It is characteristic that the **Tata** iron works, the pride of the native industry, is becoming more and more dependent on **British** banks. The same may be said of the textile and the coal industry in **India**. All these facts show that the economic enslavement of the colonies is progressing, which of course does not exclude a certain industrial development in these countries. But this development is very one-sided, it is taking abnormal forms. This industrial development which serves the interests of the mother countries, is by no means a sign of the full and independent development of the productive forces of the colonies and dependencies.

As you know, the believers in decolonisation endeavoured to substantiate their arguments by phenomena connected with the export of capital. But even if we admit the fact that export of capital to colonial countries is growing — and we have these facts in a number of countries — it would by no means confirm the correctness of the decolonisation theory, because export of capital does not mitigate or lessen the enslavement of the colonies. On the contrary it increases this enslavement, strengthens the positions of foreign capital and increases its control over the colonial economy.

Why must we pay special attention to this decolonisation theory? Not only because it is a new edition of **Kautskyite** ideas of ultra-imperialism, not only because this idea is a through and through **menshevik** idea, and fosters illusions in regard to diminution of the unevenness of capitalist development and in regard to the possibility of gradual, peaceful emancipation of the colonies from the imperialist yoke, not only because this theory is opposed to **Lenin's** doctrine that "imperialism is the epoch of finance capital and monopolies which bring with them everywhere aspirations to domination, and not to freedom", not only for these reasons, but also because the decolonisation theory gives an economic foundation to the erroneous tactic at which **Roy** and several other former workers in the Communist movement have arrived. The very slogan of active alliance with the bourgeoisie, proclaimed now by **Roy**, is the direct outcome of this economic theory. The decolonisation theory implies that national capital is growing in the colonies, that it is becoming fullblooded, in fact, that the native bourgeoisie is feeling firm ground under its feet. Hence, the believers in this theory come to the conclusion that the native bourgeoisie encounters more and more, in the course of its growth, the privileges secured by foreign capital, and that by this very fact it is compelled to direct its energy against the imperialist barriers which bloc the way to its further growth.

It seems to me that it is incumbent on the Comintern to express its view of this theory still more openly and emphati-

cally, since it has been made the foundation of the decision of the Brussels Congress of the Second International on the colonial question. It should be pointed out here that the Congress of the British Communist Party was quite right in associating itself with the Comintern view of the question and in repudiating the position taken up by the British delegation at the VI. Congress of the Comintern.

Comrades, all what I have said till now bears witness of the growing acuteness of the contradictions between a handful of capitalist oligarchists and big sections of the populations of the colonies and dependencies. But it would be wrong to imagine that imperialist aggression calls forth automatically resistance on the part of all the classes of the colonial countries and dependencies. We witness instructive processes in class relations. These processes affect the native bourgeoisie and the upper circles of the petty-bourgeoisie. The native bourgeoisie, under the influence of the labour movement in its respective countries, is giving way — as shown especially in China — to the pressure of international imperialism, and is becoming more and more the tool of foreign capital.

With the blessing, if not with the concurrence of the native bourgeoisie, fascist dictatorship is becoming established in a number of Eastern countries — a dictatorship which suppresses even the least hint at democracy. Parliament is dissolved in Syria and Egypt. The revolutionary anti-imperialist mass movement of the workers and peasants is suppressed with inhuman brutality, the mass organisations of the working class are suppressed and replaced by purely fascist trade unions and organisations of a different type which are implicitly obeying the instructions of the ruling classes and are submitting to the orders of the governing cliques. Compulsory arbitration is being introduced in all countries.

A proper appreciation of these facts leads one to the conclusion that the native bourgeoisie is gradually going over to the camp of international imperialism. These processes cannot help being reflected in the ideology of the national bourgeoisies. National reformism is developing more and more into national fascism. Such are the modifications which the ideology of the national bourgeoisie undergoes in the colonies and dependencies.

The greatest progress has been made by these processes in China, but they are noticeable also in other countries. Such tendencies are making their appearance also in India. True, one must differentiate to a certain extent between the Indian and the Chinese bourgeoisie. In India, contrary to China, the bourgeoisie is not yet coming forward openly in the role of executioner of the working class. It is as yet playing this role indirectly. But, when speaking of processes in the class relations of colonial peoples, one cannot help pointing to the fact that fascist tendencies are growing in the camp of the native bourgeoisie. True, the present transformation of national reformism is not accompanied by complete abandonment of social demagoguery. The bourgeoisie is still endeavouring to disguise its reactionary doings by cheap lip service to democracy. But hypocritical reformist twaddle is more and more accompanied by purely fascist deeds.

What about the petty-bourgeoisie? A differentiation process is going on in its ranks in all these countries. Its upper circles which are connected with the landowning class and, as agents of big foreign firms, also with foreign capital, have this year visibly swung to the Right, in spite of the fact that the fundamental mass of the petty-bourgeoisie — the exploited peasantry, home industry workers, artisans and the poor urban population — is becoming and more revolutionised.

Only the working class, in spite of terribly difficult conditions, and the exploited peasant masses, are developing an energetic struggle against their class enemies, against international imperialism.

Therefore, comrades, if we sum up the "Eastern" experiences of the past year, we cannot help arriving at the following conclusions: firstly, imperialist aggression is growing, especially between America and Great Britain; secondly, the fierce pressure of the imperialists on the colonies and dependencies is increasing; thirdly, national-fascist tendencies are growing in the camp of the native bourgeoisie, the upper circles of the petty bourgeoisie are veering to the Right and, fourthly, the strike movement, the anti-imperialist struggle of the proletariat, is developing side by side with the growth of the peasant movement in colonial countries.

Comrades, it is an easy matter to illustrate all these conclusions by a series of Eastern countries.

First of all, we must deal with China, and for the following reasons. The contradictions between the imperialist powers, especially between American and British capital, are demonstrated now in China much more clearly than in other countries. In spite of the defeat of the Chinese revolution, China still remains in the colonial world the weakest spot of international imperialism. This means that the contradictions between the individual imperialist powers, far from subsiding in China, have increased and have assumed an exceptionally acute form. China is still the spot where these imperialist contradictions are most likely to cause the outbreak of another imperialist world war.

If we consider the policy of the imperialist powers from this viewpoint, we cannot help coming to the conclusion that in China the struggle of two imperialist tendencies is more and more noticeable.

On the one hand, Great Britain and Japan aim at keeping China divided, at maintaining and extending their spheres of influence, at consolidating the rule of individual militarist cliques which serve as a military agency of British and Japanese capital.

The United States aims at formal unification of China under the regime of the Nanking Kuomintang, provided, of course that this Nanking Kuomintang will be an obedient puppet, without a will of its own, in the hands of American capital. The fact that America has no spheres of influence in China, compels it, in view of the colossal economic power of American capital, to aim at the financial-economic and, consequently political subordination of China as a whole to the interests of American capital.

America has already secured rather important positions in China. But this brings it into collision with the interests of British and Japanese capital. These differences threaten to develop in the not far distant future into a Pacific and, subsequently, into a world imperialist war. I would therefore like to draw your attention to a clause in Comrade Kuusinen's theses which says correctly that "small wars" carried on in the colonial and semi-colonial countries (China; Kwangsi versus Nanking, Feng Yu-Hsiang), which act as a screen to the growing Anglo-American rivalry, are the prelude to a big war between the United States and Great Britain for world hegemony.

At the same time, no one can dispute the fact that the national bourgeoisie has increased considerably its proportionate weight in the government. However, it would be wrong to imagine that the feudal landlords are being ousted, that the bourgeoisie is fighting the consolidation of its power and is wresting power from the hands of the landlord class. I think that there have been among us erroneous attempts to explain the war between Nanking and Kwangsi as armed struggle between the Chinese bourgeoisie and the feudal landlords. The recent circular of the Chinese Communist Party was also drawn up on these lines. The analysis of the Nanking-Kwangsi war in this circular is:

"That the bourgeoisie wants to strike at the feudal regime, to improve the position of the peasantry, to lessen the influence and power of the imperialist states and to establish Customs autonomy; therefore, radical differences exist between the bourgeoisie and the feudal landlords which cannot be reconciled."

I think that this is a wrong analysis. Kwangsi does not represent only feudal landlords, just as Nanking does not rest on purely bourgeois elements. Both represent the interests of the bourgeoisie which, in China, is closely connected with landownership. But the Kwangsi clique rests to a great extent on the old trade, comprador bourgeoisie, connected with British capital, whereas the Nanking clique is supported first of all by the younger national industrial bourgeoisie whose orientation is towards American capital. The Nanking Government has not raised and will not raise a finger against land-ownership. Hence, impossibility to solve within the framework of the existing order the fundamental differences which generate with historical necessity, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution. The real unification of the country, the destruction of the rule of the militarist cliques are impossible, unless an end is put to the economic division of the country, unless semi-feudal relations which generate Chinese militarism, are taken out by the root, unless imperialist rule, which maintains and uses in its interests the

division of the country, the feudal relics and the individual militarist cliques, is destroyed. All these fundamental tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in China are intertwined, they are connected with one another and can only be solved by a victorious workers' and peasants' revolution. Hence, it is legitimate to raise the question of the inevitability of a revolutionary revival, the symptoms of which are already coming to light.

I would, therefore, like to place before you material on the growth of the strike movement in China. According to statistical data, published by the social-research bureau of the Kuomintang for the first nine months of 1928, 175 strikes took place in Shanghai alone, in which 233,000 workers were involved. We can judge the nature of the strikes by the fact that 48 were directed against oppression and bad treatment, whereas 18 were for higher wages. There was a further growth of the strike movement in the subsequent months of 1928: strikes in Tientsin and Tsindao, 9 very big strikes in Manchuria, 16 strikes in HongKong under Communist leadership.

If we sum up the general results of the strikes in 1928, we will find that 300-400,000 workers were involved in them, and I think that the latter figure is nearer to the truth. This enormous figure is very instructive if one takes into consideration the recent defeat of the revolution and the unprecedented bloody suppression of the labour movement.

The growing peasant demonstrations are in harmony with the growth of the labour movement. In regard to recent peasant demonstrations, there was the Moslem peasants' rebellion in Kängsu, the recrudescence of the activity of the "Red Spears" and "Small Knives", the guerilla movement under the leadership of the Communists, Mao Tse-Dun and Chu-De, who succeeded in keeping their cadres intact and achieving certain successes in the Fudsiang Province in spite of all the measures taken by the reactionary authorities. Then, there was also a big peasant demonstration in April, 1929, in the Fingchun district (Kwantung) which resulted in a Soviet regime being established in nine villages. Finally, one must also mention the peasant unrest in the villages near Shanghai.

True, these facts do not justify us in saying that we are already in the midst of another revolutionary wave in China. But they are certainly a sign that premises for such a revolutionary wave are being created.

In this connection, a few words about the Chinese Communist Party. If it wants to develop its mass work, it will have to overcome vacillations of a Right character which are now prevalent in its ranks. What is the cause of these Right vacillations? In regard to some Communists, the cause is that they are very pessimistic in regard to the coming of a new revolutionary wave, they believe in the possibility of peaceful emancipation and capitalist development of China. What is the explanation of this? The explanation is — they overestimate the defeat of the revolution and the victory of reaction; they overestimate the growing strength of the reactionaries, the formal unification of the country, etc. They overestimate the partial economic revival; they take seriously the promises of the imperialist powers to meet half-way China's demands in regard to national independence and Customs autonomy. Hence, the conclusion that the Chinese revolution has been hopelessly defeated. On such grounds, individual Communists get into a liquidatory mood and lose sight of the revolutionary perspective. True, these views are restricted to a small group in the Chinese Communist Party, but this does not exclude the necessity of serious struggle by the Party against this kind of mood.

Connected with liquidatorship, is a too strong belief in legalism. There are isolated demands for less outspoken political slogans, some Party members minimise the importance of illegal Communist organisations. Connected with this, are also cases of a khvostist attitude to the Kuomintang on the part of individual Communists who demand a change of tactic in regard to the Kuomintang and declare "that Kuomintang slogans should not be undermined".

When dealing with the Right danger which has assumed threatening forms, the Communist Party of China must pay attention also to its tactic in rural districts, to a more strict definition of its attitude to the social strata of the Chinese countryside. The Party must overcome the theories which are intended to drive it into alliance with the kulak element in the villages. The comrades who are bringing forward these theories, are distorting the decisions of the last Congress of the Chinese

Party, according to which the Party must rest on the poor and middle peasantry. The advocates of "alliance with the kulak" do not take into consideration the social character of the Chinese kulak; they forget that he is the representative of feudal relations, that he is, in fact, a semi landlord; that he is, as a rule, on the side of the counter-revolution and is helping the Kuomintang to suppress the genuinely revolutionary movement of the exploited mass of the peasantry.

There is no doubt whatever that the influence of bourgeois-national reformism, which is still fairly strong, is at the bottom of all these Right errors. But it should be pointed out that, on the whole, the Party is healthy, it has a strong and united leadership which pursues the line laid down by the Comintern in regard to the Chinese question.

A few words in regard to India. We are witnessing an exceptionally strong development of the strike movement in India. But if we draw a parallel between India and China, we notice the following:

Firstly, we do not have in India rivalry of imperialist powers, such as we have in China. In India, British capital reigns supreme, it separates India from the rest of the world with barbed wire and succeeds in isolating India to a considerable extent from the international labour and colonial movement.

Secondly, India is not directly connected with the U.S.S.R. — the hearth of world socialism, territorial proximity with which had an enormously revolutionising influence on China.

Thirdly, there is no internecine struggle between militarist cliques in India which weakened Chinese reaction and facilitated the development of the revolutionary struggle of the Chinese workers and peasants. We see just the opposite in India: a strongly welded State apparatus protected by well-armed police forces and the army, cleverly distributed throughout the country for defence of the most decisive positions.

Fourthly, and this is the most important point, the growth of the Communist Party in India is slower than the growth of the Chinese Party. This circumstance is assuming more and more threatening forms.

Finally, to bring before you all the difficult circumstances which hamper the development of a mass movement in India, I draw attention to the fact that in India the movement is developing after the Chinese revolution which does not only enable the working class of India to profit by the lessons of the struggle of the Chinese proletariat, but gives also imperialism and the native bourgeoisie an opportunity to benefit by the lessons of Chinese events. One must not forget that the tactic of a united national front is impossible in India. Even if this tactic was inadequately applied in China, it has fulfilled there its historical role. It helped in the first stages of the liberation movement to rouse and bring into motion the Chinese working class and peasantry.

Comrades, with all these difficulties India has also one great advantage: a more numerous working class than in China, which is already going through a better school of class struggle than the Chinese working class.

There were 129 strikes in India in 1927 in which 131,000 workers participated; the figures for 1928 are: 203 strikes, 506,000 participants and 31,500,000 lost days. The present heroic strike in Bombay which is developing into a political struggle, is also very significant.

In this connection, I will, with your permission, read some, literally, inspired sentences of Lenin which show what importance he attached to strikes on the strength of the lessons drawn from the Russian revolution in 1905:

"The peculiarity of the Russian revolution consists in the fact that it (the revolution of 1905) was, in regard to its social character, a bourgeois-democratic revolution, whereas it was a proletarian revolution in regard to its means of struggle. It was bourgeois-democratic because the direct aim, it was capable of achieving by its own forces, was the democratic republic, the 8-hour day, confiscation of the colossal estates of the nobility..."

... "The Russian revolution was at the same time a proletarian revolution, not only in the sense that the proletariat was the leading force, the vanguard of the movement, but also in the sense that the specifically proletarian means of struggle namely the strike, constituted the chief means of rousing the masses and was the most characteristic phenomenon in the wave-like development of decisive events."

When talking about India, it is this feature of the movement which we must emphasise. It is this feature which constitutes the difference between India and China. I do not want to minimise the merits of the heroic semi-proletarian Hong-Kong strike, neither do I want to minimise the importance of the numerous general strikes in Shanghai, but one must admit that in China these strikes played a somewhat subordinate role in regard to the Northern Military Expedition, in regard to this militarised struggle between democratic and reactionary forces. In India, very significant in this respect is the fact that the strike movement there is assuming more and more a mass character, that it is visibly developing into a political struggle and that, in this strike movement, the strikers give evidence of a high degree of class-consciousness, as shown not only by the stubbornness of the strikers but also by the removal of reformists from leadership, by the appointment of their own leaders and by the strikers' rapid emancipation from the influence of bourgeois national reformism.

Comrades, all this gives us the certainty that the growing Indian revolution will follow a more sound and steady path.

We have a certain amount of material about labour conflicts in Korea where the strike movement is steadily growing. 1927 exceeded 1919 which was a record year, in regard to the number of strikes and strikers.

What are the results of these strikes? They can be roughly divided into three equal parts: one-third ends in victory for the workers, one-third ends in the workers' defeat and rejection of their demands and one-third ends in compromise.

In this connection, one must mention the famous **Genzian strike** which lasted 82 days. Five thousand workers participated in it, but if one takes into consideration the sympathy of the whole proletariat with this strike, the support given to the Genzian strikers, one is justified in saying that a general strike of a peculiar form took place in Korea. These labour conflicts correspond with the growth of **agrarian unrest in Korea**.

In the last eight years, 456 peasant revolts took place in Korea involving over 33,000 tenant farmers.

Comrades, Why do I give such details about Korea? Because directly after the VI Congress we had to take very sharp measures against the Korean Party, which, it is true, took effect very rapidly. You know that at the VI Congress the Korean Party was admitted to the Comintern. A few months later, the presidium of the Comintern was compelled to make a decision re breaking relations with the leading organ of the Korean Party. This decision became necessary owing to the factional struggle which was going on in the Party and which was inspired by the Japanese police.

And yet, the facts which I have given you, show how remarkably favourable was the situation for the Communist Party among the Korean working class and peasantry. That is why the Comintern was compelled to break off relations temporarily with the Korean Party, advising at the same time all Communists to devote themselves to basic work, work in enterprises which was to serve, so to speak, as a test that the Korean Party, having gone through a period of mass work, will change entirely its programme and methods of work, will put a stop to factional struggle and will be once more fit to enter the ranks of the Comintern as an organisation.

A few words about **Turkey**. Turkey is an example how historically impossible it is to secure under bourgeois rule independent economic and political development; secondly, the Turkish example bears witness of the ever-growing economic dependence of the country on the big powers. Finally, the Turkish example is characteristic, because it illustrates the degeneration of the erstwhile revolutionary **Kemalist Government**, revolutionary only in regard to international imperialism.

The degeneration of the social basis of Kemalism can be followed up in various directions in its present policy. We witness reconciliation with the harbour bourgeoisie; the land of the feudal lords which was confiscated, is given back to them, the Kemalists themselves are becoming big landowners. Very characteristic is the speech of the Foreign Minister, **Tewfik Rudji-Bey**. In the preparatory disarmament commission of the League of Nations in 1929, Rudji-Bey spoke against Litvinov and supported the Italian point of view. In regard to internal policy, we witness in Turkey ruthless exploitation of the workers, excessive taxes, including even a wage tax. Discussion of the protection of Labour Bill is systematically delayed, and labour organisations are raided.

Simultaneously, we witness in Turkey a **left orientation among the workers**, especially among the Turkish proletariat; the Communist Party is becoming a workers' party in the true sense of the word, it is being purged from its hangers-on. One can only rejoice at this. The trial of 35 Communists is going on now; 80% of the accused are Turkish workers. In connection with what is going on now in Turkey, it becomes necessary to re-consider our former viewpoint in regard to Kemalism.

In regard to **Persia**, **Reza-Shah** and his clique are becoming more the obedient executors of the policy dictated by international imperialism, and above all by **British capitalists**. Very significant in this respect was Teimur-Tasha's trip to England and the prolongation of the concession rights of the Shaninshah bank. Moreover, the **Iraq question** has been settled to the advantage of Great Britain. British imperialism has also been given the right to construct on Persian territory air bases, barracks, munition stores, etc. Britishers are building now strategical railways and highroads in South Persia. The Persian army is being developed, reorganised and re-equipped with British money. This is directly connected with Great Britain's plans to encircle the U. S. S. R. Finally, the annexationist aspirations of the Reza-Shah government in regard to **Afghan** territory are, above all, dictated by British capital.

This capitulatory policy of the Reza-Shah Government is becoming more and more anti-national, it creates dissatisfaction and meets with opposition on the part of the toiling masses. The **May Day strike** in South Persia, in the enterprises of the "Anglo-Persian Oil Co." took place under political slogans and led to armed collisions with the Persian and British police. This May Day strike in the Anglo-Persian Oil Co. is significant also in other respects. During these incidents, the unity and co-operation of Reza-Shah's forces with the British in their attacks on the strikers were truly pathetic. The Persian police was not strong enough to cope with the movement.

As to our **Persian Party**, we are convinced that it can cope with the present political situation, that it has rectified its former erroneous tactical line, that it will be able to place itself at the head of the growing mass movement.

The Philippines. Successful strikes took place in boot and tobacco factories and also in the timber trade of the Philippines. I am laying stress on these facts because this is the first time that a strike wave has swept this Eastern country, for the first time the working class there is making common cause with the International Communist labour movement. Moreover, just before **May Day** a huge demonstration of 60,000 workers and peasants took place in **Manila**, to protest against the deportation and imprisonment of the arrested peasants. Attention must be drawn to the fact that the numerous May Day demonstrations in the Philippines were held under the slogans of Defence of the U. S. S. R. and Solidarisation of the Philippine workers with the Chinese workers. We are witnessing now the growth of trade unions in the Philippines, the number of R. I. L. U. followers is increasing; the **Communist Party** is taking a definite shape and form.

Mongolia is a small country with a population of only 700,000. But it is of exceptional interest and enormous importance.

At the time of the VI. Congress, the Mongolian People's Republic was going through a serious political crisis, because the Mongolian revolution, while destroying the political order of the feudal regime, did not destroy the economic power of the feudal landlords and the clergy.

In the **Mongolian People's revolutionary party**, Right elements representing the interests of the trade bourgeoisie, gained the upper hand. These Right leaders did not endeavour to improve the economic position of the poor sections of the population. On the contrary, they looked after the interests of personal private accumulation. They used repressive measures against the opposition which truly represented the interests of the poor sections of the population which are swinging to the Left.

The defeat of the Chinese revolution hastened these processes in the Right Leadership.

I will now sum up the Comintern achievements in the East during the last twelve months.

1. Enormous successes in the strike movement, especially in **India**, which signalise the development of the workers' and peasants revolution.

2. Consolidation of the positions of the **Chinese Communist Party**. Growth of the Chinese labour movement which shows that depression is on the wane in the working class, that the worst of the defeat is over, that the working class is once more beginning to stretch its powerful limbs.

3. Growth of the mass movement and of Comintern influence in all Eastern countries.

4. The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party has served as a test of Comintern prestige among the toiling masses of the Eastern countries.

It is incumbent on us now to put into concrete words all our desires and intentions in regard to help to the Communist and workers' and peasants' movement in the colonial countries on the part of the Sections of the Comintern. We must set ourselves concrete tasks. Every Comintern Section must find ways and means of establishing connections with the East. Every Comintern Section must display maximum initiative in regard to helping the workers and peasants' movement in the Eastern countries.

Why should not the **German Party** organise in its country schools for **Indian Communists**? Why should not the German Section, as well as other Sections, establish a direct connection with India, with the Indian trade union movement through competent organisations? Three thousand Indonesian Communists are still in exile under appalling conditions, doomed to slow and painful death. Tens of thousands of workers are in capitalist dungeons in all the parts of the world. Can we put up with a state of affairs when our Sections do not issue a single manifesto or a single slogan, when they do not organise a single demonstration either in Western Europe or in America? The Sections of the Comintern must give real help to the revolutionary movement in the East. The world proletariat, in the person of its Communist vanguards, must play the organising rôle assigned to it, it must place itself at the head of those Sections of mankind who are rising for revolutionary struggle, in order to achieve together with them the full triumph of the world revolution. (Applause.)

