

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 6 No. 88

PRESS

20th December 1926

CORRESPONDENCE

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

VII. Meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.

Second to Seventh Session.

Fall Report.

Second Session.

Moscow, November 23rd, 1926.

The chairman, Comrade Kolarov, opened the session at 7 p. m. In the name of former political prisoners and political exiles Comrade Felix Kohn greeted the Plenum.

Comrade FELIX KOHN:

Dear Comrades:

I greet you on behalf of the Moscow section of the Society of Former Political Prisoners and Political Exiles. (Applause.)

In our ranks, comrades, are representatives of all political generations. In our ranks we even have a comrade who fought upon the barricades of the Paris Commune (Applause). We have among us, comrades, those who were sentenced to death, we have comrades among us who spent twenty years in the Schlüsselberg Fortress.

Among our members there are workers, peasants, sailors and soldiers who, in the last years on the eve of the overthrow of Czarism, were condemned to prison labour by the dying absolutism. Comrades, many of those who now belong to our organisation are no longer able physically to continue active work for the revolution. Those who are still able to do so — they are in the ranks of the Party, in the ranks of the revolutionists. Those who are no longer physically able, follow tensely every working class movement, every struggle as it proceeds. And all these comrades, who have now come together at a time when the VII. Enlarged Executive of the Communist International is in session, have sent me here to bring you their greetings. These comrades have adopted the following

Resolution of Greeting

"The general meeting of the members of the Moscow Section of the Society of Former Political Prisoners and Political Exiles hails — in the delegates to the VII. Enlarged Executive

of the Communist International, — the vanguard of the innumerable millions of proletarians and toiling peasantry of all countries and colonies who are now rising in the struggle for their emancipation.

The Moscow Section of this society numbers in its ranks about 1000 revolutionists who have fought against Czarism, and who included the most varied parties and generations. In our ranks we have comrades who fought even upon the barricades of the Paris Commune, we have veterans of the revolutionary propaganda and terrorist struggle of the 'seventies' of the past century, those who have spent whole decades in the Czarist dungeons, and also young workers, soldiers and sailors who fell into the claws of Czarism shortly before its downfall.

This thousand revolutionists, men and women, have had to pay a total of 8000 years of suffering and torture in the prisons of bloody Czarism because, instead of taking the peaceful life of bourgeois well-being, they preferred to take up the red banner of revolutionary socialism and to merge their personal destiny with the fate of the workers and peasants who carry on the struggle for the emancipation of toiling mankind from every exploitation and oppression.

Our Society of Former Political Prisoners and Political Exiles knows from personal experience that the closer an oppressor class and its despotic government is forced by History to the brink of its yawning grave, the more bestial will become its tortures and the more desperate the struggle for the continuance of its atrocious existence.

We see in the present moment the bacchanalia of the bloody White Terror which has tortured or destroyed thousands, even more bestially than did the Czarist autocracy, thousands from among the ranks of the millions-strong masses of revolutionary workers and peasants who are waging their struggle for emancipation from world capitalism, beginning from Japan, China and Indonesia, crossing India and the countries of the Near East, Italy, the European "democracies" over to the "democracy" of the American billionaires.

To all these victims of World Capital, we former victims of Czarist Despotism send, through you, our Warmest Fraternal Greetings (Applause).

We see in this bacchanalia of bestial White Terror definite signs that the triumph of the international Communist revolution is approaching and we are proud to greet in you, the delegates to the Enlarged Executive of the Communist International, the worthy representatives of that fortunate world proletariat and peasantry whose enviable lot it has become — to burst asunder the shackles and to free from the prisons of capitalism and imperialism the whole of toiling humanity — to give it freedom and create for it the opportunity to join with the already liberated vanguard — the peoples of the Soviet Union — in the joint building of a world-wide union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

Guard, as you would the apple of your eye, the great revolutionary principles and slogans inscribed upon the banners of the Comintern.

Guard, as you would the apple of your eye, unity in the ranks of your Party and in the entire Communist International — this is the guarantee for the victory of your banners. (Applause.)

Fight for the unity and the revolutionisation of the whole international trade union movement.

Strengthen at all costs the revolutionary spirit in your ranks, strengthen the faith in the victory and the will to struggle for the triumph of the international Communist revolution.

In all your countries organise, under the banner of the International Red Aid, the millions of workers and peasants,

not only to defend the victims of White Terror, but also to create mighty reserves for the revolutionary vanguard.

Carry forward the mighty, sacred banner of liberation for all mankind entrusted to you by history, and you, the revolutionary Communists of this generation, will be rewarded as no single generation of revolutionaries has ever yet been rewarded. You will complete the cause of the October Revolution in the whole world and will open the way of the young generations of the world proletariat and peasantry to real freedom, enlightenment and the happiness of all mankind.

Long live the world-wide alliance of the workers and peasants of all countries, all colonies, under the banner of the Communist International!

Long live revolutionary consciousness, revolutionary will and unity of the toiling masses, the Communist Parties and the Communist International!

Long live the International Red Aid!

Long live the Communist world revolution! (Stormy applause.)

CLARA ZETKIN (in Russian):

Our hearty, warmest greetings to our old heroes! They were also our revolutionary teachers. Long live our venerable former political prisoners! (Stormy applause.) (Shouts: "Long live Clara Zetkin!")

Comrades! Long live the world revolution!

(Stormy applause. Cheers.)

Comrade Bukharin, reporting on

The International Situation and the Tasks of the Comintern.

