

# The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. VII. No. 8.

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

FIVE CENTS.

## CONTENTS

A Congress of "Extended Advance" .....	59
The Economic Crisis and the Electric Chair .....	67
<i>First of August Campaign.</i>	
Extend the Front! .....	70
The United Front from below By F. HECKERT .....	73
On the eve of August 1st in France .....	81
The 1st of August in Britain .....	86
The 1st of August in Poland .....	89
By BRONKOVSKY	
<i>World Topics.</i>	
New Class Wars in Germany .....	93
Hais takes the road to Amsterdam By P.R. ....	97
Italy and the Immediate Tasks of the Italian Party .....	101
By GARLANDI	
Situation in the C.P. of France .....	107
By MAURICE THOREZ	
Problems of French Party .....	112

---

**A** UNITED STATES statistical authority has stated that the problems of Britain are so complicated and so grave “as to jeopardise the part which Britain plays in maintaining the balance of civilisation in the world.”

The plight of the United States is well known. In this number of the “International” a quotation from the *Daily News* makes this clear.

These countries face a testing time.

Capital is visibly breaking.

The working class need more than ever the guidance of the experience of the world revolution.

The problems and solutions of the world revolutionary parties are put at the disposal of the workers twice a month in the  
**COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL**

Order your copies now from the same source as you purchased this number.

---

## A CONGRESS OF "EXTENDED ADVANCE"

THE SIXTEENTH CONGRESS OF THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY

THE Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. opened with the Political Report of the Central Committee, given by the General Secretary, Comrade Stalin. Comrade Stalin's report was a speech of socialism triumphant. It was delivered with quiet assurance, without high-sounding phrases. The speaker referred to the indisputable facts of the tremendous achievements in the U.S.S.R., not for one moment glossing over the difficulties and partial setbacks. He made a sharp, classically Marxist-Leninist analysis of the present decline of the capitalist world and the rise of the U.S.S.R. He proclaimed an "extended advance by socialism along the whole front" in the Soviet Union. His speech resounded with the tremendous unshakeable assuredness of victory in this advance. It did not express a shadow of doubt as to whether the attack would be successful, for, despite all the difficulties which the Soviet regime has to overcome, "it must be admitted that the Soviet regime is now the most stable power of all the existing powers in the world."

At the same time, Comrade Stalin's speech was full of keen irony on the "miscalculations" of our class enemies who, formerly, were crying out about the "inevitable downfall" of the U.S.S.R., but now, waxing pessimistic, were maliciously whispering about the need to "punish this country, which has dared to develop its economic system while the rest of the world is plunged in crisis." His speech showed profound contempt for the right-wing opportunists who, at any sign of difficulty become panic-stricken and capitulate before the enemy, who through sheer funk, are prepared to make mountains out of molehills.

Through Comrade Stalin's lips there spoke the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (the Bolsheviki), a Party steeled in combat, and also the Soviet proletariat, steeled in the struggle of three revolutions. And this speech was so impressive that even the bourgeois and social-democratic press could not conceal their consternation and their confusion.

The press reports of our class enemies on Comrade Stalin's speech are notable in testifying to the feeling of depression in the capitalist world. What has so astounded our enemies?

What was the main purport of Comrade Stalin's political report for the period that has elapsed between the Fifteenth and the Sixteenth Congress of the Party? It is that this was a *period of change*. "For the capitalist countries this change meant a turn towards economic *decline*." "The present economic crisis is the most serious and the most profound crisis of all the world economic crises that have occurred hitherto." For the U.S.S.R. this change meant the *growing rise* of socialist-construction both in industry and in agriculture. In going over to an attack all along the front, we are not yet abolishing N.E.P., but the "*last stage*" of N.E.P. is already being traversed. "We have already emerged from the transition period in the old meaning of the term . . . We have already entered the period of socialism, for the socialist sector now controls all the economic levers of the entire national economy, although we have still a long way to go until socialist society is built up and class distinctions abolished."

We see the predictions of the bolsheviks justified before our very eyes, while the liberal talk of the bourgeoisie, the social-democrats, the Trotskyites and our right opportunists about "organised capitalism," about "prosperity" in the United States, about the resurrection of a bourgeois Germany thanks to the "spirit of Locarno," about the Thermidorian degeneration of the Soviet Union, is smashed to atoms.

"The present crisis is the first *world* economic crisis since the war." In the U.S.A., Germany and Poland there is a clearly expressed crisis, in England an economic slump and the first phase of crisis, in France a downward curve of growth, everywhere an agrarian crisis, everywhere a tremendous increase in unemployment, whereas in the U.S.S.R. there is now a tempestuous upsurge.

Is it long since the social-democrats were drunk with admiration at the prosperity of American capitalism, infecting Trotsky and our "right" opportunists who also bowed to its power? Is it long since the German social-democrats were priding themselves that having steered the *first* course in a westerly direction, having "staked their pile" on defending capital rationalisation, they had helped the resuscitation

of German capitalist economy? And what do we see now? The economic crisis has hit hardest of all, precisely the U.S.A., the chief citadel of capitalism. And what is the present position of Germany that has gone to Canossa? It was very appropriately described by Comrade Stalin: "America, France, England, etc., sit like overlords at the top of the pyramid with the Young Plan in their hands and the inscription 'Pay!' while rended Germany lies below, compelled to exert her entire strength in order to execute the order for the payment of milliards contributions. You want to know what that is. That is the 'Spirit of Locarno.'"

After making an economic analysis of the present crisis of over-production on the background of the general crisis of capitalism, and showing how this crisis lays bare and intensifies all the contradictions of capitalist society, Comrade Stalin comes to the conclusion that "the stabilisation of capitalism is coming to an end, the rise of the revolutionary movement of the masses will grow with a new force . . . that the bourgeoisie will seek a new way out in a new imperialist war and intervention in the sphere of foreign policy . . . that the proletariat, fighting against capitalist exploitation and the war danger, will seek a way out in revolution."

How does this crisis reflect on the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist countries? "Every time the capitalist contradictions begin to become sharper, the bourgeoisie turns its eyes towards the U.S.S.R. : cannot this or that contradiction of capitalism, or all the contradictions taken together, be solved at the expense of the U.S.S.R., that country of soviets, that citadel of the revolution, which, by its very existence is revolutionising the working-class and the colonies, is hindering the arrangement of new wars, is obstructing the re-division of the world anew, is preventing foreign domination of her extensive internal market, so necessary to the capitalists, particularly now, in view of the economic crisis? Hence the tendency for adventuristic sallies against the U.S.S.R., a tendency which should increase as the economic crisis develops."

This tendency is counterposed by another one that arises from the sorrowful experience of the first intervention, from fear in face of the growing strength and defensive capacity of the Soviet Union, from fear of a revolution behind the lines.

Comrade Stalin contrasted the interventionist tendencies of the imperialist powers with the peaceful policy of the U.S.S.R. : "We will continue to conduct this peace policy in the future by every means in our power." A section of the bourgeois and social-fascist press is endeavouring to utilise this part of Comrade Stalin's speech as though it reflected some kind of new note, as if it foretold a *new* course in the *foreign policy* of the Soviet regime, as if it were some kind of "retreat."

This is a pitiful manoeuvre aimed at diminishing the strong impression made by Comrade Stalin's speech upon the working masses. A policy of peace is far from new as far as the Soviet regime is concerned ; it has continuously pursued such a policy and will go on doing so. What was new in Comrade Stalin's speech was that we have already entered into "the last phase of Nep," "entered into the period of socialism" and we are "carrying out an extended attack by socialism along the whole front." It was to this that the main part of Comrade Stalin's report was devoted.

\* \* \*

In his report Comrade Stalin counterposed the decline in capitalist countries by a picture of the rapid growth in the U.S.S.R. He proved by many figures that the U.S.S.R. is already "on the eve of being transformed from an *agrarian* country into an *industrial* country." Further, citing data on the rapid growth of socialist industry he comes to the conclusion : "It is clear that the question ' who, whom ', the question as to whether socialism will conquer the capitalistic elements in industry or whether they will conquer socialism—has already been settled, in the main, in favour of socialist forms of industry. It has been settled finally and irrevocably."

What does the fact that the maximum objective aimed at by the Five-Year Plan is being carried out show us? It not only shows us that the Soviet Union can carry out the Five-Year Plan in four years. But that in a number of industries the plan can even be carried out in three or two-and-a-half years. In its *level* of development, the industry of the U.S.S.R. it still far behind of the advanced capitalist countries. In its *pace* of development, however, it is going ahead of all, and only a *further acceleration* of the pace of development will

enable it to catch up and outpace them in the briefest possible historical period. Therefore, people who chatter about the necessity for *diminishing* the pace of development of our industry, are enemies of *socialism*, agents of our class enemies."

In describing the stages of development of the socialist advance in the U.S.S.R., Comrade Stalin stated that "the Fourteenth Congress was primarily a congress of *industrialisation*, the Fifteenth Congress was primarily a congress of *collectivisation*, while the Sixteenth Congress is a congress of the *extended advance* of socialism along the whole front." This extended advance is connected with the mass collective farm movement of poor and middle peasants which commenced in the second half of 1929 and which opened up the "period of great change" in the life of the U.S.S.R. This turn was by no means an accident. It was prepared by the whole process of development of the U.S.S.R. It was prepared by the whole policy of the Party and the Central Committee took a number of steps in order to meet this movement fully equipped and to take the leadership of it.

On every such occasion both "scientific" people and right-wing opportunists "picked holes in" the measures taken. That was the case when the C.C. for the first time decided to organise big new collective grain farms; such was the case, recently, when in January, 1930, the Political Bureau of the C.C., in view of the mass swing-round of the peasants towards the collective farms, established different timetables in three different regions for the completion of the main collectivisation, uttering warning of course against all distortions of policy such as "commanding," etc. These measures were called fantastic; the C.C. was accused of "dissipating" the people's money, and these measures were "guaranteed" failure. The Central Committee is not perturbed by the tittering or the whimpering of right-wing opportunists and in spite of their resistance and also despite the dizziness and distortions of the "lefts," brought the matter through and achieved brilliant successes.

Thanks to the growth of the socialised sector both in the sphere of industry and in the sphere of agriculture, "the foundations have already been laid for a radical improvement of the material and cultural position of the peasants,"

for this growth means a curtailment of the exploiting elements, for it enables that part of the national income which formerly went to nourish the exploiters and their retinue to be henceforth invested in production and devoted to improving the living conditions of the toilers, because, finally, in increasing the capacity of the home market, it will impel forward the development of industry.

But already now we can register the uninterrupted numerical growth of the working-class, a big reduction in unemployment and an increase in the real wages of the workers, which, taking into account the social insurance, and the assignment of a portion of profits to the fund for improving the workers' conditions, have increased 167 per cent. in comparison with pre-war.

All these achievements have not been lightly attained; they were only possible thanks to a resolute struggle against difficulties and against class enemies. But these difficulties are the specific *difficulties of the reconstruction period*. They are not difficulties of decline or stagnancy, as in capitalist countries, but *difficulties of growth, of rise and of forward movement*. And for the successful overcoming of these difficulties only one method exists: "to organise an *advance* against capitalist elements along the *whole front* and to isolate the opportunist elements in our own ranks who hinder the advance and who dart hither and thither in a panic, bringing into the Party uncertainty as to victory."

The slogan for an "extended advance along the whole front," is sometimes falsely interpreted by bad Leninists and such interpretation gives rise to right and to "left" deviations. Therefore Comrade Stalin made this point absolutely clear in his speech.

Some people think that the *chief* thing in the extended socialist advance is repression. Because of this, the right-wingers were frightened at this slogan seeing in it the "liquidation of N.E.P." and a return to war Communism. For the same reason, the "left" exaggerators, in carrying out collectivisation, committed administrative distortions. Comrade Stalin therefore found it necessary to emphasise that "repressions are a necessary element of the socialist advance, but an auxiliary and not a main element." Certain comrades understood the

extended advance of socialism as being a "wholesale move forward." As a result of this interpretation the "left" distorters often passed by the "artel"-form and, aiming directly at the organisation of "communes," tried to effect 100 per cent. collectivisation without taking into consideration the peculiarities of each district.

As a result of such a conception, the right deviators, when they saw a drifting away of peasants from the collective farms interpreted this as a "failure of the offensive" as an "ebbing of the revolution." With the former in view, Comrade Stalin explained on the basis of the experience of the civil war, that "a wholesale move forward means death for the advance," that "there has never been and cannot be a *successful* advance without a regrouping of forces during the process of the actual advance, without reinforcing the positions taken, without the utilisation of reserves." With the second group in view of deviators, Comrade Stalin explained that "no advance, no matter how successful, can avoid gaps and setbacks on various sectors of the front" and that "it was absurd to strike an analogy between an 'ebbing of the revolution' that, usually arises on the basis of a *decline* in the movement and the drifting away of one section of the peasantry from the collective farms, which arose on the basis of a continuous *rise* in the movement."

Comrade Stalin examined in the light of Leninism the victorious path traversed in the period under report, and emphasised that the tremendous achievements on this path were only possible thanks to the superiority of the Soviet system of economy over the capitalistic, which, despite the abundance of capital, despite the better technique and despite the better training as compared with the U.S.S.R., was on the edge of a precipice.

He then outlined the tasks now facing the Party—both the ones that had long been set as also the new ones that had arisen. Among the latter he included the following: (1) In addition to the old Ukrainian coal and metallurgical basin, the creation of a powerful new Uralo-Kuznetsk basin, as black metallurgy is still the weakest spot in Soviet industry; (2) specialisation by regions, for agricultural plants and (3) acceleration of the pace of development not only of heavy but of light industry in view of the fact that heavy industry is already restored

and that the "sowing plan" for industrial "crops" has already been surpassed; (4) solution of the very acute problem of cattle-rearing which has become an urgent matter, but is quite realisable, since the grain problem, which is the key to the cattle-rearing problem, has already practically been solved; (5) the closest approximation of the apparatus to the districts and villages by abolishing the "regions," a measure which will complete the new district demarcation and which is absolutely necessary in view of the socialist transformation of agriculture.

In the concluding part of his speech, Comrade Stalin spoke of the tremendous rôle of the Party which the right-wing opportunists had greatly underestimated. For they relied on the movement propelling itself, and lulled themselves with the thought that the Soviet system contains within it tremendous *possibilities* for the complete victory of socialism, but forgot that one must also be able to transform this *possibility* into *actuality*.

That part of the report, in which Comrade Stalin showed how the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. put into operation the general line drawn up by the Party is of special interest for other Comintern sections as it is that sphere in particular—the putting of a correct line into practice—which now constitutes a vulnerable point for the majority of our sections.

"The Party cannot restrict itself to drawing up a general line," stated Comrade Stalin, "it must also verify from day to day the operation of the general line in practice. It must direct the carrying out of the general line, improving and perfecting in the process of the work the economic plans that have been passed, correcting them and averting errors . . . For us bolsheviks the Five-Year Plan is not something completed and produced for all time. For us the Five-Year Plan, like any plan, is merely a plan passed as a first approximation which has to be rectified, changed and perfected on the basis of local experience, on the basis of the experience in carrying out this plan. No Five-Year Plan could allow for all the possibilities which lie pregnant in our social order and which are only discovered in the process of work, in the process of operating the plan in the factories, in the collective and soviet farms, in the districts, etc. Only bureaucrats can think that planned work ends with the compilation of a plan. The

drawing up of the plan is merely the commencement of the planning.”

Comrade Stalin described how the Central Committee, on the basis of experience, corrected the Five-Year Plan, raising the tempo wherever new opportunities for this were afforded. But the task of the Party consisted not merely in correcting the plan during the process of its operation, but *above all*, in mobilising the masses for the carrying out of this plan and in preparing them for the general advance. These preparations began with the Party developing extensive *self-criticism*, concentrating the masses' attention on the defects of our constructional work. The preparations were continued in the struggle against *bureaucracy* and in the carrying through of a *cleansing* of Party, trade union, co-operative and soviet organisations, to rid them of hostile and bureaucratic elements. The final stage of the preparations consisted in *Socialist competition* and *mass labour enthusiasm* in the factories and works.

Socialist competition combined the mighty activity of the Party with the mighty activity of the masses. Socialist competition opened the sluice gates for the socialist torrent, and signified the start of the advance along the whole front. At the same time socialist competition brought out the fact that the great mass of the proletariat realised they were building up real socialism.

“The most remarkable thing about the competition,” said Comrade Stalin, “is that it produces a radical change in people's views on labour, for it has transformed labour from a shameful and heavy burden, as it was considered formerly, into a matter of *honour*, a matter of *glory* into a matter of *prowess* and *heroism*. Nothing of the sort does or could exist in capitalist countries.”

The most necessary prerequisite for the preparation of the general advance was a ruthless struggle within the Party against deviations from the general line and particularly against the right-wing and those who compromised with it, for the right-wing now reflects the kulak danger and is a mouthpiece for kulak demands.

Comrade Stalin described the characteristics of the Trotskyist theory, the remnants of which had to be combatted by the Party during the period under report. He also described the

“left” distortions in the carrying out of collectivisation which represented an “unconscious attempt” to revive the Trotskyist attitude towards the middle peasantry—distortions which the C.C. also had to combat. Finally, he illustrated the right deviation lead by Comrades Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky, which represented and still represents the chief danger. Comrade Stalin pointed out that “the duplicity of Trotskyism (capitulation in practice as the *content*, ‘left’ phrases and ‘revolutionary’ adventuristic disguise as the *form*) is shown by the fact that Trotskyism, generally finishes its ‘wild’ attacks against the rights by concluding a bloc with them.”

Comrade Stalin explained that the right deviators, on their part, though considering themselves the antithesis of Trotskyism, in practice, on the same fundamental questions, slip into the same defeatist position as Trotskyism. Therefore, they also “end their cock-fight with the Trotskyites by concluding a bloc with them.”

“The task consists,” he continued “in continuing in the future an irreconcilable fight on *two fronts*, both against the ‘lefts’ representing *petty bourgeois radicalism*, as also the ‘rights’ representing *petty bourgeois liberalism*. The task consists in continuing in the future an intransigent struggle against those *conciliatory elements in the Party*, who do not understand or pretend they do not understand the necessity for a resolute struggle on two fronts.”

In connection with the question of opportunist deviations, Comrade Stalin also signalled the danger of two deviations on the national question which he referred to in detail in his report—the Great Russian chauvinist deviation the bigger danger of the two, and also to the deviation towards narrow nationalism. “These deviations are not so noticeable and obstinate as the “left” or right deviations; they might be termed acquired deviations. But they exist, and what is more, they are growing. There can be no doubt whatever about that. There can be no doubt, because the general atmosphere of accentuated class struggle cannot fail to lead to a certain sharpening of national frictions, which have their reflection in the Party.”

Comrade Stalin explained that the representatives of the first deviation, not understanding Leninist dialectics, drift from a Leninist posi-

tion to Kautsky's chauvinist position on the national question. From the fact that Lenin opposed the slogan of developing national culture *under conditions of the bourgeois state*, they conclude that Communists should not support national culture *under conditions of proletarian dictatorship*, despite the fact that Lenin considered it essential under the proletarian dictatorship to further the development of a culture, socialist in content and national in form, despite the fact that in Lenin's opinion "national and state distinctions among peoples and countries . . . will continue to exist for a *long, long time*, even *after* the realisation of the proletarian dictatorship on a world scale."

Comrade Stalin, the "best pupil of Lenin," as Lenin was the best pupil of Marx, ended his report with the words: "With Lenin's banner we conquered in the battles for the October revolution, with Lenin's banner we have achieved decisive successes in the fight for the victory of socialist constructions. With this banner we will conquer in the world-wide proletarian revolution. Long live Leninism!"

\* \* \*

There was not a single delegate at the Sixteenth Party Congress who even in the slightest degree questioned the correctness of the Central Committee's line during the past two years and the current tasks put forward by Comrade Stalin on behalf of the C.C. in his report. Therefore the debates on the political report of the C.C. centred almost exclusively around the question of the C.C. line and the question of the conduct of the former leaders of the right opposition, Comrades Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky and Uglanov, who had conducted a struggle against this line. The debates on the C.C. report were thus transformed into a jury over the former leaders of the right opportunism. And the judgment was severe. The Congress, recognising that the right-wing and conciliation with it, remain the main danger under conditions of an extended advance, demanded from them complete disarmament and a ruthless condemnation of their own errors. The Congress considered that the comrades who had been a centre of attraction for all right opportunist elements in the Party, and who had played into the hands of the "third power," were duty bound themselves to be the first to extinguish the flame they had tried to ignite.

These comrades, already seven months back, after the November Plenum of the C.C. handed in a declaration in which, recognising their errors, they supported the C.C. line. However, their conduct during these seven months showed that in practice they had not disarmed but manœuvred, taking up a wait-and-see position, with an arrow ready in their bow, and even continuing their fractional work. At the Sixteenth Congress, Comrades Tomsky and Rykov once again, in a rather more categorical form, admitted their errors but even these repeated declarations of theirs did not satisfy and could not satisfy a bolshevik congress and dispel its well-founded doubts as to the sincerity and honesty of these declarations.

Why did the Congress deny confidence in them and sharply attack their latest declarations of repentance? In the first place, because now, just as following the November Plenum, they have only admitted their errors after pressure being brought to bear on them, only in view of the threatening circumstances the Party has created for them. What is more, the theoretician of the rights, Comrade Bukharin, who was absent from the Congress owing to illness, maintains shameful silence during the Congress while the practician of the rights, Comrade Tomsky, spoke at the Congress in a very wily manner; he spectacularly flagellated himself for relatively small mistakes and kept stubbornly silent as to the big ones, thus trying to deceive the Party. In the second place, the right-wingers were not trusted because the criticism of their own opportunist errors made by Comrades Uglanov, Tomsky and Rykov was half-hearted and showed that even now they do not realise what a big gulf separates their platform from the Leninist line. They do not realise that they have objectively become the mouthpiece and agents of the kulaks, that the carrying out of their line would have meant the breakdown of socialist construction and the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. Thirdly, they were not trusted because each of them only talked about himself. While not condemning the opportunism of their conciliator friends and supporters, out of fractional solidarity, they reproached themselves with having underestimated the possibilities of development of collectivisation in the present period, which is now clear even to the blind. Of course, this very position of "dragging at the tail,"



especially on the part of leaders, is in itself sufficient condemnation, but nevertheless their errors were incomparably greater. In their own imagination they also stood for a Leninist line, but proposed moving along this line more slowly and cautiously than the C.C. had done in order to ease the tension in the country. In actuality their position was much worse.

Already during the Fifteenth Congress it became clear that the country was experiencing an agricultural crisis owing to the extreme backwardness of agriculture, owing to the very poor tradable yield of the small, scattered peasant farms. There were two ways out of this position and out of the food difficulties, either by a socialist path or else by a capitalist one; either by an intensified development of collective and state farms, or else by promoting the development of big marketing kulak farms. There was no third way. The party of course took the socialist path, the only one possible for Communists; the right-wingers, however, went on the capitalist path. All their proposals meant that in the immediate future support should be given for the development of the kulak farms with the greatest tradable yield, for the sake of satisfying the bread requirements of the workers. It is clear this would not have removed the difficulties, but would have intensified them to tremendous dimensions. If now, under the present conditions of the Party, with a socialist advance, it is necessary to overcome a frantic resistance on the part of the kulaks, what would have been the position of the Party, if, after listening to the right, even if only temporarily, in the last two years, it had strengthened the position of the kulaks and weakened those of the socialist sector, diminishing the tempo of industrialisation. It is clear the crime of the rights consists not in that they were over cautious in carrying out the Leninist line, but that they took the opposite path, an anti-Leninist path, a path leading to the restoration of capitalism, and that they were objectively mouthpieces of the kulaks. They occupied the same anti-Leninist position on Comintern questions. Precisely at the moment when the "third period" was ushered in, when all the contradictions of capitalism had become accentuated, when the Communist Parties were confronted with the problem of passing over to the attack, under the slogan of "class against class," just at that

moment, they, in union with Ewert and Iljek and Chilbum and Peyer defending tactics that would lead to the disarmament of the proletariat and to capitulation to the social-democrats. That was equivalent to strike-breaking.