Comrade MITSKEVITCH-KAPSUKAS (Lithuania):

Comrades, the representatives of the Sections of the Border States — **Finland, Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania** — agree with the theses laid before the Plenum, but associate themselves nevertheless with the comrades who have proposed to develop somewhat some of the questions: firstly, the characteristic of the fascisation process in the bourgeois states; secondly, the characteristic of social fascism, especially, the characteristic of the MacDonald Government; thirdly, concretisation of the new features in the peasant movement; fourthly, concretisation of Right errors not only in the big parties; fifthly, more attention to fundamental org-questions and to the linking up of illegal with legal work.

Capitalist stabilisation in the border states shows even more signs of decline than in the other countries. As to the state of industry in the small countries, such as **Esthonia and Latvia**, where industrial development was considerable at one time, owing to the absence of outlets and separation from Russia, industry is certainly not on the same level as prior to the war, and has been even regressing lately owing to shrinkage of the home market.

These countries have become **agrarian countries**. But even agriculture shows signs of a rather critical situation. Last year, **big areas** in these countries were visited by famine in the full sense of the word, and in many places famine conditions still prevail. This has, of course, affected the whole economic life of these countries: reduction of industry, growth of unemployment not only in rural but also in urban districts, because famine has caused shrinkage of the already small available markets.

Comrade **Varga** spoke here about the rise in the real wage of the workers. Our countries are perhaps an even more vivid example than other countries of the radical inaccuracy of such views. The numerous statistical data at our disposal point to considerable **wage reductions**. In some countries this reduction has reached in the last two to three years 30 or even more per cent. This applies above all to fascist **Lithuania**, concerning **Finland**, where the economic situation was better hitherto than in the other countries, we have official price indexes and trade union statistics re wages. These statistics fully confirm the fact that wage rises lag behind the price index. Moreover, Finland

is a good illustration of the fact to which attention was drawn here by Comrade **Moirova**, namely, that skilled workers whose wages are high are gradually replaced by less skilled workers whose wages are much lower — women and youngsters.

In the famine stricken areas, most of the agricultural labourers lost their employment, and wages were enormously reduced. On the strength of this, we witness an unprecedented accentuation of class contradictions in these countries, in the rural districts. There are cases when kulak elements are asking the government to allow them to keep arms in order to protect themselves from the starving agricultural labourers. The position of the middle and poor peasantry has also grown much worse. In a word, we witness in these countries an extraordinary accentuation of class contradictions in town and country. Even unemployment which was enormous last winter in some of these countries, never reached such dimensions in the post-war period as now.

Under these conditions the discontent of the toiling masses of town and country is rapidly growing. The masses are swinging to the Left and are becoming more active. In these countries too, the number of strikes and strikers has been rapidly growing. We have no accurate data from all these countries in regard to the growth of the number of strikes and strikers. But there is no doubt whatever that this number has been steadily increasing in all the countries. We have exact figures concerning **Finland**. In 1925, the number of industrial workers on strike was 2900, in 1926 — 10,000, in 1927 — 13,000, and in 1928 — 37,000. Moreover, the dockers' strike in which 12,000 workers participated, lasted ten months. Thus, we witness here just as in other bigger capitalist countries, stubborn struggle by the workers. This is certainly a sign that the masses are swinging to the Left and are becoming more active. This swing to the Left is also shown by such facts as voting for Left candidates in parliamentary and municipal elections, such as have taken place in a number of countries in the course of the last year.

An important movement is also going on in the **Polish rural districts**. We have been witnessing in the last years an intense and wide revolutionary peasant movement, but only in the regions occupied by Poland — **West White Russia and West Ukraine**.

At present, a serious revolutionary movement is going on in **Poland proper**. We have a mass organisation there which goes by the name of "**Self Help**" and which has increased its membership in the last few months from 6000 to 16,000, and probably more by now. On **May Day**, about 30,000 peasants in Poland proper demonstrated under revolutionary banners, under our slogans, in spite of cordons of police, persecutions and ill-treatment by the police. The peasant masses broke through the cordons and united with the masses of the workers, with the workers' demonstrations. This certainly bears witness of an enormous development in the Polish countryside, among the middle peasants. I must say that demonstrations in small places have also taken place in several of the other countries pointed out by me. We had, for instance, in **Lithuania** demonstrations in a number of small localities of starving agricultural labourers, under our slogans. Similar big demonstrations of starving agricultural labourers and working peasants took place in **Latvia**. I think that we should draw attention in the theses proposed to the Plenum to the development which is going on now in the rural districts.

In this connection, I would like to deal with Comrade **Kolarov's** speech, or rather that part of his speech which deals with the peasant movement in **Bulgaria**. It seems to me, that Comrade Kolarov's speech might bring confusion into a question which we already considered definitely cleared up. Comrade Kolarov said that we had in the Balkans "hegemony of the peasantry in the general struggle of the toiling masses against the bourgeoisie and capitalism". This was said in regard to Bulgaria in Stambolisky's time. The peasant union, said Comrade Kolarov, endeavoured to carry on a struggle against big capital. It is "the leader in the struggle against big capital, the leader of the proletariat". This was Comrade Kolarov's explanation in answer to an interjection. I think that this part of Comrade Kolarov's speech, if it be allowed to stand as it is, might cause considerable confusion. The Stambolisky Government came into power in 1919, at the height of the revolutionary movement. It was called to power by the bourgeoisie to save the bourgeois order from revolution, just as in

other countries Social-Democratic governments were called to power in 1919 as saviours from the growing proletarian revolution. At such a time, if the Stambolisky government wanted to prevent revolution, it had to make concessions to the masses, it had to paralyse in some way or other the growing movement, in order to divert from it part of the peasantry.

For this purpose, laws were introduced which were certainly a definite concession to the revolutionary masses. But this was also the tactic of the social-democrats and even of various bourgeois parties. Comrade Kolarov makes the Stambolisky Government appear as champion against big capital, whereas this government represented mainly kulakdom. Comrade Kolarov makes the peasantry as a whole appear as an independent revolutionary force in the struggle against capitalism, a force capable of carrying with it even the proletariat. Could the Stambolisky Government which rested on the kulak section of the peasantry, carry on a genuine struggle against big capital? Certainly not. It carried on mainly a struggle not against big capital, but against the working class headed by the Communist Party.

The working peasantry in the Balkans in no doubt a revolutionary factor, but only under the leadership of the proletariat headed by the Communist Party. Otherwise, it gets inevitably under the influence of the bourgeoisie. But to listen to Comrade Kolarov, one would think that it can play even now an independent revolutionary role, although Rumanian and Yugoslavian facts show clearly that the contrary is the case.

It seems to me that in view of the appearance of this kind of opinion, more attention should be paid in the theses to the peasant question, especially to the new features in the peasant movement.

Comrades, we have seen that not only in the big capitalist countries the masses are swinging to the Left, are becoming more active and are going, at least in some countries, from defensive to counter-offensive. We witness a series of facts which point this way also in several of the countries which I mentioned in my speech. However, I must say that also in the countries with which I am dealing, we frequently notice that the Communist Parties and their organisations are not keeping pace with the masses who are swinging to the Left. We notice this phenomenon even in a country such as Poland where we have certainly one of our best Communist Parties, where contact with the masses is better than in many other Parties, in spite of illegality. We have already heard here about the May Day demonstrations in Poland. These demonstrations certainly indicated the revolutionary spirit of the Polish proletariat and working peasantry. However, side by side with these facts, we also have facts which bear witness of Communist Party organisations lagging behind the working class which is swinging to the Left. In some Polish districts, our Party banners and speakers were conspicuous by their absence. There were even cases — true, only one such case has hitherto reached us — when members of our Party protested against the singing of the "International", in order, as they said, not to frighten away the masses, not to provoke more repressions. In some localities, our comrades explained this attitude by saying that the masses would not come to demonstrations held under the banner of the Communist Party, and that it was therefore necessary to leave our banners behind. And yet we know that wherever our Party banners made their appearance, they were greeted enthusiastically by the masses and were frequently defended by non-Party workers when the police wanted to seize them. C. P. and Y. C. L. speakers were greeted enthusiastically everywhere. Barricades have already been seen in several Polish districts, for instance, in Kopyanitsy. Serious collisions between demonstrators and police took place in several places on May Day. It is therefore clear that the comrades who say that our Party banners frighten away the masses, as well as the organisations to which they belong, are lagging behind the mass of the workers and peasants who are swinging to the Left.

In Finland, too, big May Day demonstrations took place, but all of them minus the illegal Party banners and minus Communist speakers.

In Reval (Esthonia), the Left trade unions organised a big May Day demonstration compared with which the demonstration of the Social Democrats was quite insignificant. But even in Esthonia, in spite of its revolutionary traditions, there were no Party banners nor Party speakers. This bears witness of an extremely sad fact: the masses in these countries too, turn out to be much more revolutionary than their leaders. Helsingfors is the most vivid example of this. Owing to inclement weather

which was mentioned here by the Swedish comrade, the leaders of the Left trade union movement in Helsingfors decided to abandon demonstrations. In spite of this, the workers issued the slogan: "Bring your banners and demonstrate", with the result that we had a demonstration of 8000, whereas the Social-Democrats who were to have a separate demonstration, did not demonstrate at all.

A widespread serious error in our countries is legalism, and above all, trade union legalism. Trade union legalism has already been condemned in several C. I. resolutions, among others, in the resolution of the E. C. C. I. devoted to the Lodz strike. But this legalism was to be seen not only among the reformist trade union leaders, and not only in Lodz, but in a number of other places. Legalism was, and unfortunately, still is widespread in the Finnish trade unions. It also exists in the Latvian Communist Party. Another group of errors which again are characteristic of nearly all the countries with which I am dealing, is the attitude to social-fascism. Right errors in regard to social-fascism exist in many Polish districts. It seems to me, that social-fascism is as strong in Poland as it is in Germany. Polish social fascists were directly instrumental in bringing fascism into power, and they are also helping fascism to remain in power.

At present, not only avowed fascists, but official P. P. S. elements assert that there is no fascism in Poland. And yet, the P. P. S. has been organising for years attacks on Communists and Left workers, and ill-treatment of Left workers à la Zoergiebel already on May Day in 1928. It would seem that in Poland social-fascism is more evident than anywhere else. In spite of this, it turns out that by their "Left" phraseology to which they are having recourse more and more frequently, the social-fascists have deceived many workers, and even many local Communist organisations and individuals have erred in this direction. But this would not be so bad, if the leading organs of the Party were to remedy these errors in good time. Unfortunately, instead of remedying these errors, some members of the C. P. P. Executive have even intensified them.

Comrade Lensky has already spoken here on this subject, and as my time is short I will not dwell on this. I want merely to point out that these errors in regard to social democracy and social-fascism, have also taken place in Finland. One of the fascist leaders describes social democracy, who were in power not so long ago, not as the enemy of fascism, but as a force which is helping fascism and the "Defence Corps", namely, the armed Finnish fascist organisation. The fascists say that the time is not far distant when the Finnish social democrats will defend the "Defence Corps" openly. This is certainly true. But in spite of this, Left Finnish workers, Communists and trade unionists, are still making mistakes in regard to social democrats, above all, in connection with trade union work. Most of the Finnish trade unions have been under Left influence in the last years. At the last trade union congress in May 1929, social-democrats constituted only 20% of the delegates. But these 20% ruled the roost, they actually dictated to the Left, including the Communists. It was due to the pressure of these 20% and to the capitulation before this pressure of the Left and the Communists, that the Norwegian-Finnish-Soviet agreement of trade union friendship and solidarity was not ratified. As a result of the capitulation of the Left before the social democrats, the Trade Union Congress did not recall its representative from the Labour Office in the League of Nations. Owing to this capitulation on the part of the Left and the Communists, social-fascist actions, disruptive social democratic activity, and a number of other things were not exposed.

Right errors made their appearance also in regard to partial demands, parliament and local government organs, for instance, in the platform of the workers and peasants fraction in the Latvian Diet, in the election platform of the Left in Esthonia, in the manifesto of the Left during elections to local government organ, etc.

The third group of errors is connected with the dissociation of the Party organisations from the masses, their inertia, the lagging behind of the Communist Parties, as far as the development of the labour movement is concerned, etc. This took place above all in countries, which have no big industrial centres, where the petty-bourgeoisie has considerable influence on the working class and white terror is raging (Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia), where our best comrades are either in prison or in exile. This took place mainly in local organisations, the leading organs could not prevent it. One must say that not everywhere are the C. C.'s struggling energetically enough against these errors.

The theses say that there are relics of unprincipled factional struggle in the C. P. P. The theses are comparing the situation in the C. P. P. with the recent situation in the American Communist Party.

It seems to me that such a comparison is inadmissible because it is incorrect. We have repeatedly and severely criticised the Communist Party of Poland. We have struggled hard and will probably continue to struggle against the factional struggle which took place in the C. P. P. until quite recently, but I think that one cannot certainly compare the situation in the C. P. P. with the situation in the American Communist Party.

There has certainly been sharp factional struggle in the Communist Party of Poland which has no doubt done great harm to that Party. However, this struggle was concerned with fundamental questions. This struggle started and gained in strength as a result of the serious mistake made by the Communist Party of Poland, by all its leaders, during the May coup d'Etat in 1926. Internal struggle was bound to break out in the Party after such an enormous mistake.

The open letter of the E. C. C. I. forbade categorically continuation of factional struggle, demanded the dissolution of the factions. It was well received by the organisations. At first, it helped to weaken the factional struggle. But subsequently, approximately since March, we witnessed again a recrudescence of factional struggle in the C. P. P. One must say, however, that this accentuation of factional struggle differed considerably from the situation which we had before. We have at present, apart from the relics of the former factional struggle, a very important new factor which has certainly helped to sharpen the struggle. Some of the leading Polish comrades are guilty of errors in regard to a question which is of the utmost importance not only to the Communist Party of Poland, but to the whole Communist International, I mean errors in regard to our attitude to the I. P. S. We have now in the Communist Party of Poland a decided change for the better. After the last Plenum of the Central Committee of the C. P. P., we have every reason to believe that we are really at the beginning of the consolidation of the Communist Party of Poland, a consolidation around the line of the Communist International and based on the decisions made by the last Plenum of the C. C. C. P. P. The last Plenum of the C. P. P. condemned the errors of which some comrades in the Central Committee of the C. P. P. were guilty, above all, their erroneous attitude to the I. P. S.; the Plenum showed where the root of these errors is. In regard to the condemnation of the errors, part of the former majority of the C. C. C. P. P. associated itself with the criticism of these errors on the part of the former minority and the neutral comrades. This is the best part of the former followers of the majority. Thus, factional divisions which seemed to have firmly established themselves lately, have been dealt a severe blow. I think that also a considerable number of former political friends of comrades Kostcheva and Stepanisky who were condemned at the last Plenum for their errors which, unfortunately, they have not yet recognised (this applies particularly to Comrade Kostcheva), will find enough courage to associate themselves, not by words but by deeds, with the point of view of the resolution of the last Plenum for which they have voted. We venture to hope that they will find courage to put this resolution into practice. If this really takes place, we shall no doubt be able to report progress in the Communist Party of Poland.

In view of the coming events, the Communist Party of Poland must be united, and I think that our Plenum must have its say on this point in the theses. The change for the better which we notice now in the Communist Party of Poland must be mentioned in the theses of the X. Plenum. (Applause.)

Comrade GARLANDI (Italy):

Comrades, allow me to offer a contribution to the study of the important problem of Fascism to which other comrades have already devoted their attention.

In the period of the final world crisis of capitalism (and not only in the third period), in order to defend itself from the advance of the proletarian revolution, in order to carry out its "stabilisation" and to find a certain equilibrium, capitalism has begun the demolition of democracy.

This political demolition is on the surface the reflection of the upsetting of equilibrium in the relationships of production, which was caused by the war, which has made con-

stant progress and which presents one of the particular and acute characteristics of the present period; it is also the reflection of the changes in the social structure which have taken place in production and tend to destroy the bridge between the bourgeoisie and the proletarian masses, and to narrow down the basis which all modern capitalist democracy uses to control the proletarian masses: that is to say, the labour aristocracy. If we consider the problem from this angle, we see better that the most modern reactionary forms of capitalism are nothing else but the new form which capitalism assumes in special historic circumstances in order to control and dominate the masses. When we speak of control of the masses we cannot think merely of the control of the State apparatus over the masses, of the strengthening of this apparatus, etc. This form of control by the apparatus is not different in character from the present reaction; even if the apparatus of the present capitalist State is modified today and is being transformed and reinforced (through a veritable inflation of the apparatus) in order to serve better the domination of capitalism.

The interesting feature of the political control of capitalism to day over the masses lies in the fact that capitalism cannot give up the principle of establishing a basis among the masses, and that it must by some method or other attempt to establish organic contact with the masses in order to dominate them better, and that it must establish a mass reaction.

For this reason I believe that the Yugoslavian dictatorship is one of the most unstable. In Yugoslavia it is impossible to establish a national uniform reactionary organisation in which national contradictions would not develop.

This type of reaction, this form of control of the masses, we call Fascism. And it is well to consider that Fascism inherits from democracy this necessity of capitalism to base its support on a restricted section of the masses in order to dominate the broad masses. I cannot analyse thoroughly here this fundamental problem of the modern capitalist State, namely, the problem of the necessity for capitalism to rule by basing its support on a broad section of the masses. When the Italian Fascists, even after condemning and referring ironically to democracy, declare from time to time that Fascism "is carrying out the postulates of true democracy" they are expressing the need of capitalism in general, and thereby Italian capitalism, of finding bases among the masses. The history of Italian Fascism since 1922 and we could even say, since 1919 is very interesting from the point of view of changes in the basis of Fascism and of the obstinate and constant search for a mass basis.

Comrade Manuilsky is right when he says that Fascism appears at the weakest point of capitalism.

It must further be pointed out that the weak points are not only those which show the organic weaknesses of capitalism, but as I have already said, even those which indicate the upsets of equilibrium which occur in the capitalist system, even in the big capitalist States. The nature of these ruptures of equilibrium is part of the very nature of dying capitalism.

The reactionary transformation of democracy therefore coincides with the reactionary transformation of the capitalist system.

After pointing out the general characteristics of the reactionary transformation of the political regime of capitalism, we must see how this transformation manifests itself. The degree of the development of capitalism is not the same in all countries, nor is the alignment of political forces, or the differentiation between the classes. For this reason we say that Italian fascism, the type adopted by Italian reaction, cannot be reproduced in the other countries.

Italian Fascism is called classic, not for the reason that in Italy everything must be classic, but because of the fact that in Italy there exist together all the conditions of the exterior accentuation of class contradictions over the texture of an organically weak capitalism. The organic weakness of Italian capitalism has prevented the formation of a big labour aristocracy and has restricted the bases of bourgeois democracy. All this explains why Italian history, after the establishment of the unitary State, has only been a series of bloody and permanent class conflicts which have enabled our working masses to acquire a precocious revolutionary experience; all this explains why Italian Fascism has not been able to carry on an independent policy; it explains why the Italian Socialist Party as a whole took a stand against the war (even if its stand

was a centrist position and not a consistent revolutionary opposition); and this explains why it was represented at Kienthal and Zimmerwald and why the Socialist Party of Italy was not broken up after the war to make possible the participation of the reformists in the government. The reformists did not support themselves on a large labour aristocracy. They understood that to come into power without the Party meant liquidation in a very short time. But on the other hand, this explains why the first Fascist groups in Italy had a radical demagogic programme. Their aim was to detach the petty-bourgeoisie in the towns and rural districts from the influence of the Socialist Party and also they aimed to break up the Socialist Party which was immersed in revolutionary phrasemongering. In its composition primitive Fascism was a very different group from the Fascism of 1925 and 1926 and from the Fascism of to-day.

If we limit ourselves to Italian experience, we must say that the conditions of the appearance and the victorious rise of Fascism are a) an objectively revolutionary situation in which the democratic forms of the bourgeois State are in danger; b) The existence of a numerous petty-bourgeoisie which has no solid bonds with capitalism — a petty-bourgeoisie among whom the conviction arises that it can play an independent role in political life and solve the conflict between the two historical classes which are in a state of struggle; c) elements of small peasants and agricultural wage earners who grew rich during the war and who are against the agricultural programme of socialisation upheld by the Socialist Party of Italy; d) an independent petty-bourgeois mass organisation with armed fighting forces; e) a National and exasperated "anti-democratic" ideology, which denies the class struggle, which pretends to fight capitalism and the proletariat, etc.; f) the advance to power through the coup d'Etat.

It must be added that when these conditions arose in Italy they found a particularly favourable state of mind among certain elements of the petty-bourgeoisie on account of conditions made to Italy at Versailles, which persuaded these elements that Italy was considered by the big powers as a negligible factor with no right to share in the booty. This state of mind has been at the bottom of Fascist policy; through it Fascism is upholding certain demands of the countries which were conquered and bases its foreign policy on the revision of the peace treaties.

But must all these conditions be realised in other countries for us to speak of the existence of Fascism in these countries? Not at all. In Spain we have witnessed a different process of formation of Fascism; in the country of pronunciamientos the coup d'Etat was bound to be military; it was not until after De Rivero had been in power for some time that he organised a "patriotic" independent mass movement and utilised the Spanish Social Democracy for the exercise of his dictatorship. Certain features of resemblance to Mussolini's Fascism are appearing in Poland only a number of years after the coup d'Etat. In Rumania we have always spoken of Bratiano's Fascism; but it is only now after Maniu has come into power that we find certain characteristic traits of Fascism in Rumania.

We see that the process is differentiated and that it is even complicated. It comes about through a change which is taking place in all existing political movements through a displacement of the bases of the various parties and through a new alignment of political forces.

The coup d'Etat is not the only feature of the Fascist transformation of bourgeois democracy. After the war there were coup d'Etats almost everywhere, and it can be said that political life after the war went on through coup d'Etats, but these coup d'Etats did not bring Fascism everywhere. The coup d'Etat of 1924 in France after the political elections brought Herriot's democracy into power; the coup d'Etat of 1926 in France brought Poincaré into power, which is not Fascism yet. The characteristic feature of fascism is the abolition of the regime of the old democracy and the reactionary utilisation of a mass movement against the proletariat and the proletarian revolution and for the most consistent defence of the capitalist state.

Since this is the characteristic feature of Fascism, it is clear that the bourgeoisie is utilising the Social Democratic organisations in its reactionary work. This has already become clear in a number of small countries; but in the big industrial

countries where there is a strong proletariat the Social Democracy is becoming the centre of the reactionary mass organisation. We already see how this process of Fascisation of the Social Democracy takes place. We must not limit ourselves to superficial analogy and believe that what has taken place in Italy will take place in the other countries. The analogy with Italian Fascism has already been refuted by facts in many cases. But in any case even in Italian Social Democracy a process of fascisation is developing, the forms of which are of course different from those in the other countries. The Italian Social Democracy, after the elimination of a great number of "basic cadres", which passed over to Fascism in recent years, has already undergone a split which occurred late in 1927; the group of Rigola, D'Arragona and Company, recognised the Fascist regime of which it has become an instrument for extending the contact of Fascism with the working masses.

And when the Amsterdam International had to choose between the recognition of the C. G. T. (the continuance of which was assured by the revolutionary workers) the emigrant reformists of the Buozzi group and the openly Fascist group of Rigola, it attempted to conciliate the stand of Buozzi and Rigola and sent Citrine and Sassenbach with Mussolini's permission, to Italy to resume contact with the Rigola group. We can say that the Rigola group is the channel through which Mussolini is attempting to conquer the leading Social Democratic group among the emigrants, in which signs of disruption are already visible. It is impossible to see how the process of Fascisation of the Italian Social Democracy will come about — whether it will be carried out as a sort of compromise between the Social Democratic leaders and Fascism before a revolutionary crisis or at a time of crisis; or whether at some time in the future the Social Democracy will arise as a "new Fascism", that is to say, as the new reactionary reorganisation of the Italian capitalist State.