Comrades, you have before you a printed, comprehensive report containing an analysis of the present situation — with statistics and various exhibits — that is all in my printed report*). I therefore consider it entirely superfluous to enter upon a repetition of the ideas I have developed in that report. My present task consists in emphasising certain essential questions.

In my printed report I characterised the situation as one between two waves of the revolution. I would consider it desirable, therefore, to enter into a little, or if they prefer, even an extensive polemic with our opponents, and particularly with the Social Democrats.

THE GENERAL APPRAISAL OF THE PRESENT EPOCH.

How does the Social Democracy, which after all, wants to be a "workers" party — even though in quotation marks — appraise the present situation?

According to the Social Democrats we are living in a normal epoch of capitalist development. According to this the status in which capitalism finds itself is supposed to be an almost normal, yes, even a quite normal one. According to the Social Democrats, the new element in this development consists in the new organisational form of capitalism, within national as well as international spheres. In a whole series of countries competition on the part of organised capital is on the decline and powerful organisations are also arising on a world-economic scale. The political expression of all these processes, according to the Social Democrats, are such factors as the League of Nations, the Pan-European movement, the various conventions and treaties between the different countries, etc. All these factors are supposed to be so important, so tremendous, and so pregnant with extraordinarily great importance for the analysis of the present situation, that they are alleged to introduce a fundamental change in the condition of things. The Social Democracy dares to main-

tain that the generally accepted Marxist theses, for example, the famous all-inclusive and universally known thesis on the inevitability of wars in the epoch of capitalism, is already out of date, and no longer corresponds with realities. Therefore, the Social Democrats say, that we are approaching a new phase of capitalist development. At this moment, we are said to have peace — not in heaven, but on earth. The so-called pacifist ideas, etc., are already now taking on flesh and blood, and the League of Nations itself is to be an instrument of these noble efforts on behalf of peace. Hilferding, and other theorists of the Social Democracy also, have expressed this quite clearly.

If we remain with both feet on the ground of reality, can assertions of this sort really be maintained? In our eyes such statements, when compared with the reality, are comical: from the standpoint of reality this whole theory is simply a bluff. And in fact can one perchance in any way compare the present situation with pre-war conditions? Can we possibly maintain that capitalism is passing through a "normal" epoch and that it is developing under "normal" conditions? In my opinion, we can say only the direct opposite, and the mere fact of the existence of the Soviet Union suffices for the statement that capitalism is living under abnormal conditions. The fact of the existence of our proletarian Republic is in itself the expression of the extraordinary condition, the extraordinary situation in which capitalism now finds itself.

We are confronted with so tremendous an event as the Far-Eastern revolution, the beginning of which we see in the great revolution in China. Is this perhaps the expression of a "normal" development? Is this perhaps a little detail? Is this perhaps an insignificant factor? Of course not. This factor possesses such tremendous and historic specific gravity that for this reason alone the present situation cannot be considered as normal.

The decline of Great Britain, the contradictions within the capitalist social order — all these are, also no little details, these are facts of greatest importance which must not be under-esti-

*) See "Inprecorr". No. 85, December 3, 1926.

mated. Looking upon these events from the viewpoint of capitalist contradictions and of the diplomatic moves taking place between the various nations, the question arises as to whether one can maintain that these contradictions have become less. By no means! Who has attempted to prove this? Who has ever tried to furnish evidence to substantiate it? We maintain that since the war the contradictions have become greater, and that they are being re-produced anew on a wider scale and on a higher stage. The most powerful among the existing factors consists in the dictatorship of the proletariat in what was Russia, and in the Chinese Revolution. These two factors furnish eloquent proof that the former foundation of the capitalist social order no longer exists. And in fact, we see at the present time how efforts are being made to rescue capitalism with the aid of extraordinary, extremely intensified methods of exploitation in those countries in which no immediately revolutionary situation exists and in which the curve of capitalist development is temporarily even rising.

The lack of all those conditions which formerly constituted the foundation of capitalism, makes itself felt, therefore, in a sharpened struggle against the working class — since only through such a sharpening can the bourgeoisie hope for the salvation of the capitalist order of society.

FOR OR AGAINST THE STABILISATION OF CAPITALISM?

There immediately arises before the workers' parties the absolutely fundamental question: for the Stabilisation of Capitalism or against the Stabilisation of Capitalism? And, to a certain extent, this question becomes the parting of the ways within the working class, according to which the Social Democracy is for the stabilisation, while we are opposed. This decisive principal policy is determined by a whole series of other tactical premises. Thus, e. g. the Social Democracy is — against the Soviet Union. Why? Because the existence of the Soviet Union is a factor that directs itself objectively against the stabilisation of capitalism. The Soviet Union is the destructive factor in the confines of the capitalist world economy and of the whole system of capitalist nations.

Of course, in the process of the exchange of commodities, capitalism is able to make profits from the Soviet Union, but this has a secondary significance: all trade treaties, all recognition of the Soviet Union etc., all these are phenomena of secondary importance. In principle not this is what is weighty, not this determines the line of world history. The bourgeoisie understand this excellently.

On the whole, the Social Democracy is against the Far-Eastern Revolution. One can say even of a relatively so Left inclined Social Democracy as the Austrian, even of the Party of Otto Bauer, that it stands hostile or half-hostile neutral towards the Far-Eastern Revolution. Why? Because the Far-Eastern Revolution is a tremendous factor of a destructive nature, a powerful factor which blocks the way of capitalist stabilisation. The Social Democracy is even against all so-called "disorder" in Western Europe, and against every sort of "disorder" as such. It is extremely hostile towards the British strike. It was of course against the General Strike in England and especially against its extension, since this is tantamount to the undermining of the normal "order".