The Congress expected that the kind of criticism of their right-opportunist deviation that the right-wing leaders would give would be one in which they burnt all the boats linking them with the past, one in which they would ruthlessly criticise their own past errors and the errors of their supporters. That was what the Congress demanded of them. But they did not do that in the debates on the C.C. report. They so scarcely realised all the profundity of their differences with the Party, that at the Congress Comrade Rykov continued to defend the view that his famous "two-year" plan did not oppose the Five-Year Plan. It is precisely because of this insufficiency, this half-heartedness and insincerity of their self-criticism, thanks to their hesitation, that all the delegates who spoke after them, opened an increased fusillade in reply to their speeches of repentance.

The Sixteenth Congress condemned the right-wingers in just as strict a bolshevik manner as the Fifteenth Congress condemned the Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition. The Sixteenth Congress declared that "the views of the right opposition were not compatible with membership of the C.P.S.U." and the former leaders of the right-wing were placed in a dilemma: either disarm completely, or else submit to the most resolute organisational measures.

In ruthlessly condemning the opportunist platform of the former right leaders who had fought against the C.C. line, all the delegates who spoke at the Congress, as also all the workers' delegations who greeted the Congress, at the same time fervently greeted Comrade Stalin as the most consistent pupil of Lenin, as the most faithful guardian of the teachings that had led and were leading the Party and the proletariat to victory since Lenin's death. Comrade Stalin is thus now the generally recognised leader of the Party.

Comrade Stalin called the Sixteenth Party Congress "a congress of extended advance of socialism along the whole front." At the same time it was a congress, which demonstrated more than at any other time the monolithic unity of the Leninist Party. It was one of the few

congresses in the history of the C.P.S.U. at which there was no organised opposition capable of putting forward its own line and opposing it to the Party line. That is no chance coincidence : the successfully extended advance along the whole front is only possible, given the utmost solidarity on the basis of a correct Leninist line. And the whole C.P.S.U. realises this.

\* \* \*

The Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. should and will have tremendous significance for the entire Communist International, for all sections of the Comintern in the capitalist, colonial and dependent countries. The objective situation in the countries of capitalist encirclement are just as favourable now for the development of the revolutionary workers' movement as they are in the territory of the U.S.S.R. It is favourable because the capitalist world is now experiencing the most serious of world economic crises that has yet occurred ; it is favourable because the revolutionary mass movement in the capitalist and colonial countries is gaining new momentum ; it is favourable because the tremendous achievement of the workers in the U.S.S.R. in the way of socialist construction cannot fail to instil courage in the hearts of millions of workers and toilers of the capitalist and colonial countries. And one very important subjective pre-requisite for the utilisation of this favourable situation already exists. The majority of sections of the Comintern have already become consolidated on the basis of a correct general line and are conducting

an intransigent struggle on two fronts to defend this line from "right" and "left" deviations.

In the same degree does their political influence over the masses grow.

But that is not enough. There is still a big discrepancy between their political influence, and the organisational results of that influence. The Communist Parties cannot limit themselves to the drawing up of a correct line, they must also verify the carrying out the general line in practice. They should direct the operation of the general line, improving and perfecting in the process of work, the plans that have been drawn up. At the same time they should establish the closest possible organisational contact with the masses on the basis of an effective operation of the united front from below in defence of the workers' interests. They should organise the *revolutionary enthusiasm* of the workers for the overthrow of capitalism just as the C.P.S.U. has been able to organise the heroic *labour enthusiasm* for the construction of socialism. In this respect the Comintern sections in the capitalist countries can and should still learn a great deal from the C.P.S.U. In order to straighten out the front and get level with the C.P.S.U., which now occupies the foremost position in the fight between socialism and capitalism, the Comintern sections should have to combine correctly those slogans of extended advance issued at the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. with the routine organisational work that was discussed at the last Extended Presidium. That is the task of the day.

# THE ECONOMIC CRISIS AND THE ELECTRIC CHAIR

“THE TERRORISM OF THE BOURGEOISIE” RESULT OF ECONOMIC CRISIS.

“SIX workers are threatened with death in the electric chair for their ‘Communist activity.’ They will be tried in the State of Georgia . . . The State Attorney of Georgia, Atlant, stated: ‘We will not tolerate Communists in Georgia. If Communists appear here and publicly preach violent resistance to the laws of our State, I will demand the *death penalty* for them.’” (Letter from the U.S.A. “Pravda,” June 21st, 1930.)

“The Lemberg district court sentenced the student Proper, the commercial employee Jugend and the worker Hirsch *to death* for distributing Communist literature.”

A new phase of bourgeois terror is commencing. We have had the staging of “Communist plots,” the murdering of arrested Communists “while trying to escape,” the episode of the Jugo-Slav dungeons, the Rumanian “death chambers” and the Warsaw “cripple factory.” Now we get the execution of Communists for propaganda and the distribution of Communist literature. The more profound and hopeless the economic crisis of capitalism becomes, the more the revolutionary ferment of the masses in the metropolis and the colonies grows, so the more rapidly does the bourgeois state move to fascisation and the more fierce is the preventative attack of capitalism. Capital tries at all costs to transfer the whole burden of the economic crisis on to the shoulders of the toilers. As the crisis deepens, in Marx’s words “the Rule of the Bourgeoisie” is turned into “the Terrorism of the Bourgeoisie.”

“The civilisation and justice of the bourgeois order emerge in their true, and really awful, light when the slaves of this order rise up against the masters.”

“Then, this civilisation and this justice becomes absolutely naked barbarity and unlawful vengeance. Every new crisis in the class struggle between the producers of wealth and the amassers of it, demonstrates this fact more and more clearly.”

And the economic crisis is more and more accentuating the world economic and political crisis of capitalism. Whereas at the beginning of this year the bourgeois economists, social-fascists and their Brandlerite and Trotskyist

agents spoke merely of a temporary depression in certain capitalist countries, of temporary fluctuations prior to new rises, now the ruling capitalist circles of the entire bourgeois world are seized with profound alarm.

“The great bubble, artificially created ‘prosperity’ is bursting,” writes the American correspondent of the *Daily News*. “. . . The collapse of the myth of ‘prosperity’ the continuous bourse bankruptcies on Wall Street, the non-stop growth of unemployment, the grave condition of agriculture, act as yeast on public opinion. If a leader like Roosevelt or Bryan were to appear to-day they would without any doubt lead the American people in a radical movement which would cause a wild panic in Wall Street. One might even say that this *will probably take place even without a Roosevelt . . . The atmosphere is fraught with political excitement.*”

The situation is still more graphically portrayed in the big German bourgeois paper, *Vossische Zeitung*. In an article in the May 17th number, notably entitled “World Disorganisation,” (do you get that, Comrade Bukharin !) it is stated, literally :

“In all cultured countries there are millions of unemployed who are in need of the barest necessities of life. Simultaneously in America and Canada 6 million tons of wheat are lying in the elevators . . . Too much bread in the world—and yet millions are starving ! Cuba is choked with sugar, Brazil with coffee, Japan with raw silk, the Dutch Indies with rubber, New Zealand with meat . . . *The financial magnates are more furious than tigers, more frightened than hares. Hot and bothered they sidle from their limousines ; their leer shows it is only a mystic belief in the historic security of the rise and fall of the markets, which lulls and calms their dreams like the long waves of the ocean. Sound loud the alarm signal !*”

That is the real situation. Already nine months have passed since the first crash on the American exchange. In spite of all the efforts of capitalism, in spite of the diligent search by bourgeois economists for symptoms of recovery, in spite of the “predictions” of right-wing and Trotskyist renegades, in spite of the favourable

season, the crisis is becoming more profound and more acute, is continually affecting new countries, and unemployment is increasing hopelessly. The "organised disorganisation" of monopolistic capitalism, about which Comrade Bukharin spoke so loudly last year, has proved to be just as much a bubble as the "organised capitalism" of Rudolph Hilferding, although Comrade Bukharin "preserves stubborn silence" as to this. And it is not by chance, of course, that these two last acts of bourgeois-fascist "justice," these two yet unprecedented death sentences for the distribution of Communist literature, relate to the very two countries where the crisis has *most severely* hit capitalism.

There has been too great a perturbation in the minds and the pockets of the Wall Street robbers! There is too big a contradiction between yesterday's "prosperity" and to-day's crash, between yesterday's dictatorship of the largest, most corrupt and perverted labour aristocracy in the world, and to-day's stormy movement of the urban masses, with the unemployed demonstrating in millions, and the activity of the Communist Party growing!

The atmosphere is indeed fraught with political excitement! And neither a Roosevelt or a Bryan will prepare the attack on Wall Street, but the new and renovated mass Communist Party of America—in spite of all the renegade theories of the Lovestones and Peppers on the "exclusive isolation" of the Communist vanguard in this "exclusive" country of capitalist "isolation" from the world capitalist crisis.

The same thing with Poland. The sentence of death for distribution of literature, the legalised murder for Communist propaganda is even unusual for this country with its habitual debauch of fascist terror. Polish fascism is at an impasse and is feverishly preparing for a military adventure, "clearing the way" for this by removing from behind the lines all "undesirable" elements in the industrial centres and the border countries. The Lemberg sentence, in particular, is a sharp expression of the attempts of Polish fascism to strengthen the Ukrainian and White Russian sector of the future *front against the Soviet Union*. This is also seen from the adventurist policy conducted by Polish fascism in relation to the Ukrainian Petliurist camp, in "buying" from its leaders pieces of the South-West Ukraine, and in

enacting the comedy of "diplomatic" conversations with Petliura "State circles."

All this is not new. "Law," "Justice," "civilisation," have more than once served the bourgeoisie as implements of class terror. Now these weapons are being brought out in preparation for the war against the Soviet Union. When Thiers prepared to wreak vengeance on the Communes he informed the National Assembly that "he would enter Paris *with the law* in his hands." While still facing the jury at Cologne, Marx said: "Society is not based on the law. That is the fantasy of jurists. On the contrary, it is the law that must be based on society." And when now, capitalist society is on its last legs, the "law" of this society enters into full force, the struggle passes to a higher phase, the bourgeoisie—"more furious than tigers and more frightened than hares", cast aside the last remnants of "democratic" legality. This process is international. Why, even the clown of the February revolution, Kerensky, calls upon "future Russia" to destroy physically not only all Communists and Young Communist League members, but even the Pioneers (Communist Children's movement). And the recent elections in Saxony, where the national socialists increased their votes almost threefold—almost exclusively at the expense of the other bourgeois parties—goes to show how rapidly, in the present period, the process of fascisation of the bourgeois state is taking place!

That is why these two death sentences—in two widely distant corners of the earth—should rivet *the closest attention of international Communism*. What is *new* in the international situation is the notably *intensified preventative attack* of world capitalism against the working-class. This finds expression both in the general *offensive of the employers against wages*, and in the *death sentences* for Communist propaganda, and in the *open war—political preparations along the whole length of the western frontiers of the Soviet Union*. One can say without exaggeration that in Mansfeld the capitalists are endeavouring to decide on a European scale the fate of wages for the approaching period.

But another new factor in the situation is the fact that the activity and degree of resistance of the working-class have begun to be much more openly displayed than in preceding months. The fact that the working masses in the first

period of the crisis, in the first wave of unemployment and mass dismissals showed a rather *restrained* attitude towards the strike struggle, gave certain comrades who are easily susceptible to despondency, the false idea of a "depression" among the working-class in general. They did not understand that profound processes are now taking place inside the working-class,—the processes *preceding new fights on a higher scale*. Bradford and Mansfeld already mean the beginning of this new stage.

These comrades have mistaken their own passivity for the passivity of the working-class. We must say outright, that the Communist Parties have far from adequately utilised the objectively favourable situation created for the working-class movement by the present economic crisis. Now, every worker harnessed to the yoke of the conveyor by the threat of unemployment, sharply feels the lack of prospects of social-fascism, he feels the blind-alley into which the social-fascist policy of "industrial peace" and collaboration with capitalism has led the working-class.

We must rouse every element among the masses to combat the new methods of bourgeois-fascist terror. And it will only be possible to arouse these masses, if *the Communist Parties themselves get out of their inertia*, only if they uproot the *spirit of defencism* still prevalent in *certain* of our ranks. This not only concerns the right opportunists in practice, but also the "left" phrasemongers. The "left" errors in the united front sphere, committed recently in certain places have really been a screen for lack of confidence in the activity of the masses, for dragging "at the tail," for a policy of "defence" instead of attack. The central fighting task of the Communist Parties at the present moment is *to mobilise the factories and workshops, on the basis of the widest possible united front from below, against the growing wave of capitalist attack and fascist terror*.

A PRACTICAL  
ANTI-WAR TACTIC  
IS CONTAINED IN

HOW MUST  
THE WORKERS  
FIGHT  
IMPERIALIST  
WAR?



PUBLISHED SHORTLY

ORDER FROM THE SAME  
SOURCE AS THE "C.I."

August 1st

## EXTEND THE FRONT!

**I**N the past year the international proletariat has demonstrated its militant readiness to defend the Soviet Union against imperialist war. Together with the Soviet Union's policy of peace this international working-class readiness to fight imperialist war and to defend the Soviet Union is the most important factor preventing war. In his report to the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P. of the Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin said :

"Our policy is one of peace and of establishing economic relations with all countries. . . . The result of this policy is seen in the fact that we have succeeded in preserving peace and that we have not allowed ourselves to be drawn into any conflict by our enemies, in spite of a great number of provocative acts. We shall continue to pursue this policy of peace with all our strength, and by every possible means. We do not desire a foot of foreign soil, nor shall we give up an inch of our soil. This is our foreign policy, and it is our job to carry out this policy with the energy and persistence characteristic of bolsheviks."

The international bourgeois and social-democratic press greeted this peaceful policy with a sort of rage. This bolshevik policy, which has always been the policy of the Soviet power, was treated as a "new phenomenon," and the welcome which it was expedient to give to the policy expressed so clearly and simply by Comrade Stalin, was given unwillingly by those who are day by day preparing new acts of provocation against the Soviet Union and eagerly awaiting any incident which may serve as the occasion for further provocations and incitement to war.

Anti-war day on 1st August, last year, was conducted in the atmosphere created by the dispute on the Chinese Eastern Railway. All the bourgeois, and even more the social-fascist parties, shrieked about "Red imperialism." The Trotsky and Brandler press openly dissociated itself from the Soviet Union, declining even to pay lip service to the cause of its defence. The dispute on the Chinese Eastern Railway ended with the defeat of the attack on the Soviet's policy of peace—in spite of the activities of the imperialists and social-fascists—thanks to the firmness and strength of the Soviet Union and

the active solidarity of the workers of all countries, not least the Chinese proletariat.

## CAPITAL'S CRISIS : SOVIET PROGRESS

This year, the day of international working-class struggle against imperialist war and for the defence of the Soviet Union, is being prepared in an atmosphere characterised by the increasing acuteness of the international economic crisis of capitalism and by the new triumphs of industrialisation and the collectivisation of agriculture in the Soviet Union. The crisis of capitalism, which is continually growing and assuming a more international character, while in the Soviet Union socialist construction advances rapidly, increases the aggressiveness of international imperialism towards the Soviet Union, and provides the basis for our fight against imperialist war and for extending the front on which that struggle is taking place. Consequently, anti-war day this year, in the conditions created by the extension of the capitalist crisis, the accentuation of the inter-imperialist struggle for markets, the tariff war, the preparations for a redivision of the world and for further acts of violence in colonial countries, the tremendous increase in unemployment and the pitiless offensive being launched against the workers' standard of life, must strengthen and extend the most powerful factor making against war, the resistance of the working-class to any imperialist war, and the readiness of the proletariat to defend to the utmost the Soviet Union.

Last year the Chinese mercenaries of world imperialism tried to provoke the Soviet Union to war on the eastern frontier; this year the Finnish fascists are playing the same game on the north-west frontier. This shows that the policy of peace being pursued by the Soviet Union can only be successful in the future if it is supplemented by the militant readiness of the international proletariat to do everything in its power to prevent the imperialists from carrying on their war preparations and making it possible for them to begin war only with the greatest difficulty and at the utmost risk.

With the help of the social fascists, the imperialists are feverishly arming for war, in order to "solve" the contradictions in their own

camp and the chief contradiction between themselves and the U.S.S.R. Production in the war industries is being increased and speeded up at a hitherto unprecedented rate while, in an effort to overcome the economic crisis, surplus products are destroyed whole industries crippled and the army of unemployed increased by a new wave of rationalisation. In the Soviet Union socialist construction, the carrying out of the five-year plan and the pursuit of a consistent policy of peace has become a most powerful lever for raising the workers' standard of life; in all capitalist and colonial countries the growing economic decline and the insane war policy are leading to the impoverishment of the working-class, the pauperisation of the peasants and the intense exploitation of the colonial peoples. The imperialists, backed by their fascist and social-fascist executioners, are trying to utilise the crisis in order to crush the workers' struggle for an improved standard and to get them ready to act as cannon fodder in the coming war for the annihilation of the socialist work of peace in the U.S.S.R.

In the first place, the international proletarian front must be extended. First August last year showed that those sections of the working-class which are prepared to fight against war by deed, are even now fairly strong, but they are not numerically strong enough to be able to take effective action against imperialist war plans. Therefore 1st August this year must be carried out with the idea of extending the anti-war front, and consequently, throughout our preparations for anti-war day, we must rely chiefly on the application of the tactics of the united front from below, based upon the day-to-day demands of the working-class. United front tactics are not "pure" agitation in the general sense of that word; they are a method of mobilising the masses and contain organisational as well as agitational factors. The application of united front tactics requires organisational work among the masses, in the factories and trade unions, everywhere where the workers gather together, everywhere where the working-class can be organised for struggle. The factories, of course, take first place.

#### THE OPEN LETTER

The method of sending out an "open letter" from below, by Communist workers and organisations, addressed to social-democratic

and non-party workers, to factory committees representing social democratic and non-party workers, in itself emphasises the organisational aspect of united front tactics. It is not enough to carry on "pure" agitation against war and in defence of the Soviet Union, even if this agitation is as concrete as possible, if it unites the day to day demands of the working-class with the fight against war.

An "open letter," if there is no organisational preparation among the masses, if it is not followed up organisationally after publication, if it is not connected with organised mass mobilisation, may be pure agitation, but it is not an example of the application of united front tactics. With all the success that was achieved on 1st August last year, it must be admitted that the chief defect was the failure of the Communist Parties to mobilise large numbers of workers and to maintain and consolidate organisationally the achievements of that day.

#### MASS MOBILISATION

The development of the economic crisis, of unemployment and of the capitalist offensive on the working-class, provides an extremely favourable opportunity for the bolshevik application of united front tactics, not as pure agitation, but as organised mass mobilisation. The anti-war committees, and other united front bodies organised in opposition to the bourgeoisie and to social-fascism, and which in the majority of cases have only vegetated so far, must now be revived and built up as permanent organisations for fighting war. They must become the organisational centre for rallying the masses of social-democratic and non-party workers to the fight against war. Every worker who displays the least inclination to offer resistance to war preparations and to the capitalist offensive on the workers' standard of life, every worker who is prepared to take up, in his own interests, the struggle against imperialism—whether he be a social-democrat or outside any party, whether he be a trade unionist or a syndicalist—is welcome in this organisation. He may show signs of hesitation, and under the pressure of the imperialist state power and its social-fascist supporters, turn towards the camp of "national defence," still, as a member of the working-class he can go with us part of the way in the fight against war and for the defence of the Soviet

Union, guided by a resolute Communist Party. It will depend on us, on the strength of our conviction, and the vigour and persistence of work, whether he will be changed from an honest opponent of imperialist war into a reliable soldier of the revolution.

The advancing revolutionary wave makes the application of united front tactics more necessary than it was before. The fight against war provides the most suitable basis on which to apply these tactics. The Soviet Union's policy of peace—which is nothing new, as the social-democrats try to make out, but which is becoming more and more evident to the social-democratic and non-party masses—is one of the best weapons in the hands of the Communist Parties for mobilising the masses in defence of the Soviet Union.

It can be made clear to most workers that imperialist intervention in the Soviet Union would mean the most vigorous suppression of the world working class. The preparations for war are manifest, not only in the actual increase in armaments, but also in the intensification of fascist oppression which is taking place with the help of the social-fascist leaders of the reformist parties. The general capitalist offensive on the workers' standard of life, wage reductions in capitalist countries and in the colonies, are another method of preparing for war. The

workers are to be cowed by the capitalist offensive and the blows of fascism and social-fascism so that, even after the experiences of the last war, they will be suitable for use as cannon fodder. The counter-offensive of the workers must be utilised as part of the proletarian struggle against war. The stabilisation of capitalism, which is approaching its end, was the period for preparing the capitalist offensive on the working-class and the new imperialist war. As the world economic crisis matured, as it developed into a political crisis in a number of countries, the fruits of the relative stabilisation of capitalism became apparent. The increasingly fascist development of the bourgeois state, the preparations for war and growth of the social democracy towards fascism are different, but organically connected factors in the attempt of world imperialism to thrust the international working-class still deeper into the abyss of oppression and exploitation.

Against imperialist war and for the defence of the Soviet Union; against the capitalist offensive and for the liberation of the working-class from social-fascist influence and the organisation of the workers for united struggle; this is our work in the preparation for 1st August. The method of carrying out this work is the widest possible application of the tactics of the united front from below, the method of organising mass mobilisation.



# THE UNITED FRONT FROM BELOW

By F. HECKERT

ONLY a short space of time separates us from August 1st, the international day of struggle against the war danger. Especially this year is it necessary to organise the widest possible mass movement in order to be able to achieve a conspicuous success on August 1st in demonstrating the will of the proletariat to struggle with all their power against the danger of war. In so doing, it is essential not only to detail the signs which signalise for the proletariat the acute danger of war, although of these signs alone there is an extraordinary amount, but also to lay bare the roots of the war danger. This is not difficult for a Marxist, since the world economic crisis has brought glaringly into the light of day the contradictions of the capitalist order of society which is leading to forcible measures of solution.

Nevertheless, it is not sufficient to use the existence of this world crisis for explanation of the situation; it is even more necessary to make use of the general offensive of the employers against the working class. From this it must be clearly shown that we do not conduct the struggle against the war danger with abstract speeches, but in quite concrete fashion, in that we organise the resistance of the workers to the employers' offensive and prepare a counter-offensive of the working masses.

The struggle for defence of the standards of life of the workers, the counter-offensive against the employers' attack—this is the best method to hamper the class enemy of the proletariat in its activity in arming for war and to render the proletariat capable of striking decisive blows against war-making imperialism. We must again and again bring to the fore what Lenin laid down in his famous instructions to the Russian delegation at The Hague Conference, viz.: that the struggle against the war danger cannot be conducted by general phrases and speeches, but that those who really wish to fight the war danger must carry on a daily struggle, defending the working class against all the measures of the capitalist class. This warning of Lenin's we

must take to heart when this year we prepare for August 1st, our anti-war day.