If we examine the historic nature of Fascism as well as the fascisation of the Social Democracy instead of limiting ourselves to considering the external features of the two phenomena, we observe that the Fascist transformation of the capitalist regime is accompanied by an advanced process of concentration of capitalism and finance capital and of more or less advanced phenomena of interpenetration of economics and politics, that is to say, of phenomena of State capitalism. And these phenomena do not belong to the age of Sulla or the third Empire. Even in Germany in 1919 they were not as pronounced as to-day. When the German comrades say that social-fascism is the form of domination of monopolist finance capital, perhaps they are anticipating the development of the process, but they are correctly emphasising one of the fundamental features of the process of fascisation of Social Democracy. It could better be said that Social Fascism is becoming one of the forms of domination of monopoly finance capital. One of the forms and not the form. If we accept social fascism as the form of the political domination of monopoly finance capital we can arrive at false conclusions: that is to say, that Italian Fascism, which is already the form of political domination of capitalism, would at least be a type of social fascism, and that also in Germany the Social Democracy would have already become the form of domination of monopolist finance capital, which is not correct.

There is therefore a difference between fascism and social-fascism. Comrade Bela Kun reproached the Italian comrades for having said and for saying that there is a difference between democracy and fascism. Comrade Bela Kun thinks that democracy and fascism are one and the same thing. By following this pseudo-analytical method, a number of equations could be established:

Fascism = Democracy; democracy = Social Democracy; Social Democracy = Fascism, etc., etc. This method is similar to the one adopted formerly by Bordiga, who after confusing the historic tendencies of democracy and fascism with the complicated phases through which the process takes place, had reached a vulgar simplification of the analysis; the conclusion was that in Italy there was nothing but capitalism on the one hand and on the other hand the proletariat with its allies which were led of course by the Communist Party. Unfortunately, the situation was not like that because Parties cannot be destroyed by syllogisms, and we made errors at that time which we do not wish to repeat.

We are agreed that there is no struggle of principle between democracy and fascism, but as I have already said, they represent two different methods of grouping and controlling the masses. The class nature of democracy and fascism is the same, but the manner in which they group the masses is different.

But, comrades, a difference exists even between the old prewar democracy, which might be called "classic" and post-war democracy, the democracy of to-day. Democratic ideology (owing to the slowness of the transformation of ideologies) is being transformed more slowly than the political regime of democracy. But if we are to make a comparison between the present situation of democracy and its pre-war situation, we find that it has greatly changed. The example of what is taking place in France is typical. French democracy is advancing toward Fascism through a complicated transformation of the Left parties and their bases. We cannot exclude the possibility that the famous Centre party, of which Tardieu dreamed as the new reactionary grouping, will be established with the debris of radicalism, plus C. G. T. trade unionism, plus the French Social Democracy. Fascist reaction in the most advanced Democratic countries, must come from the "Left". If we say then that democracy is being transformed into fascism, we say at the same time that democracy is not fascism. Democracy then is being transformed, it is becoming Fascism.

More correctly, Social Democracy is not Fascism. Social Democracy is being fascised, therefore, it is becoming Fascism. The difference between Social Democracy and Fascism lies in the historic process of the formation of each of them. In its process of formation, "classic" fascism establishes mass organisations which combat the traditional class organisations of the proletariat and toiling peasants: in the process of its formation, social fascism makes use of organisations which are themselves the traditional organisations of the class struggle. "Classic" Fascism sets itself the practical task of destroying the basis of the old labour organisations; the Social Democracy, on the other hand, maintains its social basis among the workers. This difference is important from the point of view of the different problems which arise in the different situations, and from the different manner in which, in individual cases, the conquest of the majority of the working class takes place. If we have for example, in Italy, the slogan: "Out of the fascist trade union, the fascist trade union must be destroyed", the German comrades have a different slogan: "All join the reformist trade unions — the reformist trade unions must be captured."

It is quite evident that the process of the Fascisation of the Social Democracy is developing through a crisis of Social Democracy. Fascised Social Democracy will no longer be social democracy, just as the social democracy of to-day is not the social democracy of yesterday. The elements which now make up the basis of the social democracy are being displaced, and in such a way that the Fascisation of the Social Democracy is accompanied by the process of radicalisation of the masses. The more the masses become radicalised, the faster the pace at which the reactionary transformation of the social-democratic trade unions and social-democratic organisations proceeds.

During the process of the Fascist transformation of Social Democracy, the simultaneous existence of the two fascisms must even be contemplated. It would be strange to imagine that Fascism must everywhere have a monopoly of political life as it does in Italy. We already see in Austria, on the one hand, a Fascism which is typically Italian, and which is even supported by Mussolini, and on the other hand, a Social Democracy which competes with Fascism, and which is attempting to ally itself with the most reactionary groups in order to defeat fascism. But in order to succeed in its policy, the Austrian Social Democracy must gradually renounce many of its political principles. In order to struggle against Fascism it is becoming fascised. If it defeats Fascism it will itself become Austrian Fascism. Even in Germany we have recently heard from the lips of Social-Democratic leaders that if a dictatorship is to be established in Germany it will be the Social Democracy that establishes it. What does this mean if not a challenge to the fascist parties of Germany to replace them in their reactionary tasks? It is evident that in the situation of Germany and of Austria as in other similar situations, it is preferable for capitalism to accept the fascist

orientation of the Social Democracy instead of establishing ex-novo Fascist organisations which would not have any proletarian bases. For the German and Austrian bourgeoisie it would be better to proceed with the reactionary transformation of the regime, utilising an organised labour element for support.

The hypothesis was brought up of a conflict between Fascism and the Social Democracy. Such a conflict cannot be excluded and we are persuaded that between the Social Democracy and Fascism there is a competitive struggle — this conflict already exists. But it is not a determining characteristic of the situation; and in the perspective of the development of the situation we cannot include an armed conflict between the social democracy and fascism. In the perspective of the development of the situation, the revolutionary proletariat led by the Communist Party, acts as a fundamental decisive factor. From the general point of view, if we brought up the hypothesis of an armed conflict between the Social Democracy and fascism, we should then have to neglect the function of the revolutionary proletariat and the Communist Party.

If in Austria, for example, there exist reasons for conflict between the Social Democracy and Fascism, they must be sought in the weakness of the revolutionary movement and of our Party in this country. Even in Italy the perspective of an armed conflict between the remnants of the Social Democracy and fascism will be possible only if the Italian proletariat, under the leadership of the Communist Party, does not succeed from the first moment of insurrection in getting at the head of the working population. But even in this case the victory of Social Democracy over Fascism would be equal to a defeat of the revolution. It would be a very advanced stage, we might almost say, the peak of fascisation of the social democracy and not a victory of democracy over reaction. We can say that social democracy is becoming fascised in opposition to "classic" fascism when it has not already become organically and politically fused with "classic" fascism.

But another differentiation between fascism and social democracy, and one which plays an important part in the process of fascisation, is ideology. Although Fascist ideology in Italy has not had a determining function in the development of Fascism it nevertheless has had a very important function, and it even has so at the present time. It is true that the "quantity of fascist ideology" during the period of the fascist struggles for power and during the period of the stabilisation of Italian capitalism, has been diminishing to the extent that the economic positions of Italian capitalism became "consolidated": this quantitative reduction of the ideological factor coincided with the ever-more marked weakening of the political position occupied by the poor and middle elements in the Fascist ranks, thus corresponding to the modifications in the relationships of forces and classes within Fascism. But it would be a serious mistake to believe that Italian capitalism has abandoned or was about to abandon fascist ideology like a useless rag.

Comrade Bela Kun referred to the fascist programme of 1919, which speaks of the constituent assembly, abolishment of the Senate, of workers' control, etc. I have already said why Fascism adopted such a radical programme. Mussolini's programme of 1919 was a programme of a Social-Democratic type, basing its support on an exasperated nationalism and on the demand for a more favourable share in the war booty against internationalism and for revenge against the allies. But the Socialist Party of Italy, which had been opposed to the war and which represented a centrist internationalist party, had an entirely different ideology. The form of national socialism of Mussolini appeared even in other countries, particularly in countries which were defeated in the war, like Germany. The relations between Mussolini and Hitler in 1920 and 1921 — which were maintained even after this period — already constituted a sort of ideological connection between these groups of enraged petty-bourgeois who were seeking bases among the masses in order to wreak their vengeance — in the name of the "war generation" against those responsible for the consequences of peace. It is entirely correct that the Pathos of these groups is the nation. The pathos of the nation is the guiding force of the petty-bourgeoisie which is always seeking a better position in economic and political life. But it is not around this ideology, this pathos that the international socialist movement has been formed, and when the Social Democracy betrayed its principles on August 4th it had to find an ideological justification in the field of so-called

defence of democracy against reaction in order to maintain its social basis by deception.

Fascist ideology is being transformed even while it retains certain general principles. In the same manner Social-Democratic ideology is being transformed even though it maintains certain general principles. The modification of the ideology of the one and the other brings them closer together, but they retain an ideological differentiation, which results from the different manner of grouping of the masses, as expressed by the two movements, and which is also due to their origin and to the necessity of not losing their fundamental basis.

This does not prevent the points of contact between them from increasing and becoming more and more evident. Comrade Bela Kun pointed out many of these identification marks. There are undoubtedly even more which would be of interest. I would like only to emphasise what occurs at Geneva at the **International Labour Office** at its annual sessions. The so-called "labour" delegation of the Amsterdammers, systematically raises its complaint against the recognition of the mandate to the so-called "worker" Fascist delegate. But this formality, which is not even based on a solid legal position, does not correspond to a divergence on concrete questions which are being discussed. In this connection it is interesting to observe that Fascism is always making fun of the "League" Socialists every time that concrete problems come up for discussion, declaring that Fascism has already introduced in its legislation what the other countries, even with the Socialists in power, have not succeeded in doing. In this demagogic game the Italian Fascists know how to hold their own. They demanded the ratification of the 8-hour day (but in Italy there is a 12 and even a 14-hour day among categories of agricultural labourers); they opposed en bloc (representatives of the government, the employers and the "workers"), forced labour in the colonies. They brought up the question of collective contracts and their regulation; and finally they have declared to the Socialists of the International Labour Office that "it is not possible to speak of the social factor apart from the economic factor", and that social legislation must take into consideration the economic situation in each country.

Before the "Labour" representatives of Amsterdam who are in the service of their imperialisms, the Fascists, after high sounding praise of Fascist legislation which should serve as an example to other countries, brought up the expansionist demands of Italian imperialism. The Amsterdammers could reply to fascist "legislation" only by phrases. In reality the points of contact between Fascist ideology and the Social-Democrats are very numerous. Collaboration of classes, the legal trade union, the regulation of collective contracts, compulsory arbitration, the strong State over and above classes, the necessity for struggling by all weapons against the proletarian revolution, etc., represent very important points of identification. It would be wise to examine the problem of trade union liberty and to see how the Fascist and Social-Democratic points of views are identical on this question; everyone understands very well that the defence of trade union liberty, with which Social-Democrats oppose the fascists, is a deception and a demagogic trick.

It is true that the ideological castle of the fascist programme, even if transferred to the field of legislation, absolutely fails to correspond to a change in the class relations in the sense that fascist ideology would give us to believe. This symmetrical castle of fascist legislation serves for the most cynical and brutal domination of very restricted groups, which are actually the rulers of Italy to-day. Perhaps there never has been such a shameless dictatorship as that of the Italian fascism. When you hear of the corporative state and such absurdities, you must not believe that an audacious experiment in collaboration has begun in Italy through an organic modification of the class relations and between the State and the classes. There is nothing of the sort. The corporative state does not exist. I will say furthermore: if the corporative state existed it would be a menace to the regime, considering that it would have to agree to a sort of corporative democracy. We may conclude on this point with the slogan which a fascist organiser issued at the Congress of fascist trade unions: "The class struggle has been abolished in Italy, but only for the workers."

This is the true meaning of the function of this complicated machine of legislation of the Fascist State. But is it not true that the whole present orientation of the Social Democracy

and the legislation which it defends, arrives at the same results emphasised by the fascist organiser concerning the fascist experiment? There is no doubt about this.

Fascist ideology has failed. In spite of this it still plays an important part in linking up the elements of the petty-bourgeoisie with capitalism and in maintaining the unity of the Fascist apparatus. As we have seen, it puts the problem of expansion in the foreground, which is supposed to be the precondition for assuring the achievement of the Fascist programme and the corporative State.

In face of Fascist ideology, Social Democratic ideology has the strange privilege of having failed first. But the Social Democratic ideology also survives in spite of everything and serves to cloak a political method of suppressing the revolution and the working class.

Fascism and the fascisation of the Social Democracy (social fascism) confront us with different tasks and problems. Where are the workers whom we must win over in each country? Where are the agricultural workers? Where are the toiling peasants? Their different political positions call for different methods of recruiting and the solution of different political problems call for different methods of agitation. I have already said for example, that the method of capturing the organised workers in the reformist trade unions differs from the method of capturing the workers who are compelled to remain in the Fascist trade unions. Differentiations arise in other spheres of the political struggle. The working masses are not and never will be captured by "classic" fascism, but they are in the social democratic organisation and under its ideological and political influence. The formation of the front from below must occupy the centre of our mass work.

In Italy fascism came from the rural districts, and all fascists will either come from the rural districts or attempt to find their bases in the rural districts. The reactionary transformation of the Social Democracy will be accompanied by a capture of the rural masses. We are still neglecting peasant work. Woe to us if we remain in this position of neutrality or verbal parliamentary and literary solidarity towards the rural working population. Fascism still has its most solid basis in the rural districts.

The dynamics of the development of the situation is so impetuous that the most unforeseen events may suddenly arise before us. It is for this reason that all our organisational and political work must be intensified. If we analyse the phenomena of economic, political and social life in our period, if we insist on the differentiation of the reactionary forms of the regime of capitalism and demand that certain formulations be better defined, it is because we wish to find together the best ways to launch the final struggle against the enemy with the greatest chances for our success. For this purpose the elements of study which we have introduced here with regard to the forms of fascism and social fascism, may prove useful to us.

Comrade WOLF (Hungary):

Our Party has, after the reaction of 1926—27, entered on a new phase of its development. Hitherto it was engaged in the founding of the organisations, whereas now, as this task has been largely achieved, it is beginning to take active part in the political and economic struggles of the Hungarian proletariat. It is as yet rarely at the head of these struggles, but it is seeking to reach this aim. In the course of the last nine months it has experienced a series of struggles which did not remain without success although the Party made some mistakes in them.

(The speaker then dealt with the work of the Party in the various unions, as well as on the occasion of the recent elections in the social-insurance societies, and then came to the question of August 1st.)

I heard that individual comrades were dissatisfied with our programme of action. Well, comrades, we do not want to work out a big plan to be suspended in the air. We had to calculate all our forces, as many of our comrades have been and will be arrested. We had further to take into account the fact that our Party has now for the first time in ten years come out openly into the street with its own slogans. Naturally, we must not cherish the illusion that our preparations can be in any way compared with those of the Polish comrades. There is illegality and illegality, and the chances of activity are not

everywhere alike. Of course we do not want to shirk responsibility.

A discussion was carried on in the Party Executive on the question of strategy. The Party has revealed here a whole series of opportunist mistakes according to which the democratic dictatorship has in the course of years been openly or secretly the strategical aim of the Party. The Party is now trying to get rid of these ideologists. There are Right wingers and conciliators also in our Party. We hope, however, that with the assistance of the Communist International we shall be able to cleanse our ranks. This will not cause any disturbance in the Party as these ranks have no foundation in it. They are opposed to the C.C. but since they have remained in the Minority, they now depend on each others support and partly on the support of the emigrants.

The question of social fascism must by no means be approached mechanically. Fascism assumes in each country, and under the varying conditions, ever different forms, and it does not exclusively take the form of social fascism. There is no doubt that fascisation is proceeding in the whole of the capitalist world. What drives the bourgeoisie to this course? Firstly the ever deepening crisis of capitalism. Hence the nervous fear among the bourgeoisie that a proletarian revolution will break out at home. In accordance with the correct characterisation of the third period by the VI. World Congress, the revolutionary forces are increasing as the crisis of capitalism becomes more acute. This development can be observed also in our country, and that is why the bourgeoisie becomes ever more feverish in the organisation of open fascist bands, as well as in making pacts with the Social Democratic Party.

In order to check the development of the crisis of capitalism the bourgeoisie is compelled to resort to skillful manoeuvring and always to change its methods. Brute force and democracy are no longer sufficient for the defence of capitalism. In the course of the permanent crisis, in the struggle between revolution and counter-revolution, the bourgeois forces fall asunder time and again and they must be time and again reassembled. As the revolutionary forces accumulate the old methods become ever more obsolete and new methods specially adapted to the new conditions must be applied. Such a new form of organisation of forces for the protection of capitalism is fascism.

The constant fluctuation, the rise of ever new contradictions, render necessary a continual adaptation of the methods of fascisation, for which reason the question must not be dealt with mechanically. Fascist organisations are being founded in Hungary and simultaneously the social-democratic bureaucracy is being fascised while the government is pursuing a social-fascist policy, passing and promising social laws of a fascist nature.

Open fascist organisations are being established with the object of crushing the fighting revolutionary proletariat by force. They are, however, being used at the same time as a menacing spectre against the social-democratic bureaucracy upon which the government wants to exert pressure. An important reason for the creation of these organisations, which is welcomed also by the social democrats, is the aim to organise a class army against the Soviet Union or at least to create a reliable counter-revolutionary nucleus.

It is of interest to know that in our country there are quite peculiar organisations being set up for this purpose. There is a moribund fascist strike-breaking organisation directed against the internal enemy. Attempts are now being made to create a broad fascist organisation, which, for the time being and in order to diminish the resistance from below, is not used in the breaking of strikes. The chief slogan concerns foreign policy, a demagogic swindle with regard to the revision of the Trianon Peace Treaty. This organisation is the Revisionist League. Against this organisation the social democrats do not even conduct the sham fight which they conduct against the strike-breaking organisation. They see in the League merely a rival institution, but in principle they agree with it.

In the countries where social legislation is most backward, this fact is utilised by the bourgeoisie for special manoeuvres, partly against the social-democratic bureaucracy, but chiefly as a bait for the fascist plans. These social-political institutions give the proletariat in most cases nothing, in fact they only burden the workers.

There must be no illusion when open fascism is being partly displaced by social-fascism. All forms of fascism mean illegality, or at least a strong tendency towards illegality, for the Communist Parties, and it is to be assumed that also the Parties which have hitherto been working openly will be driven underground. There can be no question but that all forms of fascism mean only one thing, and that is the mobilisation of the last reserves of the bourgeoisie against the revolution. What is the attitude of the workers with regard to fascisation?

The working masses are opposed to every form of fascisation also in Hungary. It is true that some sections are with the social-fascists and even with the open fascists. But in our country this development takes a course different from that in countries where our movement is legal. For the time being it is no easy matter to win over workers for open fascism, as the terrorist work of the bourgeoisie has greatly radicalised the working class. In the provinces, fascism pure and simple can to a certain extent be advocated. The opposition to social fascism is mostly expressed in the form of passive resistance. The workers flee from any kind of organisation, but they rarely go as far as openly to break with the social fascist organisation and to set up radical class organisations.

The great difficulties in carrying on revolutionary propaganda give open fascism an opportunity to exert their influence on the unorganised. That furthers the above mentioned tendency of displacement of social fascism by fascism pure and simple. The Right danger in our Party consists in the fact that the Right wingers under-estimate social fascism and regard the unorganised workers which are already swinging towards the Left as fascist reserves. The experiences of the Communist Party of Hungary show with particular clarity that an incorrect and mechanical view of fascism leads to our adoption of an opportunist policy.

Comrade AMERIGO LEDO (Latin-America):

Comrades, I wish merely to enumerate here the most important events which have occurred recently in Latin-America. These events emphatically confirm the correctness of the theses formulated by the VI. Congress on the situation of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, and also of the line of the draft theses submitted to this Plenum for discussion.

In the centre of these events there is the counter-revolutionary insurrection in Mexico, with its two accompanying phenomena: the struggle of the working class under the leadership of the Communist Party for the hegemony of the whole revolutionary movement, and the final going over of the self-styled labour government to the camp of counter-revolution under the protection of North American imperialism.

The offensive of Yankee imperialism is increasing from day to day and is making successful headway against the old positions of British imperialism.

We find, then, an accentuation of the antagonisms between the two powerful rival imperialisms, and also on the other hand, between the oppressed countries and the oppressing imperialism.

The **Paraguay-Bolivia conflict**, which broke out as a result of the greediness of these two imperialisms for the oil fields of Chaco-Boreal, constitutes in this sense one of the most outstanding facts. We have still other facts of the same nature, such as the "peaceful" solution of the old **Tacna-Arica question**, which for decades kept Peru and Chile in a perpetual state of conflict; the intrigues in connection with the Barcos concession in Colombia; and in the state of Zulia in Venezuela aiming at bringing about a "new" independent Panama formed by these two strips of Venezuela and Colombia.

The foreign trade monopoly of salpetre in Chile was also taken over by North American imperialism. In Brazil it has recently obtained the Ford concession in the rubber districts and the Itabira concession in the iron district of Minas Geraes. All these concessions are of great importance in the struggle against British imperialism and the preparation for war. We can also include in this series of facts the "good will" trip of President Hoover, a trip made on board a powerful warship of no less "good will" to the oppressed countries of Latin America.

In Mexico, as an expression of this advance of North American imperialism in Latin America, there was the can-

cellation of the achievements of the Mexican revolution with regard to the oil laws and the laws on distribution of landed property among the peasants.

As one of the consequences of imperialist pressure on the various countries of Latin America, we can point out serious signs of economic and financial crises. This is the case above all in **Brazil**, where the government is carrying out a "stabilisation" of currency, which is in reality nothing else but a policy of stabilisation of the imperialist domination over Brazil; and in **Colombia**, there has been a suspension of public works; in **Uruguay**, where the bourgeoisie was so proud of the "solidity" of its national currency, this currency is very shaky; we have likewise noticed and can still notice an increase of unemployment in Mexico and Brazil, notably in the textile industry.

Directly linked up with all these facts, we observe a process of radicalisation among the working masses — an accentuation of the class struggle and a proletarian and anti-imperialist revolutionary wave. Thus in Mexico we have seen how the peasant organisations, which are under the leadership of the Communist Party, have carried on an independent struggle of their own organised and armed forces against the insurrection of the reactionary generals and clericals.

In the labour movement, economic strikes have occurred almost everywhere in the Latin-American countries; and these strikes have been rapidly transformed into strikes of a political character. This was the case above all in the big banana plantations strike in Colombia, which was crushed in the most bloody and brutal manner.

In Brazil there is a typical case of the strike in the typograph industry, which broke out at St. Paulo 3 months ago. The strikers, who have the support of the national labour movement, are now after 3 months fighting not only for their economic demands but for political rights. Government repression has transformed this movement, which was of purely economic origin, into a political movement, in the sense that the strikers are struggling more for elementary rights of strike and demonstration in the streets than for the economic demands which were issued at the commencement of the strike.

During Hoover's trip to our countries, street demonstrations against Hoover were held in Mexico, Argentine and in Uruguay, where the working masses under the leadership of the Communist Party greeted Hoover with hoots and cries of "Long live Sandino!" and "Hands off Nicaragua!". The recent demonstrations of May 1st also marked an episode in this rising wave of our revolutionary movement. I must stress particularly the demonstrations of May 1st in Cuba, where the Communist Party exists in a complete state of illegality and where the most bloody terror prevails against the working class and the revolutionary elements.