Any and all elements destructive of or interfering with the stabilisation of capitalism, regardless of whether they involve the Far-Eastern Revolution, the Soviet Union, or a big political or economic strike in Europe — all are fought by the Social Democracy in one form or another. And vice versa, almost every factor that fosters and favours the stabilisation of capitalism enjoys the support of the Social Democrats. Why is this? The Social Democrats of all countries support, e. g., a robber organisation like the League of Nations, because in their eyes it represents the best means for the liquidation of the contradictions in capitalism, as well as the best means of advancing the stabilisation of capitalism even though only for a time, for the immediate future. In this connection the Social Democracy looks upon the League of Nations as an instrument of peace that must be supported. The Social Democracy holds that, in essence, the League of Nations is an instrument of stabilisation and for that reason — an instrument of peace. Consequently the Social Democracy is also for the pan-European movement, for a "just distribution" of the colonies, etc., etc. The conclusions that we have to draw from this are about the following:

The treason committed by the Social Democracy in our epoch, in our own day, in recent weeks and months, is a far greater treason than that which it committed in August 1914. The clear recognition of this fact has not yet penetrated thoroughly even in our own ranks. One may say also that the proletariat as a whole has not yet come to a recognition of this. For this reason our task consists primarily in enlightening the working class on this fact.

Why is the treason of the Social Democracy greater in our own day than it was in August 1914? The reason is very simple! In August 1914 the Social Democracy defended the viewpoint of capitalist national defense. Nothing more. The situation was at that time an extraordinary one, the Social Democrats declared, the enemy was ravaging "our" homeland. To be sure they were — as they justified themselves — internationalists. But this internationalism was by no means contradictory to so-called "national features", etc. etc. This whole story is well known to us. To-day, however, the Social Democracy is defending capitalism not only on a national scale, as was the case during the war. Today it stands up for capitalism in principle, as a world-wide economic system. (Applause.) This is not clearly recognisable at first glance, but it is all the more dangerous, and we must exert all the more efforts to expose this vicious ideology. Without energetic activity in this direction we will nohow be able to attain victory.

THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PEACE — A SETTING FOR THE PREPARATIONS FOR NEW WARS.

The Social Democracy vitalises the question of the stabilisation of capitalism with the problem of peace. This problem now confronts us with particular seriousness. Let us pry a bit into the mood of the average worker, into the psychology of the proletarian masses. How is this psychology created? This mass went through the big war. Now, seven years after the signing of the peace, things are relatively better, and these masses say: "Please, let us alone! We are opposed to war, we are opposed to every breach of peace — that is all that we care about!" This psychology of the broad masses is entirely understandable. It is a sort of reaction against the militarist mood during the war, and the Social Democrats very cleverly make capital out of it for themselves. How do they do this? They raise the question: Who wants to break the peace? Look at the League of Nations, that is an instrument of peace, and now along come these damned Russians, the only ones who try to throw a monkey-wrench into the peace machinery. Or — look towards the East, there is the Revolution: "The Russians", i. e. the Soviet Union, "incite" the peoples of the East against the civilised nations. We, the Social Democracy, are trying to enlist the Pan-European movement, the pacifist circles, and the League of Nations in the cause of peace, we are striving with might and main to bring about peace. But the Soviet Union is hindering us in this. The Far-Eastern Peoples are an obstacle in the way of our work. Everywhere the Communists are trying to "start conflagrations" and are "fanning the flames" — to use Kautsky's words. At first they had hoped to "loot" the West, but they did not succeed, so now they are trying to "set the East ablaze" and to "plunder" it. Here we have the real foes of peace. Here is the obstacle that must be overcome.

This is the language that is being used by the Social Democrats. This is the type of their poisonous "ideology".

Our Parties must smash this ideology, they must wipe out such a formulation of the peace problem connected up with the so-called ultra-imperialist prattle, the Pan-European movement, etc. Unmask the Social Democratic "peace"! It is the setting behind which are being prepared even more atrocious, even more terrible wars than ever before witnessed in history. It is unnecessary to demonstrate this thesis any further.

In my opinion, we have not understood thus far how to expose the essence of this formulation of the question and to work in a proper manner among the proletariat towards this end. Hence, once more: the Social Democratic "peace" is stage setting for new and terrible wars.

On the other hand, our revolutionary movement, our risings, our strikes, as well as our work in the Socialist upbuilding of the Soviet Union — yes, the Soviet Union in itself — serves as the best guarantee of a real peace. This popular thesis, this almost banal truth, must be made clear to the entire proletariat

with all thoroughness. What we must say — and this is absolutely true — is the following: The Communist Parties are the Parties of the World Revolution! The Comintern is the world organisation of the proletariat for the preparation of the World Revolution! (Applause.) But precisely for the reason that the Comintern is the Party of the World Revolution — it is the one unshakable guarantee of a real peace to the entire world. Through the Comintern we must put the problem in this form, and especially at this time.

FOUR DECISIVE GROUPINGS IN THE CAPITALIST WORLD, AND SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC ATTITUDE TOWARDS THESE GROUPS.

The idea of the necessity to smash the ultra-imperialist and sham-pacifist ideology is closely bound up with our whole appraisal of the present situation. One of the chief aims emphasised by my printed report is the thought that the schematic formulation of the problem of capitalist stabilisation suffices neither with regard to theory nor to practice. Certainly, for our practical work, a schematic judgement of the situation will by no means suffice for all countries, in view of the tremendous differences of conditions and circumstances under which our organisations have to fight.