In order to conquer our class enemy, in order to force him to evacuate his positions, in order to make it impossible for him to carry through his plans against the proletariat and, particularly, in order to prevent him from embarking upon a new war adventure, it is naturally not sufficient merely that Communists have the will to struggle. In order to be able to lead such a struggle it is essential to be assured of the participation of the masses in the struggle. Here and there one still finds comrades who believe that this is no such difficult matter. The development of the capitalist contradictions, the measures of the capitalists against the workers, and especially the war measures, will result, they say, in a spontaneous rising of the masses to settle accounts with their class enemy. It suffices merely that a small group of capable courageous men put themselves at the head of such a spontaneous mass movement in order to be able to inflict decisive defeat on the enemy. All our previous experience goes to show that this is nothing but "left" phrasemongering. The spontaneity of the masses plays an important rôle, and will always do so, in big and decisive questions. But we must understand clearly that to-day this spontaneity plays a much smaller part than in the past. The class enemies of the proletariat have had their wits sharpened by the experience of their conflicts with the masses. Above all, they have learnt from the Great Russian Revolution. Here they were able to observe that when a determined party, conscious of its goal, stands at the head of the masses, extremely dangerous consequences result for the capitalists. Such consequences the capitalists do not desire to experience over again. Therefore, they have created for themselves suitable organs for their safety.

The capitalists have not only moulded the press, the schools, the church and Parliament into excellent organs for confusing and deceiving the broad masses and instilling harmful illusions into their heads, they have also

worked out a widespread comprehensive system for confusing, fettering, splitting and intimidating the masses of the workers. The social-democracy is one of the most important instruments of the bourgeoisie for carrying through its policy among the toiling masses. Social-democracy controls the trade union apparatus and uses it for collaboration with capitalism and for defence of capitalist industry by strike-breaking. It drives the revolutionary workers out of the trade unions and out of the workshop. The social-democratic bosses, by promises and left manœuvres, make the toiling masses believe that they are actively engaged on their behalf in the struggle for emancipation from capitalist oppression. By giving the social-democrats seats in the Cabinet, mayoral positions and jobs in labour exchanges and by using social-democrats as mediators in labour disputes, the bourgeoisie help the social-democrats to deceive the broad, unenlightened strata of the toiling masses. The social-democrats are clever enough not to deny openly Marxism and the class struggle in their press although they do so in practice in every case.

The social-democrats have to serve the bourgeoisie by making pacifist speeches, and by organising peace conferences to divert the attention of the masses from the danger which threatens them at the hands of the imperialist war-makers. At the same time, however, the bourgeoisie, by means of the social-democrats, sees to it that the masses are enrolled in militarist organisations, such as the "Reichsbanner," "Labour Protection Alliance," etc., that they fall under the spell of social-democratic war speeches (Hirsing, Magdeburg), that they adopt war legislation (Boncour in France) and that they keep the colonial peoples in check (MacDonald and Jouhaux).

In an exactly similar way, the bourgeoisie works for the disruption and terrorisation of the working masses by the fascists. The latter also approach the workers with social demagoguery, promise them all manner of things, which are to be got by struggle against "Jewish capitalism." The members of the fascist organisations get work easier, are less frequently dismissed, have certain prospects of foremen's jobs, apparent privileges, etc. The fascist organisations in the

various capitalist countries include big masses of workers and not merely the most cowardly and morally defective elements of the working class. On the contrary, they have been able to enrol considerable sections of active proletarians who have been disillusioned by social-democratic betrayal and workers who have taken up an anti-capitalist position and yet through the fascist organisations are being used as tools for the defence, maintenance and strengthening of capitalist domination.

In the rationalised factories, in the powerful trust organisations and in the employers' organisations of the key industries there exists a subtle system for watching over the entire mass of workers. The worker at an endless band in the mechanised workshop can be superseded much more easily than was the case with workers in factories on the old systems. A gigantic espionage net has been spread in the rationalised factories. Fascist spies, social-democratic overseers and social-democratic trade union officials are vigilantly on the alert to see that no revolutionary elements create "unrest" in the workshop. A card-index system has been introduced dealing with the employees, in which the whole life of the individual worker is detailed. The workers are superseded by means of an elaborate information service and by the aid of official and private labour bureaux. The old system of the black list is put in the background as antiquated. The control of labour bureaux by social-fascist or fascist trade union officials provides a wider scope for supervising and eliminating revolutionary workers. The masses are made pliable by such methods as the exclusion from employment benefit for long periods of workers who voluntarily leave their place of work (or participate in so-called "wild" strikes, strikes against existing agreements or against decisions of the State arbitration machinery which have been declared compulsory.

There should also be mentioned the Trotskyists and Brandlerites, those renegades from commissions whose chief activity consists in assisting the bourgeoisie to disrupt and weaken the fighting strength of the masses by slandering the revolutionary labour movement of the Communist International and its sections, the R.I.L.U. and especially the leading

cadres of these organisations. These elements acquire the greater importance, the more the difficulties in capitalist society increase, and the more the capitalists prepare for carrying through their offensive against the working class and for the waging of a new war. One need only observe how attentively the bourgeoisie and their social-fascist helpers study the activity and the arguments of the Communist renegades and how adroitly they manage to incorporate these arguments in their armoury for fighting the Communist movement. The nearer we approach to the outbreak of a new imperialist war, to a surprise attack of the capitalist powers against the Soviet Union, the greater the significance attached by the bourgeoisie to the activity of the Communist renegades.

The difficulties must be taken into account of initiating mass movements, indeed even small defensive fights of the workers, in a situation in which in the capitalist countries there are twenty million workers on the streets and where the workers are terrorised by means of exceptional laws and ruthless employment of police and military force. In such circumstances, it is at any rate more than thoughtlessness, rather a real crime, to wait passively for a spontaneous mass movement at the head of which at the moment of revolt a small determined group could place itself in order to settle accounts with capitalism. We must understand absolutely clearly that only the most persistent, systematic and patient ideological and organisational work will create a platform for us by which it will be possible to mobilise the masses in order to bring them into the decisive fights against the capitalist class. Without winning over the key strata, without winning the majority of the working class for our arms, it is not possible to deal a decisive blow at capitalism. We have to learn the art of winning the masses and of organising the masses, and only in the measure that we are able to learn this art will we be able to extend our actions and make them more powerful. The art of winning the masses is the correct development and application of the united front tactic.

The Communist International in the third period, naturally with entire correctness, demands the carrying through of the tactics of

the united front from below. The Communist International decisively repudiated the renegades and Brandlerites who, under the flag of the united front which they only conceived of as a bloc with the social-democrats and lower T.U. bureaucracy, have been attempted and press forward their liquidatory and capitulatory activity. This has been particularly noticeable in the present period of the upsurge of the labour movement. Almost every week these renegades invite the Communists and revolutionary trade unions to resume once again the old history with the social-democratic and trade union leaders. They recommended united May 1 celebration with the Second International at the very moment when the latter was issuing a call for the support of counter-revolution against the Soviet Union. They wanted to get the Communists to form a Government in Saxony in union with the Zörgiebel social-democrats. They demanded the liquidation of our trade union policy as regards putting our own lists forward to the factory councils and in regard to the carrying through of independent economic struggles, in order to form an alleged common united labour front against the capitalists with the trade unions, the leaders of which are social-fascists who live in class collaboration with the capitalists.

It was in this sense that the Brandlerites also made use of their positions in the Unity Committees called into being at the time by the Russian trade unions, which committees developed into organs for the political corruption of the workers and were therefore correctly put an end to. A similar corrupting influence was exercised also by the discussion circles organised by the Brandlerites, together with "left" social-democrats in order to win these "left" social-democrats for the class front of the proletariat. To-day, the leader of the one-time ultra-left opponents of every united front tactic, viz., Trotsky, actually preaches a united front with the Second International and the Amsterdam Trade Union International. The Soviet Union and the Communist International is asked to collaborate with these two social-fascist associations in order to fight unemployment in the capitalist states by securing industrial orders from the Soviet Union. It would be ludicrous to

bestow even the slightest attention on such recommendations of the renegades considered as something which could bring advantage to the proletariat. Such a united front tactic is only an obstacle to the development of a real revolutionary fighting front against the capitalist power.

Thus, under the banner of united front tactic, not merely an opportunist but even a directly counter-revolutionary tactic can be carried through, and consequently we must use every effort to expose the renegades as assistants of the class enemy. If they once again recommend such a united front tactic, that is not an argument to be used against the united front tactic in general, but merely against the application of a false united front tactic, against the application of a united front from above with the treacherous leaders on a corrupting basis which deviates from the laws of the revolutionary class struggle. A correct united front tactic, the united front from below, with the mass of the proletariat, with the mass of the enslaved and down-trodden strata of the working population for the purpose of the promotion, development and expansion of the class struggle, is to-day more necessary than ever.

Let us recapitulate the problems facing us for the solution of which in a revolutionary sense we have to contribute.

First of all, the war danger. All the capitalist States are arming vehemently under the banner and leadership of the League of Nations and the disarmament conferences. They no longer deny the existence of the war danger, but often point to it in speeches, *e.g.*, the danger of war between France and Italy. In China, in India and in Indo-China, war intervention and punitive expeditions are in full swing; in part, war of the hired generals maintained by the various capitalist powers, as in China, or war of the imperialist slaveholders against the rebellion of the oppressed peoples, as in India and Indo-China. The theatre of war for the onslaught of the imperialist powers against the Soviet Union is being energetically prepared. Eloquent testimony of this is to be found in the fascist coups carried out in Roumania and Finland and in the activities of Pilsudsky in Poland.

In the second place, fascism, the forcible suppression of the working masses and destruction of their organisations, goes forward. The Italian example has spread over the whole of the South-East of Europe. Poland, Finland, Austria are all ranged in the camp of fascist States. Fascism is spreading in Japan, in Mexico and in South America, but also in such countries as Germany, England, Czecho-Slovakia and the U.S.A. fascist forces are growing, mostly with the powerful support of social-fascism.

In the third place, the industrial crisis has led to the full unfolding of the employers' offensive. In the U.S.A., wages are being reduced just as in Germany, France, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, etc. Advancing capitalist rationalisation in all countries is throwing ever greater masses of workers into the ranks of the army of the permanently unemployed. In this offensive against the working class the employers have on their side the fascised State apparatus and the social-fascist functionaries of the social-democratic parties and trade unions.

It is, however, quite clear that the workers can only successfully conduct their defensive struggle and the counter-offensive against these threatening dangers—they are not distant threats, on the contrary the workers are being immediately threatened—by means of the widest united front of the working class.

In the struggle of "class against class," we must clearly recognise who can be our allies and co-fighters and who stands or will stand in the camp of our opponents. That the social-fascist functionaries can be no kind of ally in the struggle of "class against class" is self-evident. The allies of our enemies cannot be our own allies. Such a stupidity only exists in the heads of crazy opportunists or is preached to us by the Communist renegades round Trotsky and Brandler. On the other hand, the broadest strata of those masses which are being seized upon by the social-fascists and also by the fascists can and must be won as fighting allies in the struggle of "class against class." The position of the capitalists in all countries is such that they are not in a position to bribe large strata of the working class with economic or political privileges. On the contrary, they are com-

pelled to thrust into misery ever larger strata of the working population by increase of bread prices, rationalisation, pressure on wages and unemployment. They have to terrorise the starving masses by means of ever more draconic measures — exceptional legislation, prisons, police batons, shootings, etc. Capitalism, therefore, creates a basis on which it is possible to win over all the strata which are essential for the struggle of "class against class." For this purpose the tactic of the united front from below is necessary.

It is entirely erroneous to assume that the rank and file members and electoral masses that have come under the social-democracy are for all time lost for the revolutionary class struggle. And it is exactly the same error to assume that the fascists are able permanently to fasten to themselves the masses of workers and petty bourgeoisie won through social demagoguery. The oppressed class demands that its oppression be removed. It demands bread to satisfy its hunger, it demands labour for its idle hands, and if its present leaders are not able to satisfy these demands, it will turn away from them. This is quite natural. The leading German employers' paper, the Cologne *Volkszeitung*, exhibits an excellent instinct when it writes, after the Saxon elections which gave such gains to the National Socialists:—

"In the concept 'National Socialism,' only the word 'national' is seen and no attention is paid to the word 'Socialism,' behind which is hidden a much more dangerous because younger and more revolutionary Marxism. There are even some industrial circles, who are otherwise accustomed to sober thinking, who all the same fall into National-Socialist demagoguery. Nevertheless, it is being recognised slowly that there could be no greater misfortune for Germany that if National-Socialism came into power, for it would bring with it civil war and would indubitably be replaced by Communism, strengthened then by the entire working class, radicalised to the utmost extent."

How could it be otherwise? It is flatly impossible that capitalism, that is writhing in the convulsions of its economic contradictions, that, when it looks for a way out of the crisis only finds means which engulf it deeper, will be able to succeed for long in holding down the broad masses by demagogic phrases and by terror. Only the blind fail to see that, alongside of the multiplying economic difficul-

ties of capitalism, a wide process of radicalisation is taking place among the masses. In fascist Italy this year there have been already big labour demonstrations and strikes. And in the country of capitalism with the alleged "permanent prosperity," in the U.S.A., in which, according to the Brandlerite Lovestone, the catastrophic Stock Exchange crash of November last, year which initiated the American and through it the world crisis, was only "a sign of the strength of capitalism," there took place demonstrations on international unemployment day, March 6, of one and a quarter millions of workers. Or, again, have the terrible massacres perpetrated by victorious Chang-Kai-Shek in the China revolution of 1927-28 been able to prevent the further development of this revolution? Even in India this could not be prevented by the oily phrases of MacDonald, supplemented by the squadrons of bombing aeroplanes.

On such facts, the Communists and revolutionary trade unionists must base their work. A proper approach to the proletariat and to the oppressed masses makes it possible for us to link ourselves with them in a wider and wider measure. It is a question of how the approach is made and to what purpose we mobilise the masses. Let us take an example. For the putting forward of revolutionary lists in the factory councils' elections in Germany, the Communists could not get even all the functionaries of the party. It was often easier to win over workers standing outside the party. But for the revolutionary lists votes were cast by fairly broad strata of workers. We saw a similar thing in the mobilisation of workers for independent strike action. A comparatively large number of workers could be won for the strike movement in spite of all the dangers associated with so-called "wild" strikes. In Mansfeld, the unity of the strike was brought about by the revolutionary united front organs, in the Rhino-Westphalian industrial region at least ten times as many workers struck as there were Communists or red trade unionists, and this we owe also to the application of a correct united front tactic. In the demonstrations against reaction, the Communists often mobilised ten times as many workers as they actually had members. In parliamentary and municipal elections, it

has been possible to mobilise thirty voters for each Communist.

These facts show that for various purposes different numbers of workers can be attached more or less closely to the Communist or revolutionary movement. Still more, in strikes and especially in demonstrations, large sections of social democratic workers take part. If it has not yet been possible to secure the participation in active struggle of still greater masses of workers from the social-democratic camp against the will of the social-fascist labour leaders, that is to an important degree due to our own very faulty ideological and organisational work. The Communists do not yet understand how to link to themselves the workers of a different school of thought, but who still are ready to stand up for the defence of their class interests. Consequently, the united front actions which so far have taken place have yielded often little or negative results, even when the "united front from below" was applied.

Two things must be taken into account in the application of the united front from below. Firstly, one should not demand more from the workers who have been won for a united front more than they are willing and able to give at the particular moment. Secondly, in the application of the united front tactic one should make no concessions to illusions or hostile political views. In both cases, such concessions will yield only negative results. As a rule, when united front bodies are set up for any campaign inside or outside the factories, they are overburdened with tasks, which cannot be their tasks, but must be the tasks of the Communist Parties or revolutionary trade union opposition. When, *e.g.*, as has actually happened, a leading Communist says that in England the committees of the Friends of Soviet Russia should become the leaders of a mass movement because under existing conditions it is difficult for the Communist Party to do so, this is more than a lapse, it is complete misunderstanding of the rôle of a Communist Party and the rôle of a united front organ.

United front organs always can only be auxiliary organs in the mobilisation of the masses, they can never independently lead the masses, *i.e.*, with wishing to replace the

leadership of the Communist Party. This last is, indeed, what the opportunists once tried to do, when they stamped the united front bodies called into being by the Russian trade unions as organisations which would have to carry through the tasks of the proletarian class struggle, because the two "Labour" Parties (Communists and Social-democrats) were incapable of doing so on account of the fatal split and refusal to collaborate between their leaders.

United front bodies can only fulfil a limited task, usually limited both in subject and in time. United front bodies cannot exist as permanent bodies. As permanent bodies for conduct of the working class struggle there can only be firm organisations, the parties, and the organised revolutionary trade unions. If united front bodies are set up for the carrying through of a campaign, the Communists or revolutionary trade unionists must from the start be perfectly clear as to what tasks these united front bodies have to fulfil. If, *e.g.*, in such a case they contain elements who demand from us that during the carrying through of the campaign we should refrain from propagating our Communist ideas or from recruiting for the strength of our organisations, then we are confronted with a united front body which can only be effective in hampering the development of the revolutionary movement. We can never participate in the formation of united front bodies which hinder propaganda for our ideas or recruiting for our organisations. Although we are in favour of the widest demonstrations of the toiling masses, we correctly refuse to participate in joint celebrations of May 1st with the social-democratic party or with the reformist trade unions, not because we want to be alone, but because the others lay down conditions, not to allow our speakers to have the platform, not to make propaganda for our ideas, not to agitate against the pernicious reformist views and not to issue our slogans. If that were permitted to us we would have every reason to use the opportunity for the broadest agitation and recruiting activity for our Communist Party among the assembled workers.

As we cannot allow ourselves to be prevented by those taking part in a united front movement from developing our propaganda

and recruiting activity, so we cannot demand that those who are ready to demonstrate with us against war or to conduct a campaign for the release of proletarian prisoners, or to make a strike for reinstatement of dismissed workers, or for defence of wage standards, should pledge themselves to support our deeper aims. In doing so, we frequently prematurely break up united front organs or movements, without using them to the fullest extent for the revolutionary aims.

Where, however, we create united front organs, it is essential that we should also in them bring into action all the forces which stand outside our party and the revolutionary trade unions. We can be quite certain that such an activation of elements standing with us in united front organisations or movements will lead to the widening and development of our revolutionary movement. Such activation also makes it possible to expose and remove from the movement members of united front bodies who are unsuitable or who have been smuggled in by the enemy.

In the carrying through of the August 1st campaign for the development of mass struggle against the war danger, against fascism, and for development of a counter-offensive against the employers' attack, the tactic of the united front from below must be used in the greatest measure. Every limitation to our own forces is an isolation from the masses and therefore harmful. In order to secure the greatest possible successes for the U.F. tactic in this campaign, all the problems which are agitating the masses must be linked up with the slogan of struggle against the danger of war. These problems are different in different countries and at different periods. Our comrades must understand how to find out the important questions with the aid of which it is possible to mobilise wide masses of the workers.

For the U.S.A., for example, the problem of the struggle for the introduction of State social insurance at the cost of the employers is at the present moment are extremely suited for winning the masses. In this highly-developed capitalist country there are six to seven million unemployed facing bitter want without any kind of assistance. This struggle for the introduction of social insurance stands

broadly connected with the fight against the war danger. The capitalists preach struggle for new markets outside the country as the sole way of conquering unemployment. Many uneducated workers, still more confused as a result of suffering, fall victims to this manoeuvre. This applies also to other countries. Thus the social-democrat Hürsing in Magdeburg, a leader of the social-fascist "Reichsbanner" organisation, declared:

"The international labour market, and especially the German, will experience a radical alteration when Bolshevism has been overcome. Here lies the root of all the evil. The hundreds of millions in Russia are the powerful mass of customers who are lacking for world industry. Therefore, it is the task of all civilised countries, and not least of Germany, immediately and by all means to stimulate the internal market and create the possibility of labour so that industry increases and the finances are put in order. Only thereby can the cultural progress of the twentieth century be maintained. We want them, the world wants them, but it cannot happen as long as Bolshevism withdraws hundreds of millions of men from the world market and from world culture."

That is clear enough. These extracts say that what is necessary is not support for the unemployed but war against the U.S.S.R., in which the unemployed will provide the cannon-fodder.

It is especially important through the united front movement to expose the social-fascists, the Christian trade union leaders and similar "friends" of the workers. *The method of open letters is of the greatest value for the mobilisation of the masses, if these letters are addressed directly to the personnel of the factories and to the members of trade union organisations, proletarian, sport and culture organisations.* Here also it is not a question of addressing letters to the leaders, to social-democratic factory councils, etc., but letters to the rank and file members of these organisations. These letters should point out to the workers, etc., in simple language with easily understood arguments, the necessity for common action for a definite purpose in the attainment of which they have the greatest interest. They should be invited to state their views and to joint discussion of the questions involved and to common struggle under joint leadership.

The open letters for the development of the August 1st campaign and the struggle against

the employers' offensive should not be written by the upper leading bodies of the Communist Parties or revolutionary trade union organisations. They must be letters of Communist cells, of the lower Communist groups in the factories, in the workshops and in the workers' mass organisations. The comrades in these lower organs of the revolution movement must, of course, under control and direction of leading bodies, must use every suitable opportunity in order by means of such letters to encourage the workers to occupy themselves with all the important questions of their daily life and to discuss them with us. By the system of open letters the workers should give each other mutual support, exchange advice and experience, and expose false friends and their devices for deceiving the masses.

By means of the open letters, the barrier must be broken down, which has been set up by the social-fascists, the fascists, the employers' terror, or by State-organised fascism in order to separate the revolutionary workers

from the broad masses of their class comrades and from other oppressed strata of the population. Above all, it is important, by this method to initiate a broad discussion between the oppressed masses, including those workers who have been confused by their class enemies, and ourselves. If we succeed in establishing convictions and entering into discussion on these important problems, such as the war danger, fascism, the employers' offensive, etc., with the masses who have not been reached by the hitherto adopted methods of the Communist Parties and revolutionary trade unions, then a wide path opens before us for common action in combat with the class enemy.

In this way, the united front tactic must be made the most important factor in the mobilisation of the masses for the struggle of "class against class." The carrying through of the August 1st campaign must show that the members of the Communist Parties have been successful.



## ON THE EVE OF THE FIRST OF AUGUST IN FRANCE

AUGUST 1st comes at a time when French capitalism already affected by the economic crisis faces grave difficulties. An end has come to the stilted speeches of Tardieu, the "manager of France's destiny," and his insolent juggling with "prosperity" milliards. An end has come to the reign of optimism!

Capitalist France is frantically fighting against the growing strike movement of the French proletariat whose wages are the lowest of all those current in the big capitalist countries. French capitalism is anxiously watching in the south the elements of a peasant movement. It is seeking a way out in a vast political offensive against the C.P. of France, which job has been specially entrusted to its allies the social-fascists. And, above all, it is impatiently sounding the ground of war which is the ultimate means of solving the economic and social difficulties.

\* \* \*

If any Communist could doubt the necessity and urgency of a great day of fight against imperialist war, let him take a look at the actual activities of French imperialism and its vassals of the Little Entente and Poland.

In a distant recess of the Slovakian mountains the Little Entente has just held a conference. Under the aegis of Briand, the representatives of Czecho-Slovak "democracy," Roumanian fascism and of the Yugo-Slav dictatorship have just come to terms on the secret clauses which bind these adventurist states to all-powerful French finance-capital, which has furnished the Roumanian loan, controls the Skoda works and installed Alexander's bloody dictatorship at Belgrade.