Two congresses were recently held at Montivedeo — in February and in May. I refer to the trade union congress against the war danger and to the continental trade union congress which resulted in the establishment of the Latin-American Trade Union Federation. The success of these two workers' congresses is a clear proof of the radicalisation of the working masses in our countries. But what are the most characteristic features in the present period of Latin-America? They are:

First of all the fascisation of the national governments in the service of imperialism, which is demanding "order". The most typical case of this fascisation is to be observed in Mexico, where the government poses as the champion of Latin-America in the struggle against imperialism.

Secondly, the passing, or the tendency to the passing, of the revolutionary and anti-imperialist movement under the hegemony of the working class, led by the Communist Party.

I must say a few words also on the situation of our Communist Parties in Latin-America. What is said with regard to the retardation in the formation and development of our Party as compared with the more rapid development of the objective revolutionary situation in Latin-America is true. But we have witnessed a certain amount of progress both in the extent of our influence over the masses and in the organisation of our Party.

In Ecuador and Peru for example, where there is not yet any Communist Party as such, but revolutionary organisations of the working masses, we find a certain consolidation of the Communist groups existing within these organisations.

In the Communist Parties which have already existed for a number of years, notably in Mexico and Brazil, we have observed during the past few months a notable growth in their membership and organisation and in the political influence that they have among the working masses. But what is important in this field is the leading role of the Party in the strikes and in the labour movement in general. This can be observed above all in the strikes in Uruguay and Brazil, where the Party has taken the direct, effective and fruitful leadership of the recent strike movements. The Communist press has also made progress. I shall quote two cases: the organ of the Mexican Party "El Machete", the circulation of which has reached 15,000 copies and has nearly 400 worker and peasant correspondents, and the organ of the Brazilian Party "A Classe Operaria", which also has a circulation of 15,000 copies and has great influence among the workers.

The continental conference which has just been held at Buenos Aires is also an indication of the political and organisational development of our Parties.

Comrades, it was said on the occasion of the VI. Congress that the Communist International has discovered Latin-America. I believe that Latin-America is now sufficiently discovered, and that it is no longer sufficient to be content with this happy statement, or with good resolutions on paper. The resolutions must be energetically carried out, that is to say the Communist International must devote constant attention to our small Parties in Latin-America, making more tenacious efforts at organisation and providing them with more effective political support. I may say that we have a right to hope for the support of the Parties of the United States and England in the struggle against the two imperialisms.

We may then expect really great success in our task, which is the conquest of the majority of the working class and the hegemony of the entire anti-imperialist revolutionary movement in Latin-America.

Comrade SHUBIN:

Most important in Indian work just now are the practical conclusions. At the same time the statements contained in the materials on the Indian question which have been distributed here, and which have not been disputed, furnish sufficient foundation for these practical conclusions.

The theses formulated in the Materials may be summarised as follows: 1. the maturing of an objective revolutionary situation in India, and 2. the alarming question regarding the subjective factor in India is lagging too much behind the important tasks dictated by the objective situation.

When speaking about India, we frequently draw a parallel with the Chinese revolution. Of course, the lessons of the Chinese revolution may and should be considered in connection with judging the work in India. The question about the treacherous role of the bourgeoisie, about the inevitable wavering of the petty-bourgeoisie, about the inevitable desertion of its upper layer, about the decisive importance of the resolute unfolding of the agrarian revolution, about the necessity of the theoretical, political and organisational independence of the Communist Party, about the necessity to educate the industrial and agricultural proletariat to trust only their own Party, their own forces, their own weapons, etc. etc., — all these dearly bought lessons of China should become the common property of all the colonial revolutions, and of the Indian to begin with.

But, comrades, when speaking about India, we should bear in mind also another experience, the severe experience of Indonesia. What was the situation in Indonesia in 1926/27? The Comintern instructions in connection with the questions raised by the Indonesian comrades about an armed insurrection failed to reach the country, so that they could not influence the march of events and prevent serious political mistakes due to an incorrect analysis of the class forces, as well as organisational mistakes due to the inexperience and youth of the Party. The result was that the armed insurrection broke out which was politically and technically unprepared for, and which was not backed by a general strike, and all of us know the outcome of it.

When speaking about the Indian revolutionary movement, we should remember that it differs from the Chinese revolution, in being unarmed. The Indian revolution is still unarmed. Furthermore, in contradistinction to the Chinese revo-

lution, it has no contact with the international revolutionary experience, it does not possess those exceptionally important and specific connections with the international revolution which China had, and which I am not going to enlarge upon. The Indian revolution is isolated. Those comrades who are working in India are constantly compelled to work at their own risk, while the conditions are exceptionally complex and are rapidly changing. Therein lies the danger, the gravest danger in connection with the actual maturing of a revolutionary situation in India.

I do not believe Comrade Losovsky particularly accurately characterised this situation when he said that "the struggle against Communism occupies now the central attention in India", or when he went on to emphasise that "the last year in India was marked by the struggle against Communism". To accept such a characterisation would mean to overestimate to a great extent the place now occupied by Communism in the national-revolutionary movement in India. Of course, Comrade Losovsky was quite right in so far as he wanted to say that a revolutionary upheaval is maturing in India; that the revolutionary movement is entering upon a higher stage of development; that the leadership of the national revolution is passing to the organised proletariat; that the bourgeoisie is becoming more and more identified as a counter-revolutionary factor in the struggle against the workers' and peasants' movement, and that consequently, all the counter-revolutionary forces are becoming united against the working class and its vanguard. But I should deem it my duty to warn against an overestimation of the weight and influence already achieved by the Communist Party and by Communism in India.

Of course, one may give a few quotations from one or another Indian newspaper — as was done by Comrade Losovsky — particularly from the frank imperialist press, in which the most varied forms of protest, and even of simple discontent with British imperialism, are designated as Communism. Of course, the fact that a newspaper like the "Times of India" dubs the bourgeois intelligentsia as "Communist" (in order to scare it) is an indirect tribute to the growing influence of the proletariat as an independent factor in the revolution. Yet to jump to the conclusion that the struggle against Communism has become "the flag under which the movement in India is developing" would mean to draw an altogether hasty conclusion.

Comrade Losovsky was hardly to the point when he said that "on this question (i. e. the question of the struggle against Communism) a united front had been formed in India between the native reformists and the various shadings of the national bourgeoisie." If Comrade Losovsky wished to emphasise that the national bourgeoisie had identified itself as a counter-revolutionary force, this statement should be endorsed in every way. It is to be regretted, however, that his formula which characterises the anti-Communist front, while mentioning both the reformists and the national bourgeoisie (which is quite correct, of course), does not take note of the imperialists, i. e. of the central organising and leading counter-revolutionary force of this front. It cannot be said, of course, that Comrade Losovsky has failed to take notice of imperialism, i. e. of the elephant in India. This was but a chance "omission" on his part. Yet this can hardly be described as a fortunate chance, because it has subsequently laid a peculiar stamp upon some of Comrade Losovsky's practical conclusions.

Let us take, for instance, one of the most essential tasks — the unmasking of the treacherous role of the bourgeoisie. Now that we speak to the Indian comrades — and we should do so in a full voice and without any reservations — about the counter-revolutionary role of the national bourgeoisie, is it permissible for us to fail to point out that in spite of the treacherous role of bourgeois nationalism, it is essential to take advantage of all and any conflicts between imperialism and the national bourgeoisie, between the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie, among the different factions of the native bourgeoisie, among the imperialists themselves, and so on? This question is certainly of practical importance just now. Let us take, for instance, the campaign for the boycott of foreign cloth which the Swarajist Party are trying to conduct so as not to release the activity of the masses, so as to keep all the threads of the movement in their own hands, in order to crush it upon receiving the first bribe from the imperialists. At a conference of students, I believe it was at Puna, when the vote was taken on the Swaraj resolution about this form of boycott, one of the participants said: "This is bourgeois deception and bourgeois

speculation." There was thereupon a great noise and everybody shouted: "Are you then in favour of supporting British imperialism?" The comrade did not lose his wits and he replied: "You want to boycott British textile goods. Very well! But let us organise this boycott so that it should be really dangerous to imperialism. Let us organise the dockers and the seamen, who would elect their pickets and organise a control over British imports through their mass organisations." This proposal was rejected by the Conference which was under the influence of "Left" phrase-mongers of the stamp of Nehru junior. Nevertheless, by raising the boycott question in this manner, he brought about a division of opinion in the Conference, gathering a group around himself and preparing for the adoption of real revolutionary struggle against imperialism by that section of the petty bourgeoisie which is capable of it. Can we say categorically that the treacherous tactics of bourgeois nationalism preclude any future possibility of such utilisation? Of course, no. The possibility is not entirely excluded that in spite of the growth of the revolutionary movement, perhaps under the influence of this very growth, bourgeois nationalism at one time or another may begin to "waver", particularly if the international situation should be such that it would feel behind its back the possible support of American imperialism. Of course, the Indian revolution will be unable to take advantage of such "wavering" in the bourgeois and imperialist ranks unless it will develop under the leadership of the proletariat and its Party, unless it will form its own organisations independently and regardless of the bourgeois nationalism.

Comrades, I have dwelt on the "unhappy" formulas of Comrade Losovsky in order to separate them from those of his formulas which appear to me to be absolutely correct. I may even say that these formulas will be resolutely supported also by the Indian Communists, to judge by available material. Comrade Losovsky has literally said the following: "We, both the Comintern and the Profintern, and all the Parties together, have done exceedingly little to help the development of the Indian Communist Party." The stenographic reports an interjection: "Quite right!" This would have been the unanimous exclamation of Indian Communists at this point. Not only have we done little, but we use the words of Comrade Losovsky, "exceedingly little". This may appear at first sight as a common phrase, as a hackneyed formula, so to speak. Quite often we say in connection with other questions that we have done little, that we should have done more. But, comrades, if you will consider the general appraisal of the situation in India which nobody has disputed here, the maturing of the revolutionary situation while the Communist forces in India are in an alarmingly weak condition, you will find this formula to contain a serious warning. You will then find it to be a vitally urgent and indispensable task to do away with the weakness of activity pointed out by Comrade Losovsky.

In the opinion of Indian Communists (I am quoting them almost literally), one of the reasons why so little has been done during a number of years for the building up of the Communist Party of India consists in the fact that there was "the monopoly representation of Roy who did not unite, but on the contrary, separated the Indian Communists from the Comintern." Long before Roy had come out with opportunistic statements in the press, they did not put any high value on his activity. At the time of the IV. Plenum, playing the rôle of a lonely orphan, Roy appealed to the Indian Communists for support, complaining of being slighted by the Comintern. The answer to this plea was quite clear that he was going to get no support. At the Conference of the worker and peasant parties (even of the Worker and Peasant Parties!) Roy's plan for joining the Independence League failed to get a single vote; although it ought to be said that he managed to cause some vacillation on this question among the Communist groups of India. (The "Forward" gladly allowed space for Roy's propaganda on this question.) It can be definitely said that if anyone will support the present Right platform of Roy on the colonial question (the "fighting alliance with the bourgeoisie", the Swaraj "Independence Party", etc.), it will not be the Communists, but that section of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia which has deserted even from the worker and peasant parties in anticipation of the wave of repression.

I now come to those minimal conditions which are essential for eliminating the weak points in the Indian activity described by Comrade Losovsky. One of them is that at least the

responsible comrades in the Sections should watch the development of events in India. This cannot be said to be the case just now. Our newspapers write very little on this subject, and when they do, they display an exceedingly slight acquaintance even with fully available material. Even the E. C. C. I. Manifesto on the Indian revolution was published fully in only a few newspapers.

With such limited information it is quite inevitable that the comrades, when speaking about India, should frequently limit themselves to most general topics, displaying a lack of acquaintance with the content of the rapidly developing and extremely important revolutionary process. Think of this feeble interest in the Indian revolutionary movement displayed by the Sections, with perhaps the exception of the British Section, in the light of the fact that the Sections in the capitalist countries ought to spare some workers for India without delay. The Sections may delay, postpone, protract the solution of this problem. It means only that they will furnish workers with a good deal of delay, at the last minute, in a hurry, without preparation. But they will have to furnish workers, because this will be dictated by the vital interests of the revolution.

My limited time compels me to confine myself to one question, about the worker and peasant parties and the way to liquidate them. Comrade Lozovsky is quite right when he says that the liquidation of the worker and peasant parties in India is taking place slower than it should. What is the trouble here? We must bear in mind that it is relatively easy to form a worker and peasant party, but it is hard to turn into a Communist Party an already existing worker and peasant party with its affiliated revolutionary mass organisations of the workers on the one hand and of the peasants on the other hand, i. e. to rectify the mistake of forming a party of dual composition. It is a characteristic trait of worker and peasant parties that when they cease to live they refuse to die, clinging to the shell of their existence, hindering the development of sound forms of organisation. Comrade Tanaka, the representative of the Japanese Party, could tell us many interesting things in this respect. The Japanese Communist Party is a good deal stronger than the Indian, it has infinitely more practical experience, more theoretical preparation, more consistency and perseverance; nevertheless there is not even the outward appearance of a foundation for the existence of a combined Party of two classes in Japan, with its tremendously growing industrial proletariat. Nevertheless this form of organisation is eliminated very slowly in Japan. The Japanese Communists have established the Rodo Nominto, but now when they justly repudiate this "proletarian" party, it is not easy for them to replace it with properly constructed mass organisations. One of the reasons for the persistence of the worker and peasant parties, and of the possibility of a repetition of this form of organisation, is that this form of organisation in the colonies does solve, even if awkwardly, the task of the Communists in the colonies, namely the organisation of the workers' and peasants' alliance. Perhaps, the apparent ease of realising this alliance in the shape of worker and peasant parties constitutes the chief inducement for forming them, and the difficulty of liquidating them. Moreover, under conditions of illegality, at certain stages of the struggle the worker and peasant party creates something like a screen for the activity of the Communists. Of course, even this advantage is chimerical and illusory. Nowhere was it shown by experience so clearly as in India that the form and composition of the worker and peasant parties are hindering in every way the building of an illegal apparatus. Yet these supposed "technical conveniences" make it so difficult to liquidate the worker and peasant parties, particularly if we make it our aim — as we naturally should — to take advantage of those ties with the masses for the purpose of further activity.

In the theses of the VI. Congress on the colonial question it is said that

"the consolidation of all the Communist groups and individuals scattered throughout the country into a single illegal, independent and centralised party is the foremost task of the Indian Communists. While rejecting the principle of building the Party upon the basis of two classes, the Communists should utilise the ties of the existing worker and peasant parties with the toiling masses to strengthen their own party..."

On the other hand, these Theses embrace a number of other highly important and varied questions of fairly wide scope. There is a danger that the essential instruction of the Theses will be overlooked; in fact, it is considered by some local comrades as disputable and really superfluous.

In passing, I should like to remark that the documents intended for the colonial countries, bearing in mind the illegal conditions of activity, should be drafted as briefly as possible, stating the questions as concisely as possible, even if it should mean that in some documents the questions might not be fully dealt with and full instructions might not be given to the comrades as to the possibilities of further development, and so on. Of course, the Indian Communists could not fail to see in the Theses the point about the liquidation of the worker and peasant parties. Yet vacillation arose when it came to carrying out these instructions. In this respect a decided change is to be observed, if not universally, as the result of the activity of the masses. Comrade Kuusinen has already pointed out here that in India the leaders grow together with the masses. This is unquestionably true. It may be added that they grow under the pressure of the masses, that until quite lately the Indian comrades were dragging in the rear of the revolutionary mass movement. And in the question of the substitution of the worker and peasant parties by genuine class organisations, the initiative belongs to the workers of Bombay. In what sense? In the sense that the mass Left trade unions have shown the most effective form of utilising the influence of the worker and peasant parties among the workers.

The liquidation of the worker and peasant parties raises with equal acuteness the problem of creating mass peasant organisations upon the basis of revolutionary leadership in the everyday struggle of the peasantry. Indeed, the workers and peasant form of party organisation proved entirely useless in regard to activity among the rural population. Instead of helping, the worker and peasant parties have hindered the Communists from approaching the basic masses of the peasantry. Even the most active Communist groups have only recently taken up the question of practical activity in the village in connection with the decision to form a Communist organisation.

The X. Plenum should raise with the utmost clearness the question of the responsibility of the Sections of the C. I. for the further development of the Indian revolution. With the rapid march of events it will not be easy to rectify the mistakes after committing them in connection with Indian activity. It must therefore be made possible, comrades, to take steps in time, by efficient leadership, to prevent the commission of such mistakes.

Comrade KATAYAMA (Japan):

Comrades, Comrade Tanaka already mentioned yesterday that Japan has been entirely neglected in the reports of our comrades here, although that country is a powerful imperialist country.

Japan is but a small country with an area of 147,000 square miles. Only 13% of this territory is arable land. Japan's population is about 65 million. Japan is a militarist country with compulsory military service in the strictest sense of that term. From 5 to 6 million young men are examined annually for conscription. The standing army consists of 20 divisions which in time of war can mobilise 20 million men. Even the schools are militarised, compulsory military training being provided there. As to the navy, you know that the Japanese ratio is 3:5 as compared with America and England. Japan has 900,000 tons of various kinds of warships. She fought three wars in the last 30 years. Japan is a neighbour of the Soviet Union and a great menace to the Soviet Republic. She is the gravest and greatest enemy of the Soviet Union and the Chinese revolution.

A few words concerning the economic conditions and especially the sharpening of the inner contradictions of Japan. An outstanding contradiction in the social life of Japan is that of the supply of and demand for intellectual labour. There are 45,000 schools of various kinds, from universities to the lower type of grammar school. There are 281,000 teachers and professors and 11,500,000 students in all these schools. As a result of this educational progress there is great unemployment amongst the intellectuals. Almost every day we

hear of disturbances, riots, strikes and demonstrations against the authorities in the universities, colleges and high schools.

When I first came to Tokio in 1881 there were only 20 miles of railways in the whole of Japan. Now there are 11,000 miles. The paid-up company capital in 1887 was 25 million, but in 1928 banking capital alone amounted to 1,961,000,000 yen.

The Japanese proletariat is terrifically exploited in view of the rapid rate of industrialisation of the country. There are 9,608,000 labourers of various occupations — 5½ million industrial workers, of whom 2 million are factory workers. Only 300,000 are organised in labour unions.

Japan's foreign trade in 1928 amounted to 4,171,000,000 yen. Steamer and sailing vessels covered a tonnage of 4—5 million tons. Before the Chino-Japanese war the national budget amounted to 280,000,000 yen, but this year it amounts to 1,753,000,000 yen. Of this, over 35% is used for military purposes.

Japan has a national debt of 60,000,000 yen.

The budget and the debts of course fall very heavily upon the workers.

With regard to the peasantry there are 3,800,000 families cultivating less than 2½ acres each. Of the 5,600,000 rural families 3,800,000 are tenants. The latter are very poor and terribly exploited. It goes without saying that above all Japan needs an agrarian revolution.

Comrades, capitalism in Japan has developed with extreme rapidity, resulting in the sharpening of contradictions in every field of industry and society between the exploiters and the exploited, and among the exploiters themselves. The relatively extensive armaments, heavy taxation, extreme poverty of the workers and peasants, rationalisation of industry and increased unemployment, give, on the one hand, rise to acute class struggles and on the other to oppression, terror and fascism. Japan has already experienced several economic crises — 1920, 1923 and 1927. The general crisis of capitalism has acquired acute forms in Japan, which is now experiencing a grave financial crisis expressed in the gold embargo which has not yet been lifted since the world war; the increasing capacity for production and decreasing power of consumption; the high prices and diminishing exports, all of which have further contributed to bring about a general crisis. Since the VI. World Congress the policy of the Tanaka Government with regard to China has completely failed, which resulted in a change of the Ministry and the formation of a new government.

All these events show that the analysis of the VI. Congress with regard to Japan was correct.

Another point I wish to deal with is the sharpening of the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants against capitalism and against the government. In the first place the government severely persecutes the Communists. On March 15, 1928, raids were made on Communists and 1000 active Communists and Left Wingers were arrested. On April 10, 1928 three Left Wing revolutionary organisations were suppressed. The Tanaka Government has perpetrated arrest, persecutions, murders, etc. On the occasion of the coronation which took place in November last year, the Government made preventative arrests of tens of thousands of comrades and radical workers and peasants just previous to the coronation in order to have a peaceful celebration. Again, on July 29th, the government, with the object of destroying the Communist movement, amended the Peace Preservation Law under which an active Communist could receive a maximum term of 10 years imprisonment, and introduced the penalty of capital punishment. Then again, on April 16 of this year the government instituted a nation-wide raid of Communists in which more than 2000 comrades active in the movement were arrested. At the end of May over 300 Communists and sympathisers were put on trial. Such police persecutions and murders have been going on since October last. Already eight comrades have been either assassinated or beaten to death in prison. On March 5 of the present year the proletarian parliamentary representative Yamamoto was assassinated by an ex-policeman and fascist. The reign of white terror and the ruthless persecution of Communists have been growing in sharpness within the recent period, as these facts show.

In spite, however, of the increasing persecution and oppression, the masses of workers and peasants are not in

the least discouraged but are moving towards the Left and increasing their resistance to the point of conducting an offensive struggle against the ruling class. There are many signs of revolutionary upheaval among the workers and peasants. To give a few examples, in the city of Miyazaki a riot took place on December 15, 1928, which started with a demonstration of 3000 citizens against the Prefectural Assembly. The demonstration grew until the whole city was involved. The demonstrators assailed the hall in which representatives were considering a Bill objected to by populace. The most conspicuous feature of the attack was the participation of the fire brigade of the city who turned their powerful pumps on the Assembly and on the official residences of the Governor and the Chief Police inspectors.

Then there was the great peasant uprising in the Gifu prefecture on January 8—11, 1929. It involved seven villages with a population of over 20,000 peasants. These peasants originally intended to force the authorities to change the scheme that affected seven villages by mass demonstrations and mass appeal to the Governor, but the authorities called out the police, the gendarmerie and the troops to put down the riot. The peasants fought the police and the gendarmerie, wounding and killing 60 of them. The village officials were on the side of the peasants. They resigned their posts to join the demonstrations. The Miyazaki riot failed in its object, but the Gifu riot succeeded. Both were of a political nature and directed against the government and the opposition parties — the Seiyukai and the Minseitō. The country experienced many peasant riots and workers' conflicts, bloody conflicts between the police and strikers; the authorities are resorting to murder and assassination. Here are some facts.

On January 27, 200 peasants of 5 villages of the Nigata Prefecture marched to the Governor's office breaking their way through the cordons of police forces with an appeal to remedy their grievances. Further, 13,000 peasants of 7 villages of Saitama went to the governor and demanded that he should remedy their grievances. They camped there and declared that they would not leave until the governor granted their demands. Of course conflicts took place as a result between the police and the petitioners. Then late in the night 300 peasants attacked a big landowner in Tokimura demanding the cessation of transferring the land held by them. 1000 peasants in the Kagashina Prefecture attacked the village Assembly Hall while the members were in session, destroying everything available and attacking many of the representatives.

Signs of social fascism in Japan can be seen from the case of a union branch secretary in Wakayama city who was murdered by a member of the Left social-democratic party — Yamanaoka.

The first anniversary of the Communist raid on March 15 was marked by the burial of Yamamoto and Watanabe in connection with which funeral processions were organised in several cities and many workshops attempted a few minutes strike. In the Yokohama docks 3500 workers went on strike on the evening before. Police brutality and fascist violence are increasing daily and the workers are organising red defence groups in many places.

The April Communist raid, instead of weakening the struggle of the proletariat, strengthened it greatly and increased the resistance of the workers against government oppression and persecution which is met with strikes, sabotage and even riots. Many cases are reported in the bourgeois press of attacks on police stations by workers and peasants and of the release of arrested Communists.

The revolutionary movement in Japan shows signs of intensification and one can see now the rapid approach of great clashes between the workers and the ruling class. The Japanese workers and peasants will catch up with the advanced Western countries in the revolutionary movement. The third period has been characterised in Japan by a sharpening of the class struggle and the antagonisms of capitalism.