In my written report I attempted to divide the various groups of countries into sub-groups. I believe that to-day we have to reckon with four big sub-groups. History is even pleased to furnish a coincidence of names, e. g., the Union of the United States of North America and the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics — thus two "unions" which, however, are simultaneously two opposite "poles" in the existing world situation. And aside from these we have the East and Europe, each of which constitutes a sub-group.

How are we to understand the universally benevolent attitude of the Social Democracy towards America, how are we to appraise this in the light of the world situation as a whole. America represents that pole in world history at which, as in a burning-glass, the greatest forces of capitalism are concentrated. From the viewpoint of broad historical perspectives it is the chief foe of Socialism. How should we, therefore, interpret the glorification which the Social Democracy lavishes upon America? It is an eloquent expression of the counter-revolutionary role of the Social Democracy — it gives its pledge, its guarantee for future support of the greatest among the existing foes of the working class. This completely charmed tone of speech, these paens sounded by the Social Democracy regarding America — must all be interpreted chiefly in this sense.

Fundamentally different is the attitude of the Social Democracy towards the other "Union", towards the U. S. S. R.: we need only recall the obstacles it prepares for us, we need only recall the incitement it whips up against us, and the appraisal of our work of Socialist construction that it gives. In this again the outspoken counter-revolutionary role of the Social Democracy is expressed. World history this time shows us two opposite poles: America and the U. S. S. R. — the counter-revolutionary pole versus the revolutionary pole. The attitude of the Social Democracy towards America and towards the U. S. S. R., is entirely clear: the Social Democracy is for America and against the U. S. S. R. for capitalism and against Socialism, for the capitalist counter-revolution and against the proletarian revolution.

The current propaganda of the Social Democracy against the Far-Eastern revolution is the third major point that evidences the counter-revolutionary role of the Social Democracy. In a whole array of articles, theses, etc., the Social Democracy declares: "We are for the 'liberation' of all peoples, among others also the Chinese people, of course, but we are opposed to 'chaos' in China, we are opposed to the 'hatred' of foreigners and all that sort of thing."

The "just distribution" of colonial mandates is likewise a problem in which the Social Democratic press and especially the organ of Herr Hilferding ("Gesellschaft"): interests itself very much. And this is also characteristic of the counter-revolutionary role of the Social Democracy. In this connection also, we must consider the favourable attitude towards stabilisation, the helpful role of the Social Democracy in the salvation of the capitalist system. On all important points in which the weak spots of the

capitalist system are revealed, the Social Democracy plays a directly counter-revolutionary role, and fights against the Soviet Union, against the Chinese Revolution, against disorder in Western Europe, while, however, being for "Americanisation" and fighting for it. Here also, the counter-revolutionary role of the Social Democracy expresses itself most clearly.

THE TASKS OF OUR SECTIONS. THE SO-CALLED "RUSSIAN QUESTION".

As regards the work of our Party it is a matter of course that from this major viewpoint the task of our Parties and of the Young Communist Leagues must take on different forms in the various countries. In the U. S. S. R. we are confronted with one task, in America with another. In Western Europe and in China, we likewise are faced with entirely special, specific problems. But this difference is not based upon these problems differing from one another in principle, rather, the exact reverse is true: in order to be able to realise our common and universal task — the proletarian revolution — we must put the question differently each time, in accordance with the peculiarities of the situation.

Let us proceed first of all to the work of the Communists in the Soviet Union. Here, in the U. S. S. R., our chief task is a creative one; the building up of Socialism. The Social Democracy denies this. But also in our own ranks, in various oppositional groups of our Party as well as of the Parties abroad, one can encounter a certain scepticism with regard to the Socialist upbuilding in the U. S. S. R. I therefore believe that it must be clearly stated that this scepticism is to be traced back to Social-Democratic origins.

With regard to the theoretical side of the question, I shall not go into detail on this since it will be dealt with extensively by Comrade Stalin in his report. I would like to say just a few words about the source of this scepticism. How is it that the opposition comrades speak of the all-but impossibility of Socialist construction, of insurmountable difficulties and other things of this kind? Why this lack of faith in the victorious perspectives of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union? Why does this disbelief find a certain echo in the Parties of Western Europe, yes, even among certain strata of the proletariat? Putting this question theoretically one immediately understands where the roots of this sceptical attitude lie. The sceptics say that Russia is a backward country in which, while it was possible to capture power, the building of Socialism there is something entirely different. According to Engels, one might conceive of a case in which the workers' party came into State power prematurely. Such a possibility is not excluded. According to the Social Democrats and the sceptically minded comrades within the Communist movement, this case now exactly fits the U. S. S. R. According to this view, the Bolsheviks captured power too soon — even before the objective premises for the real building up of Socialism were ripe. This is expressed primarily, as the Social Democrats say, in that the Bolsheviks are compelled to retreat again and again. In any case, the situation would have been a different one had there been an immediate outbreak of the world revolution. Then the world revolution would have saved the Russian Revolution. But the world revolution does not arrive and the Bolsheviks make one concession after another. The New Economic Policy itself, according to all Social Democrats (and sorry to say, not only the Social Democrats), was a proof of the insufficiency of the objective forces of the revolution in Russia. The New Economic Policy was, so to say, the Original Sin, and, in proper harmony with the laws of nature, it has — as is customary in cases of sinning — it has brought children into the world. Now a whole sinful family has arrived: a "degeneration has set in the Party", the "Thermidor analogy" has arisen, impermissible concessions are made to the peasantry, Stalin is enjoying the role of a "peasant king", "liquidatory tendencies" are appearing in the Comintern, etc., etc. The Social Democrats and their copyists invent all kinds of such nonsense we have heard of late from various sides.