Secret military treaties, dynastic and fascist intrigues, the granting of new loans for the building of strategic railway lines and the purchase of new artillery—these were the questions dominating the Little Entente conference, while at Rome, London and Budapest they prepare for the restoration of Prince Otto on the Hapsburg throne and the issue of a Hungarian loan.

In this situation "*any attack on the existing treaties (particularly the putting of Otto of Hapsburg on the throne) would bring incalculable consequences. We say frankly this would mean war, and very probably a general war.*" Who,

then, pronounces these frank and cynical words? None other than M. Mironescu, Roumanian Minister for Foreign Affairs, in his interview in the *Echo de Paris* of June 17th.

At the same moment, General Gouraud was in Czernovitz.

In a distant recess of the Bosnian mountains, sixteen years ago almost to a day, the 1914 war was prepared in an analogous manner, and identical words were uttered.

But a simple repetition of 1914 is impossible. A new inter-imperialist war under present conditions could not last very long side by side with the international revolutionary movement, of which the U.S.S.R. is an integral part, without intervention against the Soviet Union, and, thus, without rapidly being transformed into a civil war. French imperialism is already conducting an openly anti-Soviet activity in the Far East. Faced with the vast movement of revolt in Indo-China the entire French Press is howling against Moscow: "Wicked and criminal instigator of the events in Yen Bay and Cochinchina." Despite the gag of a discreet censorship we learn that French airplanes and troops have crossed the Tonkin frontier and put to fire and sword the Soviet districts of Southern China.

Thus, whatever be the concrete form in which war breaks out, whether it have its origin in the rivalry of the States of Balkanised Europe, or in the ultimate revolt of the Indo-Chinese people, oppressed by French imperialism, the coming war cannot fail to be transformed immediately, or rapidly, into an imperialist war against the U.S.S.R.

It is precisely at this moment that French imperialism has decided, all of a sudden, and in most unexpected fashion: "That as a result of facts ascertained by the Sub-Committee of National Defence of the Chamber, and the declarations of Messieurs Maginot, Dumesnil and Laurent-Eynac to this Commission, the Government would without delay ask the Chamber for supplementary credits of about a milliard francs to be assigned for the requirements of the War, Naval and Air Ministries."

Such are the actual terms of the official declaration of the French General Staff. At one stroke, a milliard must urgently be voted (probably this sum will in the end be greatly

augmented) for stocks of munitions and armaments which, it appears, have run low, whereas only recently, 3,700,000,000 francs were voted for the "defensive organisation of the frontiers."

Such is the "work of peace" of French imperialism, which seeks in a war the indispensable solution for the economic crisis in which it is gripped. Similarly in 1914, the economic crisis which was spreading over the world was "stopped" by the war, that ideal market for the kings of steel, petrol, rubber, chemical products and military cloth.

At this time last year there took place the imperialist attack against the U.S.S.R. in Manchuria with the aid of the Chinese counter-revolutionary hangmen-Generals. Then it was a question of establishing a permanent state of war against the U.S.S.R. commencing with the utilisation of an auxiliary front. The imperialists thus hoped rapidly to enlarge and generalise the war against the U.S.S.R. until it reached the European front. Blücher's Red Army men and the action of the international proletariat, on August 1st, 1929, frustrated this manœuvre.

But to-day technical preparations are taking place for direct aggression on the European front of the U.S.S.R.—from Finland in the north and Roumania in the south. The war preparations have thus passed to a higher stage. The imperialists, headed by French imperialism, are passing on from the *general strategic* preparation of war against the U.S.S.R., to the problem of the *tactics of its inauguration*. We have a series of brilliant illustrations of this tactical preparation by French imperialism. It is sounding the masses of its proletariat ad peasantry, with a view to preparing them for the war. Such factors of preparation were the Kutiepoff campaign, the campaign of the French bishops under the orders of the Pope, the campaign against "those responsible for the insurrections in Indo-China," etc. It would only need one of such campaigns, skilfully conducted, to succeed in troubling and sowing confusion among the French proletariat, even if only for a few weeks, and the declaration of war would be made more easy.

In the fight of the French workers against war and in defence of the U.S.S.R., the difference in the factors and the forms under which the war may arise, should be carefully taken into account.

The C.P.F. should avoid all abstract agitation in its present August 1st campaign.

Last year the object confronting our Party for August 1st was to *bring the masses to the alert*. That objective was achieved and to a large extent was quite in keeping with the situation. It counteracted the strategic manœuvre of the progressive establishment of a state of war against the U.S.S.R. Now it is *no longer merely* a question of rousing the proletariat against such manœuvres, but above all of concretely organising them in view of the danger of sudden aggression on the European frontiers of the U.S.S.R. August 1st, 1929, was primarily (and one could even say uniquely) an August 1st of *agitation* of the French workers. August 1st, 1930, should be above all a day of *organisation* of the French workers.

\* \* \*

Parallel with the activities in preparation for the next war, that are being organised before our very eyes, the August 1st period in France is also characterised by the continuation of the efforts of the bourgeoisie and its government to "liquidate the Communist movement."

On this sphere, a number of bourgeois politicians are endeavouring to reassure their class by pretending that the Communist movement henceforth is not in a condition effectively to oppose the war policy of the bourgeoisie. In order to embellish anew in the eyes of capitalism, his coat-of-arms which had become somewhat tarnished since the "era of prosperity," has been replaced by an era of crisis, Tardieu declares: "The strong, silent policy of the Government has brought about the decomposition of the Communist Party which can no longer, as it did three years ago, disturb the peace and liberty of the streets. Its activities, which since then seem to have been transferred from the metropolis to the colonies, will be met there with a no less firm resistance."

He is going rather fast and taking his desires for reality. Nevertheless, such a declaration signifies more than ever that the central task for our Party in this August 1st period is to prepare the fight against war, putting in the forefront the question of consolidating the Party, organisation, recruiting, the struggle against fluctuations in the membership, and contact with the masses by means of united front tactics from below, on a wider scale than hitherto.

But the struggle for "the liquidation of the Communist movement" is above all being waged with the aid of the social-fascists or of the right-wing renegades and Trotskyites wherever the "Socialist" Party has not been able to get its teeth into the masses. That is why the task of consolidating and organising the Party cannot be carried out properly without strengthening the Party's fight against the social-fascist and their Trotskyite and P.O.P. auxiliaries. Every blow we deal against the bourgeoisie should be accompanied by a similar blow against the Parti Socialiste and its auxiliaries.

Already the Party's counter-offensive during the last few months has brought considerable results. In the Nord the Socialists' campaign could not develop owing to the activities of the C.P. A series of big socialist meetings in big provincial centres (such as Alès, Marseilles, etc.), ended in complete fiascos for the socialists, thanks to the work of our organisations. But this counter-offensive should still be strengthened considerably.

The preparations for August 1st give us an opportunity for exposing clearly and in detail, the position of the Socialists on questions of war. The burial of the question of "national defence" at Bordeaux without flowers or wreathes, shows that the Socialist Party is compelled to leave questions of principle in the shade so as to be able to continue its dual militarist and nationalist policy in its real practical activity of capitalist collaboration and its demagogy of "not a man, not a sou," for the shameful deception of the masses.

The sixteenth anniversary of the war and the latest militarist and imperialist exploits of French imperialism enable us to unmask the war policy of the Socialist Party. On the questions of the Little Entente, the Socialist Party is actively supporting the tortuous policy of "its own" imperialist country against British and Italian imperialisms.

One year ago the S.P. showed itself to be the most ardent defender of the Roumanian loan. The Socialist deputy Jules Uhry, then pressed the Government to enable French railway construction companies, to benefit widely from the issue of this loan. Indeed, this meant hastening the construction of strategic railway lines, thanks to which, military operations against the U.S.S.R. would be greatly facilitated.

To-day the Socialist Party shows itself to be the most ardent opponent of the Hungarian loan because the latter is an essential part of Italian and British imperialist policy, while the Roumanian loan that it defended was an essential part of French imperialist policy.

And when the "left" Ziromsky is asked what he would do in the event of war between France and Italy, he replied: "We would go."

When the question is brought up in the Chamber, of urgently voting a milliard for stocks of munitions, arms and equipment, the policy of the Socialist Party consists in bitterly reproaching the Government for having allowed the stocks necessary for "national defence" to have remained depleted for so long. "If you had made economies, perhaps you would have been able, by avoiding waste, to replenish the stocks (applause from the Socialist Extreme Left). You will explain to the nation how it is that with 10 milliards per year you have left it without defence for five years." (Applause from the Socialist Extreme Left)—(Question by Vincent Auriol, Journal Officiel, June 27, p. 2,715.)

Who could have thought that France had been left undefended for five years! Fortunately, for the capitalists, the socialist "super-defencists" have just found this out and are there to rebuke severely the Government, the general staff and the munition manufacturers for not doing their duty and for committing the crime of leaving France without defence for five years—a crime worthy of anti-militarists!

Similar examples abound; they should be utilised methodically during the whole of our campaign; they should be incessantly explained, and thoroughly commented upon by our press and our speakers throughout the August 1st campaign, the object being to denounce the character of the socialist demonstration on August 3rd and to bring about its failure.

The Party has understood that the whole month of July should be one of serious agitation, a month of direct contact with the masses on the basis of the fight against the war. Vast meetings like the one on June 24th with an audience of 5,000 permits this direct contact, remedies the distortions, and false interpretations of the Party line, and, above all, vigorously asserts the Party's identity and shows that the influence of the Party among the masses continues to grow.

It would be a great mistake to think that we can achieve this result solely by propaganda or solely by agitation on the actual form and degree of the war danger, nor merely by replying to the campaigns of the bourgeoisie and their lackeys against the U.S.S.R.—even if this agitation be sufficiently concrete and popular. This result will only be attainable if the Party, from top to bottom, is capable of practically utilising all the real opportunities for agitating and above all, for *organisation* of the masses, whatever be the forms in which these opportunities arise.

There are at present in France at least three opportunities for organising the masses. In the first place the fighting spirit of the masses against the bourgeois social-insurance laws; secondly, the present persistence of the strike movement in face of the reinforced offensive of the bosses against wages and a certain spreading of lockouts and unemployment: thirdly, the growing discontent of the small peasants and agricultural workers in face of the agrarian crisis which particularly effects the production of corn, beetroot and above all, wine. To this must be added the mass movement in support of *l'Humanité*. This movement must be extended, while conserving its original form, otherwise it would be endangered. One must also add the discontent of the masses at the high cost of living, at the police machinations, and at the over-cynical incitements to war.

Of course there is a great distance to be traversed from the organisation of the masses on these concrete bases to the unified organisation of the masses against the danger of sudden aggression against the U.S.S.R.

A double danger exists. On the one hand the danger of lagging behind the masses who tend to rally spontaneously, electing committees of action for one or other of the particular struggles which we have just referred to—a danger of an opportunist nature. On the other hand, the opposite danger of wanting to confound everything, of wanting mechanically to unite all the original forms of reaction of the masses—the committees of struggle against workers' deposits, with the committees of defence of *l'Humanité*, the Southern disaster committees, strike or lock-out committees, etc.—a danger of a leftist nature.

The Party will be able to conquer both these dangers. It will succeed in accelerating and

directing the development of mass organisation for the struggle against war, particularly in the sense of preparing for August 1st in the correct degree, while paying due attention to the original objects of the various groupings or organisations, so as not to run the risk of breaking them up altogether. For it is precisely their original and particular aims which constitute their *raison d'être*, which makes their contact with the masses wider than those we usually deal with. The Party should therefore work methodically and with the necessary flexibility to ensure that the greatest possible number of these various committees place the question of August 1st on their agenda, that they participate in the preparation of, and even organise mass action for August 1st.

Moreover, it is of great importance that wherever such committees do not exist, the Party works for the election of August 1st committees by the masses. The capacity of our Party for mass work will be gauged by the number of these committees, which either under the title of August 1st Committees or under the other particular names, will devote themselves in a more or less big way to the preparation and realisation of the August 1st day of fight. This requires among other things basic fraction work of the Communists in all these elementary formations, a fraction work which is as much, if not more, a work of persuasion, propaganda and agitation as it is a work of organisation.

It is from this angle that the central essential question of the united front from below is presented in France at the moment. It must not be thought, however, that the problem of the united front from below is solved in a locality or district just because some committees have been formed in the factories. It is also necessary that all our policy, that the whole policy of these committees, be impregnated with a correct understanding of the united front tactics. Otherwise we will restrict our basis of action to limited strata of the working-class.

The united front tactics will not be carried out if our committees only comprise Communists and unorganised workers, who, in practice, are only a *section* of our sympathisers. The committees should work in such a way that they can for the most part rally to their meetings and draw into their work the workers in the reformist unions as also the socialist or semi-socialist

workers in the factory or locality. Unless this be done there can be no serious talk about or real success of the united front.

Last year, not only were there very few August 1st committees in France, but those committees that were formed, generally did not include a single socialist worker.

This proves that our political agitation in the localities has not been on a sufficiently broad basis. It is urgent that this year we have a broader policy for rallying the masses. In France, more perhaps than in other countries, it is advisable for the united front committees to use the method of open letters addressed not to the reformist or socialist organisations, but to the worker members of the Socialist Party or

reformist C.G.T., and also to those who are under the influence of these organisations. These open letters should be drafted in language containing arguments capable of convincing the rank and file members of the S.P. and the C.G.T., as to the necessity for participating in the struggle. It is only in this manner that we can succeed in progressively detaching the socialist and C.G.T. workers from these organisations, and from the social-fascist personalities whom they still follow at the moment.

August 1st, 1930, will only be a day of mass organisation for the fight against war in the measure that the united front from below is made the chief object of attention of the C.P. of France.

## THE FIRST OF AUGUST IN BRITAIN

**T**HE First of August this year will find British imperialism grappling with growing difficulties at home and in the colonies, and unable to find a peaceful solution of its difficulties. The deepening world economic crisis is affecting Britain and the capitalist class has resigned itself to seeing the figures of the registered unemployed mounting well over the two million mark. The Simon Commission report has been spat upon by the overwhelming majority of the Indian nation and British imperialism must perfect its organisation, in an endeavour to stem the rising tide of revolutionary struggle.

In such circumstances, the problem of overseas markets is becoming an exceedingly acute one, and every effort of the capitalist class backed by all the powers of the State apparatus, is being exerted in order to conquer a larger share of the world market for British imperialism. A fierce rationalisation drive is being carried through, the intensity of labour has been increased and a certain increase in production per worker has been obtained.

In the main industries listed in the British census of production, there is an increase of 11 per cent. in production, and a decrease of employment of 8 per cent. compared with 1924, which works out at an increase of 21 per cent. per worker employed, and a decrease in employment of 498,000 in the industries listed. The London and Cambridge Economic Service declares that the bulk of this increased production took place in the years 1928 and 1929.

In spite of this effort there is no increase in the competitive capacity of British imperialism and its exports reach barely 80 per cent. of pre-war. The recent rationalisation drive of the British capitalist class had (before the full impact of the world crisis was felt in Britain) brought British production up to about the pre-war level, whereas its leading competitors, particularly the United States of America, are far above the pre-war level.

The weight of American competition is particularly felt in the British Dominions and in former spheres of British influence, like the South American countries. The latest available statistics show that while the British dominions obtained 44 per cent. of their total imports from Great Britain, to-day, they only obtain 36.1 per

cent. In Canada for example, imports were £100,000,000 greater in 1927 than in 1913. Of this increase, £66,000,000 was obtained from U.S.A. and only £11,000,000 from Great Britain. In Australia imports were £86,000,000 greater in 1927 than in 1913. Of this increase, U.S.A. took £27,000,000 and Great Britain £31,000,000. In India imports were £69,000,000 greater in 1927 than in 1913. Great Britain and the U.S.A. secured about £12,000,000 each.

British imperialism is struggling desperately, however, against the attempt of the U.S.A. imperialism to undermine in the British Empire and on the world market generally. It sends J. H. Thomas to Canada to win a greater share of the Canadian market at the expense of the U.S.A. It utilises Canadian opposition to the new U.S.A. tariff in order to get Canada to raise its tariff against the U.S.A. while giving preference to Britain. It attempts through the D'Abernon Mission to South America to re-establish its influence in the South American Continent. It utilises the hostility of the capitalist states in Europe against the U.S.A. tariff to range them against the U.S.A.

On the other hand the growth of the world economic crisis is compelling the U.S.A. to prepare a more energetic drive for new markets, new spheres of investments, new sources of raw materials, and everywhere it turns it encounters the resistance of British imperialism, which has some of the richest undeveloped territory of the world in its grasp, and is fighting the U.S.A. step by step in nominally independent countries like China and U.S.A. In South America and in China the internal struggles of the ruling classes, mirror to a considerable extent the struggles of British and American imperialism.

The U.S.A. imperialists support the struggles of the national reformists in India, not only for the reason that such sympathy is good for U.S.A. trade, but also because it is a step in the way of establishing good relations with the national reformists in those countries with a view to the final struggle with British imperialism.

It is clear that the conflict for the re-division of the world cannot be settled by the peaceful pushing out of British imperialism by the U.S.A. The whole proceedings of the late Naval Conference showed that British im-

perialism is only giving concessions to the U.S.A. in order to more effectively prepare for the impending struggle by the rationalisation of its industry, by the creation of new alliances etc.

The whole development of the world crisis will force U.S.A. imperialism to strengthen its drive against Great Britain, will stimulate the organisation of the British counter-offensive and will lead to a definite sharpening of the war danger between those two great imperialist powers. Therefore on August 1st, this year, the British Party will keep the question of Anglo-American antagonism *well to the front* of its August 1st campaign.

The growing war danger between the U.S.A. and Great Britain does not lessen but *increases* the danger of attack on the Soviet Union. At first sight it appears as if the hostility of British imperialism towards the Soviet Union has somewhat abated. Diplomatic relations have been renewed, the trading agreement has been signed, trade between both countries is growing, and in *open* anti-Soviet hostility Great Britain seems at the moment to take second place to France. It would be a criminal mistake, however, to regard those signs as a weakening of the anti-Soviet attitude of British imperialism, an attitude which has affected the upper strata of the Labour Party to a greater extent than seemed possible a few years ago.

Outwardly, Great Britain has the same relations with the U.S.S.R. as it has with Germany. Actually, however, the Labour Government continues the former policy of the die-hards towards the U.S.S.R. The same attitude was obvious during the religious campaign against the U.S.S.R. The "Labour" Cabinet Ministers were only too eager to accept all the varieties of "holy" lying which were brought to their notice. Even more significant is the attitude of Henderson with regard to propaganda. Henderson claims that the Communist International is a subsidiary organisation of the Soviet Government, and that Communist propaganda in the British Empire is propaganda by the Government of the Soviet Union. The Conservatives developing Henderson's point are now claiming that every piece of propaganda activity on the part of the British Communists, is in effect Soviet Government propaganda.

Further, it is clear that British anti-Soviet

activities in the states bordering on Russia have not diminished. In Finland a sphere of British influence, we see the powerful development of a fascist movement which carries on open war against the U.S.S.R.

That is why, while giving all due weight to the developing Anglo-American antagonisms, the British Party will stress the fact that the chief danger is the danger of war against the Soviet Union. The more the U.S.S.R. successfully builds up socialism by carrying out the Five Years' Plan in four years, the more it provides the world with an object lesson with regard to the self-determination of peoples, the more the tottering capitalist stabilisation is shaken, the greater will grow the danger of attack on the Soviet Union. This danger will emanate particularly from those capitalist countries whose economy has been most deeply shaken by the taking of the market of the U.S.S.R. out of the circle of "normal" capitalist relations, by the successful world competition of certain branches of socialist industry and by the growing revolt of the colonial peoples. And in the front rank of those countries stands Great Britain.

In developing this campaign the Party must strive to improve on last year's August 1st campaign, which could not be regarded as anything other than a failure. Last year's campaign revealed the *very grave under-estimation of the war danger* in all ranks of the Party, particularly, however, in the C.C. The call for strike action was put out feebly and the attempt to link up the call to strike with the immediate demands of the workers was of the most mechanical description. Scepticism reigned throughout the Party with regard to the possibilities of getting action on August 1st. It was the first attempt of the Party to run a big factory campaign and showed the deficiencies of party organisation which was on a residential basis. Nevertheless, the campaign showed the possibilities of factory campaigns and prepared the way for the more successful effort which was made on March 6th.

This year the campaign is being linked up with a struggle against the offensive of the employers who are endeavouring to put the whole cost of the decline of British industry on to the shoulders of the working-class. Right in the forefront of the campaign will stand the organisation of the unemployed for the struggle

for immediate improvements in the scale of maintenance. In this struggle the Party must expose the character of the capitalist "remedies" for unemployment, whether emanating from the Government or from the pseudo-"lefts" and will contrast this with the success of the U.S.S.R. in eliminating unemployment. Thus in the most concrete fashion the immediate struggles against unemployment and the war danger will be linked up with the struggle for the Revolutionary Workers' Government. The struggle of the unemployed will be linked up with the struggle against capitalist rationalisation and for the seven-hour day. This struggle will be carried out with particular energy in two industries where the capitalist offensive has reached great heights, namely, cotton and coal.

In the coal industry the Government, the mine-owners and the bureaucracy are conspiring together to drop the seven-and-a-half hours clause in the Coal Bill in favour of a proposal for

a 45-hours week—a proposal which will give the miners no reduction of hours whatsoever. In the cotton industry the report of the Government Committee of Enquiry recommends the workers in the weaving section to agree to work an increased number of looms. Therefore, in those two industries the Party will lay its greatest weight.

Attempts will be made to organise United Front Committees of employed and unemployed workers and to get the unemployed to participate in factory gate meetings. A series of local unemployed demonstrations will be organised before August 1st as a preliminary to district demonstrations in the leading centres on August 1st. Throughout the whole campaign an effort must be made to build up the circulation of the *Daily Worker*. In every respect August 1st this year has been better prepared than last year and the results should be much greater also.



# THE FIRST OF AUGUST IN POLAND AND THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAR OF 1920

By BRONKOVSKY

**T**HE August 1st campaign will take place this year in a situation of severe economic crisis and of the growth of elements of the general political crisis and revolutionary upheaval. It will take place in a situation of intensified war preparations. The bourgeoisie is seeking to find a way out of the crisis through war on the Soviet Union.

In Poland this year the August 1st campaign will possess special significance, for the bourgeoisie are organising observance of the anniversary of the Polish-Soviet war of 1920 and are attempting to utilise it for a further mobilisation of their forces against the U.S.S.R. If the Polish bourgeoisie carries through thanksgiving services on account of the "miraculous deliverance" from the Bolsheviks, the workers of Soviet Union can, nevertheless, in spite of the fact of the retreat, celebrate their victory.

In January, February and March, 1920, the Soviet Government repeatedly made overtures to the Polish Government for the opening of peace negotiations. The Soviet Government was ready to conclude peace with provisions for shifting the Polish frontier considerably more to the east than the then existing front line. It demonstrated thereby its unwillingness to decide the frontier question by the method of arms, being confident that this question would be settled by the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants of the Western Ukraine and White Russia. To these numerous peace proposals, the Polish Government responded first by deceitful manœuvres and afterwards by the attack on Kiev. The toiling workers of the Soviet republics who, after two years heroic struggle against intervention, were striving to advance to peaceful construction, were compelled once more to have recourse to arms. Inadequately equipped, often hungry and ill-clad, but inspired by a splendid enthusiasm, the ranks of the Red Army carried through a remarkable advance for hundreds of versts towards Visla and the German frontiers. They filled with panic, not only the Polish, but also the international bourgeoisie, and evoked an enor-

mous response from the international proletariat, raising a new wave of revolutionary feeling.