Comrade KOLAROV (Bulgarian):

I am once more on my feet to answer a few critical remarks in regard to my speech. Firstly, I want to answer Comrade Varga who called opportunist and even social-fascist my criticism of his theory re the higher standard of living of the working class in the third period of the post-war crisis of

capitalism. I would like to explain to you what all this is about. Comrade Varga has made a written proposal to delete from the Theses on the first item of the agenda where it is said that capitalist rationalisation "being a burden on the working class, is lowering its standard of living", the words: "is lowering the standard of living of the working class" and to say instead of this that capitalist rationalisation "is decreasing its (the working class) share in its own production". This is how the question stood. In his first speech, Comrade Varga said that the standard of living of the working class, far from being lowered, is rising, and as an example, he pointed to the fact that in Germany wages according to wage agreements have risen to a greater extent than has risen the index of the higher cost of living, whereas in Great Britain, where it is true that wages have been reduced, the index of the higher cost of living has been reduced still more. Thus, in the most important countries — Germany and Great Britain — we witness, according to Comrade Varga, not a lowering of the standard of living of the working class, but just the opposite.

It is this proposal and these explanations of Comrade Varga that I have called an attempt to revise one of the fundamental points of the Communist programme. Comrades, allow me to remind you that in the 90's of the 19th century, Bernstein and his followers in Germany got hold specially of that point in Marx' "Capital" which speaks of the "accumulation of poverty, suffering, slavery, ignorance, a brutalisation and moral degeneration". Marx says:

"Accumulation of wealth at one pole produces at the same time at the other pole, i. e. on the side of the class which produces its own product in the form of capital, — an accumulation of poverty, suffering, slavery, ignorance, brutalisation and moral degeneration."

(Translated from Russian, page of quotation not given by the speaker, Tr.). Bernstein attacked this point about the "accumulation of poverty", i. e. about the lowering of the standard of living of the working class and the toiling masses, about lowering in the physical as well as the social sense. Comrades, you will be able to see the sense of this point in Marx's "Capital" from Lenin. In the first volume of his works, in the article on the "Draft Programme of Our Party" Comrade Lenin wrote as follows:

"Thus, the words (Marx's) about 'the growth of poverty, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation' must be, in our opinion, included in the Programme, — firstly, because they describe correctly the fundamental characteristics of capitalism, because they characterise the process which is going on before our eyes and which is one of the main premises which create the labour movement and socialism in Russia; secondly, because these words are excellent material for agitation, being a resume of a whole series of phenomena which, owing to their oppressive nature, are most likely to arouse the indignation of the toiling masses (unemployment, low wages, starvation, under-feeding, Draconic capitalist discipline, prostitution, growing number of menials, etc., etc.); thirdly, because by this exact characteristic of the pernicious effect of capitalism and the necessity and inevitability of the indignation of the workers, we will dissociate ourselves from those half-hearted people who, while "sympathising" with the proletariat and demanding "reforms" for its benefit, are endeavouring to take up the "golden mean" between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the autocratic government and the revolutionaries."

Comrades, now, in the third period of the post-war capitalist crisis, when we place on record in our resolution the revolutionary spirit of the masses, the swing to the Left of the proletariat and of other sections of the population, when we declare that gigantic class struggles are already going on and that even more gigantic, more acute class struggles are in store for us, to demand at such a moment from the Comintern that it should delete from its resolution on the political situation the point which says that capitalist rationalisation is attacking the standard of living of the working class, "is lowering its standard of living", — is tantamount to playing havoc with our point of view concerning class struggle in the forthcoming big struggles. It simply means depriving the

orientation of all the Communist Parties towards the forthcoming struggles of every economic foundation.

Comrades, it is this criticism, with which nearly all those who spoke from this platform agree, which Comrade Varga has described as opportunist" and even "social-fascist". But why is it "social-fascist" and "opportunist"? Comrade Varga hinted at that part of my speech which deals with the crisis. Of course, I am not a theorist, and do not consider myself an economist. Therefore, I have probably used expressions which are not quite correct. This is quite possible. I have even nothing against my speeches being looked through, as Comrade Varga advises. But, comrades, the main thing to which I drew the attention of the Plenum and on which I insist, is — that the basis of the crisis which is becoming more and more acute, of the class struggles which are in store for us is the lowering of the standard of living of the working class, and not the improvement of the position of the working class.

In his reply, Comrade Varga criticised also what I said about semi-colonial methods of exploitation in the Balkan countries on the part of international finance capital. Here too he discovered an "opportunist" sin. I will give you the facts. If in one of the Balkan countries, for instance, in Bulgaria, finance capital has managed to bring about the following state of affairs: firstly, to convert the state bank from a state institution into a private joint stock bank under the control of the representatives of the international finance capital; to create a privileged mortgage bank which is in the hands of foreign capitalists with the privilege of holding the whole mortgage credit and the guarantee on the part of the state that the interest on the capital of this bank be never lower than 8% (just now when the profits of this bank amount only to 1½%, the state must pay out of its budget the difference between this and 8%); to take into its own hands control over railways in order to abolish open tenders in regard to orders for rails, railway carriages and engines and let these orders go to the French industry; to obtain enormous concessions — timber, mining, agricultural, etc., etc. If finance capital has obtained all this, what does it mean, comrades? Are these not colonial methods? If not, what kind of methods are they? Are they normal capitalist methods? I called them semi-colonial methods, but I should have really called them colonial methods.

Why should Comrade Varga prefer not to speak on this question? Because one might come to the conclusion that the Balkan Parties must not struggle against their own bourgeoisie from the point of view of war. This is what he asserts.

In all the Balkan countries, the Balkan bourgeoisie is the tool, associate and companion of this international capital. It acts together with it and shares the privileges which the Balkan governments are compelled to concede to foreign capital. The Balkan bourgeoisie is the tool of international capital. We must proclaim this, in order to be able to struggle effectively against the war danger in the Balkans. The Yugoslavian bourgeoisie declares, like the Bulgarian, that it does not want war: why should Yugoslavia and Bulgaria make war on the Soviet Union? What can they demand and expect from war against the Soviet Union? Comrades, if we associated ourselves with the point of view of the Yugoslavian and Bulgarian bourgeoisie, it would be difficult to carry on in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia a mass struggle against the danger of an anti-Soviet war. But when we explain that finance capital, that international imperialism hold in their hands the economics and politics of the Balkan bourgeoisie, it becomes clear how great and serious is the military danger, the danger of war against the Soviet Union. Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Greece are tools of the imperialists, purveyors of cannon-fodder to international finance capital. It is this point of view which allows us Balkan Communists to carry on a real, serious struggle against the war danger in the Balkans. In connection with this struggle we declare that the Balkan bourgeoisie, which carries out the policy of international imperialism in the Balkans, which is the instrument of this policy, must be attacked by us, and we explain to the masses why and wherefrom comes this war danger.

In conclusion, I will say a few words in reply to Comrade Mitzkevich. I do not know how Comrade Mitzkevich could "gather from my speech" that the peasantry is playing an in-

dependent role. It is just the other way about. I wanted to show that the Balkan peasant masses are learning by experience that they are unable to carry on an independent struggle and must, consequently, look for an ally and leader in the shape of the proletariat. The Stambulisky Government has proved the bankruptcy of this so-called "independent role of the peasantry" in Bulgaria. In Yugoslavia, the events of the last two years have shown the bankruptcy of the Raditch peasant party, its inability to carry on the struggle in the interests of the peasants. In Rumania, the advent to power of the National-Zaranist Party has exposed its true character. Under the cloak of defence of peasant interests, it is practically a tool of the capitalist class. It is perfectly clear now that this Party cannot pursue a peasant policy. Thus, experience has proved to the masses the necessity of leadership by the proletariat. On the other hand, this experience opens a new phase of practical struggle to the proletariat. The Balkan proletariat, backed already by experience, can take up the hegemony, can play a leading role in the struggle against the Balkan bourgeoisie. When I speak of hegemony, I do so only in a relative sense. The peasants did not have hegemony, but the fact remains that they took up the struggle. In Bulgaria, there was a peasant insurrection already in 1919. In Rumania, we witnessed last year revolutionary actions by the peasantry (I am speaking of the peasantry, and not the peasant parties, the peasantry acted in a revolutionary spirit, it wanted to march on Buckarest). In Yugoslavia, the peasants have been and are acting in a revolutionary manner. The same can be said of the Greek peasantry, for instance, in Crete. Owing to the character of our countries, the Balkan peasantry has been acting in a revolutionary manner in all these countries. But now, I assert, we have entered upon a new stage of development in the Balkans, when the proletariat must and will lead the masses into the class struggle. It is already taking up this role, it is carrying on a direct struggle and is drawing the other toilers along with it.

Comrade BANDERAS (Communist Fraction of the Peasant International):

The Right danger in the Communist Parties of Latin-America is chiefly expressed in the existence of the so-called "broad parties". We know that this Menshevik slogan has become widespread in the various parts of the world and especially in Latin-America. A most characteristic example of such a broad party is the Colombian Social Revolutionary Party which is affiliated with the Comintern. Last year there was still in that party a Council of the Central Committee; and in that Council, consisting of five members, four did not belong to the party, but represented some radical liberal groups, and only one was a member. This sounds rather like a tall story, but it is an actual fact that in a leading body of the party there were people who did not belong to the organisation but belonged to some radical bourgeois groups.

If we take the Mexican Party, there we find people occupying responsible positions, although they have nothing in common with communist ideology, people coming from two different camps — either the camp of anarcho-syndicalism or the camp of the left petty bourgeoisie. The existence of such broad parties and the tendency to form them, parties which seek to embrace the whole of the Labour and peasant movement, is explained by the weakness of the labour movement and the powerful pressure on the communist parties brought to bear by the petty bourgeois and other "revolutionary" groups. This left petty bourgeois ideology fosters a tendency to organise broad parties, containing the most variegated elements. No one in Mexico advocates now the idea of such a broad party, but we have in that country a farmer labour bloc the tendency of which is to become an independent political factor.

We find the idea of the hegemony of the peasantry expressed in all kinds of proclamations and manifestoes of organisations under communist influence. Thus for example in a proclamation of the Farmer Labour bloc to the Peasants of Cruz we read:

"The peasants of Vera Cruz, who constitute the vanguard and the strongest supporters of the proletarian revolution, will unquestionably continue their revolutionary struggle in the State of Vera Cruz."

As you see, they speak in that manifesto of the peasants as the vanguard and the strongest supporters of the proletarian revolution. These ideas prevail in many places and on many occasions in the Communist organisations of Mexico. It should be mentioned that Mexico occupies one of the most outstanding positions in Latin America; that the Communist Party of Mexico is one of the strongest communist organisations. Until recently nothing had been said by the Mexican Party concerning the differentiation of the peasantry and the dangers arising therefrom for the peasant movement. Only recently has it begun to speak of the danger of the rich peasantry and of the differentiation and this as a result of the fact that in two locals which had the most radical peasant organisations under the leadership of the Communist Party, the leadership has fallen into the hands of the Rights. This happened in Vera Cruz and in Durango. Two conferences took place and the Right wingers who seceded from the Communist Party retained the leadership of the peasant organisations, as a result of which the Communist Party began to speak of the Right danger among the peasantry arising from the rural class differentiation. True, this tardy dealing with the Right danger in the peasant movement can largely be explained by the fact that the process of differentiation was previously very weak among the Mexican peasants. But nevertheless, the silence on this point was a mistake resulting from the position of which Comrade Manuilsky spoke, the peasant orientation which predominates in the Latin American parties based on the idea that the peasants constitute the main motive force of the social revolution.

In this connection there is still a good deal of confusion in the Mexican Party, confusion on the question of immediate and ultimate demands.

In the May Day Manifesto of the Mexican Party there is to be found such a moderate demand as that of asking the capitalists to support the unemployed and to exempt them from the payment of rent. This is immediately followed by the ultimate demand — the factories for the working class. This confusion of immediate and ultimate demands is quite common. It shows that the Communist Party has not yet rid itself of the illusions concerning the revolutionary character of the petty bourgeois movement, the revolutionary character of the petty bourgeois parties.

What are the present tasks of the Mexican party in view of the growing reaction? The Mexican government has not only come to terms with the church and thereby renounced the old traditional struggle between the Liberals and the Catholics, but retreated on the question of agrarian reforms. We have recently seen a declaration by the official presidential candidate of the Mexican Republic, Ortis Rubio, saying that although the Mexican government will carry on its agrarian reforms, it will take into account the fact that the landlords have a right to live and that the big landed estates have the right to be supported by the government. This is a decisive turn towards the right on the part of the Mexican government which clearly reveals the hopelessly reactionary character of the petty bourgeois nationalist tendencies concerning which the Mexican party has cherished certain illusions. Such a definite reactionary change will unconditionally rid the Party not only of these illusions but also of all elements which have hitherto hampered the development of the Party.

In view of this the immediate tasks confronting the Communist Party of Mexico and the Communist Parties of Latin America are first of all the tasks of working out their programmes of immediate demands for the poor and middle peasants, and linking up these demands with the prospect of the workers and peasant revolutions, the prospects of the further development of the struggle for the Social Revolution.

A further important task is the organisation of a separate union of agricultural labourers, as this extremely important question has until now been neglected owing to the general peasant organisation. Now that differentiation has set in among the peasants and some of the peasant groups have joined the reactionaries, this question must occupy a foremost position in the rural work of the parties. Then comes the cleansing of the Party of all petty bourgeois and anarcho-syndicalist elements which interfere with the development of a proper struggle of

the Communist Parties. Of course, the reaction has undertaken this cleansing, but in many parts of Latin America the cleansing of the Parties from alien elements is nevertheless now on the order of the day. Finally, there is the task of setting up leading bodies which would be in a position to give a real lead to the

Parties. The chief shortcomings of the Mexican and other Latin American Parties now is that they have no body of functionaries capable of leading the organisations of the industrial centres, capable of leading the peasant movements. The development of such a body of functionaries is now an extremely pressing task.

Fourteenth Session.

10th July 1929 (afternoon).

Comrade PERSSON (Sweden):

The Swedish Party quite rightly received here attention which was far from flattering, so that one feels almost diffident to speak on this question even if one belongs, as I do, to the opposition. The opposition cannot boast of having always acted as it should.

Although the phenomena which are the subject of dispute now in our Central Committee and in the Party, are comparatively of recent date, similar phenomena have also been noticeable before, and everyone knows how they originated. Many faults have been committed since 1924, and nearly as many have been unfortunately pardoned without anyone asking for it. Some comrades have now and then criticised some of the activity of the Party, but they have seldom carried this criticism to a conclusion useful to the Party, they rather allowed themselves to be scared by the demagogical language of the C. C. majority, according to whom the opponents are "chronically dissatisfied", are "negative", "uncomradely" and guided by selfish motives.

Comrade Flyg said: The Party is a real proletarian and active Party, and its membership is sound. This is right in its way, as well as the assertion that new members were won through political activity and struggle against the Social Democrats, and naturally, it is also right that the workers whom we have won over are looking upon our Party as the only workers' Party. But all this does not mean that our political activity has been energetic enough, that it has pursued a clear Communist line and has always been directed clearly and sharply against the Social Democrats. Neither does all this prove that the workers are not looking upon us as a radical Social Democratic Party. But I will come back to this question.

About 7,000 members remained in our Party after the Höglundiade in 1924. Many of them did not work energetically for the Comintern, they were merely loyal to it. The new Party Executive made commendable efforts to recruit new members, and by the Party Congress in 1927 the membership had already increased to over 15,000. At this Congress some of the comrades who belong now to the opposition, especially Comrade Linderoth, warned those present not to take a onesided view of the numerical growth of the Party, and not to forget that quality also counts. This quite correct standpoint was not received very enthusiastically by the comrades who belong to-day to the Right group. The opposition were wrongfully accused of being opposed to the numerical growth of the Party. Apart from the really successful political campaigns carried through by the Party, as for instance the so-called naval campaign, the campaigns of the Party were too much devoted to the recruitment of members and did not concern themselves enough with the political education and activation of the members. We must not be a sect of professional politicians, but a mass Party, says Comrade Flyg, and he is quite right. But he should have added that to be able to call a Party a mass Party, a leader in the struggles of the working class, the members must fully realise what the tasks of the Party are, and must be prepared for struggle and sacrifice in the carrying out of these tasks. We must do our utmost to increase our membership and to strengthen our positions organisationally also by other means, but we must not commit a crime against the Party and the workers who join it by neglecting their education for and through the struggle. Everyone should also realise that the education of members does not consist only in book learning and Party schools, nor in periodicals and the agitprop department which we have at last established, but above all, in every nucleus being imbued with political life and

every member being made to feel that he is participating in the political life of the Party. Among other things, this can be achieved by the discussions on the correct political line being an affair of all members and not only of the leaders.

Only a small percentage of the membership participates in active Party work; an even smaller percentage is politically awake and active. The theoretical level of the Party is low. To judge by some contributions to the discussion on the disarmament question, the five year Party activity, since 1924, seems to have given some fairly prominent comrades a low opinion of theoretical education in general: the leading comrades are not up to the task of leading the struggle of a revolutionary Party. Among other matters, the divergence is: whether we are to conceal these facts or whether we are to admit them in order to remedy them.

Was the struggle against the Social Democrats sufficiently sharp and clearly Communistic? We think that it was not. Strong language was certainly used about the Social Democrats, but a proper analysis of the role of Social Democracy was frequently missing. If leading comrades are not clear on these points, it is impossible to expect the rank and file members to be clear concerning the role of Social Democracy. This again has its effect on their propaganda among their fellow workers and on their policy in municipal bodies, etc. The Social Democrats in Sweden are not different from other Social Democrats — as the articles of Comrades Kilboom and Samuelson suggest — who are designated as social fascists by the Comintern. The analysis of the Comintern applies to them also, up to 100%.

In this connection, a few words about May Day. In regard to this question, Flyg said that the C. C. of the Party received telephonograms from the provinces asking permission to drop the demonstrations, but that the C. C. did not give this permission. I have really my doubts about these telephonograms. In any case I know that the demonstrations were held everywhere in the provinces in spite of bad weather. Only in Stockholm, the Executive, which according to Flyg, insisted on the demonstrations being held in the provinces, did not assert its authority and the demonstrations were abandoned. Flyg thinks that the demand to abandon demonstrations came from workers. But who were these workers? Of course, Party members. Several of them had actually come to the rallying point, but there were also Party members who did not turn up at the rallying point owing to the rain. Why did they want to abandon the demonstration? Surely on the plea that bad weather means bad attendance, and bad attendance means bad results in regard to the sale of badges and newspapers. Are the comrades to be blamed for this? Certainly not. This is the result of Party activity as carried on in the Party in general and in Stockholm in particular. Moreover, it is an old opportunist trick to put the blame on the workers. According to Flyg, Comrade Ollsen, the Secretary of the Stockholm Party organisation, did not run to the Social Democrats to bargain with them about May Day, but Flyg admits that Ollsen called up the Social Democrats on the telephone. I fail to understand that the manner in which the understanding was arrived at can make any difference. More important is that Comrade Flyg associates himself with Ollsen's explanation that although he telephoned to the executive of the Social Democrats, we would have marched also if they had decided to have the procession and demonstration. The fact remains 1. that the demonstration was abandoned; 2. that this happened after negotiations with the Social Democrats, and 3. that the fate of the Communist demonstration was decided by the Social

Democrats being afraid of rain or not. The Social Democratic labour aristocrats were anxious for their new spring suits, hence the abandonment of the demonstration by the Communists. This was not an innocent opportunist mistake for which Party members from the factories could be partly blamed, but a gross opportunist error which shows vividly how much still remains to be done in the Swedish Party before it is ripe to do justice to the tasks imposed on us, as the leader of the working class, by the third period of accentuated class struggles. If Comrade Flyg does not understand that something is radically wrong in this whole story, he only proves that struggle against the Right is necessary in the Party, a struggle in which there must be no wavering if our Party is to become a militant Communist Party.

But we must candidly admit here that the opposition was not as energetic as it should have been in this whole question. Comrade Flyg was right in pointing to other tendencies which exist among relatively prominent Party members. For instance, the idea to break off relations between the Swedish miners and the Russian, the demand that in regard to trade union questions the unorganised should not meet with the organised at public meetings, and the municipal bloc with the Social Democrats. To this must be added the strong inclination at the Plenum of the C. C. to dissolve the unity committee or to retreat in some other form before the trade union disrupters. A comrade who belongs to the Right group wanted to know who will give work to those who become unemployed through expulsion from trade unions, and another comrade declared that he does not feel inclined to sacrifice himself. In regard to the bloc, Comrade Flyg declared that the C. C. of the Party opposed the formation of this bloc which was thereupon dissolved. Such an instruction might have been sent to one or other of the districts, but the fact is that formation of blocs goes on, and also that the Party has hitherto left the municipal fractions entirely to themselves. Surely, all the leading comrades are responsible for this.

The fundamental question in the discussion of the Swedish Party is — if Sweden is an imperialist country or not. The Right group asserts that Swedish capitalism has imperialist tendencies, is developing towards imperialism, etc., whereas the opposition says that Swedish capitalism is of an imperialist character. Not only the heavy industry, but also the light, is of a monopolist character. There are also several trusts which are struggling for domination on the world market. Among them are the Kreuger-Concern, the Elektrolux, E. M. Erickson, the Grangesberg Company, etc. There is also a strong concentration of production and capital. Four big banks hold two thirds of the Swedish bank capital. Moreover, Sweden has become in the last years a capital-exporting country. Argentarius, a bourgeois economist, declares that the export of capital since 1924 amounts to 493,900,000 Swedish kronen. Against all these signs of imperialism, the Right group has two main arguments: the first is that Swedish capitalism has no world monopolies. They evidently want Swedish capitalism to dominate the whole world market before they designate it as imperialistic. The second counter-argument is: that Sweden has no colonies, and this is correct. But Germany too has no colonies, and yet no one will assert that contemporary Germany is not an imperialist country.

We are also opposed to useless formulations. We therefore think that even if the Right group is gradually compelled to admit that Sweden is an imperialist country, not much will be gained if it still refuses to adapt the policy of the Party to the more accentuated situation which such an admission implies, or if it continues to look for all sorts of subterfuges in order to divert attention from the fact that nothing is being done in the anti-war campaign. Moreover, it seems as if Comrades Flyg and Samuelson are afraid of the war danger problem, because neither of them has spoken on this matter here at the Plenum or in the Commission. We can understand them, because nothing was so neglected in the Party as the anti-war campaign. The anti-militarist work of the Party was left to the Young Communist League. During the strained situation in 1927, when one could reckon with an outbreak of war at any moment, practically nothing was done to mobilise the workers against imperialist war. Probably to conceal this fact — that nothing was done — the Party issued together

with syndicalists, anarchists and a few reformist trade unions a so-called anti-war manifesto in July 1927 which was so thoroughly pacifist and social-democratic that it seemed strange to find the Communist Party among the signatories of the Manifesto. This manifesto was a scandal altogether, but especially because it contained not more than two lines about the war danger problem. The defence put up subsequently for this scandalous manifesto was — that the situation was so strained that war might have broken out within a fortnight, and that the masses had to be mobilised for it. According to this reasoning, a more acute situation was a justification for greater confusion, the masses had to be mobilised at any price, but what they were being mobilised for, is a secondary matter.

I hope that by my presentation of the facts, I have succeeded in proving that our Party which has great merits, has also great defects which are very dangerous in the present situation, also that the chief problem now is relentless struggle against all Right deviations and against all those who want to conceal these deviations, as well as struggle for the further Bolshevisation of the Party. According to its social composition our Party is a good Party. The minority in the Central Committee does not see any danger in the old or in the new members, as Flyg wanted to make out here. On the contrary, we rely completely on the good proletarian elements in the Party and are convinced that they will understand the tasks of the Party much better than such leaders as Comrade Flyg. Thus, the Swedish C. C. minority does not take a pessimistic view of the situation in the Swedish Party. By purposeful work under the leadership of the Comintern, we will overcome our weaknesses and defects and will convert the Communist Party of Sweden into a real Bolshevik mass Party.