Of course the Social Democracy finds a certain comfort in that also within our Party such sentiments arose. I say "arose" since I hope that these sentiments will be liquidated after the present Plenum. And in this sense we are certainly the most vigorous "liquidators" (stormy applause).

Comrades, all these theoretical explanations are confirmed by a whole array of facts.

Above all, the actual facts about the course of development in the U. S. S. R. speak for them. I will cite no figures here since you can find them in my pamphlet as well as in other articles and books.

An important indirect judgment is contributed, however, by the echo that our Opposition has found in the bourgeois and Social Democratic camps. This is an extremely important indication that must unquestionably be given consideration. What echo have our Opposition and the ultra-Leftists found? I believe — a very poor one. They were overwhelmed with praise by the bourgeoisie, by the semi-bourgeoisie, by the Social Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks. This is an incontrovertible fact.

Further, as to the question of the allies of the Opposition. Is it an accident that Ruth Fischer, expelled from the German Communist Party, stands upon a joint parliamentary ballot with Herr Korsch? By no means. No more than it is an accident that Ruth Fischer, Maslow and Urbahns are moving ideologically in the direction of Korsch.

Is it an accident that the ultra-Left Opposition's ideology in the so-called "Russian question" establishes closest contact on a number of points with such vulgar, genuinely counter-revolutionary works as the Kautsky pamphlet? That is by no means an accident.

Is it an accident that the so-called "anti-Moscow tendency" joins up with the Western orientation of the German bourgeoisie? No, that is no accident, but merely the reverse side of one and the same question.

From the viewpoint of our internal work in the U. S. S. R. our chief task is the final combatting of the bourgeois elements of our economy, the waging of the struggle with all the vigour, faith and conviction, with the belief that we are able to defeat our internal bourgeoisie on the economic field. If someone or other approaches this field sceptically, then this is the scepticism of the Social Democracy. Our task in the Soviet Union — the building up of Socialism — can be effectuated only if we really believe in the cause that we are working for.

OUR STRUGGLE SERVES THE VICTORY OF THE REVOLUTION IN CHINA AND ITS AVOIDANCE OF THE CAPITALISTIC PHASE.

We have another task in China. At former Congresses and meetings of the Executive, we had dealt with the Chinese and Eastern questions. Nevertheless, I would like to emphasise, as I have done also in the printed theses and report, that our immediate perspective and our immediate next task in China consists in defeating the imperialist foe. This is the chief task at the present moment, this is the task that creates the premises for further construction. But we are by no means such roughshod Empiricists as to see only the immediately next tasks even when the chief tasks of the moment are involved. We like to look a little further. We must emphasise that the Comintern considers possible a development avoiding the capitalist phase in China, and that this perspective really presents the prospect, for which, as a Communist Party, we have to fight. Of course, this in no sense sounds Social Democratic; the Social-Democrats, furthermore, try to ridicule us just as they also try to ridicule our October Revolution and our Socialist construction. For this reason they will also try to ridicule us on the point of our formulation of the problems involved in the Chinese question. But we shall see what the future has to say. First of all, development in China is proceeding in such a manner that the first half of our task, the struggle against the imperialists, is being solved in a quite successful manner (but it has not yet been solved). The Canton army is advancing while Feng's Peoples Army keeps its eyes on Peking. Thereby, the unification of China is proceeding under the hegemony of the revolutionary forces. If it is established it will naturally have its immediate effects upon the whole international situation. But after that, what? What are then our next tasks? I believe that the Comintern can say here that our whole general perspective, our greatest and most ambitious perspective — consists in the establishment of the alliance between China, the Soviet Union and the Western proletariat,

in order, in this manner, to make possible the avoidance of the capitalist development of China. This is rather a big job and I might almost say a bold job which the Communist International and the Communist Parties set themselves. But we know our own forces and we will try to accomplish this task. We set ourselves to this task, we will fight for its realisation, and we are convinced that we know how to do it.

THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF THE WEST IN THEIR STRUGGLE FOR THE MASSES.

In America our Party is rather small. American capitalism is the stronghold of the entire capitalist system, it is the most powerful capitalism in the world. Our tasks in this country are for the present still very modest. We are only on the road towards winning the masses. We can for the time set ourselves only the modest task of winning additional points of support for the coming struggles in this country.

But matters stand otherwise in Western Europe. The slogans: "To the masses" and "Win over the masses", remain as hitherto the central point of our attention. With this task of winning the masses, with this task of fighting to organise and lead the class struggles of these masses, we are the complicating element in the development of capitalism. Even the problem of stabilisation, viewed from this standpoint, constitutes nothing else than an object of the class struggle. Naturally, this stabilisation is an objective process of capitalist development. But the totality of this process makes of it one that includes, along with a number of other factors, also the factor of the working class and its ability to mobilise to defend itself and to attack. The balance is determined by various factors, and the resistance of the working class will be the "embarrassing feature" in the process of the stabilisation of capitalism. The only Party that comes forward as this point of resistance and struggle is the Communist Party, and the only world wide organisation that plays this role is the Communist International.

A few words now on the West-European questions.