The Polish and international bourgeoisie, who only a little while previously had answered peace proposals by new attacks, began to demand peace negotiations. Britain demanded cessation of acts of war, threatening the intervention of its fleet. At the same time, the British proletariat organised Committees of Action against intervention, compelling its bourgeoisie to moderate its ardour.

The Polish Government, to whom only a few months earlier proposals had been made for the conclusion of peace on much more favourable terms, was compelled to agree to the shifting of the frontiers to the west of the line of the front and to restoration of the capital of White Russia, Minsk.

By its heroic struggle against all attempts at intervention, the toiling masses of the U.S.S.R., with the aid of the world proletariat, achieved a breathing space and assured for itself for a number of years the possibility of peaceful construction.

After the series of actions by the biggest imperialist Powers, after the counter-revolutionary outbreaks of Denikin, Yudenitch and Kolchak, the Polish war, in unison with the campaign of Wrangel, constituted the last attempt in this stage at intervention against the Soviet Union. Moreover, this war was an attempt at the realisation of the predatory endeavours of the Polish bourgeoisie and landlords, an attempt to regain the lost landed estates of the Ukraine and White Russia, to extend markets and to realise the Polish national programme "from sea to sea." These imperialist designs up to now remain the axis of the policy of the Polish programme, of Polish fascism.

Though the toiling masses of the Soviet Union have, with the help of the world proletariat, succeeded in securing a breathing space for themselves, this does not by any means signify the removal of the danger of war. On the contrary, the last years have been years of

furious preparation for a new war and the growth of the danger of war, which has attained the form of a real immediate threat. The antagonisms and forces, which led to the Polish-Soviet war of 1920, have considerably grown.

On the basis of further concentration of capital, of the trustification of industry and strengthened association with and dependence on foreign capital, the imperialist tendencies of the Polish bourgeoisie have been intensified. The denial of the existence of the pre-requisites for this expansion led the right deviators in Poland to conclusions weakening the estimate of the war danger. The same conclusions were arrived at by theories revising the estimate of the possibilities of stabilisation of Polish capitalism on the basis of the internal market.

In Poland, more than anywhere else, the ten years since the time of the Polish-Soviet war have been years of uninterrupted preparations for war. The numerical strength of the standing army is growing, the cadres of professional military experts are increasing. The military budget is increasing, a new war industry is being created and the rôle of State capital in industry is being strengthened. Bourgeois science and technique is creating new means of war. The mechanisation of the armed forces is going on at an accelerated pace, many times exceeding the level reached in the last war. The militarisation of the nation is being carried through, compulsory preparation before calling-up is introduced, fascist war organisations are being created. The State apparatus, industry and the railways are being adapted to the requirements of the future war.

Fascism is attempting to convert Poland into an armed camp. Simultaneously, fascism is creating new, and strengthening old, war associations with neighbouring States and is building under its leadership the united front against the U.S.S.R.

In these preparations, the most active rôle is taken, and will continue to be taken, by the social-democrats, who are endeavouring simultaneously to lull the vigilance of the masses with the help of pacifist phraseology or sham fights against the war danger. The most active participant in the 1920 war—the Polish Socialist Party (P.P.S.)—has also in the last few years been the leader in the intrigues against the U.S.S.R. and the author of provocative inven-

tions. In the endeavour to hide the imperialist efforts of the Polish bourgeoisie it even now attempts “to find the roots of the war danger” in the alleged imperialist tendencies of the Soviet Union. Representing as it does one of the most hopeful reserves of the bourgeoisie, Poland will play in the coming war, as in 1920, a very active rôle.

Polish fascism in its plan of war does not anticipate, obviously, any new lines of attack. It sticks to the old line, although already unsuccessfully attempted, of attack on Kiev. The fascists are promising to proclaim there a new revised constitution of the Polish republic.

With the object of preparing the theatre of the coming war, fascism once again puts on the orders of the day “the Ukrainian question.” The many years’ practice of the Polish bourgeoisie in the service of the imperialist powers before and during the period of the imperialist war have not passed in vain. The Polish bourgeoisie “put the Ukrainian question” in a still more unconcealed form than the Tsarist and Kaiser’s Governments used to put the Polish question. In April, 1920, Pilsudsky concluded an agreement with Petlura, on the basis of which Poland seized for itself Western Galicia, Volhynia and Holmshchina. In June of the current year, as part of the duty of the preparation of a new war, the ex-minister Yuzevsky carried on negotiations with Levitzkin and Salsky on the further extension of the occupations.

The Ukraine bourgeoisie wants to subject the toiling masses of the Ukraine to a double yoke. In reward for this, fascism promises to allow it closer access to the State feeding trough, to guarantee it more solid assistance for the exploitations and oppression of the workers. Forging an alliance with the Ukrainian bourgeoisie, Polish fascism seeks at the same time to suppress the revolutionary struggle of the toilers of Western Ukraine by means of an unheard of terror. As an example, there may be adduced the Lvov judgment, condemning to death three members of the Young Communist League for having distributed Communist literature.

However, the plan and programme for war is a complicated and thorny matter. In connection with it the antagonisms of the imperialists become sharpened, the disputes of the separate groups of the bourgeoisie become intensified. This finds its expression in the sharp dissension

in the camp of fascism, covered up by pacifist phraseology or the discussion of the Ukrainian question.

The final aim of the war is represented for the bourgeoisie by liquidation of the proletarian dictatorship of the U.S.S.R., throttling of the revolutionary movement and the opening to the capitalists of the gates leading to the enormous expanse of the U.S.S.R. War against the growing Soviet Union, which has behind it the support of the toiling masses of the whole world, is a risky expedient demanding solid preparation and choice of moment. It is precisely these questions which are the subject of dispute between the national democrats and the Pilsudsky supporters. The advisability of a solution of the Soviet problem through the Ukrainian gateway, the safeguarding of the rear, guarantees on the part of Germany, appear as the real objects of discussion. Pacifist phraseology serves only for fooling the masses; for the real objects the national democrats are fighting, still laying claim to the vote of the decisive force in the camp of the Polish bourgeoisie.

The preparations for war now being completed, against which the toilers of Poland, the Ukraine and White Russia are indefatigably fighting, are proceeding in a specially acute situation. Poland is faced with the perspective of a further development of the crisis, particularly heavily threatening agriculture. All hopes of the support of foreign capital are being frustrated. The wave of revolutionary struggle, at first unequal, now proceeds along the path of removing the disproportion, and strengthens the strike struggle of the basic sections of the Polish working-class—the metal workers, textile workers and miners. This struggle assumes an ever more clearly expressed political character. Street demonstrations continue and collisions are taking place between the unemployed and the police. The activity and the participation of the peasantry in the general struggle is growing. May 1st of the present year demonstrated the growth of activity of the broad masses and the increasing influence of the Communist Party.

The May 1st campaign, like all the preceding campaigns, was closely linked up with the struggle against the preparation for war and for the defence of the U.S.S.R. It showed even

more clearly the patronisation between the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. and the proletariat of Poland. August 1st will be a continuation of the preceding campaigns. In preparation for and in the carrying out of August 1st, we must take into account previous experience, previous defects and, especially, the experience of the August 1st campaign last year.

In the preparation for August 1st last year, the Party exhibited considerable energy, and élan. The huge number of preparatory meetings (169 in Warsaw alone), the series of huge demonstrations, the greater supply of literature, all this was the result of great exertion in the work of organisation. In spite of the unprecedented mobilisation of the whole fascist apparatus, August 1st was also signalised by the great number of demonstrations and outbreaks. Considerable masses of the peasantry were drawn into the struggle; to a certain extent, although far from sufficiently, the army was also involved. The August 1st campaign completely disorganised the attempts of the social-fascists to draw the masses into their pacifist anti-war comedy of August 4th.

Nevertheless, in the preparation and carrying through of the campaign there were not a few mistakes, which it is necessary to take into account in the present year. Especially requiring attention is the inability to apply the tactic of the united front. The creation of "August 1st committees" did not attain sufficient extension. In some places, these committees were created artificially without sufficient attraction of the lower workers. The mass revolutionary organisations were also inadequately drawn into the preparations.

In the current year, in connection with the sharpened situation, with the general strengthening of the struggle of the Party for the masses and for the liberation of the workers from the influence of social-fascism, the question of the wide application of the united front from below acquires especial significance. Alongside of old forms already applied in the past, the Party must utilise new forms, e.g., the addressing of letters to the working masses in separate factories.

The whole campaign must be based primarily on the factories and workshops, and it is there that the tactic of the united front must find its application. The factory and workshop must be the *starting point* for the development of wide

demonstrations. The strengthening rôle of social-fascism, the intensification of demagogic pseudo-revolutionary phrase-mongering, and the attempt on the part of fascism to draw the masses of workers and peasants away from revolutionary struggle, demands considerable strengthening of our work for the exposure of the P.S.S. and for a sound application of the tactic of the united front in relation to the workers already marching behind our banners. The August 1st campaign must be primarily connected with the fight against the social-fascist leaders and with the exposure of their real features.

In last year's campaign, in a number of places we failed to utilise to a sufficient degree, the current economic struggle of the proletariat and did not sufficiently link it up with the anti-war campaign (Petrokov, Belsk). At the present moment, in connection with the widely developing economic struggle, it is essential to have a specially close connection of the August 1st campaign with the day-to-day struggles and demands of the working-class, just as it is essential to have a close connection with all anti-war agitation and propaganda, anti-war struggle and struggle against the crisis and the attempts of the capitalists to shift on to the shoulders of the working-class all the burden of the economic crisis.

The development of the revolutionary struggle in the village creates the pre requisites for a still greater attraction of the peasant masses into the anti-war campaign and the strengthening of their connections with the proletarian battalions in the towns. The struggle against the national fascists and the wide application of the united front are here also preconditions of the successful development of the campaign.

For the best possible drawing into the general struggle of the army, into which revolutionary moods are more and more penetrating, there is required very good timely organised preparation and the assuring of the connection of the workers in the factories and workshops, and also of the unemployed, with the mass of the soldiers.

In last year's August 1st campaign, we had a series of mistakes of a right-opportunist character,

the roots of which lay in the conceptions of the right-way group being still not overcome, thus leading to an inadequate estimation of the danger of war and of the counter-revolutionary rôle of social fascism. The current campaign must be a further step towards the complete eradication in the Party of these views and to overcoming them in practice. Decisively rejected must be all attempts at joint demonstrations with the social-fascist organisations or renegades, such as took place in isolated instances even in the May 1st campaign (Western Ukraine). There must be decisively countered all attempts to confuse the Party character of the separate demonstrations (absence of flags, appearance under the cover of mass revolutionary organisations, etc.).

The enormous significance of the occupied territories of Western Ukraine and White Russia in regard to the preparations for the coming war demands from the Party in the preparation of the August 1st campaign special attention to the questions of national emancipatory struggle (in collaboration with the struggle against all national-opportunist deviations). The Parties in Western Ukraine and White Russia must develop especially widely the anti-war campaign, closely linking it with the struggle against the treacherous rôle of the local bourgeoisie and against its participation in the preparation of war.

The terrorist methods adopted by fascism and the experience of past campaigns, which show that fascism can mobilise forces against the workers in their preparations for demonstrations, makes necessary the best possible working out of the questions of the tactics of street demonstrations on the part of the Party, and demands the best possible organisation of the masses themselves for proletarian self-defence. It is necessary to develop the activity and resistance of the masses and to direct it in such a fashion as to overcome the police barriers and to conquer the streets. The excellent and instructive examples afforded by the struggle of the workers of the Dombrovski Basin at the time of the May 1st demonstrations must be fully studied. The Party must lead the masses who are searching for methods of struggle against the police brutality.

World Class War

## NEW CLASS WARS IN GERMANY

IT is characteristic that in Germany to-day there is a feeling of alarm, almost amounting to panic, not only among the masses but also in leading bourgeois circles, caused by the rapid deterioration in the economic position of the country. "Germany is in a position of utmost disaster" is how the editor of the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, the organ of big capital, recently expressed himself. The whole bourgeois press, individual big figures and members of the Government insistently repeat the same theme: *We must hasten to seek a way out of this critical position*; if we do not succeed soon in alleviating the grave financial and general economic crisis, the position by the autumn will become absolutely catastrophic and no measures will be of any avail.

The Chancellor, Brüning, who came to power as a "strong man," promised to introduce complete order into the finances of the German State within two months. He has many times flaunted the special powers he has at his disposal, threatening to dissolve the Reichstag the first day he came to power. But this "new strong man," in drawing up the latest version of the financial programme, made a speech full of complaints about the extremely grave, almost inextricable position of the Government. Brüning demanded indulgence in view of the fact that "the Imperial Government and all governments of the world were quite unexpectedly confronted with exceptionally difficult tasks."

One cannot help admitting Brüning is right. Indeed, there is no country in the capitalist world which has not felt the heavy blow of the world economic crisis and has not suffered a period of sharp depression in the market situation and accentuation of the class struggle.

## "UNEXPECTED" BUT INEVITABLE

The German Chancellor was compelled to affirm that the world economic crisis was quite unexpected for the "statesmen" of the German Bourgeois Republic, that the crisis in the United States not merely showed the erroneousness of the general optimism displayed in the bourgeois world, but surpassed the worst expectations.

It is indisputable that the crisis being experienced by German economy and at the same

time the German State, is determined in a decisive manner by the development of the world economic crisis and in particular by the crisis in the U.S.A. But at the same time no small part has been played by the fact that as a result of the general depression there has been an increased action of those specific causes by dint of which Germany of the Dawes Plan and Young Plan period must inevitably be confronted with a most acute internal political crisis. Brüning asserted that in accepting the Young Plan a miscalculation was made and at the present time, as a result of the market situation, they would, with the greatest difficulty have to reconstruct the State Budget in such a manner as to meet international obligations and at the same time avoid bankruptcy. But the fact of the matter is that this "miscalculation" in connection with the depression, has merely made itself felt earlier than would have been the case if there had been a more favourable economic situation. What the Chancellor calls a "miscalculation" or "discrepancy" in the market situation is really a manifestation of the basic contradiction of German economy.

In order to fulfil the obligations placed on Germany by the Young Plan, and to improve the position of German capitalist economy, the German bourgeoisie is carrying out an unprecedented exploitation of the working-class and is making every effort to extend Germany's position on the world market. But the German proletariat is prepared for the fight against the bourgeois offensive. On the other hand, Germany's competitors on the world market are by no means inclined to allow a serious extension of German exports. These factors were bound to have made themselves felt, and the "miscalculation" of the German capitalists would inevitably have been revealed. The world economic crisis has greatly accelerated these processes and the basic profound contradictions, perilous for German capitalism, are already now manifested in the most acute form.

History is thus bringing nearer those inevitable events which are to deal decisive blows to German and world capitalism. The development of events in Germany demands the keenest attention and activity of the Communist vanguard of the proletariat. In view of the collapse

of the partial stabilisation of German capitalism, the moment of decisive struggles for the German worker will come earlier than it might have seemed six months ago.

#### SAXONY ELECTIONS SYMPTOMATIC

There is one very characteristic indication of the position in the country and of the feelings of the masses of the population. This indication is the result of the elections in Saxony. As is known, these elections ended in a loss of votes for the parties of the German bourgeoisie, a fall in the number of supporters of social-democracy, a big victory for the national-fascists and a strengthening of the Communist Party. The result of the Saxon elections in the first place represents a vote of no confidence in the present governmental system in Germany. The masses are disappointed in the parliamentary democratic republic; they are seeking a way out of the present situation. It is highly characteristic that literally the entire German bourgeois press estimates the results of the Saxon elections, *despite the big successes of the national-socialists*, as a symptom of the radicalisation of the masses, as an indication that the way is being cleared for revolution. In the daily supplement to the nationalist organ *Kreuz-Zeitung*, of June 27th, an analysis of the Saxon elections is headed "A Revolutionary Wave—that is the Meaning of the Saxon Elections." No one could be deceived as to the true rôle of the national-socialists, or fascists, as the servants and executors of the will of capitalism. But, nevertheless, the very fact that this Party, by means of demagogic slogans spuriously directed against the present State system, was able to triple the votes it received—this fact is important. The job of the national-fascists is to drive the workers into a cage prepared for them by the bourgeoisie. But they will not succeed in this. In the last analysis, their success represents a very alarming signal for the bourgeoisie. Those workers who reckon on realising their class interests in the ranks of national-fascism will very soon understand, and by bitter experience be convinced, that the fascists are not the defenders of the workers' interests, but, on the contrary, are the ruthless enemies of the working-class. Then the indignation, the discontent and the activity of the workers will be directed into the channels of real revolutionary activity under the leadership

of the Communist Party. It is not in vain that one of the most serious German bourgeois newspapers, the *Kölnische Zeitung*, fears that in the future the successes of the national-fascists will inevitably be utilised by the Communists, "supported by the entire proletariat, radicalised to the last degree."

#### MANSFELD STRIKE

The possibility and inevitability of such a process in a situation of serious class struggles in practice, is proved by the strike in Mansfeld. The Mansfeld workers could not by any means be counted among the vanguard of the German proletariat. The influence of the fascists in the Mansfeld factories was fairly strong. The revolutionary trade union opposition until quite recently was rather weak in the Mansfeld district. But when the moment of decisive encounters with the employers arrived, when the necessity arose to inflict a real revolutionary repulse on the employers, Mansfeld provided an example of a real active strike struggle under the leadership of the *revolutionary trade union opposition*. It is very characteristic that precisely in the Mansfeld district were the blacklegs the most isolated. The four-weeks' strike in Mansfeld gave an example of a revolutionary strike struggle correct both in method and in form.

#### WAGE CUTS THEIR ONLY HOPE

The strike in Mansfeld and the renewal of mass strikes in the north-western district is a serious blow for the German bourgeoisie. The offensive against the material interests of the working-class, systematically carried out after the acceptance of the Young Plan, should have been crowned, in the view of the capitalists, by a methodically enforced general reduction of wages. To the degree that the crisis of markets becomes more acute, and the utilisation of the productive possibilities of German industry diminishes—reduction in wages becomes, for the German bourgeoisie, the chief measure, and practically the main source of "capital-accumulation"; if, in general, one may thus term that method of saving a capitalist enterprise from closing down or going bankrupt. There is no need to cite proofs of the fact that the German bourgeoisie regard wage-cuts as its chief and desperate resort at the present juncture. Under

such conditions, the stubborn struggle of the proletariat against wage-cuts will inevitably *be transformed from an economic into a political fight*. In resisting the wage-cuts the proletariat of Mansfeld, of Krupps and the Ruhr as a whole, are fighting not only for their own direct vital economic interests, not only against the united front of the employers, but they are striking a blow at the chief link in the whole chain of the political measures of the German bourgeoisie. The strike movement developing in Germany, which has in it serious elements of a change from the defence to the attack, is a manifestation of the growing *open fight of class against class*. At the same time, the resistance of the German workers to the attempts to place upon their shoulders the consequences of the economic crisis, confirms the prognosis made by Comrade Stalin in the Political Report of the C.C., C.P.S.U., where he pointed out that "the world economic crisis will grow into a political crisis in a number of countries."

The German bourgeoisie is beginning to realise that the prospects of an offensive against the capitalists may not merely turn out to be of little benefit to the capitalists, but may release class forces that will upset all the plans of the bourgeoisie. The *Kölnische Zeitung* has already re-started propaganda for an agreement with the social-democrats, for the return of the latter into the Coalition. In other words, certain circles of the German bourgeoisie are beginning to think about the need for manœuvring and for attacking the proletariat not by a frontal assault, but by means of various flanking movements. The anxiety of the bourgeoisie is expressed in the short formula of the social-democratic T.U. bureaucrat Reichel, who stated at Essen that "a strike on a wide scale means a governmental crisis." While the social-fascists, in making such speeches to the workers, once again, by the aid of the fiction about the general welfare of the State, want to break down the workers' resistance, the bourgeoisie on the other hand, is bound to recognise the risk that exists inasmuch as *the extension of the strike movement indeed means not merely a governmental but a national crisis for the German republic*.

The more the fight of the workers already on strike in the north-west and in Mansfeld acquires significance, the greater is the responsibility that falls on the revolutionary trade

union opposition and the German Communist Party. In the present circumstances, the correct, active and successful operation of the strike struggle in Germany is one of the most important *political* tasks of the revolutionary vanguard of the German proletariat.

In encountering the resistance of the working-class, in experiencing ever-increasing blows from the economic crisis, the German bourgeoisie is beginning to seek new means in order to avoid complete catastrophe, in particular in view of the persistent fall of prices on the world market. These tendencies were formulated by the present Minister of Labour and leader of the Christian trade unions, Stegerwald, in his speech in the Reichstag on June 28th. Stegerwald insisted with great determination that the decrease in wages should be accompanied by a real decrease in prices. There is no doubt that Stegerwald was least of all concerned about the needs of the consumers. The advocates of a serious reduction of prices in German industry are evidently moved by the two considerations: they think that only in that way can the purchasing capacity of the German market be preserved, and—most important of all—only on that condition will German industry be able to preserve its position on the foreign market, under conditions of the world crisis now raging. Stegerwald's speech attracted wide attention in Germany. In particular, the *Vossische Zeitung*, the very next day, had an article about this speech, in which it was emphasised that Stegerwald's statement constituted a very important warning.

To whom was Stegerwald's warning addressed? What is the special significance of the demand for a real and extensive reduction of prices in German industry? The characteristic feature of this demand is that its fulfilment would contradict the ordinary policy of monopolistic capitalism. The price of iron has already had to be lowered, and that fact of itself reveals that the trustification of the German steel industry has not succeeded, in a time of crisis, in ridding this industry of the usual consequences of capitalist crises. The situation current in Germany is an excellent illustration of the contention that the rule of monopoly capitalism does not mean an alleviation of the inherent contradictions of the capitalist system, but, on the contrary, at a given moment these

contradictions make themselves felt under new conditions with increased acuteness and increased insuperability.

The German Government, the representatives of the various branches of industry and the German bourgeois press cannot conceal the fact that the coming autumn threatens serious new complications. Brüning and the present Minister of Finance Dietrich have had to admit that the financial programme they have proposed is a palliative, the effect of which is limited by very brief terms. On the other hand, German economists definitely predict, being already taught by bitter experience, that no improvement of the market situation is to be expected in the near future. Autumn is depicted in the most dismal colours by the German bourgeoisie. It is in the autumn that the revision of the new collective agreements is to take place. By autumn a new fall in treasury receipts and a new deficit in the State budget will be revealed. By the autumn the number of unemployed will have increased and the

material position of the broad masses of the population deteriorated. "The possibility of revolutionary events in the autumn—if the present development is not successfully stemmed—is not a threat, is not a dark spectre, but is a danger which really exists and which serious politicians must reckon with." Such are the gloomily prophetic tones of the Berlin organ of the German People's Party, the Party of big capital.

The growing revolutionary feelings of the masses can be considered as an inevitable and indisputable process. In view of this situation, the German Communist Party is confronted still more urgently with the task of getting into close contact with the masses, of organising and heading the incipient movement of the masses, of organising and leading the united front from below, or organisationally strengthening its influence in the factories and thereby preparing the proletariat and the Party itself for the approaching big class battles.



## HAIS TAKES THE ROAD TO AMSTERDAM

RENEGADES IN CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

By P.R.