Comrade SKRYPNIK:

Comrade Teodorovitch, the representative of the Communist fraction of the Peasant International, said here that he thanks me on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Peasant International for saying that work among the peasantry is absolutely necessary. But at the same time he considers my proposal unsatisfactory. I would like to know what for. I said in the course of my speech that our Parties should not deceive themselves. Comrades, even if all of us strain every nerve and concentrate our attention on the conquest of the majority of the working class, this is not enough to ensure the victory of the proletarian revolution. We must conquer the majority of the working class, such is our main task. Nothing can be done without it, it is at the root of all things.

Our whole activity must be directed towards the conquest of the majority of the working class.

But it would be self-deception to imagine that we can capture proletarian power, can make the proletarian revolution victorious, if we have behind us only the majority of the working class.

We must get rid of this craft spirit, we must understand that the proletariat has a great task to fulfil, a historical task — to be the leader of all the toiling masses. Therefore, we are face to face with the inevitable task — at least for the time being, before the victory of the proletarian revolution — of securing the sympathy, if not the active support, at least the neutralisation of the mass of the working peasantry. It is against this part of my speech that Comrade Teodorovitch has spoken here. He declared that this idea of mine is inadequate, unsatisfactory.

What constitutes, according to Comrade Teodorovitch' notion, the inadequate and unsatisfactory character of my idea?

Evidently two things, as one can gather from Comrade Teodorovitch's, unfortunately, not very clearly expressed view. Firstly, I was, according to Comrade Teodorovitch, wrong in talking about the neutralisation of the peasantry. Comrade Teodorovitch declared that "I spoiled the effect of my speech by bringing forward the formula 'neutralisation of the whole peasantry', considering that this formula has been long ago relegated to the archive".

Comrades, I am perfectly sure that I did not say a word about the neutralisation of the whole peasantry. This erroneous,

obsolete Luxemburgian viewpoint about the neutralisation of the whole peasantry has been long ago relegated to the archive by us; it has been long ago repudiated by the Comintern and is no longer the theoretical basis of our work among the peasantry.

I said that in all advanced capitalist countries, the premise for the victory of the proletariat is not only the winning of the majority of the proletariat, but apart from this, also the capture of the peasantry and its neutralisation.

Comrade Teodorovitch says that it was a mistake on my part to speak of the neutralisation of the peasantry, I should, according to him, have spoken of the neutralisation of the middle peasantry. But I base my statement on the Programme of the Comintern, a document recently adopted unanimously by the whole VI. Congress of the Comintern, and refer to the paragraph which contains an explicit statement on this question.

Speaking of our task in regard to securing the dictatorship of the proletariat and transferring the former big landed estates to the peasantry, the Programme declares:

"The amount of land to be so transferred to be determined by economic expediency, as well as by the degree of necessity to neutralise the peasantry and to win them over to the side of the proletariat."

Comrade Teodorovitch, one cannot really approach the Programme in such a formal manner. One cannot really except us, every time we speak about the peasants, their neutralisation and capture, to speak also about the proletariat the semi-proletariat, the middle peasantry and the kulak peasantry, about all the four main groups of the peasant population. Sometimes it is possible — and this Programme gives us the right to do so — to speak of the peasantry in general, bearing always in mind that when we speak of the peasantry, we always mean its middle and semi-proletarian sections.

Just now, I am interested in something else, and on this I will speak. I took the question of the correlation between the proletariat and the peasantry not in the general political situation, not in the general correlation of classes throughout the proletarian revolution, but in the strategical correlation of classes, on the assumption that this is the premise for the victory of the proletariat and its forthcoming revolution. Comrade Manuilsky was quite right in saying that the chief premise for the victory of the proletariat in the forthcoming revolution, is the conquest of the majority of the proletariat by the Communist Party. This is true. It is with this premise that we must approach everything else, measuring everything by it. In every country, we can only capture the peasantry to the extent that we have captured the majority of the working class.

But Comrade Teodorovitch brings forward a different premise. He says: "To us, Communists, Lenin's doctrine means that only with the peasant reserves, only by supplementing the proletarian revolution by peasant war, the proletariat can guarantee its own victory."

Comrades, if Comrade Teodorovitch's statement means that the necessary premise for the victory of the proletarian revolution is not only the capture of the majority of the working class, but also the capture of the majority of the peasantry, we must disagree with him.

I have before me the decision of the II. Congress of the Comintern which says directly clearly and definitely: "Bourgeois-democratic and parliamentary prejudices explain the failure to understand the truth, fully proved by theoretical Marxism and confirmed by the experience of the proletarian revolution in Russia, namely, that with the exception of the agricultural labourers who are already on the side of the revolution, the scattered, crushed, and intimidated rural population of the aforesaid three categories which is condemned even in the most advanced countries to semi-barbaric conditions of life, being economically, socially and culturally interested in the victory of socialism, will only be able to give adequate support to the revolutionary proletariat, after the latter has captured the political power and after it has decidedly settled accounts with the big landlords and capitalists."

One should bear in mind that this decision of the II. Congress of the C. I. was formulated with the direct participation and under the guidance of Lenin.

We cannot agree with the view that the preliminary condition of proletarian revolution in the main capitalist countries is not only capture of the majority of the working class, but also capture of the majority of the peasantry. In this respect, Comrade Manuilsky is right when he says it is precisely the conquest of power by the proletariat which is the premise for the capture of the majority of the peasantry by us.

To avoid any misinterpretation of my conception, I would like to say that I fully agree with Comrade Kolaroff who has pointed out — as I too said in my speech — that in the countries of the second category, where considerable relics of feudalism and servitude still exist, where a considerable revolutionary national-liberation movement has developed, in countries with a certain capitalist economic development, we are faced not only with the task which confronts the capitalist countries, — neutralisation of the peasantry — but also with the task of establishing proletarian hegemony in the peasant movement, as well as in the national-revolutionary movement. However, the peasant movement cannot be approached directly, it must be approached dialectically. In highly developed capitalist countries where the proletariat constitutes the chief force, where it constitutes a considerable section of the population, where the chief movement of the liberation epoch is manifest in the chief section of the proletariat, we are confronted with the task of capturing the majority of the proletariat, of securing the sympathy and support or at least the neutrality of the most important sections of the working population, of the peasantry first and foremost.

If we fail to understand this, we will never be able to unlock the tactical door of the Communist Party to let in the victory of the proletarian revolution. The attitude of the Communist fraction of the Peasant International, at least to judge by Comrade Teodorovitch's speech, is: we, Communist Parties cannot think of the victory of the proletarian revolution in the advanced capitalist countries unless, apart from the capture of the majority of the proletariat, we set ourselves the task of capturing the majority of the peasantry. Comrade Teodorovitch, this task we will set ourselves only after the conquest of power, after we have captured the majority of the working class and have brought about the proletarian revolution. As to the backward countries, the semi-capitalist countries and the only partially developed capitalist countries and colonies, our task is certainly: securing sympathy and hegemony in the peasant movement, as well as in the national-liberation movement.

Comrade TEODOROVICH (Communist Fraction of the Peasant International):

Comrade Skrypnik says that the formula "neutralisation of the peasantry" is used on page 27 of the programme of the Communist International (London 1929 edition). His reference to this formula may be explained probably by the fact that Comrade Skrypnik read only the headings of that document and noticing the word "agriculture" he looked up the page dealing with that subject. But to his misfortune, Comrade Skrypnik failed to notice that under a different heading, the heading "The Fundamental Tasks of Communist Strategy and Tactics" the question of interest to us is expressly dealt with in the programme. Be so good, Comrade Skrypnik, and look up page 59 of the programme and you will see.

(Skrypnik: As it is my formula I know it without reference.)

Is that so? Until now we all thought that this was Lenin's "formula". Comrade, I read (page 59—60):

"The Communist Party must secure for itself the wholehearted support of that stratum of the rural population that stands closest to the proletariat, i. e. the agricultural labourers, and the rural poor. To this end the agricultural labourers must be organised in separate organisations; all possible support must be given in their struggles against the rural bourgeoisie, and strenuous work must be carried on among the small allotment farmers and

small peasants. In regard to the middle strata of the peasantry in developed capitalist countries, the Communist Parties must conduct a policy to secure their neutrality."

Is that not clear to you, Comrade Skrypnik? Now listen further.

"The fulfilment of all the tasks by the proletariat — the champion of the interests of the whole people and the leader of the broad masses in their struggle against the oppression of finance capital — is an essential condition precedent for the victorious Communist revolution."

Comrade Skrypnik does not like my words "the proletariat can guarantee its victory only by supplementing the proletarian revolution by the peasant war". But in the document known as the "Programme of the Communist International" as we see, it is said that the winning over of the small peasantry is an essential condition precedent for the victorious communist revolution. Do you hear that, Comrade Skrypnik?

Comrades, all of you know that at the Second Congress Lenin put forward the idea that the proletariat cannot fulfil its historical mission if it keeps within its narrow craft and purely labour interests and forgets that it is the leader of all toilers. This idea promulgated by Lenin is fully contained in the formula of our programme.

(Vassiliev: And that is no mere accident.)

Of course, it is no mere accident. Now it suits Comrade Skrypnik to say that somehow somebody got confused and that the Programme of the Communist International, in speaking of the "neutralisation of the peasantry" instead of the "neutralisation of the middle peasants", failed to harmonise with the fundamental problems of Leninism. But I think that this case of the "neutralisation of the peasantry" needs a more tenable explanation namely, that Comrade Skrypnik has simply failed to understand the passage on page 27 of the Programme in regard to the neutralisation of the peasantry. He, like all people who get into such a predicament, does not take the whole clause which says

"to neutralise the peasantry and to win them over to the side of the proletariat".

We have seen above, that on page 59 of the Programme "neutralisation" relates to the middle peasantry, while "to win them over to the side of the proletariat" refers to the small peasants. But the passage which confused Comrade Skrypnik also speaks at once of two tactical tasks which Communism always clearly distinguishes. The first task is to win over the small peasants and the agricultural labourers who, according to Lenin, comprise the vast majority of the rural population, and to draw them entirely over to the side of the proletariat. The second task is to neutralise the middle peasants in a certain epoch and under certain conditions. (Lenin definitely says — in the capitalist countries, in the first stages of the dictatorship). Thus, there is no contradiction between the passages of the Programme of page 27 and page 59.

How are we to understand Skrypnik's slip? I think that in his ardent study of the historical mistakes of the Spartacus Bund and Rosa Luxemburg, he apparently had no time to make a proper study of the Programme of our International.

Comrade THÄLMANN (Germany):

If we want to carry out successfully our revolutionary policy in the capitalist countries as well as in the colonies, it is essential for all the Parties to achieve perfect clarity on our fighting experiences, particularly in the application of the new tactics, and also on inner Party questions. I believe the question may be seriously put to all the delegates of the X Plenum of the C. I. whether the German Party would have been able to carry out its policy as it was necessary, if it had hesitated and wavered in conducting the fight against opportunism in its own ranks. The answer to this question would be decidedly negative. Only by a relentless fight against opportunism in our ranks was it possible to bring down to a minimum the opposition in the Party to the new tactics and to the organisational

political change which we carried out since the VI Congress. Apart from the expelled liquidators and the conciliators, we have had also other vacillating elements in the majority of the Party. At the VI World Congress, for instance, there were comrades in the different delegations who voted for the decisions, although in reality they were vacillating. Even in the German Party we have committed various mistakes in carrying out the inner Party policy during the time from the Essen to the Wedding Congresses of the Party, from which we immediately drew the proper lessons. For instance, on the question of concentration. At the Essen Congress we raised correctly the question of concentration when we drew Comrade Meyer and his friends into the political leadership of the Party. However during the evolution from the second to the third period this kind of concentration was no longer quite correct, because it transpired that these comrades were backward in their political development. We have committed mistakes, e. g. in the case of Thalheimer and Brandler, in the question of carrying out the inner Party course as laid down in the decisions of the IX Plenum, and so on. By these mistakes we have learned and realised that self-criticism should not be employed as a method for the mere sake of criticising, but that we should rather combine it with the throbbing life of the Party and with the growth of the class struggle. I would like to say that at the VI World Congress there was still great resistance in the various Parties to the decisions of the VI World Congress. The resistance was not in the form that the delegations had spoken openly against the decisions, but it was rather revealed in the tendencies of the discussion of the different problems in the commissions and in the delegation meetings. These deviating tendencies, already revealed then, grew ever stronger in the course of the inner Party fights in the Comintern, particularly in the C. P. S. U., in the German Party, in the Czechoslovakian Party, etc., assuming at times a very strong explosive form. There were many delegates at the VI World Congress who did not understand the harsh, irreconcilable language and the fight which was waged at the VI World Congress, for instance, by the majority of the German delegation against the conciliators with Ewers at their head. This led, for instance, to the fact that it was declared already in the plenary session of the VI World Congress that no one thought of eliminating Ewert from the PolBureau if he would carry out, jointly with the Party and in a spirit of discipline, the decisions of the VI World Congress. Comrade Ercoli though at that time the arguments of the majority of the German delegation were unconvincing. Ercoli was wrong in this matter. Already at that time we had no longer any illusions about Ewert after he had taken up a different political position and after he had made his declaration against the German delegation at the VI Congress. The question as to the possibility of co-operating with Ewert was to us merely the question of how to convince the membership as quickly as possible that a member of the C. C. of the Party was developing into a cowardly opportunist. Comrade Ercoli said at the VI World Congress the following, among other things, on the German question:

"As to different tendencies within the PolBureau, we believe that the differences of opinion on various questions are such as should be considered quite normal and permissible to exist in a C. C. of our Party without leading to the formation of groups or factions within this C. C. Should these differences of opinion lead in the German Party to a fight of groups or to organisational measures by the majority of the PolBureau against the Minority, this would be a dangerous thing, because it would mean a narrowing of the basis of the C. C. and might lead also to a limitation of the political life of the Party and of its inner democracy."

Comrade Ercoli will no doubt have to admit at this Plenum that he took then an entirely wrong view of the development of the Communist International and of the German Party. (Hear, hear). Is the political life stifled at present in the German Party? On the contrary. Was it possible to go on co-operating with Ewert in the C. C. of the Party if we were to carry out immediately the decisions of the VI World Congress jointly with the Comintern? Ercoli was wrong in his opinion that these differences of opinion were such as could normally exist in the C. C. of a Party. This has been shown by the questions raised at the IX Plenums, by the frequent discussions on political, and particularly on personal questions since the Essen Congress,

and by the open discussions at the VI Congress. At this Plenum it was said by Comrade Ercoli among other things:

"The slightest mistake in the appraisal of the different elements of the situation and of their relative importance is fraught with tremendous consequences, because it inevitably leads either to misunderstanding or to a wrong conception of the whole character of the present period."

At the that time it was not a slight mistake, it was the clash of two political views in the German delegation. Then it was Comrade Ewert and his friends who were in solidarity with the open renegades around Tittel on some questions against the majority of the German delegation. The second question raised by Comrade Ercoli is the following:

"This internal struggle has taught us to see the big things in the little things, the shades of meaning in the interpretation of a fact or of a series of facts; it teaches us to see the roots of the political differences of opinion which in the further course of events must inevitably become unsurmountable, because they signify either open or disguised desertion into the camp of the enemy."

Comrades like Comrade Ercoli should certainly be asked to raise these questions not only from the standpoint of the fight against the liquidators and against those who have openly gone over to the enemy, but also against those groups in the Communist International which have taken over the role of the Rights, i. e. the conciliators. If we do not carry on properly the fight against the conciliators, if we do not combat them seriously and sharply, we may sustain various losses by the development of events until the XI Plenum, instead of this development giving us the united leadership which is absolutely indispensable. Take the way in which the case of Comrade Serra was treated by the Italian Party. The well-known document by Comrade Serra does not agree with the fundamental points in the basic line of the Comintern. Thus, Serra writes on the question of stabilisation:

"The German Comrades say that the stabilisation of the German bourgeoisie is rotten. This means that they are putting themselves outside of the development of the events."

Serra does not conceive that he already stands outside of the development of the revolutionary events. He goes on to say:

"Comrade Stalin asserts that the present fight of the working class undermines and shatters the capitalist stabilisation. This means that the outlook on the stage of development is rendered nebulous to the Communist Parties."

Again a wrong appraisal of the Third Period. As against the Programme of the C. I. we read in this document the following:

"The two slogans of 'control over production' and 'factory councils' become inseparable as soon as the factory council movement has become a serious thing."

Now then, the factory council movement has already become a serious thing. Hence, according to Serra, it would be necessary to raise the question of the slogan of control over production. About the E. C. C. I. the following is said by Comrade Serra:

"After some preliminary hesitation, the people at the head of the C. I. have proceeded with ever greater resolve to create a hopeless situation and to widen the cleavage."

Here, as well as before, he resorts to the worst kind of sophistry to combat the correct Bolshevik course.

Finally, on the question of the tactics of the C. P. S. U., its activity, and its sharp fight against all capitalist elements, Comrade Serra has again taken an opposite view to the Party policy. In the document he says among other things:

"There is the danger of the kulaks, but under the present situation this danger stands apart from reality."

Such assertions can be made only by one who either stands apart from reality or deliberately takes a wrong view of the development of the class forces.

Comrades, if a leading comrade advances such a programme, the question should be raised by us in a different way than this was done by the Italian Party which said that "Comrade Serra pledged himself to abstain from making propaganda for his ideas in any way." What is meant by "his ideas"? It is not here a question of ideas, it is a question of a new programme against the Communist International.

What would happen, for instance, if a comrade in the Comintern would raise the slogan of religious socialism, or if a comrade would demand the introduction of bourgeois democracy in the Soviet Union? Hence it is not only a question of group allegiance, but when the Parties become more mature we shall have to raise also the question of a more drastic organisational fight against such comrades who advocate views that are definitely contradictory to the fundamental line of the C. I. At least it should be ascertained whether Serra did pledge himself to carry out actively the decisions of the VI World Congress and of the C. C. of the Italian Party, and secondly whether he was prepared to withdraw immediately his political document.

A few remarks about the conciliators on an international scale. From the international point of view the position of the conciliators may be characterised that they hold different views from the Comintern upon three fundamental questions. First, in the appraisal of the international situation as a whole; second — and this is the consequence of the first — the great difference in the application of the new tactics; third, the demand which they raise in all spheres of inner Party life: renovation of the cadre of officials, in the Sections up to the leading organisations in the Comintern. Of course, the Comintern, in agreement with the Parties, will institute such a composition of the Party Committees as will fully guarantee the pursuit of our revolutionary line of policy.

I will only point to the declaration of the conciliators at the last Congress of the C. P. G. as a striking instance which illustrates the complexity of our inner Party questions. Already the fact that the conciliators at the Wedding Congress — although we had allowed too much democracy in the preparations for the Congress were represented only by one delegate is evidence of the fact that they came to the Congress as officers without crews. After this fact they had the temerity to present a minority declaration. The term "minority" is ridiculous, as there was no minority. They had been defeated everywhere in the Party. In districts where they had previously held important functions in the Party, in the Halle-Merseburg district, they got only one out of 17 delegates. Comrades, in their factional document the conciliators said the following:

"The differences we have with the Party leadership, and partly also with the Executive of the C. I., are entirely of a tactical character. We have a different appraisal of the present situation than is taken by the majority, especially since the VI World Congress, just because we stand upon the ground of the VI World Congress. We do not agree to the tactics of the Party in the domain of mass policy. We are opposed to the present inner Party course. The Party has decided against us. We are convinced that its decision is wrong. We know, and this is demonstrated by the history of the Party, that in the course of development the conditions of the revolutionary struggle will bring a correction of the present wrong policy."

This is only a portion of the document which occupies about 11 pages. We took a stand on this question, and the Party Congress put three demands to the conciliators. Firstly, they should give up their semi-Menshevik standpoint and admit the factional character of the platform which they had submitted to the Party Congress. Secondly, immediate dissolution of the faction and of all group associations. Thirdly, disciplined carrying out and defence of the decisions of the Party Congress and all the instructions of the Party leadership.

This unanimous decision impelled the conciliators to declare their attitude. On the last two points they yielded. On the first question, of withdrawing the factional platform signed by 9 comrades, they did not give a satisfactory answer. There is no more doubt that one section of the conciliators (one section went over to the liquidators already during the Congress) will quit the Party, while another section will perhaps come back to

the Party line. The major part of the conciliators, apparently, are going to continue their factional activity against the line of the Party and of the Comintern.

These inner Party problems which confronted the German Party are still confronting other Parties in the capitalist as well as in the colonial countries. We know that the German conciliators are only a portion of international opportunism in the Comintern. In the platform which they submitted to the Party Congress they wrote that they also had differences with the C. I. This is equally evidence of the fact that the German conciliators are only an international group in the Comintern. And at this Plenum we must clearly see that the leadership of conciliationism and of the Right deviations is in the hands of the Russian opportunists, of the group of Bukharin, Tomsky, etc. Is this a new phenomenon in the history of the International? By no means. Just as the C. P. S. U. plays the leading role in the Comintern as regards the development and Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties of other countries, just as it gives the most active assistance and furnishes an unsurpassed example to all of us, especially in the fight against opportunism in the ranks of all our Sections, so all the opportunist groups of the C. P. S. U. have a magnetic power of attraction for all the rotten and degenerate elements in the Comintern. (Hear, hear). This disorganising and disruptive role was played by Trotskyism in the Comintern for several years. This group is now defeated and routed together with the ultra-Lefts in the different countries. Trotsky has met his fate. The functions which Trotsky used to exercise are now exercised by Bukharin in the C. P. S. U. and by his friends in the Comintern. Perhaps not all the delegates at this Plenum are aware of the fact — although the material has been distributed here — that already before the VI. World Congress an attempt was made by Bukharin to organise a fraction behind the back of the PolBureau, as it transpires from his known conversation with Kamenev. The VI World Congress analysed the struggle against the Right danger as the chief danger in the Comintern which obliged all the leading comrades, together with the C. P. S. U., to wage a resolute fight against the ideas of the Rights in all the Sections. Bukharin hindered and combated the carrying out of this Leninist policy of the Comintern. We may declare right here that the struggle against the opportunism with Left phraseology was much more difficult than the present fight against the Right opposition. Why was that a more difficult fight? Firstly, because the opposition came out then behind a Left mask. Secondly, the struggle against the present Right opposition is easier and simpler because we have learned and grown in the struggles of the last years against Trotskyism and the ultra-Left. The Bolshevik Party under Lenin's leadership, became strong and consolidated through relentless struggle against opportunism and "Left" liquidatorship. The inner-Party development of the C. P. S. U. and simultaneously also of the German Section, of the C. P. of France and of other Parties is a big plus in regard to the carrying through of our great revolutionary tasks. There are, of course, also in the inner-Party sphere still big defects and gaps in the development of the German Party. Serious mistakes were made in the carrying through of inner-Party concentration. But we have also made other mistakes. Have we not to record such facts as the belated recognition of political changes in the bourgeoisie? We placed on record at the Wedding Party Congress that in connection with the social-democratic Party congress in Kiel where Hilferding brought forward his famous theory "nearer to the State" etc., our Party did not immediately interpret the big political change which is taking place within the social-democracy as a decisive step towards the present social-fascism. The Party failed to notice this change immediately, missing thereby the opportunity for immediate political reorganisation of our ranks. The tactical and organisational methods of the second period will no longer do for the third period. As in many other Parties, a political regrouping had to take place also in Germany. The leading cadres had to be entirely changed in all the Party organs and organisations, in order to do justice to the demands of the third period. We are justified in saying that we have sometimes already "faded" elements in our ranks. Not open followers of conciliators or the Right, but leading comrades who are lagging behind in the revolutionary history and are not able to carry on the work as the new situation requires.