The problem of winning the masses is at present the basic problem. It is empty resonance to talk about a struggle against stabilisation without holding mass organisations in our hands. We have written a lot about it, we have passed many resolutions, and the Central Committees of our Parties as well as the whole Comintern have recognised the weightiness of this problem. However, it is one thing to pass a resolution, and something else to carry it out. If, e. g. we take a problem like the capture of the trade unions, then we must say that this task, which we will recognise as one of the most important, has thus far been carried out to but a very slight extent. The trade unions are pre-eminently economic organisations, although of course there are no such things as purely economic "neutral" organisations. The trade unions are the most important mass organisations of the proletariat. If the capitalist offensive takes on a special form and to increasing extent turns over into the form of economic pressure, then the role of these mass organisations will thereby become all the greater. Now how do matters stand with the work of our Parties in the trade unions? How are things here?

From the viewpoint of the development of the Communist Parties, the answer is not a particularly satisfying one. We can enumerate Party after Party and say about practically everyone that its work in the trade unions is insufficient.

Looking into the mood of the proletariat, we can note the following: the political influence of our Parties is growing, the broad masses trust our Parties when political questions are involved. Let us take e. g. the German Party. In the struggle against the expropriation of the Royal Houses our Party played such a leading role that even the Social Democracy was forced to take some steps in our direction. But what is the attitude of the workers in case of an ordinary strike movement? Here we see something entirely different, here the confidence in the Communists is incomparable slighter.

As to the tempo of development, the best successes were gained by the British Party. It is true that even at present, in comparison with other Parties, the British Party is relatively small. But the tempo of the successes attained is undeniably a good one. And this is precisely to be accounted for in that the British Party more than all others has worked in the trade unions. This is one of the greatest services of our British Party. I will not discuss its mistakes here, because we shall talk of

that in another place. But this fact remains in its full importance as a big credit to our British Party.

Has everything been done, on our part, that could be done in the Trade Unions and in the various mass organisations? Have we completely liquidated the sectarian spirit? Have we made progress in the problem involving the Left Social Democratic workers? No. Sometimes we do not adequately make contact with the masses and are not able to find the really correct road to them. This problem and the task — the work in the mass organisations, in front rank in the trade unions, — is in my opinion the basic problem that confronts our Parties in the West. This must certainly be emphasised again and again. Perhaps it is tiresome that we always speak of this anew, that we must always listen to this over again. **But we cannot get one step further if we do not throw all our forces upon this important sector of the front.**

With this is connected also the question of self-criticism inside of our Party. We have already mentioned here that some comrades look upon things as if we concern ourselves here with question of "prestige". Many of the comrades took pains to hunt up first of all what was said in the written reports about the Party by which they were delegated. This interested them primarily and in this connection the characterisation was judged not from the viewpoint whether it was correct or not, but from the viewpoint whether their Party had been subjected to any criticism whatever. I believe that, to put it mildly, this is not an altogether correct way of looking at things. What is it that we lack? What we lack is **self-criticism** inside of our Parties, that is the ability to sum up our own work in a correct manner, to draw the practical conclusions from the daily struggle with which to vitalise the movement tactically on its road to victory, along the decisive march route of the world revolution. We can utter excellent words about this, that we are in favour of Communism, of the Chinese Revolution and of the world Revolution, we can emphasise these slogans with all means, yet we cannot e. g. help the Chinese Revolution in Germany or in France if we do **not carry on sufficient work in the Trade Unions and among the broad masses of workers.** Thus all links of this chain depend very closely upon each other. This dependence is a very complicated one, but it is a fact that cannot be put out of existence.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE STRUGGLE IN CENTRAL EUROPE

Some comrades believe that our appraisal of the situation would logically lead to the view that at the moment no good prospects exist in central Europe for the work of the Communist Parties. This is wrong. I maintain that the revolution at present marches in three directions, primarily: China, England, and in Soviet Russia. This is the fact. But this by no means signifies that the situation in Central Europe is an unfavourable one for us. Despite the stabilisation the situation for our Parties in Central Europe is far more favourable than that which prevailed some time ago. Why?

There were three stages which followed one another in about this way:

The first period was the period of storm and stress. The Communists arose to the storm. That was the time of the immediately revolutionary situation. The Social Democracy played a direct reactionary role and "protested", weapons in hand, against the Communist Parties, against the Spartakaus, etc. Commencing from the first steps towards the stabilisation of capitalism, we had a new phase. A certain shifting in the balance of forces took place. This shifting consisted in that the Communists had to make a slight retreat, while the Social Democrats experienced a certain renaissance, a certain growth and they consolidated themselves to some extent. This proceeded along with the stabilisation of capitalism.

Now, I believe, we have a **new phase** — a phase in which the process of the stabilisation of capitalism brings forward its contradictions in ever sharper form. The relations between the classes are sharpening. This creates a favourable situation for our Parties. Now, for instance, as to the situation in Germany, which is in the centre of the European stage, — is not this at the moment a favourable one? It is favourable, and from day to day becomes more so. Capitalism is attacking. The working class is daily becoming more convinced of the necessity of active and determined struggle.

The Leftward trend within the working class is an eloquent expression of this process. An initial sign of this leftward trend, and of the beginning of active resistance by the workers against the pressure of the bourgeoisie, was given in the Hamburg harbour-workers' strike. Of course, this is only the first step. The activation of the working class will go further, the more that the contradictions of capitalist stabilisation are intensified. The Social Democracy will also transform itself more and more into the representative of the moods of the labour aristocracy, which is constantly declining numerically and in importance. Of course, the sharpening of class antagonisms and the regroupings within the working class constitute a tedious process. But this process furnishes already now a favourable soil for the development of our Party.