**R**EMARKABLE developments have taken place in the last few weeks in the camp of the Czecho-Slovakian liquidators. The process of development from liquidator to social-fascist is revealed particularly clearly in that country because, with the strongly opportunist traditions of the Czecho-Slovakian Communist Party, openly social-democratic elements have been able to stay within the ranks of the Party there for a longer time than in any other section of the C.I. Just as the ideology of the right wing liquidators, which grew up in the ranks of the Comintern after the Sixth World Congress, was expressed most clearly in the crisis within the Czecho-Slovakian Party, so, too, the process of the definite amalgamation of the right wing renegades with the social-fascists is apparent there in its most unconcealed form.

The Czecho-Slovakian example shows that withdrawal from the Communist International was only the first step, and that the second step was bound to be unity in organisation with the social-democrats. How long Brandler, Samuelson & Co. need to draw this final conclusion from their political ideas, is a secondary question. What is important is the realisation that, in the period when class contradictions become more acute—and at the present time these contradictions are being still further intensified by the economic crisis—the basis for an organisationally independent political party of the liquidators becomes smaller and smaller. The overwhelming defeat of the Brandlerites at the Saxon elections, the disappearance of the Wjinkoop group in Holland and, finally, the amalgamation of those trade union organisations in Czecho-Slovakia which are led by the liquidators, with the Amsterdam International, all reveal, on an international scale, the same process of development among the liquidators. The essence of this process is determined by the fact that the social basis on which the liquidators stand has been undermined by the sharpening of class contradictions and that, consequently, a process of complete dissolution is beginning among the liquidators, in the course of which the worst elements among them are going over, publicly

and formally, into the camp of social fascism, while the class-conscious workers who at the turning point between two periods of capitalist development, were misled for a time by the liquidators are slowly and hesitatingly finding their way back to the Communist International.

The shocks sustained by capitalist stabilisation and the more pronounced approach of the right wing renegades to the policy of social democracy, now make it possible for these workers who, with a sound revolutionary attitude, lagged behind the sharpening of the class struggle, to find their way in the new situation. This is the explanation of that international process in which a part of the workers who supported the right wing are turning again to the Communist International, while the leaders desert to the camp of social-democracy.

Only a month ago the leaders of the Czecho-Slovakian liquidators hotly denied that the question of open adherence to reformism was a real question of the moment. When the return of the liquidators to social democracy became undeniably apparent, Neurath, on 29th May, wrote in *Vorwärts*, which he had a short time previously appropriated from the Party :

“Some comrades—and they are certainly not many—confuse the collapse of ultra-radicalism with the collapse of Communist ideas, of the Communist movement. A fraction of these people have gone into the camp of social democracy . . . The opposition should not allow itself to be used as a rallying centre for those who crawl away from the class struggle.”

A similar statement was made at the same time in the organ of the Czech liquidators by another of their great men, Mr. Berger:

“All the efforts of the entire social-democracy are directed towards eliminating, as soon as possible, the revolutionary trade union movement, the I.A.V. and the opposition Communist movement, for in the past the social democrats have been convinced of what a revolutionary trade union movement and a correct Communist policy mean for them.”

The denial of any intention to return to social democracy was accompanied by a specific denial that there was any intention of dissolving the I.A.V. In his article on trade union unity, Neurath wrote :

“This unity must be established from below, and in such a manner that the influence of the workers with Communist ideas can make itself felt. Only if this is done will these trade union organisations be able to develop and go forward for a revolutionary class struggle.”

And in the same article Neurath declared :

“The official Party press accuses the leadership of the opposition and the leading officials of the I.A.V. of the desire to take the members of the unions into the reformist camp, wholly ignoring Leninist trade union tactics. There is no point in touching any further upon their stupid slander.”

This is what Mr. Neurath wrote. His friend Berger reporting on a joint meeting of the Central Committee of the I.A.V. and the representatives of the opposition, wrote as follows :

“The discussion at this session ended with a binding declaration from Comrade Josef Hais that all reports dealing with negotiations concerning the organisational amalgamation of the I.A.V. with the O.S.C. (reformist trade union federation of Czecho-Slovakia) must be categorically denied.”

These reports were denied for several weeks in the opposition press, until it became clear that Josef Hais had been deceiving, not only the workers, but also his own friends of the “Leninist” opposition. (Actually, of course, this was nothing but a division of labour.) This appears from a letter written by Neurath to Arno Hais immediately after the denial published on 3rd June, which has fallen into the hands of the Communist press. In that letter Neurath complains that his dear bosom friend Hais has shamefully deceived him :

“You yourself have repeatedly stated, not only at the opposition executive, but also to me personally, that an organisational union is scarcely possible before at least two years. I do not know whether it will take so long. It is quite possible, with careful, persistent and conscious work, that this period could be considerably shortened.”

At the same time as the leaders of the “Leninist” opposition were disclaiming any intention of dissolving the I.A.V., they were actually in complete agreement with Hais about effecting amalgamation. They merely insisted upon adequate preparation, and this minor tactical difference gave rise to a discussion among the renegades in the course of which Mr. Hais cheerfully lied to his friends, stating that he was not considering amalgamation for some time. But a few days later the denials of the liquidators were revealed as sheer bluff.

A few weeks after the Neurath-Berger disclaimer, an official proposal from the trade union liquidators to the reformists was published containing a number of political agreements as to common procedure. Shortly afterwards a counter proposal was made by the reformist trade union centre, suggesting amalgamation of the organisations. This proposal was placed before the conference of the Central Committees of the I.A.V. sections on June 22nd, and was accepted after a long debate, three votes being cast against it. Three weeks were enough to refute all the denials which had been made. Messrs. Berger, Neurath and Company then began to explain that unity with the reformist trade unions was the outcome of a consistent Leninist trade union policy, and Heinrich Brandler in person was brought from Germany to persuade the Reichenberg officials of the opposition to accept amalgamation. Thus spake Heinrich Brandler in Reichenberg :

“Without greatly increasing our influence over the trade unions, and imbuing them with the revolutionary spirit, without decisively influencing the trade unions in this sense, the revolution cannot triumph. Whether or not the union of the I.A.V. with the Amsterdam unions is a surrender to reformism, depends to a large extent on your work.”

Mr. Brandler and his Czecho-Slovakian lieutenant, the ex-Trotskyist Neurath, are trying, now that union with and unconditional surrender to the reformists is an accomplished fact, to represent union with the reformists as designed to achieve the object of carrying on revolutionary work within the reformist organisations. The letter from Neurath, to which we have already referred, contains a similar statement :

“To carry through amalgamation now, without any work, without creating conditions in which amalgamation is possible in the sense of Communist trade union policy, would not be unity with the reformist unions, but sheer surrender to reformism. We can all agree that organisational union will be seriously and openly prepared without reference to the Political Bureau, but prepared in the sense of a Communist trade union policy. The date of organisational union, in these circumstances, had necessarily to be postponed, until we can truly say that this step is taken in the name and at the request of the revolutionary workers organised in the I.A.V., in the name of the Communist movement.”

Why this affectation on the part of Mr. Neurath, who in principle agrees with Hais on the question of unity and who, like Hais, is anxious to lead the workers over to the ground of social-fascism? Neurath believed that amalgamation had to be “prepared,” for, after he had for years been telling the workers that he remained true to Communist principles, that he was the true defender of Leninism in Czechoslovakia, he realised very well that the workers would not grasp the change with regard to union with reformism as quickly as his more hot-headed colleague Hais. But after Hais refused to wait any longer, and the amalgamation was already decided upon (on 22nd June), Neurath had to change his position and together with Brandler he was forced to explain to his followers that amalgamation would be carried out in the spirit of Communist trade union policy.

The tactical difference between Hais and Neurath amounts to the following: Hais wants to go over to social fascism openly and without any manoeuvres; Neurath wants to take the same road while retaining revolutionary phrases. Neurath understands better than Hais that without such manoeuvres the few workers who still stand with the liquidators may get lost on the road of amalgamation.

Neurath’s talk about “preserving Communist principles” in the reformist trade unions is a refined form of deception, as is also his declaration that unity must be established from below. His manoeuvre, however, was defeated in the suggested principles of co-operation, which Hais put to the reformists before the proposal for

organisational union was made. These suggestions contain the following clauses:

1. Wage and other demands, as well as suggested changes in collective agreements, will be placed before the employers or their organisations jointly.
2. Negotiations concerning demands, collective agreements, etc., will be conducted jointly until the conclusion of the matter. If an open struggle is unavoidable, it will be launched after a joint statement from the two organisations, and a joint strike committee shall be elected.
3. This joint procedure will also be undertaken in regard to any other industrial action . . . .
7. In the forthcoming elections for sickness insurance authorities and other social bodies, the two parties shall put forward joint lists of candidates.
8. Mutual attacks in the press and at meetings, particularly any personal attack or abuse, shall cease.

Mr. Neurath, together with Brandler, may babble of a Leninist trade union policy and try to prove that union with the reformists has been brought about “in the spirit of Leninism.” Mr. Hais, who revealed himself as a ‘practical “man of action” in the putsch last year, is negotiating with the reformists on the basis of conditions which mean complete and unvarnished submission to social-fascist trade union policy. In so doing, Hais exposes to the workers the real value of the left wing phrases uttered by Berger, Neurath and Co., who, in fact, agree with his policy.

The developments which are taking place among those workers who still support the liquidators, indicate clearly that the left manoeuvres of a few leaders are necessary in order to preserve the hold which the liquidators still possess. The rebellion of the workers against union with the reformists has already begun. A few groups of workers who have hitherto supported the liquidators have already returned to the red trade unions, while other groups are still irresolute. Characteristic of this attitude is the decision adopted by the Klohovec local group, which protested against unity with the reformists and demanded that negotiations be undertaken with the red trade unions, although their policy was “not 100 per cent. correct.”

This development among the workers brings the C.P. and the red trade unions of Czecho-Slovakia face to face with new tasks.

The conditions required for winning back the workers who allowed themselves to be misled for a time by the liquidators, are in existence. The surrender to the reformists at the time of the economic crisis and the new capitalist offensive, must arouse deep indignation among these workers. Consequently the red trade unions, must carry out a mass campaign in order to expose the treachery of Hais and his allies, Neurath and Co. We should make it clear to the workers that the red trade unions in Czecho-Slovakia are the only proletarian

class organisations which fight for their interests. The desertion of Hais and Co. to the court of reformism must be made the starting point for strengthening the leading rôle of the red trade unions and for increased recruiting among the organised and unorganised workers who are breaking away from the liquidators' policy. In so far as certain sections of them still hesitate, their return to the R.I.L.U. must be made as easy as possible by comradely explanation and indication of their mistakes.

Working on this basis, the red trade unions will succeed in strengthening their mass influence and enrolling those workers who once followed Hais and Co., into the ranks of the revolutionary class struggle.

# ITALY AND THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE ITALIAN PARTY

Comintern

A CHANGE IN THE GENERAL WORK OF THE PARTY

By GARLANDI (continued)

**I**N the country there is more than a million unemployed between agricultural and industrial workers. The paralysis of production and agrarian crisis prevents the using up of the new generation of workers. The pressure of unemployment, the oppression of the policy of limiting emigration, sharply increases the poverty of the masses. Wages are sufficiently low and the cost of living as before, high. The crisis of the internal and export trades alarms the ruling circles. The political crisis manifests itself not only in the above-mentioned symptoms, but in the narrowing of the mass basis of fascism. A whole series of episodes prove the exhaustion, tiredness, and the low spiritedness of the provincial fascist organisations; in the periphery, the national militia (Black Shirts) themselves are infected with defeat and weariness. In Fienze in December the order about the mobilisation of Black Shirts, for the crushing of a few manifestations called forth by fascist provocation, was answered by an insignificant number of Black Shirts. In the provinces there were a number of cases of fraternisation of the fascist militia with the workers. Of course, the Government took measures to prevent the further development of such events. Not long ago was issued a decree for the creation of a militia of 60,000 Black Shirts, which are obliged to remain in the service for the next ten years. This must put an end to the fluidity of composition which was a consequence of the old organisation of the militia upon the basis of periodical mobilisation. Other signs of the changed situation is the departure of all the broad strata of the petty town and village bourgeoisie from fascism. It is true that fascism more than once experienced a similar breaking away of strata of the petty bourgeoisie. But the departure of the petty bourgeoisie now occurs in a situation which differs from the situation of yesterday and before yesterday. Those who are breaking away have hitherto been known to be active and the breakaway takes place in the conditions of a society which has been

unstable for eight years under the régime of fascism, in conditions which have all the more narrowed the possibilities of fascist political manœuvres, in conditions where the possibilities of reconstructing the mass basis of fascism is extremely limited.

The most important movement in the new situation is the movement of the masses. In what sense has this movement a "new" character? It is before all new because of the economic background upon which it has developed. The possibilities of economic manœuvring for fascism has significantly contracted; the abolition of internal duties (which in 1927 was able to deceive the masses) cannot at the present time mask before the masses the lying game which this conceals—a new attack against wages.

This movement again has a new character because it sufficiently often appears in the character of a violent movement. The masses in their rage come forward to the attack and in their anger resist the consequences of the crisis which they associate with fascism, the employers and landowners. This means that the present mass movement unfolds itself upon a higher stage than three or four years ago.

These facts show that we in Italy are confronted with a situation in which the correlation of forces will change, we are confronted with a revolutionary situation. The feeling of some kind of change hangs in the air, this is examined by all classes, commencing with the ruling class, who in the conditions do not conceal this from themselves, and this is reflected in the press and official speeches, in their recollections, and warnings, threats and wrath.

What does the Party do in this situation? Here it is necessary to repeat those circumstances which underestimated the faults of the Party; we suffered defeat ten years ago, we have had greater defeats. The world proletariat and the Italian proletariat which is our judge and the Communist International know our history for the last ten years. But our defeat does not free us from the necessity to have a correct Party line

and to play a rôle in the present situation. Otherwise we must announce our capitulation. In the majority of those cases in which the masses came forward during the last few months we were politically absent. The situation changes, the masses begin to come out of their passivity and we politically did not appear amidst the mass. In such conditions the Communist Party leadership must be firm. Why are we absent? What must we do in order to mingle with the course of events?

A Party—weak organisationally and politically—what can be done to strengthen it? What measures—it is possible to move quickly—should it undertake to again come in contact with the broad masses, to use our privileged position as the only Party which in 1926 and later remained at work in Italy, in order to struggle against fascism? The secretariat worked on a series of measures upon the basis of the September resolutions, which allowed the Party to occupy its place in the given situation. Among these measures was a change upon which we should have decided in September.

And there grew the opposition. It offered its organisational counter-project from which was excluded the slightest hint to the character of the present situation. During this time the Political Bureau of the Party received a letter from Comrade Paskvine (for motives of health he had for the last year not participated in the life of the Party, and therefore also in the work of the September session of the C.C.) in which Comrade Paskvine requested to examine how the official declaration of the C.C. was the occasion of the September session.

This letter (published in No. 11 of the C.I., April 10th, 1930) immediately became the political platform of the opposition.

If we attempt to find those points which politically unite these comrades we would see that these points represent the further development of the ideas, which Serra defended, although outwardly they would seem to deny these ideas. Did we not hear at the last March session of the C.C. and later, when the Presidium of the E.C.C. accepted the project of a resolution bringing in the C.C. of the I.C.—did we not hear on the side of the opportunists the accusation that the majority of the C.C. of the Party were opportunistic? They remained in the position of definite right deviation and at the

same time attempted (truly like children) to prove that their position was—right and “left.”

The opportunistic base of the “right” and “left” deviation in the international arena appears with such clearness that at the present moment it not easy to distinguish one from the other. They differ only in the style, which “right” and “left” reflect its opportunistic viewpoint. It is not accidental that our neo-opportunists have discovered an ideological and political contact with the French Trotskyists.

In what manner will there develop the revolutionary process in Italy? Precisely here is the basic point of divergence.

Setting out from the formal view about the identity of capitalism with fascism (which has sense only as information upon a definite historical-political growth) the opposition should have come to the deduction of the impossibility of a democratic transformation of Italy, that is of the impossibility for the Italian bourgeoisie to produce democratic changes in the fascist order when it is menaced with a crisis. And the neo-opportunists on the contrary consider the perspective of the possibility of “democratic” transformation of present-day Italy. It is evident that a convenient perspective is that of denying the given situation in Italy, not to appraise the process of fascisation of social democracy (which the Bordigans meanwhile deny and for those who acknowledge the process) to deny the reactionary transformation of bourgeois democracy in the epoch of proletarian revolution, to acknowledge the leading rôle—for an entire period of revolutionary development—for the petty bourgeoisie which are generally given too much significance in Italy, exaggerating its activity and on the contrary insufficiently appraising the movement of the working masses and its new character, laughing at mass political strikes, not giving up a significant interference with the work of the Party and its rôle in the present movement of the mass.

In the last resolution of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. (January, 1927) and in the resolution of the second Party conference (1928) we described the perspective of the development in Italy; in this perspective there was reflected for many reasons insufficient clarity and was so formulated as to call forth a mistaken understanding and to provide food for opportunism.

(Taska-Thalheimer.) The Party, however, always denied the possibility of a democratic stage and affirmed that if a "democratic" stage (it was entirely a novelty as the significance and contents of democracy now was quite otherwise than twelve to fifteen years ago) had arisen in Italy in the epoch of a revolutionary movement then it was equivalent to the defeat of the proletariat and would not have helped the creation of more satisfactory conditions for the victory of the proletariat.

Comrade Paskvine, who, perhaps, against his wish, became the leader of the neo-opposition, no longer agreeing with this view of the Party. To its position the Party came on the one hand with an analysis of the process of reactionary reforms of bourgeois democracy and social democracy on an international scale in the period of proletarian revolution, and on the other hand analysed why it was agreed that with the growth of the capitalist economy in Italy and the history of the class struggle in Italy, fascism was the last stage of imperialism in our country. Paskvine, from two perspectives, chose the perspective of conflict between "concentration" and fascism, based upon the experience of the last revolution (the struggle of the Girondists against the monarchy, Kerensky against Kornilov, Noske against Kappa, etc.), and did not understand that this analogy was unsuitable to the present situation in Italy. Paskvine took for his example three characteristic moments in the circumstances of the bourgeois democratic revolution. Are we in Italy on the eve of a bourgeois democratic revolution? Evidently not. The war placed before Italy a dilemma: it opened the dictatorship of capital, or the dictatorship of the proletariat. This exasperation, this simplified political struggle in Italy in 1919-20 was the result of the sharpening of the internal antagonisms of the capitalist régime. The advance and defeat of the proletariat in 1920 did not solve this dilemma.

But it is evident that the historic dilemma is perhaps not yet clearly understood by the broad masses. This means that among significant sections of the working mass—and even the politically advanced sections—there has grown the belief that without a "democratic" restoration it is impossible to think of the overthrow of the capitalist régime in Italy, in other words, that democracy is the necessary prerequisite for

proletarian revolution. This way of placing the question which is dear to the hearts of our reformists, who excellently understand the reality of this play, and dear on the other hand to those who remain with the Maximalists, who do not understand what is said and what is done and are quite popular in Italy—this we must acknowledge. But the cause of this is the circumstance that the movement of the masses and, before all, the industrial proletariat, is weak relative to our Party, which was at its post to a greater or lesser degree before the middle of 1928, afterwards for many reasons significantly weakened in its activity, to which it returned only sporadically as, for example, in the case of the plebiscite of 1st May, 1929, and 1st August, 1929. Before the masses our anti-fascist politics were not yet differentiated from anti-fascism in general. It is usually known that Communists are more courageous, that they struggle and accept all possibilities of victimisation, but outside the limited circles of the proletarian advance guard the aim of our struggle was unknown. This arose from the fact that we as yet did not participate in the actual struggle of the masses, that we as yet were unable to agitate and organise the masses around partial demands, that we for many months were politically at the rear of the political advance of the masses. At the present moment there arises the struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution, which is destined to destroy fascism and capitalism. Alongside of this, Paskvine and the remainder of the opposition—and in this they are in solidarity with Serra—speak about the conflict between "concentration" and "fascism."

They foresaw a conflict of democracy with fascism or (a compromise) the democratisation of fascism. It is evident that such an outlook must have its strategical-tactical consequences. When Serra affirmed that it was a necessity for us to formulate the transition he started out from the outlook of the neo-oppositionists. The so-called "left" Bordigans, which as is easy to prove, affirmed that social-democracy was not fascism (it is, but there does not exist in social-democracy the process of reactionary regeneration of a fascist character); to start out from such a view, as Serra and the neo-oppositionists on the period of Kerensky etc., in order to come to a denial of the leading significance of the Party in the mass movement now, signifies an acknow-

ledgment and acceptance of the initiative and leadership of "democracy" in the movement of the masses in the entire period of revolution. This means to work for one's own defeat.

It is understood that from such views arises also mistakes of a social-democratic Maximalist character on the rôle of the Party and the mass. Paskvine wrote in his written platform "we cannot ourselves see the serious activity of our party *otherwise the results would be better in the present situation* (emphasis mine.—M.G.), when the activity of the party will be defending the movement of the masses, etc." This point of view divides the whole neo-opposition and it divided Serra already in 1927 when instead of putting the question of the organisation of party work with the victims of the owners, the question of the present and full political tasks of the Party was put. The restoration of the activity of the Party and the leadership of the struggle of the masses may in the opinion of the neo-opposition be realised when the activity of the Party will be defending the movement of the masses.

When the masses come into movement, without any organisation and without any kind of leadership, and upon their shoulders the Party, that is the advance guard of the proletariat, like a shield. The process of increasing activity and fighting preparation of the Party, widens the movement of the mass and gives it direction, the neo-opposition preferred the process of leading the masses from afar, from the press and illegal advances, which must gradually acquire such explosive strength which will bring the masses to insurrection.

The idea of an organised revolution, one of the characteristic ideas of Leninism, a big achievement of Leninist experience, is here completely denied. The change which was advocated by the Party leadership to bring out the slogan of mass political strikes, is declared by the opposition to be senseless and criminal. Consequently, here a discussion arose on two different political positions, about two different estimations of a situation, the future development of the revolution in Italy and the rôle which the Party must play in the continuation of the whole period of revolution and also the rôle of the social-democracy and petty bourgeoisie in this period.

What rôle can the social-democracy play in the coming events? Social democracy is fascisised in two deviations: the path of becoming "inculcated" in the fascist regime (here it is disputed in which part of the social-democracy the process of fascisisation has proceeded far enough—Rigolia, Doragona and others) and the path of an internal and independent process of fascisisation. Rigalia, Daragona and their comrades on the one side, and the leaders of "concentration" who have remained on one side, cannot to-morrow demand of the King that he calls them to take the place of Mussolini who will be dismissed in the manner of De Riviera. The difference between the fascist régime in Italy and the régime of De Riviera is not all of a secondary character; this difference is rooted in the original development of capitalism and class relations in the two countries, consequently in the original organisation which the fascisti brought to society in both countries. The rôle of the Italian social-fascists is independent of separate individual transitions from fascism to social-fascism and back again, unfolding itself at that moment when there is a definite revolutionary situation, and all this rôle comes to is the smashing of the revolutionary impulse of the masses and to give capitalism a new form of direction, a new personal, a new mass basis. In order to play this treacherous rôle, social-fascism in Italy ran to demagogy which it had already set in action in 1919-20, when it declared that it acknowledged the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in order not to be removed from the mass and the better to betray them in the moment when the masses came into movement. Of course we have in Italy other political forces which play and will play a noticeable rôle in the developing political crisis, for example, the Catholic organisations. But the question that interests us here mostly is to know, who and which force remains with the power to extort acceptance of one or the other position, in a word, in whose hands will be the initiative and leadership of the anti-fascist struggles. Either that the initiative will be in the hands of the workers and peasants, led by the proletariat and its Party, or the movement of the masses will be exploited by "democracy" (Catholics and social-fascists) in order to attempt to give capitalism a new reactionary form.