I will now pick out a few problems which must be dealt with specially. There are still questions which are not clear,

points in regard to which we cannot define exactly or foretell the development. Let us take, for instance, the development of the Müller-Stresemann-government in Germany and that of the British MacDonald-government. In this connection, we have correctly estimated the development as development from social-democracy towards social-fascism. There are still in our ranks a few tactical divergencies of opinion in regard to this, but fundamentally we all agree. We have now countries with different fascist and social-fascist methods and forms of government. Firstly, countries with so-called bourgeois "democracy" where attempts are made to beat down the working class by new dictatorial and fascist means, as for instance, Germany and Britain where social-fascism is making its appearance for the first time as a form of government. Then we have in Italy the fascist form of government familiar to us all where Mussolini also tried various methods at first and took three years to build up and develop the present system.

The development of German social-democracy into social-fascism at the Magdeburg Party Congress is of the greatest importance to us and the working class. Wels' and Severing's recent statements about the "dictatorship of democracy" etc., throw light on and lend force to this orientation. Bourgeois democracy is bankrupt, the bourgeoisie is looking for new methods of political oppression and crushing down of the working class, and in this it is energetically supported by the social-fascists. We must also point out at the present juncture that new forms of militarisation can and will make their appearance, for instance, militarisation of trade unions under social-fascist leadership, militarisation of the Reichsbanner as adumbrated by the Prussian Minister of the Interior. I will not deal here with the revolutionary problem, the development of economic struggles into political, the question of strike and mass strike committees, their legality and illegality, because these questions are dealt with in the trade union report, which will also deal with and throw new light on the question of the rapid consolidation of our organisational position among the masses and the question of bodies of revolutionary representatives. A very important question is politico-military work in all our Parties in all spheres of revolutionary work, also the establishment of selfdefence organs for the protection of demonstrations and meetings, as well as of strikers from police attacks, of functionaries and speakers etc., as this was, for instance, necessary on May Day in Berlin.

The last question which is important for inner-Party orientation and which must be raised at the X. Plenum, is — how our Sections have popularised the decisions of the VI. World Congress, what they have done to bring them to the notice of the proletarian masses. The decisions of the VI. World Congress concern the following spheres:

Firstly, utilisation of the decisions in the Party itself, secondly, the orientation in our press, thirdly, special courses about the VI. World Congress and the problems dealt with, fourthly, influencing the masses outside the Party and informing them about the revolutionary development throughout the world and about our tasks, fifthly, general political work among workers and sixthly, utilisation and popularisation of the decisions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. We have one Party in which the popularisation of the decisions has been actually carried through. The C. P. S. U. has done this in discussions, through various material and special information. This is not only a question of inner maturity, but especially a question of strengthening internationalism, because the question of the militant workers of the imperialist countries, of the fighting colonial peoples and the absolute solidarity of the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union with the oppressed of the whole world was in the forefront of the deliberations of the VI. World Congress. Although, generally speaking, we have to place on record here many weak points, we can also place on record progress in this sphere. Our strength in the struggle against our class enemies consists in our growing ideological maturity, which is also noticeable in the struggle against all shades of opportunism in our own ranks; we are certainly justified in saying that in this respect we are growing and are not "degenerating and disintegrating" as asserted by the liquidators and conciliators.

Comrades, we can say that the third period is a period of mighty social shiftings in the capitalist countries as well as in

the Soviet Union. In the capitalist countries, the third period means sharp accentuation of contradictions of the capitalist stabilisation, its disorganisation, transition of the working class to counter-offensive against the bourgeoisie and sharp struggle between communism and social-fascism for the majority of the working class. In the Soviet Union, the third period means transition from the period of reconstruction to the period of construction, gigantic socialist offensive against the capitalist elements, impetuous development of collective forms of economy. Comrades, if this is our estimate of the third period, then the demands on the Communist Parties, including the C. P. S. U., are so enormous that all the Parties are confronted with the important task of purging their ranks of opportunist ballast. I venture to say here, at the X. Plenum, that between now and the next Plenum of the E. C. C. I., many more renegades must be and will be thrown out of the Communist International. This arises out of the whole development: because the class enemy is sharpening and increasing his attacks our Parties must be more active and energetic; because history progresses so rapidly, even leading comrades cannot sometimes keep pace with it. Hence, accentuation of inner-Party conflicts in various Parties. Comrades, now when we must be more energetic and revolutionary in our struggle against the capitalist state, against reformism, fascism and social-fascist dictatorship, when the proletariat must be always ready for political struggle in all its partial struggles, when we must link up agitational and partial demands with the struggle for the establishment of proletarian dictatorship, we must use in our agitation everything, all the facts which can illustrate the new impetus which is given to socialist construction now in the Soviet Union.

What are the new and important facts in the mighty constructive work of the Soviet Union which we must utilise in our agitation. We witness in the Soviet Union a new development of proletarian dictatorship, possibilities of progress which we could not foresee a few years ago. The development of socialist industrialisation is so rapid that, as Comrade Molotov said yesterday, plans made for the next weeks and months are frequently out-distanced by facts.

Comrades, what is the most important task of all our big Sections in this situation? We must convince the masses of the necessity of an offensive against the capitalist economic system, against the capitalist state, and we must win them for the socialist economic system, i. e. for the overthrow of capitalism in their own country. We must point to the development of the Soviet Union under proletarian dictatorship in the 11 years which have passed since the victory of the Russian revolution. The present extremely favourable development in the Soviet Union in spite of all difficulties gives us an opportunity to give a correct presentation of facts: over there capitalist rationalisation accompanied by new and sharp social and reactionary methods of exploitation, and here socialist rationalisation with new methods of development on the basis of higher wages, introduction of the 7-hour day in the most important branches of industry, of cultural freedom of the proletariat etc.

The socialist principle of planned economy is not limited to industry, it is extended to agriculture. One can say that this development is a new page in the history of mankind. What we are bringing forward in the capitalist countries as a general slogan: alliance between the proletariat and the working peasantry, is already a fact under the proletarian dictatorship. The age-long difference between town and country is being overcome through socialist construction, industrialisation of the countryside and collectivisation of peasant farms. The entire national economy is being reconstructed according to plan on a new socialist basis. The alliance between the proletariat and the working peasantry under proletarian leadership is given a sound basis through the industrialisation of the countryside, through the establishment of tractor and machinery centres. This development is not taking place peacefully, as Comrade Bukharin and his friends assert, by kulaks growing into socialism, it takes place in the midst of a sharp class struggle against the kulaks and all the capitalist elements of the country.

I will only recall here the wrong conceptions represented by Comrades Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky in regard to the vital questions of socialist construction. What was their standpoint in regard to industrialisation? They spoke of too hasty

industrialisation, they proposed to retard the development of the heavy industry for the benefit of the light industry. What does this point of view and this demand mean? The result would be: greater dependence of Soviet economy on the capitalist world economy. In regard to relations between the proletariat and the peasantry, they accuse the C. C. of a "feudal regime" over the peasants. They propose "free development of the economic forces of the whole countryside", including the kulaks. They opposed the policy of developing the socialist sector, of Soviet and collective farms. They spoke of the degradation of the countryside. Facts have refuted their conceptions completely, as convincingly stated at this Plenum by Comrade Molotov.

Comrade Bukharin's conception is — that the capitalist elements will peacefully merge into socialism, and that the class struggle will gradually cease. This view is diametrically opposed to Lenin's conceptions. Lenin made the following statement in regard to this transition period:

"The annihilation of classes is a long process of difficult and stubborn class struggle which does not disappear after the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of proletarian dictatorship (as the simpletons of the old socialism and the old social democracy imagined), it merely changes its forms and becomes in many respects much more ruthless."

In regard to ignoring the class struggle, the clearest exponent was Frumkin who asserted that it cannot matter in the least to the proletarian dictatorship where the corn comes from. Frumkin said in his letter:

"You can abuse me as much as you like, but I must say once more that under the existing conditions, in view of inadequate agricultural production, every pood of corn, regardless from what group it comes, strengthens the proletarian dictatorship and industrialisation, whereas every pood of corn which is lost to us, weakens us."

We see here the wrong ideology, the direct challenge to the Party in regard to the accentuation of the struggle against the capitalist elements, and especially, against the kulaks.

These are only a few examples how the Rights and the conciliators in the C. P. S. U. want to divert us through their tactic from the Leninist path and to weaken thereby the struggle of the Comintern and the world proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

Let us only take the development of the Five-Year Plan, as far as we are acquainted with it, the brilliant progress, the wonderful success in which even the leading comrades of the C. P. S. U. did not believe. The most striking feature is the competition of the big enterprises with one another, not only competition for higher wages and, may be, special recognition on the part of the masters, as this is the case in the capitalist countries, but earnest self-persuasion, self-initiative, strenuous collective efforts, in order to promote socialist construction and give it energetic support. Not development of a few enterprises; but like an electric stream which galvanises millions of proletarians employed in the big enterprises of the Soviet Union, is socialist construction carried through. But the boldest element in this new tactic in the Soviet Union is the socialisation of agriculture and its course towards socialist construction. We can assert that this development is so rapid that even the figures of the Five-Year Plan can be considered exceeded every month by new facts in the development. There are of course still great difficulties and many shortcomings in the carrying through of this great Plan: constant sabotage by bourgeois experts and engineers, inexperience of some of our comrades in the sphere of technical science, lack of competent skilled workers for the rapid carrying through of this big technical revolution etc. But progress in spite of all this! Connected with it is the growing confidence in the leadership of the C. P. S. U., the growing confidence of millions of non-Party workers and peasants in this policy, in this mighty task of the proletarian state. If we put this question internationally, we can say, those who undermine the confidence of the masses in the C. P. S. U., who endeavour to impede this development, are undermining the authority of the Comintern and the confidence of the revolutionary world proletariat in it (hear, hear). Hence the great importance

of considering the question of the opposition from an international viewpoint. This opposition fails to see the new revolutionary revival, it fails to see the shattering of the capitalist stabilisation and the transition of the working class to the counter-attack, and it certainly fails to see the necessity of purging the Comintern of the opportunists.

It is a well-known fact that the inner-Party orientation of this group, which is also of general political importance, has not developed in a day. There was divergence of opinion in the Russian delegation already at the time of the VI. World Congress. It is a well-known fact that the majority of the Russian delegation demanded a sharper analysis of the contradictions of the capitalist stabilisation than was contained in the original draft theses of Comrade Bukharin. It is also known that there was nothing in Comrade Bukharin's draft theses on the importance of the reconstruction period of the Soviet Union. It is also known that in regard to the Left S.P.G. and the special international definition of conciliatorship, it was the majority of the Russian delegation together with the German delegation who introduced new proposals and suggestions to the draft theses. Was this perhaps accidental? We can see now that Comrade Bukharin has gone even a step further in his estimate of capitalist stabilisation.

I would like to quote from Comrade Bukharin's article: "The Theory of organised Mismanagement":

"Problems of markets, prices, competition and crises are becoming more and more problems of world economy and are replaced in the individual 'country' by problems of organisation."

Organisation is underlined by Comrade Bukharin. What does this mean? This formula proves that Bukharin under-estimates and slurs over the contradictions within every individual country, and this inevitably leads to slurring over the accentuated class differences caused by capitalist rationalisation, to a fatalistic theory of revolution only as a consequence of war. Comrade Bukharin ignores completely the possibility of an acutely revolutionary situation also before the outbreak of war, as a consequence of an accentuation of the internal differences of capitalism. All the speeches of the Bukharin-group and its friends in the Communist International are permeated with pessimism and disbelief in a new revolutionary wave.

In all their documents and speeches, the conciliators also harp on the "disintegration of the Comintern". In this connection, they actually defend the standpoint of the opportunists of the whole world. In spite of numerous requests Bukharin and his friends have avoided a frank statement concerning Brandler and Thalheimer.

The Bukharin group has become for the time being the Executive Committee of all conciliatory and Right groups throughout the Comintern. It is incumbent on all Sections to put an end to such an opportunist centre as soon as possible. We must ruthlessly smash this opportunist centre, and if it does not take up a different political attitude, we must use against it political and inner-Party measures well-known in the history of the Comintern. This relentless struggle demands that in the various Parties the leaders of these groups be isolated, by all the ideological and persuasive means at our disposal, from the honest workers who are still following them. But, comrades, it is not enough to fight opportunism only where it is welded together in groups and is carrying on an open factional struggle against us. Our foremost task consists in freeing our own ranks from all opportunist vacillations and Social-Democratic traditions. Such half-heartedness and wobbling is making its appearance in regard to the application of the new tactic and revolutionary policy, in regard to the politico-organisational change in the internal life of the Party, especially in regard to the political reorganisation of the development of self-initiative and the new life of the Parties. Comrades, I want to give you just a few examples from the **German Party**.

At the time of the XII. Congress of the C.P.G., the conciliators could no more be regarded as dangerous enough to do harm to the Party, to disturb in any way the unity of the Party. But we have within the majority of the Party comrades who agreed with the decisions, but are wobbling and hesitating in regard to the application and carrying through of the

new tactic. This wobbling and hesitation we were only able to overcome by the practical demonstration of a successful application of the new strike tactic which persuaded these comrades of its correctness. We have also comrades who hold trade union legalism higher than the importance of the revolutionary movement. Furthermore, we have vacillating elements who shrink from the difficulties of the struggle against the class enemy. We have also cases of surreptitious sabotage in the application of the tactic. These vacillations and hesitations are frequently very dangerous and difficult to cope with. This state of affairs exists in the German Party. But let us take a few other Parties, for instance the **Swedish C.P.** The leading Swedish comrades did not even have the courage to declare at the Plenum that the mistakes of leadership are opportunist mistakes which must be condemned by them. How can the Swedish Party successfully fight reformism, if even its leading representatives in the E.C.C.I. do not want to admit that it was a serious error not to demonstrate on May Day.

There is also the **Swiss Party** which was headed till quite recently by Social Democratic elements who influenced the whole C.C., with the result that instead of encouraging the revolutionary energy of the workers, this energy was paralysed, as shown in **Basle on Red Day**.

I also want to make a few brief remarks about the **Polish Party**, which has to struggle under very difficult conditions, under a fascist regime which is sometimes more cruel than the bloody tsarist regime. In this Party, too, we have a Right wing which has a wrong idea of the situation in Poland and also of the Left-wing of the P.P.S. The C.P. of Poland will play an important role in case war breaks out against the Soviet Union. If some of the leading comrades are following the Right wing of the Polish Party, if this Right wing has been frequently able to influence the other comrades in the Polit-Bureau and to make them hesitate, this constitutes a serious danger to the Polish Party. It is incumbent on all our Polish comrades to take up this question in all seriousness. If this state of affairs continues, not we will benefit through the accentuation of the economic crisis, but our class enemies.

Although we have liquidated in the **Czechoslovakian Party** the liquidatory wing, the struggle against the conciliatory elements is not yet at an end. There is not in the Czechoslovakian Party the necessary full development of activity in all spheres, not only in the general political sphere, but also in the inner-Party sphere. It is not enough for the leaders to dissociate themselves from the liquidators and conciliators, the most important thing is concretisation and energetic carrying through of their tasks. Considering that — according to latest news — about a dozen newspapers have been suppressed and that there is the danger of the Party being driven into illegality, if we do not make now full use of legal possibilities to weld the Party together, this will mean a loss and waste of perhaps only a few months which will cost us very dear in the future.

There is perhaps no other country in Europe where democratic illusions are as firmly established in the minds of the proletariat as in **Great Britain**. Therefore, the struggle of the British Party against the Labour Party must be carried on on a much sharper political basis than before. The tactical change, class against class, decided upon at the IX. Plenum, was not taken up seriously enough by the Party, and especially among the workers on the periphery of the Party. In view of splendid opportunities for development which our Party has there, in view of the policy of the MacDonald Government which will carry through the policy of the Conservative Baldwin Government in all spheres, there must be complete and firm ideological unity and clarity in the British Party from top to bottom. Therefore, the Plenum must immediately take up the question of reorganisation of leadership, of drawing new proletarian elements into the leading organs.

We fully appreciate the truly difficult work of the **Italian Party** under the cruel fascist regime. We welcome the fact that the Italian Party has secured in the last year new positions in the enterprises and also in the trade unions in various parts of Italy. But, comrades, we must not be modest in regard to such a Party. From a Party with such experience, which has comrades at its head who have already gone through various experiences of the Comintern, the latter expects more than

from any other Party. It expects above all that the fundamental questions of struggle against the class enemy be treated correctly in the Party's own ranks. It is from this viewpoint that we have dealt with the question of the Italian Party at this Plenum and have endeavoured to consolidate organisationally the progress which was made. In this connection, we must not forget to deal severely with those who impede the development of the Italian Party.

In the American Party, the Lovestone clique is sure to create many difficulties for us. The sooner the Party gets the best of these renegades and the more energetically it pursues the course of drawing new fresh proletarian cadres into the leading organs of the Party, the sooner it will recuperate and progress.

I will deal now with a few other inner Party tasks. The general political change since the VI. World Congress and the carrying through of the decisions of the X. Plenum demand a radical change in the inner-Party course in all spheres.

I think that this is one of the weakest spots of all Communist Parties including the C. P. G. We have ascertained in the various countries the groupings within the working class, groupings which have come into existence owing to capitalist rationalisation. Let us take, for instance, the fact that there are at present in Germany three million more women in industry than in 1913. I am not familiar with the figures of the other countries, but I assume that a similar process has also taken place there. We also notice that the youth is being more exploited by the bourgeoisie than before, much more than adult workers. In this connection, the Parties have been very conservative in their development. Hardly any language is strong enough to impress you here, at the X. Plenum, with the necessity of a radical change in this sphere which the Parties must absolutely effect. The Parties must strengthen their cadres by drawing into them women workers, especially those employed in industry, and by promoting them to important posts. We have only to consider the composition of the Plenum, to realise that a big change must absolutely take place. There is the same Conservative attitude also in our Young Communist Leagues in regard to drawing more young women workers into their ranks. Here too, winning over young women workers must be our chief concern.

In connection with the carrying through of these inner-Party tasks, it will also be necessary to further develop inner-Party democracy and self-initiative in all Parties, Self-criticism not for criticism's sake, but to raise the standard of the Party, to develop self-initiative from below. Without bourgeois sentimentality and presumption, we must criticise and overcome our errors publicly, in order to remedy them together with the masses, in order to do justice to our revolutionary tasks together with the masses.

The struggle for the carrying through of these inner-Party tasks is not only a struggle in our ranks, we have seen in Germany in the last months that the unorganised and non-Party elements are fully supporting and energetically helping us in the struggle against the liquidators in the trade unions as well as in the mass organisations, in order to rid the revolutionary movement of them as quickly as possible. Another important question is that of discipline, which cannot be separated from the general inner-Party work. I would like to say that in regard to discipline, all of us can and must learn a great deal from the C. P. S. U. But we can also record progress in this sphere. Revolutionary discipline must be still more strengthened in all Parties, it must be a firm, military discipline, especially when our Parties are driven into illegality. It will play a very important role in all serious struggles. Subordination of the minority to the majority, especially in illegal Parties, is an important premise for effective revolutionary work. We cannot smash the State apparatus of the bourgeoisie with its powerful organisations unless we have a still better organisation, a still more powerful apparatus which rests on the highest degree of class-consciousness in our ranks and among the mass of the workers.

There is just an international idea to which I would like to draw attention. It is incumbent on the German and all other Parties not only to launch new economic struggles, wage

struggles, but to know how to develop these economic struggles into political actions, into struggles against the bourgeois State and social-fascism. This is one of the most important questions confronting us now. In this connection, our stubborn systematic struggle against the imperialist war danger and for the defence of the Soviet Union — and this means organisation of the struggle against one's own imperialist State — must be explained to the proletarian masses. Our work must be given a loftier revolutionary basis on an international scale and must be further developed for revolutionary mass mobilisation against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and for the dictatorship of the proletariat. This requires encouragement and consolidation of real internationalism in our own ranks. The international solidarity of the Russian workers is well known to us. Let us bear in mind our international weakness at the time of the great events of the Chinese Revolution and at the time of the miners' lockout in Great Britain. At the present juncture, when the international struggle and revolutionary solidarity actions are of enormous importance, when it is more necessary than ever to be prepared for the outbreak of an imperialist war, it is incumbent on us to start strong solidarity movements and international actions.

We must endeavour everywhere to link up the economic struggles with the political ones, strengthening at the same time our ideological influence on the masses organisationally, making the factories our revolutionary citadels of Communism. If we weld together our ranks, make millions of men and women workers realise their strength, and if we pursue our revolutionary line with ruthless determination, neither the bourgeoisie, nor social-fascism, nor any other class enemies will be able to stop our victorious progress. (Loud Applause.)

Comrade MINOR (United States of America):

Comrades.

The American bourgeoisie, already taking the position of hegemony in world capitalism, now is pushing forward in the struggle for the world market which can only end in war, which all recognise must be war with Great Britain as the principal opponent, a war for a monopolist position. The big Wall Street publications speak of America as the "new Roman Empire" gathering tribute from all the rest of the world.

In the midst of the preparations for the coming war, in the midst of this aggressiveness of imperialism, there is of course a tremendous ideological drive, a cultural drive of American imperialism reflecting the general aggressiveness of American capitalism. The theme in many capitalist journals today is: revolution menaces the whole world except America; poverty grips many countries, but not America; the working class has occasion to struggle in all other countries, but not in America.

America is put forward in this cultural drive as the country of permanent counter-revolution, the country in which proletarian movements are forever banned. At the same time, in the efforts of the American bourgeoisie to meet the needs of competition on a world scale with other capitalisms, the sharp attacks upon the living standards of the working class are bringing about a tremendous change in American society. Everywhere we see, and it is especially accentuated in the past few months, the process of radicalisation of the proletarian masses in America. Every struggle that breaks out is peculiar in this respect: that practically every struggle is a struggle against capitalist rationalisation. This capitalist rationalisation is driving the American masses to the Left at a pace which I believe would astonish many European comrades who have the habit of thinking of America as the country of a backward proletariat. I will add that it has astonished many of us American comrades also, and our failure to see it in its full value has caused us to make some very serious mistakes.

Every strike is a strike against capitalist rationalisation, and another peculiarity is that every strike is wide open to the Communist Party to step in to play a prominent role, and in nearly every important recent instance the Communist Party has had the opportunity to take the leading role. This has been true in every important strike during the past two or more years.

The strike in the Southern textile field was recognised by our Central Committee as signifying not merely an isolated event, but as the harbinger of a tremendous wave of struggle throughout that important section of the country. A great many, or at least some steps, in the usual development of the American proletariat will be jumped over in the case of these Southern new proletarians. In the case of the textile strike at Gastonia and the surrounding towns, the struggle has lasted now for some months. It has gone to the point of a bloody clash with the police and the armed guards of the millowners. In the most recent clash the textile workers engaged in armed combat with the agents of the employers and the police.

The drive for the defence of these workers means an opportunity for a still higher elevation of the struggle in the newly industrialised South. In respect to this fight in North Carolina it has already been possible to advance the slogan of the right of the workers to defend themselves by means of arms against the attacks of the bourgeoisie. We have a great strike movement amongst the shoe workers. We have had rather considerable strikes among the needle workers of the big cities, we have strikes among the food workers which have reached a very militant stage. In the coal mining field the C.P. is already recognised as the one and only force which fights for the working class. The new union movement has taken hold and this shows how completely correct the tactics of the IV. Congress of the R.I.L.U. are proving to be in America. The new union movement in its organised expression has difficulty in keeping up with some of the opportunities which present themselves. For instance, there are cases where the coal miners are spontaneously organising local unions without even knowing that the Party is engaged in such a movement, showing we have not been able with our limited forces and, of course, coupled with the factional struggle in the Party, to reach out far enough to take advantage of the opportunities.