I have noted here that the stabilisation is not only an objective process, but also an **object of the class struggle.** This thesis finds its confirmation first of all in the English strike, which — as I must emphasise here — was not sufficiently supported by our Communist Parties. We must admit this in order to draw certain lessons from it. The British strike was, and at present is still, a gigantic struggle. In accordance with the development of the stabilisation process, such struggles will take place also in Central Europe, since the difficulties at present confronting capitalism in Central Europe are very big and clashes with the proletariat are inevitable. For this reason it is the task of our Parties to mobilise the proletariat and to prepare it for the coming battles. In what way can this be done? First of all through persistent intensive work inside of the trade unions. How can the Chinese revolution, or even the Soviet Union, be supported practically? In what way can the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat of the West support the sectors of the world revolution now under direct fire? Of course all forces must be mobilised for the material and moral support of the fighters. But this can be done in a lasting, serious and effective manner only through the carrying out of these very "modest" tasks that consist in good work among the masses and in the mass organisations. Only in the degree that we extend our influence here can we reckon with a mobilisation of the broad strata of the toilers. This, also, is what every Chinese worker will tell you. If you have not sufficient means to support the British and Chinese workers, then at least work well in the trade unions and in the various mass organisations. In this way you will be fulfilling the chief task that now confronts us in Central Europe. And then you will have the following picture: in China the immediate revolution is on the march, in "Russia" the immediate revolution (for our work of construction is no supplement to the revolution, but it is the revolution itself) is likewise on the march, and in England we have the first symptoms of the most serious shocks. **Upon you in Western Europe will depend whether such shocks will come in your quarters also.** This depends upon your modest work among the masses, for the biggest of events are not fired from the pistol, — they are prepared for. In our Party we, in our time, talked about the **organising of the Revolution.** The conceptions of the old Social Democracy, that the revolution is a naturally inevitable process and that for that reason no one "has the right" to prepare this revolution, are false. No, we must **organise** the revolution by work among the masses, and especially by the work in the trade unions. The consolidation of our Parties, the winning of the masses for the banners of the revolution — that is the organising of the revolution.

If you fulfil this task then, in Central Europe also, "an immediately revolutionary situation" will appear. But if you do not fulfil this task then the West European proletariat will not be able, even in capitalism's darkest hours, to capture political power, — just as was the case in Italy and, already more times than one, in Germany.

If however, this "modest" task is fulfilled then, in our struggles, in the immediate sharpest struggles, we will effectuate the greatest alliance that the world has ever seen: the alliance of the Far Eastern peoples with the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and with the fighting West European proletariat. If we can bring about this alliance then we will reach our goal, and we will **solve our basic task:** Communism will celebrate its decisive international victory. (Stormy Applause.)

Third Session.

Moscow, November 24, 1926.

Comrade Jillek (chairman) opened the session at 11 a. m. and called upon Comrade Pepper for the reading of a telegram of greeting from the Communist Party of Great Britain to the Secretariat of the E. C. C. I.

To the Secretariat of the Communist International.

London, November 22, 1926.

The Communist Party of Great Britain sends its greetings to the Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. In the name of the British workers we thank the Parties of the International for their magnificent support of the heroic struggle of the British miners. This support must

be continued. During the present difficulties, just as during the general strike, the Party looks to the Communist International for leadership and fraternal support. The reformist leaders' coalition with Joynson Hicks serves notice on our Party of new and heavier attacks. Our Party faces them bravely. We are devoting our full energy to the training of our 6000 new members, which, gained in battle, will only be consolidated through persecutions. We congratulate the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. upon the surrender of the Opposition. The world proletariat in full confidence looks to the Communist International as the leader of the world revolution.

Long live the Communist International! (Applause.)

The Next Tasks of the Communist Parties. Report of Comrade Kuusinen:

Comrades, Comrade Bukharin has pointed out the great differentiation in the forces of Revolution and of Counterrevolution, which from year to year are developing increasingly throughout the whole world. Of course this differentiation does not proceed evenly in all countries. But in the capitalist world there is hardly a single country in which this process is not going on at the present time. Nor is it an accident that in so many countries at present White Terror prevails. The whole "torrid zone", one might say, bordering Soviet Russia to the West is composed of countries in which the White Terror reigns, and even behind these countries the glow of the Russian revolution makes itself felt. The existence of White Terror in these countries is not a proof of a firm stabilisation. It is rather a proof, firstly, that our parties, although they are small parties, are taken seriously, and secondly, that in comparison with pre-war times the counter-revolutionary character of the capitalist regime appears more and more in the foreground.

Force is the midwife in attendance at the birth of every new society, but force is also no less a prop of every old social order when it seeks to save itself for just a little while by throttling the revolutionary forces. Undisguised force becomes more and more a system of capitalist government science. This is by no means the case only in the model countries of White Terror. The bourgeoisie even in these countries might to some extent desire to be rid of the White Terror and, in the place of the marked ferocious system of force, to create a system of masked violence and "legal" dictatorship. But it can do this only with difficulty, and only transitorily. We are told that in Russia — here was also terror. Yes, the Russian proletariat had to resort to Red terror during the class war, but long ago the Russian proletariat already succeeded in stabilising its power, in transforming it into a legal dictatorship. The bourgeoisie would like to effect an analogous stabilisation in the countries of the White Terror, but it meets with little success.

But not only in these countries, also in countries like Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, and also in England and France a great deal of naked force, of undisguised class justice, of mass arrests of workers, of police spying, provocation, etc. is found. Even in such a country as Sweden, where, in comparison with Germany, for example, class antagonisms are still rather undeveloped, even there it was recently exposed that the Chief of Police of Stockholm had long ago acquired a whole lot of machine guns in case of "Communist disorders". Thus, in Sweden, where every minister is ready to address a Communist deputy as "honourable Sir" the police-chief of the capital prepares modern technical arms for use against these "honourable Sirs". That is also a symptom. That is the capitalist counter-revolution, which is working its way up.