It is necessary definitely to remember that there are not two economic programmes for the Italian bourgeoisie and the economico-political essence of fascism cannot alter the personnel of the various ruling cliques.

The struggle to conquer the majority, and in consequence for the hegemony of the anti-fascist struggle, will be, therefore, not only to bring forward resolutions and publish articles in the press, but before all to occupy a definite position in the actual struggle of the masses. If we do not realise this then we shall capitulate before social-fascism. If we do not now attempt to place a proletarian and socialist impress upon the developments in our country of the mass movement, bring forward extremely violent forms and go forward under the slogan of the struggle against the organs of the fascist state ; if we deny the growing politicalisation of this movement, we shall fail to see that which is now in the present situation, the essence of what the situation has for us. The change which is of necessity in the sphere of the organisation of our activity, is before all a political change. If there is something in our change that invites criticism, then it is that it was not commenced immediately following the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. ; already, then, the analysis of the situation of things in Italy, was affirmed as a correct appraisal given by the Communist International of the world situation. But we had not then as yet found the lines of the Central directives for our work ; only later this became possible for us, though not without a breaking of the Party leadership, and this break showed how excellently opportunism can be masked when it is necessary to carry into practice the directives of the Communist International and the Party.

The struggle against neo-opportunism, is the path upon which the Party must go, in order to realise the change of its political activity. It guarantees a correct application of the change. The organisational measures which the C.C. should have taken against groups of its members has not destroyed as yet the danger of opportunism within our ranks. Opportunism threatened in the leadership in the centre and in the party apparatus, to speedily defend its position, to utilise the shortcomings in the ranks of the Party, the shortcomings of our leadership and the disposition to passivity, which appeared in the period of reactionary repression and also in the emigration decomposition which was the

successive product of political struggles conducted in artificial surroundings.

The C.C. of the Party drew the attention of comrades to the causes which nourished opportunism in our Party. This opportunism displayed itself in close connection with the tasks of struggle arising from the beginning of the growth of an anti-state mass.

The enlarged Plenum of the E.C.C.I. in its February session, clearly placed before our Party its tasks and defined the political-organisational significance of the change.

The March session of the C.C. crowned the September session ; in September we commenced the struggle against opportunism with some care, not very courageously and not very widely, as at the present time it is necessary to popularise this struggle in order not to compromise the immediate political future of our Party.

The March session of the C.C. has again a great significance for the history of our Party in that it decided to exclude from the ranks of the International Amadio Bordiga, who is the last Trotskyist leader who remained in our ranks.

In the Communist International many comrades asked themselves why was Bordiga still in our ranks. The reasons why we were late in taking measures against Bordiga depended upon a whole number of circumstances ; the first reason was the circumstance that the ideological-political struggle which liquidated Bordiga at the Third Congress of the Party (Lem., 1926) and which continued after the Third Congress, destroyed in our ranks the Bordigan ideology was at the end of 1926 interrupted by the announcement of exclusive laws and the transition of our Party to full illegality. At this time Bordiga, with a hundred others of our comrades went along one path and were exiled to an island where they remained during the last three years.

During this time many events came to pass in the world, in the International and in our Party. Trotsky was expelled from the Russian Communist Party and afterwards sent out of the territory of the republic ; the world situation changed and created elements of new revolutionary waves ; the Party was drawn into difficult struggles in which it suffered more losses, but which strengthened its importance for the masses, although it was unable to organise the masses and bring them into action under the Party leadership.

Bordiga meanwhile changed in no way his ideology, he did not revise a single one of his old views ; even when he read the article of Trotsky published in the fascist press, and when he was aware that Trotsky had been turned out of the territory of the Soviet Republics, he agreed with Trotsky and stated that "Trotsky finally had come to his point of view."

Bordiga afterwards did not shun the disgusting campaign of slander against the Party, against its leaders, against its workers ; he organised fractional work with the clear aim of destroying the loyalty of comrades in the present leadership of the Party and again conquered the Party!(8) on the basis of the Rome thesis (1922) which originated from the textbook of Bordigan tactics. But this new attack upon the Party did not resemble the complaints to struggle with fascism : as it happens on the contrary ! As it happens at the moment when Bordiga finished his period of exile he sent a question to the Minister of Internal Affairs to be asked Mussolini about a decision to allow him to remain on the Island of Ponse in order to take up there his profession as an engineer ! In his independence of the Party and the Communist International, he did not see the abyss before which he stood. For all these and others much more significant motives (the decisions of the Ninth Plenum underlined by the Sixth World Congress not to permit in the ranks of the Communist International all those who were in agreement with the position of Trotskyism) Bordiga was expelled from the C.C. a member of which he was still and out of the Party.

The expulsion of Bordiga ended a whole period in the history of our Party. About two years have passed by since the time when our Party was created and the Party has been hardened in the struggle. Bordiga was ideologically foreign to it. He remained the same conscious follower of "Maximalism" which was known when Italy was known.

However, it would be a deep mistake to think that the influence of Bordiga has been entirely destroyed in our Party. Those who believe this do not know our Party. Originating in the tribulations of the "most left" schism of the old socialist party, in the fire of civil war our Party was born with the infantile sickness of leftism. The struggle against Bordiga and Bordiganism was not easy to conduct in our Party. Bordiga is the representative of sharp reaction, as the antithesis of the disgusting, garrulous, cowardly,

depraved and endless theorists of Italian socialism. It is clear how the best part of the Italian proletariat are disposed to Bordiga.

It is necessary, therefore, for our comrades to remember that for the successful conduct of the struggle on two fronts we must firmly stand upon the foundation of the directives of the international, without delay, but without a compromise with remaining elements. During the last two years we have a little separated from the mass. Our basic task consists in restoring contact with the masses, while at the same time remaining at the head of the mass. Not to go too much ahead and not to lag behind.

It would be a mistake of a shameful character to hide that in our struggle against right opportunism we had made some kind of left mistakes. Our Communist Youth, who generally in their practical work succeed in carrying out the directives given at the December Plenum of the Y.C.I. not long ago in a few articles stated views which if they had not been immediately corrected as mistaken and dangerous, could have brought our youth on to the path of the garrulous, phrasemongering sectarians on to the path of scorning the difficulties of conquering the majority of the proletarian youth in the present situation, and could have had its consequences even in the sense of influencing the Party itself, especially in the periphery with its slogan of a change.

In Italy we are on the eve of a revolutionary situation, but we are not yet in a revolutionary situation. Here the difference is by no means small. If we do not understand this difference, this distance, we shall neglect all the work of mobilising and conquering the mass upon the basis of their daily and partial demands, we shall jump over important stages in the process of struggle for the conquest of the majority and for the hegemony of the proletariat in the anti-fascist struggle.

The 1st May is the first verification of the slogan of a change. At the moment I am not in possession of the necessary materials for deciding in what fashion we replied to the obligation we accepted for ourselves before the International and the Italian proletariat. But already the first information shows that opportunism is defeated in the Communist International and the Central Committee, and the defeated are preparing their small talk in their village kitchens and will soon be quite dead. The International has the tradition of vanquishing opportunism.

# THE SITUATION IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF FRANCE

By MAURICE THOREZ

THE attention of the Communist International has just been specially directed towards our Communist Party of France. Why was the critical assistance of the C.I. both necessary and beneficial for our Party? Would the French C.P. have taken a political line opposed to the decisions of the recent meetings of the International? By no means. The general policy of the French C.P. is in line with that laid down by the C.I. And this policy assures for it certain success in a period of sharpening class antagonisms and of the revolutionary upsurge of the proletariat. Nevertheless the activity of the Party shows great weaknesses, the principal one consisting in the continuous and persistent weakening of the Party organisation, which jeopardises the contacts of the Party with the masses. It is obvious that the problem of the membership of the Party, of its consolidation in the factories, of the circulation of its press, is closely connected with our manner of approach to the working-class, and more especially with our method of applying the correct line of the C.I. It is these questions—the great weaknesses in organisation; the attitude towards the masses, especially towards the workers who are socialists or becoming socialists, and as a pre-requisite of correct politics, the internal line of the Party—it is these questions which caused our Party to deserve the bolshevik criticism of the C.I., a criticism which was both firm and beneficial. It must be said that the leadership of the Party did to some extent pay attention to these questions, and had tried to answer them in a document addressed to all of us in the form of a "Letter to the members of the Party," but it did not give these matters sufficient attention.

## THE ORGANISATION OF THE PARTY

The most serious phenomenon which faces the C.P. of France is the composition of its membership at a moment when the correct perspective of the C.I. is being incontestably proved, since we are witnessing, a revolutionary upsurge of the proletariat. On the basis of the contradictions of French imperialism, we have

an abundance of facts marking the extension and deepening of the working-class struggle and the highest degree of consciousness and militancy. Examples of this range from the great strikes in which a large forces of police and reformist hounds are mobilised against the workers, to the more and more frequent collisions of working-class demonstrations with the flying squads. Notice must also be taken of the reaction of such events as the occurrences in Indo-China.

It is, moreover, the Party and the unitary trade unions which lead the strikes and the demonstrations, as at Piennes, Belfort, Upper Rhine, Le Boucan, or Lens and the "Wall of the Federalid."

But the Party is losing members. From a membership of 56,000 in 1926 our members have fallen to 39,000 in 1930. It is in the industrial districts that members have been lost: in the Paris district 45 per cent.; in the Troyes 49 per cent.; in Alsace Lorraine 39 per cent.; in Marseilles 42 per cent.; and—greatest loss of all—in the East district, the centre of French metallurgy, 78 per cent. The situation appears even worse when it is considered that the Party has recruited new members since 1926.

Various campaigns and the continuous work of recruitment have brought tens of thousands of workers into our ranks, of whom a large number have left the Party. There is therefore a considerable fluctuation in our cadres. Hence our problem is not only one of *gaining* new members but of *keeping* them.

Since the problem is not entirely a new one explanations have already been put forward, especially explanations of a technical kind. It is certain that radical improvements in methods of organisation must be made as well as changes in methods of recruitment. For instance, the scandal of workers vainly trying for years to join the Party must be put an end to. At the last session of the congress of metal workers of Paris out of twenty-two members applying to join the Communist Party, seventeen were applying for the second time. Many examples could be given of bureaucratism impeding recruitment or

causing a certain amount of disintegration in the Party by the lack of attention to changes.

But this is not the real problem. As the C.I. has just pointed out, the question at issue is the aptitude of the Party, its political capacity to draw every worker into revolutionary work, educating him, imbuing him with the militant bolshevik spirit which clearly perceives the revolutionary perspective, without forgetting the day-to-day struggle for minimum demands.

This profoundly practical view of the problem is confirmed by a consideration of other disturbing events.

Foremost is the drop in the circulation of *l'Humanité*. It has lost 30,000 readers out of a total of 180,000 of which Paris accounts for one third. Yet last year the defence of *l'Humanité* aroused a magnificent effort on the part of the proletariat which subscribed more than two million francs and spontaneously flung up its Defence Committees.

There is also the serious loss of the Party in all the bye-elections at the beginning of the year. Here also technical reasons can be given and ordinary weaknesses in organisation brought forward. It is our duty to be more severe in our judgment of ourselves and to seek for the true reasons for our loss of influence—for this is the question at issue—a loss of influence which cannot be excused by the objective conditions of our movement.

#### MASS WORK

The only way to meet the present difficulties of our C.P.F. is by more attention to practical work. The Party has carried on excellent campaigns of agitation which have brought it right into the heart of the masses. Its authority over the best proletarian fighters is incontestable. It has aroused and led great mass actions such as those of August 1st and March 6th. Under its leadership the First of May did to a very great extent become a revolutionary demonstration of the proletariat. But the Party does not know how to accomplish the "little" daily task and it does not know how to *organise*.

On the question of organisation there is the unpardonable mistake of the Party and of the leadership in the matter of the "Humanité" Defence Committees. The workers had spontaneously organised to collect funds for the menaced newspaper. Initiative from below had suggested and brought into existence new forms

of organisation whose members proposed to levy themselves regularly. The leadership of the Party was not able to understand the primary importance of this initiative of the masses the result of which would have been a broad organisation around the Party's paper and consequently around the Party. The *Humanité* Defence Committees were left to themselves, and it was even decided to transform them, quite unreasonably, into committees of struggle, a very different thing.

Then again the great weakness in mass work has been the lack of attention paid to partial demands, either general or in relation to a particular enterprise. There are numerous examples of militants who though fairly well qualified when it comes to events in China or America, lose hold when it is necessary to speak about factory or craft demands. Such comrades when responsible for a district can accordingly speak at length about what is happening amongst the ranks of the socialist enemies, but cannot say a word about what is going on amongst ourselves. It is this scorn of detail work which constitutes one of the greatest obstacles to the increase of the Party's influence and to the strengthening of its organisations. The effects of this are felt in the Party's trade union work. The same defect is often witnessed in the trade union centres under the influence of the Party. Further there is a tendency to treat the relations between the Party and the trade unions mechanically. Communist ideology has made great progress in the C.G.T.U. and the general leadership of the working-class movement by the Communist Party, is fully recognised. But this does not exempt us from specific trade union work such as the broad organisation of the masses on the basis of joint demands. The leadership of the Party has already had to combat the tendency to "give orders" to the trade unions and to limit the latter's functions and activities. The carrying out of the First of May campaign in the Paris district was marked by this tendency to relegate the trade union organisation to the background. Now that unemployment is about to begin in France we have had powerful trade unions mobilising the masses of the worst paid industrial workers and the associating together, without distinction, of the French and the immigrant workers. One must note here the almost

complete absence of work amongst the workers belonging to the C.G.T. which is a mistake in view of the repeated attempts of the yellow organisations to smash strikes even for minor demands, thus performing their function in the interplay of the bourgeois and reformist organs for the carrying out of imperialist policy.

#### THE UNITED FRONT TACTIC AND OUR ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE SOCIALIST PARTY

The mistakes and weaknesses in the tactic of the united front are connected with the question of mass work. As the Political Bureau has pointed out in its letter to the Party, the tactic of the united front has, so to speak, been forgotten. It is no longer used. Or it is badly used, in a way which is a caricature; a few workers hastily meet together and form the united front, even if they are members of sympathetic organisations. But the most important point of all is that the united front tactic is not applied. The indispensable correction of Party policy which led to the tactic of "*class against class*" necessarily laid it down that the united front tactic consisted in mobilising under the leadership of our Party, and against the bourgeoisie and the *socialist organisations*, all the workers including the socialist workers. This was forgotten by the Party and united front action is rare; especially the *effective organisation* of the united front in struggle, particularly in the factory. Owing to lack of sufficient work of this kind strikes have been broken by the reformist leadership (the East) and many demonstrations against social democrats were not able to achieve the required amount of breadth and influence.

The failure of the united front is moreover closely connected with an undoubted retreat of the Party in face of the social democratic campaigns. In the objective conditions of the hitherto more slowly developing crisis in France, social democracy has retained the basis of its influence, and, helped by the mistakes or weaknesses of the Communist Party, has even widened it. Now that only the symptoms of the approaching crisis are being revealed, a section of the workers and of the politically backward middle strata, believes it will find salvation in the social democracy which has not yet been actually in power. The government as it appears from the speech of Tardieu at Dijon, help to create this illusion, delivering violent

attacks on the Communist Party for the benefit so he declared, of the French section of the Second International.

Confronted with the effect of these causes, the increase in the influence of social democracy at the same time as its increasing fascisation, the reaction of the Party was hesitating and partially incorrect. Certainly the leadership of the C.P. of France appreciated exactly the nature and the policy of the social democracy, but it was not able to reply vigorously and effectively to the latter's campaigns. It may be said that for some time the C.P. lost initiative and almost retired to a defensive position. Not able to go beyond the use of formulas and clichés concerning "social fascism" and give clear and popular expositions of every event marking the fascisation of social democracy, it could not win over the workers and encouraged two tendencies in respect of our policy towards the socialist party.

The first of these tends as a result of the fear engendered by the socialist successes to revise our line of attack against social democracy; to the liquidation of our policy of "class against class." The second tendency which displays an equal terror in face of the temporary progress of the socialists, pictures the socialist party as an established fascist bloc and ends in repudiating the united front. It refuses to differentiate between the leaders and the cadres of the socialist party which consciously carry out the work of imperialism, and the workers who still remain in the socialist party. This last tendency has developed especially in the north. Up to a point it indicates the fundamental break of our militant Communists with social democracy still strong in that district, and the real hatred of the Communist workers for the social-fascist leaders. But it nevertheless constitutes a danger when it comes to the point of classing together the socialist miners of the north with the Boncours and the Jouhaux. The leadership of the Party saw the danger of these two deviations and both pointed them out and fought against them in a special letter to the Communists of the North.

#### THE FIGHT ON BOTH FRONTS

The above short exposition of the most palpable problems of the French Communist Party and especially what has been related

concerning the application of their policy, shows that the internal resistance to the Party line, and the deviations from that line are manifest in two directions. There still persists, as the principal danger, the opportunist "right" deviation, there also exist as a danger threatening the contacts with the masses, the "left" deviations which have developed partly in reaction to opportunism but with social bases which merge into those of "right" opportunism. Both are derived from the confusion engendered by the difficulties of the moment and the complexity of the Party's tasks—although in the case of one they mean retreat and in the case of the other a "jump."

The opportunist deviation was vigorously fought by the leadership of the Party, the core of it being the ten-year struggle against the democratic and reformist, the anarcho-syndicalist and parliamentary survivals. Against the elements which personify these deviations, one of the last acts in this struggle for the bolshevisation of the C.P.F. ended in the expulsion from the Party of the clique of nationalist adventurers who had been contaminating the Communist organisations of Alsace and Lorraine, and of the decomposed politicians of the municipal council of Paris. The whole International gave its approval to our Party in this struggle for the correction of our policy and the consequences this entailed in organisation. Nevertheless, our leadership may be reproached for not having carried on this struggle deep enough among the masses, especially in the case of the renegades Sellier and Co., and their group already directed towards social-fascism.

The leadership was also weakened in its struggle against opportunism by its allowing one of the principal reports made at the National Congress of the Party to be made by a comrade who was politically vacillating, and who had on several occasions shown serious deviations of an opportunist kind from the policy of the Party. In consequence of the fact that almost the whole leadership was either in prison or wanted by the police, this comrade, provisionally, made a personal report, in which he estimated "that there was no need to speak of opportunism" and concentrated on "mechanical" shortcomings. Uneasiness resulted in the Conference and all through the Party. More so, because the position taken up by the comrade who gave the

report showed serious divergencies from the Party policy as was demonstrated in the subsequent discussion.

But the main weakness of the leadership was shown in its hesitation in waging the "struggle on both fronts," which was evidence of an underestimation of the "left" danger. It is true that the leadership perceived the "left" deviations and pointed them out in the "Letter to the Party"; giving up of the united front with the socialist workers, abandonment of partial demands, "mechanisation" of the trade unions, "verbiage" and "sectarianism" which cuts the Party off from the masses and weakens the organisation. Nevertheless it did not know how to "take the bull by the horns" and formulate in bolshevik fashion as the C.I. has just expressly told them to, the question of the "struggle on the two fronts."

This is not a matter of a simple formula but of understanding that the Party will not accomplish its tasks without a vigorous struggle against opportunism in every respect, a struggle which cannot be waged consistently if the "left" deviations in all their manifestations are not simultaneously striven against.

#### THE LEADERSHIP AND THE CADRES OF THE PARTY

In declaring that the general line of the Party is correct and that its mistakes proceed from an insufficient application of that line, the whole importance of the problem of the leadership and the cadres of the Party is emphasised.

In so far as the leadership of the Party is concerned, or, more exactly, its Political Bureau, it is satisfactory to note that it has been vindicated in essentials. With many members imprisoned and almost all the rest of them wanted by the police, the P.B. was able to give proof of its stability in a difficult period. The liberation of the imprisoned members and their resumption of responsible positions did not cause any shock; so firm did the homogeneity of the leadership, formed on the basis of principles, prove itself to be.

The only difficulties which arose were on the one hand with comrade Vassart, provisional secretary, who spoke against the line of the P.B. at the National Congress, and on the other hand with Comrade Doriot, who acknowledged his past opportunist mistakes and who although outwardly working, did not actively participate in

the work of the leadership. This must stop. Yet there is now a question of reforming the leadership, in the direction of a more effective and efficacious realisation of the Party policy. It is a question of limiting the numbers of the P.B. (seven members and two candidates instead of thirteen and four) in order to give it greater flexibility and to restore to the C.C. its function and authority of general and decisive leadership. For it must be stated that the C.C. has only met twice since August 1st, the last time being in February. This is both abnormal and dangerous. With the same ends in view there will also be a transformation of the secretariat of the Party which numbered six members of the P.B. and which accordingly was becoming an actual P.B. itself. In future only one comrade of the P.B. will direct the secretariat which will be made up of members of the C.C., and charged primarily with the quick execution of the decisions of the P.B., controlling the carrying out of these decisions by all ranks of the Party.

Similar modifications in structure are also necessary in the leadership of the districts and locals. The district committees work little or not at all. The bureaux are little parliaments and the feeling of responsibility is not sufficiently developed. It is, moreover, more than a question of organisation. In reality the problem which confronts the Party is that of its cadres. None of the many tasks incumbent on the Party can be carried out without a qualitative and quantitative improvement in its intermediate and basic cadres. It must be admitted that there has not been sufficient effort on the part of the leadership to achieve this end, to form and train new cadres and also to *retrain and assimilate the old cadres*. Good politics in the cadres is the measure of the effort made by the leadership to convince and persuade the whole Party ideologically and politically.

#### SELF-CRITICISM

The principal shortcoming of the leadership of the Party during the last period, has been its inability to make use of the weapon of self-criticism. There was plenty of criticism here and there and especially in the P.B., but there was no "self-criticism by the masses" stimulating the whole Party to accomplish its tasks.

Yet the Party is ready for this bolshevik self-criticism. It is waiting for it and there have been signs of local initiative. For instance, after the First of May, when the leadership did not make public the critical and serious study of that day of struggle in which it had been engaged, some local organisations made their self-criticism *before the masses*, and sent their reckoning of failure and achievement to the Party paper. This shows what might be done, what will be done, for the development of initiative by the members and the organisations of the Party.

#### TASKS AND CONCLUSIONS

The tasks of the C.P.F. are many, but for the immediate future the effort of the whole Party must absolutely be concentrated on certain definite objectives, to attain their early realisation through the First of August and the campaign for the tenth anniversary of the Party.

(1) Stem the fluctuation in membership and increase the number of Party members once more to 55,000 at the same time creating or consolidating the factory cells.

(2) Increase the number of readers of *l'Humanite* to 200,000 and organise a strong network of Humanity: "Defence Committees"

(3) Intensive recruitment into the red trade unions especially in the large enterprises.

In order to accomplish these three tasks in addition to the real problems of the working-class movement and the class war, the Party must learn to formulate and popularise partial demands; not to seem only the Party of the revolution of to-morrow, but also the only Party of the everyday struggle in the factory and in every sphere. All this entails also a tremendous amount of organisational work to convey the watchwords of the Party—as in the struggle against the workers' contribution to social insurance—to large factory meetings; to rally and organise the majority of the working-class on this basis and by a judicious application of the united front from below; to popularise without delay the idea of committees of unemployed and to bring them into being under the aegis of the military trade unions as the crisis develops, paying special attention to the question of foreign labour; to be able better to prepare for and lead all economic struggles, all strikes.