Let us note the effects of what I described as the cultural drive of the bourgeoisie — these effects on the working class. We find Matthew Woll, Vice-President of the American Federation of Labour, making himself the most active, consistent, energetic propagandist of the theory of the immunity of the American proletariat from any role in the world revolution. Woll writes without any phraseology of social reformism; he uses that of the bankers of Wall Street. The A.F. of L. bureaucracy for which he speaks has definitely become an organiser of mercenary gunmen for breaking strikes. It has appeared in that role in the mining strike, the needle strikes, in the textile strikes, and on every other possible occasion. The Socialist Party in its ideological aspect is now developing very clumsily an attempt at revision of Marxism. For instance, Mr. Abraham Cahan, Editor of the Jewish Daily Forward, the chief press organ of the Socialist Party, comes out with a statement that Marx must be revised, especially in America where we have "exceptional" conditions. The Reverend Norman Thomas has made a great scientific contribution recently. As leader of the Socialist Party, he evokes a peculiar philosophy, somewhat akin to the movement attached to the name of Mach in Central Europe some years ago, which Lenin specially analysed in his work "Materialism and Empirio Criticism". The Reverend Norman Thomas applies the "lessons of modern science" to Marx. He revises Marx to fit what this reverend gentleman calls "modern science", and makes out of this compilation of Marx and "modern science" a mystical concoction which has in it a great deal of his former profession — theology. Everywhere we find the attempt to establish the fact that America must have an exceptional philosophy, an exceptional movement, and exceptional role in world history. And we are now able to say that this exceptionalism has very definitely penetrated into the Communist Party of the United States and has had disastrous results. What is this exceptionalism? Exceptionalism in its initial stages is the beginning of the path which leads straight to bourgeois patriotism. It is the direct effect of bourgeois imperialist ideology on the working class, and this has penetrated into our Party. As far as I know, the first definite signs of this penetration are to be found in the reactions of our C.P. to the IX. Plenum of the E.C.C.I. After the IX. Plenum Lovestone and Pepper made themselves the prophets, who were going to show the American Party (and they had some success, I am sorry to say) that somehow or other the findings of the IX. Plenum did not quite apply fully to the United States. The IV. Congress of the R.I.L.U. was a splendid Congress for

every country in the world "except the United States". When once you begin with this theory of an exceptional position for one's "own" country, you are sure to go further upon the path. When it came to our last Party Convention, it was not an accident (No, Comrade Losovsky, there are no accidents), that in the thesis of the majority of the Party, which was in fact, produced by Pepper and Lovestone (although we must share in responsibility for having accepted it), there was not one word of the Third Period. The reason for that, which is clear enough now, was simply that Pepper and Lovestone had concocted the theory that the Third Period was a splendid conception for the whole world, except America.

I will confide the fact that all was not complete harmony within the majority faction about the majority thesis. But we committed a gross offence against Communist principles in smothering up the differences that were in existence in the majority faction. We had disputes about these differences, and I would like to exhibit to some of the comrades the large slices of praise of American capitalism which we cut out of the original Pepper-Lovestone draft before the thesis was finally presented. It was unprincipled not to insist on carrying through the whole of the discussion of the thesis in the Political Committee before it was presented.

In the thesis devised by the majority, and to some extent also in that of the minority, the Right danger was more or less of an abstraction.

The question of Trotskyism. Why was Trotskyism presented as being the crassest expression of the Right danger? That we can recognise now had the basis that Pepper and Lovestone — and we also have to share to a certain extent in this fault — looked upon this Right danger as somewhat of an abstraction for the American Party. In Pepper's Machiavellian tactics it was necessary to make some formal statements against the Right danger. It was not convenient for him to present it as the same thing as the Trotskyist danger and thereby give an appearance of struggle against the Right danger, of which he was rapidly becoming (with Lovestone) the clearest representative.

In regard to the VI. Convention, I want to say the Communist International made no mistake when it takes a position of recognising that VI. Convention. The Convention was not of a bad composition. On the contrary, it was the most proletarian Convention that was ever convened in America. It was the most representative of the best sections of the Party, the most proletarian sections. The trouble with the Convention was not its composition, the trouble was that we gave it bad factional leadership instead of allowing that proletarian convention to take its natural expression. In that connection, I have in the last few weeks in the enlightenment campaign in the Party, been accused by former members of the minority to the effect that I was not sufficiently criticising the minority. So as to avoid being subject to that criticism again I want to make a few criticisms of the minority here and now.

The minority also was completely swamped in factionalism. The fundamental basis of the mistakes of the minority was exactly the same as ours — the theory of exceptionalism. The mistakes of the minority were Right mistakes and not "Left" mistakes as they so proudly claimed when their mistakes were being attacked. It is very much to the misfortune of the Party, as the Comintern points out in its last letter to the Party, that certain comrades of the minority showed themselves incapable of acting as a unifying force of the Party in the time of the VI. Convention. That, however, must not be stressed too much by me especially, for I must say that the majority must take the larger share of responsibility.

When the Comintern letter came, making certain organisational proposals, we immediately said

"those organisational proposals mean to turn the Party over to the minority and we are against them".

And the minority said:

"Yes, those organisational proposals mean that the C.I. wants to turn the Party over to us, and we are for it." And in other words, there was nobody in the whole of the Convention that was able to see that the C.I. did not propose to turn the Party over to any faction, but to destroy

every faction and to make our C.P. a unified Section of the C.I. The comrades of the minority made proposals immediately for a Polcom to be composed of the most hard boiled factionalists of the minority, to form a majority of the Political-Bureau. That was evidence enough that they did not understand the C.I. letter. But our mistake is more sharply to be criticised than theirs. I think the comrades that represented the C.I. did not realise the heterogeneity within the majority of the Convention. They drew a hard and fast line simply between the majority and the minority and we were so hard boiled and the way we treated them was so inexcusable, that they did not see we were differing among ourselves at the same time.

Now comrades, the heterogeneity of the majority of the Party at the Convention was concealed, but I think it is perhaps justified for me to mention that Comrade **Weinstone**, Comrade **Olgin** and myself had already made attacks upon the thesis. And we were not principled enough to bring it outside the faction. I think it is worth mentioning that there was already developing a strained attitude between some of us and Pepper and Lovestone. On the Russian Party question I agree with what the C. I. says in its letter of the unprincipled manner in which we handled the Russian Party question; but I want to make this additional suggestion: that the differences within the majority section on the Russian Party question also could be studied with some advantage to understand why such a peculiar course was followed on this question. That of course does not excuse the outrageous fact that the whole thing was handled without a single word of discussion in the Convention.

Very well, we went through that Convention and we sent a Delegation to the C.I. to fight for what we called the correct position — to convince the C.I. on the organisational proposals. Of course, the friction on organisational proposals had decreased somewhat towards the end of the Convention, as the points at issue were brought down largely to questions, or I might say to the one question predominating in this matter, — of the sending of Lovestone away from America for a while. The delegation which we sent over here had an understanding with us, clearly expressed in words, that they were to fight, but that they were to accept the decisions, under any and every condition, no matter how severely it might violate what we considered was our point of view.

But the comrades came over here with a different programme, and treated with the C.I. in a non-Communist manner. They regarded it as a negotiation between two powers, as a test of which was the stronger — in order to see whether we would have a strong enough force to defeat the E. C. C. I. Lovestone told the E. C. C. I.: "I have the Party; it is our Party." but what Lovestone had to learn is that it is not his Party, but the Party of the C.I. all the way through.

Pepper had stayed in the United States to pull the strings of the Convention from behind the scenes. Pepper showed himself to be an international adventurer of the worst sort, an intriguer against the C.I. He made himself an agent, an ambassador, of an international Right wing, attempting to win the American Party for the international Right wing to combat Leninism in the C.I.

This Pepper adventure, of course, severely shook the political views of that portion of the leadership of the Party which then was in the United States.

Then another very important thing which the comrades must understand. On the 15th of May, Lovestone and Gitlow, the majority faction of the delegation in Moscow, sent a cablegram to us through factional channels. The character of it was, a call for us to mobilise the Party for a fight against the Comintern decision. It called upon us not to publish the forthcoming letter of the Comintern, to suppress it, to take measures to seize the Party institutions, to sell the Party buildings, and to remove any who oppose the programme of fighting the Comintern. In other words, this cablegram, which we have taken to calling the "treason cablegram", called for a political struggle against the Comintern, an organisational mobilisation against the Comintern and physical resistance to the carrying out of the Comintern decisions. The cablegram even went so far as to call for us to make an open propaganda in the Party press against what they called the "forcible de-

vention" of those good American Communist leaders in Moscow. It could only mean an open propaganda along the lines of the rottenest Menshevik groups against the Comintern, against the Soviet Union itself, against the "tyrannical" Bolshevik Government that forcibly detains the good revolutionary leaders of the working class behind the bayonets of the terrible, blood-thirsty Red Army in Moscow.

I want to show that the famous counter-revolutionary organ, "The Rul", published in Berlin, agrees with Lovestone on this point. In fact it published an article on the question of the American delegation in Moscow. I will translate it from the Russian:

"Arrest of Americans in Moscow. In Moscow the G. P. U. has arrested 19 American Communists who a short time ago arrived in Soviet Russia. The arrests followed when these Americans, having just arrived and become acquainted with the Soviet order, subjected it to sharp criticism and carelessly stated their intentions, on their return to America, to expose the Soviet Government." Then listen to this:

"One of the Americans succeeded in escaping." And that one American who "succeeded in escaping" was Lovestone. Well, that shows the nature of the development of this anti-Communist point of view of Lovestone and Pepper.

Well, we had two days after the receipt of this private factional telegram before the arrival of the C.I. address to the Party. And comrades are wondering how is it possible that the C.P. U.S., or rather its Polcom, on receiving the decision of the C.I. which was the most drastic, the bitterest document ever addressed to a Communist group, how is it that on the first day, on the very day we received it, we were able to get a unanimous decision accepting and endorsing it by the Polcom? The answer is as follows:

The majority of the Convention was elected on the conviction that we were going to that Convention to fight against reservations to the decisions of the VI. World Congress. That was an indication of one reason why the American Party fundamentally could not be turned at that time and in those circumstances to an anti-C.I. position.

Secondly the "treason cablegram". Through the "treason cablegram" we had had two days of complete knowledge of the Lovestone programme before the C.I. address came. We had already in the Majority faction discussed the whole thing, knowing the conditions and knowing what resistance to the address meant in the eyes of Lovestone and Pepper, that it meant a fight against the C.I. not from within but from outside. We had already had the Pepper adventure as an example. We had the example of Lovestone having made the chief issue with the C.I. the careerist issue of whether Mr. Lovestone should work in Moscow or in America.

And so, comrades, the situation which we faced when the Comintern decision arrived was not entirely a surprise. There had been developments that made it possible to get an immediate decision in favour of the C.I. address. Now I want to say I am proud of the fact that an 85% majority of the Party (perhaps not fully 85%, but we in our factional spirit called it an 85% majority), that we succeeded in turning that 85% majority against Lovestone within a very few days. It was a good job and I have so little to boast of that I must be allowed to boast of that.

Now the Lovestone opposition, the anti-C.I. opposition, has a programme. What is this programme? The programme is to defend all that the C.I. attacks in the American Party. What is that? The basic fundament of the Lovestone programme is to represent and defend the theory of exceptionalism. Lovestone also has taken a leaf out of comrade Meyer's book in the German Party. Lovestone says: "I defend the VI. Congress of the C.I. and the E. C. C. I. is repudiating the VI. Congress". Lovestone takes the position of the "degeneration of the C.I.". The degeneration of the C.I. carries with it the theory of the degeneration of the Soviet Union. They are now agitating against what they call the impermissible methods of the C.I. Impermissible methods! Let me say, comrades, that we have learned that the methods employed by the E. C. C. I., in

this case of the American Party, are the best and most necessary methods that could possibly be found for such a case as this. Those methods are effective. Comrades of the E. C. C. I. do not hesitate to use those methods, that have been curative for us; they can safely be considered as a good precedent.

Now, necessarily the Lovestone programme is that of the Right wing. Already they are finding a great deal in common with **Brandler** and **Thalheimer**; their followers are even using the name of **Brandler** and **Thalheimer** in a propaganda against the C. I. They ask: where would we go if we went out of the C. I.; would it be possible to find some good in **Brandler** and **Thalheimer**? They are now, through the mouth of **Gitlow**, according to reports we received, making a propaganda against the German May Day action, the idea being that the May Day action in Germany is an example of the putsches with which the C. I. tries to cover up its mistakes and its deviations. In other words, comrades, there has already developed within these few short weeks a sharp, clear, definite social-democratic reaction among those who were formerly so prominent in the leadership of our Party. Right wing opportunism is clearly consolidated already.

Lovestone is back in the United States and he and his followers are starting an agitation to organise an anti-C. I. party in the United States. **Lovestone** and **Gitlow** were summoned to appear at the Secretariat meeting. They failed to appear. They were summoned again and failed to come. **Wolfe** came to the Polcom and made a speech at that Polcom meeting which absolutely astounded us.

Well, we expelled **Lovestone** with a unanimous decision of the Political Bureau, with the exception of the vote of **Wolfe**. And we suspended **Wolfe** from the Political Bureau with only one vote in addition to his own against his suspension.

Now we have to face the situation in which it is already clear we will carry the overwhelming majority of the Party for the Comintern. But I want to issue a warning against too great an optimism. The fact that we were able to have every district bureau record itself for the Comintern within a few days, every Language bureau within a few days, the entire Political Committee, every district organiser within a few days, must not make us blind to the fact that American imperialism has a power for poisoning the working class ideologically which will penetrate into the rotten elements of our Party. We must record the fact that that first mobilisation for the Comintern, as successful as it is, may be misunderstood. We have a situation where the opposition has one district organiser, or did have when I left.

What is the extent of the opposition? It consists chiefly of a few petty functionaries of the districts. A district organisation secretary, the second rank of functionary in the district of New York, **Bert Miller**, was caught trying to organise nationally a caucus against the Comintern decision, and we removed him. In Philadelphia another functionary of the same rank was found to be mobilising support for **Lovestone** to fight the Comintern. Two members of the N. E. C. of the Y. W. L. have been removed or suspended from the Bureau for opposing the expulsion of **Lovestone**.

We have other weaknesses. For instance, some of the better elements among the trade union functionaries, sincere comrades, are confused, and we have to handle them with more care. In other cases we have to be more sharp. We must not hesitate where it comes to such a position as taken by some that we must "save **Lovestone**" or "save" somebody else.

We have now this propaganda which **Lovestone** with the support of **Wolfe** is carrying on, which represents most completely the crystallisation of the Right Wing in the American Party — its definite crystallisation. The propaganda against the C. I. takes the form that the C. I. is removing the leadership of all the Communist Parties and particularly of the American Party, that the C. I. is "running all of the Communist parties through secretariats" instead of Polcoms. The C. C. of the American Party, says **Wolfe**, was a few weeks ago called a C. C. which could not be termed a Right Wing committee. But "now the C. I. calls the C. C. a Right Wing C. C.". Our answer to **Wolfe** is: No; the same C. C. is in power today that was elected by the Convention. The C. I. recognises that C. C.

The Right danger in the American Party has been concealed in the past by the factional conditions. It exists also in the minority, and it is the chief danger in the Party now.

The Right danger, I think, is peculiarly illustrated in the matter of the **Negro question** in the U. S. We find everywhere the tendency to look upon the Negro question as a sort of backward affair. The Negro question is something we "ought to handle". But it comes second. In Chicago, for instance, the Negro work is being sabotaged by the District Organiser and has been for some time. On all questions of the struggle in the South, the Negro question has always been a test which has shown up the opportunist tendencies in the Party. In regard to this struggle in the Southern textile field, the first big test, where we have many Negro workers and white workers on strike together standing shoulder to shoulder against the employers in actual physical combat, there we have the most serious, most severe test. Now the Negro comrades in the Party inevitably have a more acute ear for question of this sort than any other comrades in the Party; and it is peculiarly interesting to note that the Negro comrades always tend to be against the C. C., no matter which C. C. is in power; if it is the present majority or the present minority, the Negro comrades tend to drift into the opposite direction. Why? Because the Party as a whole is opportunistic — or has opportunistic tendencies on the Negro question. The comrades instinctively feel the Party has not yet taken a proper revolutionary attitude towards the tremendous question of the Negroes, and the C. C., no matter which group may be in power, is always to blame for such condition.

When it came to work in the South, we found, for instance, in **Norfolk**, Virginia, that the whole of the unit of the Party in that city refused to accept Negro members. (Shame!) It is almost inconceivable that a unit of a C. P. could manifest such a crass anti-Communist character. What did we do? We sent Comrade **Otto Hall**, a Negro member of the Polcom, to **Norfolk**, Virginia with instructions to re-organise the branch, to throw out every white member from the Party and then to build the Party unit up on the basis of the Negro workers, who were either already in the Party or sympathetic to the Party, and then to add to that unit whatever white workers could be found who were fit to join the unit. When it came to the fight in **Gastonia**, we found a tendency of our Party comrades to take the position (and they quoted Comrade **Lozovsky**, as the one responsible for this theory and **Lozovsky** will, of course repudiate the slander) that when we get to the South where the struggle is so sharp and the prejudices so great against the Negroes, we must not try to build a single union of white and Negro workers together, but "if the Negro workers themselves are of the opinion" that white workers will not give them justice in the ranks of the same union, then they must organise separate unions for Negro workers only. And they say even the R. I. L. U. and Comrade **Lozovsky** have said we must build separate Negro unions under such circumstances. We have pointed out to the comrades that is an outrageous calumny against the R. I. L. U. and against Comrade **Lozovsky**. The R. I. L. U. calls for the building of separate Negro unions when it is against the old bureaucracy and unions in their control; when we cannot get the Negroes into the union, then we organise the new union of Negroes against the bureaucracy. But at the same time we give instructions that where we have the new revolutionary union under our control, being built in a new field, we will not under any circumstances accept any separate organisation of the Negro unions. We say to the comrades who say we cannot organise these unions, that it is most important that on entering on this work for the first time, in the virgin soil of the South, that it is more important to be correct on that question than it is to succeed in organising a local union here and there.

I will not name particular comrades, on that mistake, not because they were not particular comrades who made these mistakes, but because I think it should not be fixed on to one particular comrade, because the question is far too important and the responsibility for it rests on all the Party.

What is white chauvinism? It is the very finest flower of imperialist ideology (**Lozovsky**: It is race exceptionalism). It is the twin brother of exceptionalism. White chauvinism is an inevitable disease of a young Communist Party in an imperialist

country. Where we have an imperialist bourgeoisie now starting out for a conquest of Asia, Africa, Mexico, South America; where the ideology of white chauvinism is driven to the highest degree it has ever reached, is it conceivable that a Communist Party as young and as raw as our Communist Party should not be tainted with white chauvinism? It is impossible. We are combatting it. We have recently expelled a considerable number of members and some functionaries, even district committee members have been expelled for taking a wrong attitude on that question. However, on the questions of white chauvinism and of exceptionalism, the question of organising the unorganised into new unions, on all these questions we find the Right danger most sharply expressed.

In the Southern Illinois coalmining field, we find a very distinct anti-Party tendency cultivated in the Party by the influence of the degenerate Trotskyists under the leadership of Cannon. The Trotskyists are now going over to a position between the Lewis bureaucracy of the coalminers' union and the new union led by the Communist Party.

All the manifestations of the Right danger in the American Party will tend to crystallise under the leadership of Lovestone against the Party and against the Comintern. It will be a fight, comrades, do not fool yourselves. We have no easy situation. But we will win 99% of the rank and file of the Party for the Comintern decision.

I intended to say something about the manifestation of the Right danger in the Party which I think now justified, and that is our neglect of the agrarian question. That is simply due to the fact that the factional situation in the Party has made it impossible to carry on any serious activity along that line. When there are two warring factions, such things as the agrarian work are sacrificed. We have recently had plans laid out at an agrarian conference. The Hoover frauds and swindles in the agrarian question have given us an excellent opportunity to do agrarian work. Why have we not done it? Blame us for that, there is no excuse. Because we were factional we did not give this serious attention. We have few capable comrades to do the work. We now have a big agricultural conference under plan, and we have at least one competent comrade at work on it and hope soon to have some results.

Comrades, I must come to an end. What is the nature of the opposition? The answer is: a **Right wing**. Is there a field in which this Right wing can operate as a separate group from the Party? Yes. Where will Lovestone and his Right wing go? We cannot say for sure. It is even conceivable that there might be a rapprochement between Lovestone and Cannon. We have been told correctly by the Comintern that never so much as in America have the Trotskyists shown themselves (behind their masks) to be in such full bloom as opportunists, and it is entirely possible that Lovestone may consolidate with the Trotskyists. Let me remind you that Lore, the original Trotskyist leader in America, is already going in with the Katonah, New York group, the Brookwood Labour College group of so-called Left wing socialists. We can expect the very great likelihood that Lovestone will be approaching Lore through the medium of the Rev. Mr. Muste, who conducts a little business

as a Left wing socialist at this so-called Labour College at Katonah, New York. There is a rich field, and that rich field will be occupied by Lovestone and by those who will ally themselves with him, and our business is to see that none of the proletarian members of our Party are misled into that group. Organisational measures are being taken. We will take more organisational measures. After the expulsion of Lovestone, something of a new period for the development of the struggle commences, and we will have to act sharply against some. We will, of course, put up a different standard for proletarian members from those who are of the office-holding type in the Party, and particularly of those of petty-bourgeois extraction. But we must not let ourselves be fooled that there is no danger of losing some proletarian elements at the same time. We have to be very careful.

However, among the Polcom, what is the position? Comrades, we believe that the address of the C. I. to the American Party is correct in every particular; that address is the consistent development of the line of the VI. World Congress of the C. I. It is consistent with the earlier open letter sent to the Convention; it is consistent with the clear-out line of the Central Committee of the Russian Party and it is the most wholesome and helpful thing the C. I. has ever done for the American Party.

Comrades, what does the C. I. want? We know now the C. I. wants exactly what it says: the abolition of factionalism. We are working together and are abolishing factionalism already. The little remnants will be gotten rid of. The C. I. knows the correct way and it has pursued the correct way, and the American Party will follow that way, and we will have a mass Communist Party in the United States. A better and stronger Party will result from this action of the C. I.

We have a perspective ahead of us of the most brilliant opportunities for the C. P. We have a rising tide of struggle, and the radicalisation of the workers quickly developing. The development of the class struggle proves the correctness of the C. I. perspective in regard to the radicalisation of the masses. There is, it is true, a reactionary tendency to sharpen the attack of the capitalist agents in the working class against the Party, but we have in every strike that develops, the opportunity to evince the heavy influence of our Party. If we get rid of factionalism we can lead these strikes, we can develop the struggle to a higher plane. We have unemployment in America as never before; the organisation of the unemployed will become a tremendous feature of the near future. The new unions of the T. U. E. L., and the T. U. E. L. Convention which will be held at the end of August, offer a new chapter in the history of the American class struggle. The new unions already play a tremendous role; with the new centre they will play a much bigger role and a new period is open for the C. P.

All that is happening confirms the correctness of the C. I. line, of the line of the R. I. L. U., and shows that the American Party has been saved by our C. I. from a most dangerous situation, and has put us on the path of victorious development of a mass C. P. in America, which will not come to you next time with an "American question".

TO OUR READERS!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England	2 sh.
Germany	1.50 marks
Austria	2 sh.
Norway	1.50 crowns
Denmark	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. R.	1 rouble

For other countries the subscription rate is six dollars for one year.

Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39, East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent. The subscription rates in the U. S. A. are, \$ 2 for three months, \$ 3.50 for six months and \$ 6 for one year.

The Business Manager.