# PROBLEMS OF THE FRENCH PARTY

By COMRADE BARBE

**I**N the report which I am about to give, my object is to explain to all our comrades the general reasons which induced the Central committee of our Party to issue an extremely important document, addressed to our Party as a whole, which we consider to be of decisive importance for the immediate future and the immediate tasks of our Party. The object of that document is to explain the origins of our policy, for that is the central question which must be understood by everybody. We ourselves have realised that we could not deal with all the problems facing our movement without the criticism and suggestions of the C.I.

The formal origin of the political letter addressed to our comrades was the Party centre's summing up of the National Conference of the C.P. of France. The last national conference of our Party revealed some extremely interesting facts both to the centre and to the Party as a whole.

If we examine the Conference itself, its composition, it was a good conference, for of 150 delegates, 100 were factory workers, many of them workers from large factories; but one of the grave defects in the Conference was that, with this good composition, there were many discussions in which the rank and file members took no active part at all; that was one of the greatest weaknesses of the National Conference of the C.P.F. This means that there is in our Party—and this represents an extremely grave political and organisational state of affairs in our Party—the old active group of militants who do not try to draw in all the new elements which have come over to us in the recent period of struggle, whose main political concern is not to make these latter share actively in Party policy.

Is there anything new for the Party centre in this? No; but it is a striking confirmation of that conviction, and it demonstrates the urgent necessity of carrying through a number of political and organisational measures in order to abolish this system of stifling the rank and file which exists in our Party; at the present time we still have a large number of intermediary cadres in the Party districts which form a barrier between the Party centre and the proletarian

basis of the Party, a number of intermediary cadres which do not correspond to the new social composition of the Party, to the influx of new workers into the Party.

How were the political problems dealt with in the preparations for the Conference and at the Conference itself, and what were those problems?

The principal problems put forward by the leadership and the Central Committee of the Party were, first of all, the question of preparing for mass political strikes, not merely from the general point of view, but with the objective of May Day, 1930, in mind. This was the big question which was at the basis of all the preparations and discussions prior to the national Conference of our Party, but obviously this question and this objective required the Party to deal with a number of other questions. Were these questions discussed in the whole Party with the necessary care? No! What was the cause of this? It arose particularly from the fact that the Party leadership itself had not examined these questions thoroughly.

The National Conference of our Party was marked by a wholly characteristic political incident. All the reports which were presented had been drawn up by the C.C. or the P.B. The reporters, therefore, were comrades who were in the name of the Party leadership and who should have defended the collective thought of the Party leadership. But there was one comrade, Vassart, who, at the National Conference defended, not the opinions of the collective leadership of our Party, but his personal opinion of our Party policy.

What did Vassart defend at the National Conference, and what conclusions can be drawn from his report? At the Conference itself, this comrade tried to revise the policy of our Party on two essential questions. The first was the question of the Party's leading rôle, a question of elementary principle. Vassart took about an hour to try to explain to the Conference that at the present time the danger which threatens us is to affirm too strongly, and to achieve too completely, this leading rôle of the Party. That was the first question. The second important



question raised by Vassart, under the pretext of fighting a number of deviations—sectarian, mechanical and pseudo-left opinions, was the attempt to revise the fundamental policy of our Party in the struggle against opportunism. At the Conference Vassart took up the attitude that, since there were no opportunists at the Conference, the Party should only struggle against the left danger.

Of course, it is one way of putting the question. Even if there were no opportunists present at the Conference, a responsible comrade of the Political Bureau never has the right to think that he is speaking only for the 150 delegates; he is speaking for the whole Party; he should put forward the opinion of the leadership for the Party as a whole. But what was more serious was the fact that there were some typical opportunists at the Conference. What did these opportunists, such as Guy Jerram, do? All these comrades, after Vassart had finished speaking, declared themselves in complete agreement with him—no struggle against opportunism. At the Party Conference there was a political grouping of the opportunists around Comrade Bassart, directed, of course, against the policy of the P.B. of the Party.

You may ask, why was Comrade Vassart asked to report to the Conference. Because Comrade Vassart was a member of the Political Bureau, secretary of the Central Party trade union department, and he was asked to give the report of the P.B. in order to make him face up squarely to the job, either of defending the P.B. or of revealing himself before the Party Conference. We have now exposed him before the National Conference of the Party, and before the Party as a whole. Later we investigated Comrade Vassart's opinions, in a thorough discussion with him, from this discussion it was clear that the matter was not one of disagreement on detail, but disagreement on principle. Comrade Vassart revealed to the Party leadership a number of wholly incorrect political opinions. On the estimation of the working-class movement in France, which is obviously the most tangible question to which to relate and apply Party policy, Comrade Vassart stated, both during and after the discussion, that he considered the Party policy to be too far in advance for some sections of workers, and too much in the rear for other sections. This

means that in general he considers the Party policy to be too far in advance of the mass movement.

What is really the position in our Party at the present time? In face of political events, in face of the development of the situation and the rate at which problems arise and confront us, the Party reveals a number of inadequacies and deviations from the policy of the Party and the C.I. which we examined during the discussion of the P.B. and which we have put down in this document, submitted to our Party and to the C.I.

These distortions of our policy are encountered in every sphere, in our appreciation of the situation, in our analyses, in our tactics, our strategy, and the objectives of our work. Let us take some examples. What views are to be found in our Party concerning the economic crisis and its application to France? There are some comrades who maintain—not openly, for that would expose them at once—that at the present time French capitalism occupies an exceptional and privileged position in the general development of the economic crisis. The comrades do not formulate this opinion, as clearly and as brutally as I have done; but there are comrades in the districts who say this. In the east, to take a particular example, what does Comrade Guy Jerram say? He is of the opinion that French capitalism is in a prosperous and exceptional situation which does not permit us to say that France manifests those symptoms and conditions which would draw French capitalism into the economic crisis. Better still, this comrade claims that this applies not only to France, but to his particular district as well. On the theory of the inequality in the development of the crisis, he maintains that the metallurgical industry in France still occupies an exceptional position within French capitalism which means, for his district, that we should not and cannot speak of a crisis which may develop because French heavy industry—this is the actual phrase employed by another comrade from the same district—is in a prosperous and exceptional situation which prevents it from being drawn into the economic crisis.

You are aware that the Enlarged Presidium described the economic situation in France and the French aspect of the economic crisis from the following angle: France may be described as a

country where we can speak of a pre-crisis. We are entirely in agreement with that, but there are some comrades, the opportunists, who proceed from this formulation to say: You see, we cannot talk of a crisis in France, we can only talk of a pre-crisis. What did we say in reply to that? We say that the formulation of the Enlarged Presidium must not be utilised in this fashion. The formulation of the pre-crisis is quite correct for our country; it means that in France we are only in the period when the symptoms of crisis are gathering, when the developments taking place in some industries, more than in others, such as in textiles, leather and hides, enable us to say that we are approaching a crisis; but pre-crisis does not mean no crisis; we cannot say that. This will show you how the judgments of the C.I. are distorted. There is also the contrary form of distortion. There are in our Party comrades who do everything in the name of a complete economic crisis, who speak of the economic crisis in France as one can speak of it in the U.S.A. or Germany. There are also comrades who describe daily events in the language of a complete economic crisis.

These distortions are apparent in a number of other questions besides the analysis of the situation; in the estimation of the mass movement, for example, typically opportunist ideas are encountered. Some comrades sum up the evolution of the working-class movement in the sense, not of the radicalisation of the working-class, but of a slowing down in the working-class movement. There is also the distortion which consists in hiding the necessity for mass work to direct, to advance and to organise the working-class movement, under left phrases about the progress of the movement, which develops of its own accord.

There have been of late a number of significant strikes. There was, for example, the strike of building workers in the Paris area, which mobilised ten to eleven thousand navvies and cement workers. How was this strike mismanaged? It was mismanaged by comrades who, in general, are in agreement with the policy of our Party. These comrades considered the strike in a most mechanical fashion, without explaining the contents of the movement, without explaining the demands which were at the basis of the movement, without preparatory

work at the yards and shops where the builders work, in order to ensure the maximum amount of effectiveness to the movement. This was an example of the typically mechanical fault of launching a movement without serious preparation. What did the comrades say in justification? "But why ask all these questions about preparation when the majority of Paris building workers are organised in the unions? Where is the need for all this work to prepare the movement?"

Why do all this mass work? Why—for example, carry out the directions given by the Party leadership for building workers in the Paris area? These directions were: the immediate organisation of real committees of struggle in the shops; the organisation of a building workers' congress in the Paris area before the strike. Our comrades launched the strike without carrying out these directions. But the strike once begun, they committed another mistake, that of wishing to enlarge the strike, with the same "contents". This strike was carried through purely on trade union discipline; this is an extremely interesting fact; the navvies in the Paris area struck on trade union discipline, because they were told by the leading body of their union; from to-morrow you will strike. Without exactly understanding the contents of the struggle 10,000 building workers came out on strike, but did not fight. It was, as they say, an invisible strike. In Paris, for the first time, we witnessed a strike of building workers, that is, of most militant elements, without a trace of struggle. It was very difficult to get a few hundred building workers to tackle some scabs.

This same strike gave us a picture of another aspect of the question—the sabotage of a number of opportunists; for example, the leaders of the cement workers' union, who should have rendered the utmost support to the workers, sabotaged the movement, prevented the cement workers from taking an active part; they sabotaged openly.

Many similar cases could be quoted.

Let us take May Day this year. What is our opinion of May Day in France this year? It is that, in spite of a number of weaknesses in our Party in preparation and leadership for that day, the 1st of May was a political success for our Party and for the French revolutionary trade

unions. There was a great political mass strike. May Day, 1930, was much better than May Day, 1929, and it took place in objectively favourable political conditions, but in unfavourable conditions as far as our movement was concerned. We must not forget that preparations for May Day were made by a completely illegal body, while the 1929 demonstration was organised in quite different conditions. What else did May Day show? A considerable increase in the level of the struggle of the provincial workers. For the first time in the French provinces there was an almost complete break—I say almost complete—with the old traditions of May Day, in particular with the tradition of united demonstrations with the reformists and the social democracy. You know that in France, even in 1929, there were in the provinces united demonstrations with the social democracy and the reformist machinery.

This year, in the majority of industrial centres, we broke both politically and practically with these traditions and there were special contingents of the C.G.T.U. and the C.P. In the north, where the social democracy is even stronger from the point of view of its influence over the proletariat, in all the industrial centres and in all the towns except Lille, the majority of the workers demonstrated with our Party and the C.G.T.U. There were some cases where the reformists rallied four hundred workers while we had four to five thousand, and that in spite of police intervention. In the north, the home of social democracy, May the First showed that the majority of the active workers demonstrated behind our banners, and not behind the banners of the social democrats, except at Lille, where they had two thousand workers more than we did.

This was true of all the provinces, we could take more precise examples, living examples of the changes which have taken place in the provinces in regard to May Day. In some provincial centres the demonstrations were organised in agreement with the municipal authorities and the prefect; the route was mapped out in consultation with the prefect, and that route was followed. In a number of towns where this took place, attempts were made to compel us to follow the usual route, and our comrades broke from the old custom and fought the police all day in order to follow the route

they desired. These facts indicate a considerable rise in the level of the struggle and the militancy of the workers, in their class consciousness and their understanding of political mass struggle. In the Paris area more workers downed tools than on previous May Days; the importance of this is increased by the fact that new groups of workers took part, for example, the workers at the *Produits Chimiques* concern.

In the Paris area, however, although there were great strikes, there was great weakness on our part, criminal weakness I would say, if we do not eliminate it immediately; this weakness was expressed in the fact that although hundreds of thousands of workers came out on strike, we were unable to rally these workers of Paris, not for their organisation into unions, but to take part in the May Day demonstration; for there were no real mass demonstrations in Paris this year, only scattered demonstrations in the suburbs.

In this respect Paris was far behind the provinces. Why was this? Was it because Paris workers are less militant than those in the provinces? Some comrades may hold this opinion, but we do not share it. The workers of Paris are just as militant as the provincial workers. But in Paris our Party has not yet succeeded in discovering the political, strategic, and practical methods of mobilising these masses and bringing them out to demonstrate on the streets. We had decided to hold the demonstration at the La Saute prison, as the question of repression and the demand for the liberation of Marty, etc., would appeal to the workers. We had drawn up all our plans for the demonstration and what happened was that the workers did not know of these plans, that we had failed to make them known to the large body of strikers and that it was only a small company of workers who turned up at La Saute and they, of course, were arrested by the dozen.

Let us take another case. Last Sunday there was a demonstration at the Wall in Paris.\* We are told that 50,000 workers took part, and the whole thing was done in opposition to the police, who prohibited placards, banners, singing, etc. The workers of Paris raised their banners and sang; they had their demonstration. Why did we succeed in getting a mass demonstration in

\*The wall of the cemetery where the Communards were shot down in 1871.

Paris on May 25th and not on May Day? Is it because the one tradition is so strong? That played its part, but the May Day tradition is also strong for it made thousands of workers strike. Consequently, the failure of May Day is entirely our own failure.

This capital weakness, however, does not diminish the importance of the fact that May Day, 1930, was the occasion of a great political mass strike whose political content was quite clear to the workers: the struggle against the Tardieu government and against the fascist and police dictatorship, against the social democracy which helps the government and the struggle for the open existence of our organisations, etc. These slogans rallied the workers. This is the important fact which emerges from May Day. What else did May Day show? It showed that there is now in France a mass movement which is developing both in quality and in extent.

And there are some comrades among us who do not share this opinion, opportunist elements who deny or minimise the importance of this development in the mass movement, whom we must fight mercilessly.

Another problem which faces our Party, and which raises a number of related questions, is a correct appreciation of the rôle of social democracy. This is a capital question for the future work of our Party. In considering this problem at the present time we find a number of ideas and opinions contrary to those held by the leadership of the Party. There are some comrades who are taken in by the new social democratic offensive. In France the social democrats are carrying out a new offensive in every possible form, and in forms which are new to us.

There is more than the work of the socialist party as a party, or of the C.G.T. as a trade union organisation; there are a number of new political formations which strengthen this social democratic offensive against the working-class and against ourselves; their struggle is conducted in the name of a struggle against reaction, against fascism and against Tardieu. It is clear that this social democratic demagogy, if we are not armed as we should be, involves the risk of giving rise to certain illusions, not only among the workers in general, but also in certain sections of our Party itself; it has already

created illusions on the question of the character and rôle of social democracy.

What are these new forms adopted by the social democracy? Firstly, more intense mass work. There are some towns in France where the social democrats have held no meetings since the split in 1920 and where, in 1930, they have run large mass meetings. In several instances our comrades have not answered the social democrats, they have not attempted to mobilise the workers against this new social-democratic offensive, they have allowed the social democrats to establish contact with the workers.

The reformist trade unions are also being utilised in this new social democratic offensive. These trade unions are making tremendous efforts to increase their influence and to organise the workers; unions have been established in the metallurgical and in several other industries. In the east, which is by far the most important centre of the French metallurgical industry, this movement has gone as far as the creation of an executive committee uniting all the reformist forces in the French, Belgian and Luxemburgian industries and maintaining contact between the French, German, Belgian and Luxemburgian trade union federations; the object of this step is to win mastery of the movement, not in the interests of the workers, but in order to serve the captains of heavy industry. I could quote several examples to prove that in the "red" towns, as they are called, where our Party for the first time gained decisive influence, the reformists are taking up the question of forming trade unions. These facts indicate the extent of the social democratic offensive.

The political aim of the social democrats is to win power in order to be able to carry out the policy of the bourgeoisie with the maximum number of workers behind them; this is their objective, as the social democrats themselves cynically admit. The social democracy is used by the French bourgeoisie, not as a governmental body which is in power, but as an oppositional body, as a force destined to deceive the workers and to prevent us from winning the leadership of the movement. The French bourgeoisie has already made great progress in the ability to use the social democracy. Let us take the case of by-elections, at which we suffered a great political setback. In two of

these elections, Berguac and Lorient, bourgeois reactionaries, even the most extreme reactionaries of Brittany, openly voted for the socialist party candidate. At Bergerac the priests and the bishop voted for the socialist candidate.

This is not the only lesson which the by-elections have to teach us. We lost votes at those elections. Why? Mainly because our Party was not well enough armed to expose the new social democratic offensive, because our comrades did not understand the offensive clearly enough to be able to convince the workers of its real meaning. Moreover, in these by-elections, our Party displays a great weakness. We are inclined to attach too little importance to them, in a reaction against over-emphasis. Our comrades in charge of the district wrote: "What do you want us to do in the by-elections? We are getting ready for May Day for strikes, for fighting for our demands. The by-elections don't interest us." That is how the scorn in which this form of mass work is held is translated by the rank and file. Obviously we must correct this, and our work in this direction has already begun with the election at Puteaux.

United front tactics encounter great resistance in the Party, which is manifested in attempts to revise the tactics of "class against class," and in the doubts expressed by some comrades as to the correctness of a united struggle with social democratic and reformist workers. This has happened in the Lyons district. There is also another aspect of this attempt to abolish united front tactics, represented in this delegation itself by Comrade Deleuze, who maintains that in general no great distinction can be made between the social democratic machine, the social democratic workers and those workers outside, but under the influence of social democracy. Deleuze is here, and we shall ask him to explain why he holds this opinion and give us an indication of the facts on which it is based. It will be of interest to us and to the C.I. Deleuze is an excellent comrade working in the northern district of the Party; in 1927 he was the only one in that district who agreed with the Party's electoral policy and he has fought hard against all opportunist deviations. But in this fight, Comrade Deleuze is likely to commit a grave mistake by not working energetically enough to establish a united front among the workers in

order to win them away from social democratic influence—unless we succeed in convincing him. And we shall convince him.

A great deal has been said about the "struggle on two fronts." Can this formula help our Party? Might it not become a slogan which, instead of helping, will only confuse the issue and put obstacles in the way of carrying on an effective struggle against the principal danger in our Party? We think that this formula of a struggle on two fronts, involves the risk of setting the Party's attention in the wrong direction, for we must not forget the formation and the development of our Party. Everybody knows that the formation of our Party is typically social-democratic. It is the formation of a Party which has passed through all the bourgeois democratic and social democratic traditions. On the other hand, in the present situation, with the formidable social democratic offensive, the chief danger which threatens us in the possibility of our ranks being penetrated by social democratic influence and the illusions to which the offensive may give rise. In addition, we must consider the state of organisation in our Party. If we take any Party district, even Paris, we can say that opportunism is the chief danger. Admitted that there are a number of comrades who try to hide their opportunism behind left phrases. On the other hand, we can observe a number of sectarian and mechanical deviations in our Party. We have dealt with them in our document.

But I think that in the present state of affairs the thing that we have to fight is opportunism, and one of the conditions for victory over opportunism is an understanding throughout the Party that we must get rid of all deviations, sectarian, pseudo-left and left. This is an essential condition for success because there are a number of comrades who are taking advantage of this caricature of Party policy to spread the belief that it represents the real policy of the Party, and to ask for a revision of the Party's policy. There are other comrades who, using the cry of a battle on two fronts, give up the fight against opportunism, making the struggle on two fronts merely a struggle against the left danger. As far as France is concerned, we cannot say that the struggle against the lefts is as important as the struggle against opportunism. The chief fight must be directed against

opportunist deviations, which give rise to the worst obstacles in carrying out our work, and in carrying on this struggle against opportunism, we must eliminate all left deviations and convince comrades such as Deleuze of the incorrectness of their attitude to united front tactics.

It is in this form, and with this content, that we should put forward the question of the struggle on two fronts, not drily and mechanically, but with a clear explanation to the Party that opportunism represents the main danger and that one of the conditions for overcoming this danger is the elimination of left deviations.

Another question which I wish to raise is that of the new objectives which have been laid down. These new objectives, which are contained in our letter, include preparations for the congress of the Workers' International Relief and for August 1st as a political mass strike of French workers in defence of the U.S.S.R.

A matter which requires emphasis is our opinion of the state of organisation in the Party and the methods which must be used to carry out the Party policy; the two essential questions which arise in this connection are, firstly, the renewal of the Party cadres by bringing new forces on to the leading bodies of the Party; and secondly, an increase of mass recruitment into our Party.

Recently we have had some experience of renewing Party cadres, of strengthening them with workers; we collected statistics on this—that does not happen very often—and published the figures relating to changes in the district committees of the Party, showing that there has been some progress made in the proletarian composition of those committees by the entry of factory workers. But that in itself is not enough, and we have employed other methods, such as district schools for the systematic training of the district leadership and more direct contact between the Party centre and the districts. This contact is maintained not only by delegates from the Central Committee to the districts, but also by the despatch of political documents containing the leadership's opinions about each district. We have, for example, sent a political letter to all the members of the Paris, eastern and northern districts.

Another question which arises in connection with any estimation of our capacity to carry out

our tasks is that of our central press organ, *l'Humanité*, which is at the present time, our Party's chief weapon. At times it acts, as it were, as a substitute for Party organisation, and consequently it is always one of the most important questions to be dealt with by the Party leadership in any serious discussion about carrying out Party policy. In the Paris district we have lost 10,000 readers of *l'Humanité*, out of a total of 38,000, but since then, following changes in the paper, we have won back two to three thousand. This is not the case with our paper in general, for if we lost 10,000 readers in the Paris district, in the provinces we have maintained our circulation, and in certain cases increased it. The loss in Paris is due precisely to the Party paper's failure to respond to one of the most important questions now current in the Paris district, its failure to explain the position in regard to the renegades, the P.O.P. and the minority in the C.G.T.U.

On this question, comrades, we have been wholly inadequate and we have displayed great weaknesses. For example, we have not explained to the workers that the P.O.P. is really a part of social democracy; we have not explained clearly that the minority is really one form of the new reformist offensive. Very often *l'Humanité* failed to deal with the mass work which we have conducted against the renegades, with our meetings in the trade unions, our workers' conferences in the Paris district, our counter-demonstrations to the renegades.

I shall now deal with the last question, the problems of the Party leadership.

In this meeting which we are holding here, we have several times discussed a report on our Party conference, and on this question of the Party leadership opinions have been expressed which are far from being clear and which are, in our opinion, partly erroneous. For example, it has been stated that the leadership of our Party has recently returned to that policy of personal combinations, not based on principle, which characterised the life of the French Party some years ago. Comrades, we cannot agree with that statement. Not only has there not been any personal combinations in the leadership of our Party in recent times, but all the positive work of the Party leadership, all the political problems by which we have been faced, have been dealt with on the basis of principle

and this has resulted in political differentiation within the leadership. Our difference with Vassart is not a question of personal politics, our discussions with him have no personal content. We have fought Vassart because he is developing ideas about our movement which are fundamentally incorrect and opportunist.

It is wholly incorrect to say that there has been a return to the policy of personal combinations, such as there was in the time of Treint, in the leadership of our Party.

The essential weakness in the Party leadership is our extremely great theoretical weakness ; we are continually being made aware of this, and it

explains the slowness with which we react to certain questions. There is, for example, the question of the social democracy, of understanding correctly the character of the new social democratic offensive. Why were we so slow in reacting to this question ? Because of our theoretical and consequently our political weakness. How can we raise the theoretical and political level of our Party ? By improving the theoretical and political discussions in the Party leadership. In order to achieve this, stronger contact must be established with the C.I. This closer contact is one of the essential conditions for improving the political character of our Party leadership.

---

---

# **THE DAILY WORKER**

**An Essential Weapon  
In The Fight Against  
THE WAR DANGER**

**Build It Into The Workers' Lives**

---

---