But the organs of State power are not sufficient for the bourgeoisie in their struggle against the proletariat. Even in the countries of White Terror they are not adequate. The bourgeoisie needs and seeks allies among the broad masses, among the masses of peasants, of urban petty-bourgeoisie, and also

among the masses of the proletariat. The real representative of the mass movement of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie is Fascism. The character of Fascism as a counter-revolutionary movement is not difficult to recognise. But it is not so readily understandable that Social Democracy at the present time also plays a counter-revolutionary role, and that this role is even far more dangerous than that of Fascism. We often say that Social Democracy, that reformism, is bankrupt. Yes, as a progressive labour movement it is bankrupt, but as the henchman of the International counter-revolution it is by no means bankrupt. In no White Terror country, aside from Italy — I shall speak specially of this — does the bourgeoisie dare to dispense with the aid of the Social Democrats. To be sure this aid does not always take the coarse form of participation in the government. On this single path Social Democracy would never succeed for any length of time to enroll any considerable masses of workers in the service of the bourgeoisie. Only temporarily can the Social Democrats of one country or another participate in the government. But by means of their "loyal opposition" to the capitalist governments and White Terror regimes, Social Democracy is rendering the best service to the counter-revolution. Only in this manner, only through its loyal opposition, is it successful in betraying the workers.

In Poland, recently the P. P. S. declared that it is going over to a principal opposition to the Pilsudski government. At the same time it was stated in the central organ of the Party that its opposition did not have the same aim as had the bourgeois opposition, namely, to poison the life of the ministers. We do not want to carry on such an opposition — it wrote — we want to conduct a loyal, respectable opposition, and as a sign of this opposition the Central organ of the P. P. S. then demonstrated against the government on the occasion of the national holiday. It did so — by refusing to publish Pilsudski's photograph! This was the expression of the Social Democratic "class struggle". I am not altogether sure whether the P. P. S., by means of this "demonstration" did not poison Pilsudski at his most sensitive point, but that it is in the interest of Polish Fascism for the P. P. S. to carry on such an opposition seems absolutely clear to me.

In Italy Mussolini is at present attempting to get along without the aid of the reformists; the reformists also are now being persecuted in Italy, at least to a certain extent. Whether or not this effort on Mussolini's part is a wise one, viewed from the standpoint of capitalist class rule, remains still to be seen. It strikes me as somewhat venturesome. In this way Italian reformism has been made completely bankrupt. Poor Turatti, the great leader of the reformists — not the General Secretary of the Fascist party, — now looks towards our Italian comrades and complains: you fellows are Communists, surely you are for the revolution, why don't you do something, so that we get out of this situation! This is the complete bankruptcy of Italian reformism. But it is possible that after this bankruptcy will follow soon the bankruptcy of Fascism also. It may turn out that Mussolini, in waving aside the aid of the reformists in his

counter-revolutionary job, finally exposes himself as an ordinary adventurer.

So, comrades, in my opinion the real political counter-revolutionary machine consists not only in the state power organisation, but in this plus the Social Democracy; not only in White Terror, but in this plus reformism. Naked state power in time becomes impotent against the revolutionary movement. Only with the aid of the reformist labour leaders can the capitalist class at the present time stay firmly in the saddle, (and in a number of countries, even only relatively firmly). Therefore: state power plus Social Democracy — that is the steed on which the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie wants to ride us down.

In a certain sense we could say that in all the various countries the Social Democracy gives a reflected picture of the relative stabilisation. Take Germany for example. Of course we all wish that there were no stabilisation of the capitalist regime there. But when one sees the relatively powerful Social Democracy that is still on the job there, and the relatively strong reformist dictatorship in the trade unions, then we must recognise that our Communist Party still has a big job ahead of it before it has overcome the relative stabilisation of capitalist class rule.

In Austria one quite often hears the statement that the whole economy is so rotten there that there is really no basis for a relative stabilisation of capitalism. But, comrades, where a so relatively powerful Social Democracy exists as in Austria, where the Communist vanguard still looks so small in the shadow of the Social Democracy, we must recognise that the relative stabilisation of capitalism still has a strong political prop.

In France, in recent times, the Socialist Party has won quite a large number of new members. That is a bad sign, a sign of a certain political stabilisation of capitalism.

In England, there is a crisis within the reformist labour movement, but no one can deny that there the reformist executives still have a very strong influence. Reformism has not yet been defeated in the British Labour movement.

I hold it very important that all members of our parties see absolutely clearly that the Social Democracy and reformism, in the present period, play a counter-revolutionary role. It is an entirely different thing, however, to content ourselves with enunciating this truth before the non-Party and Social Democratic masses. In this way we shall not get ahead in our work among the masses. Here the problem consists precisely in how this simple question can be made clear to the non-Party and Social Democratic-reformist workers. How can we explain the fact, first, that such considerable masses of workers still continue to stand behind these Social Democratic leaders, who after all are carrying on a counter-revolutionary policy? Second, how is the betrayal of the Social Democrats to be exposed? And third: How are we to behave, in our work, towards the non-Party and Social Democratic masses? I think that it will help us solve the last question if we apply a three-fold political control in explaining our line.

The left deviation — expressed roughly — in practice means the complete abandonment of any practical revolutionary work among the broad masses of workers. It places value only upon revolutionary propaganda for the final goal. The Right opportunist deviation results in the following: In the present period in which there is no immediately revolutionary situation, no revolutionary work is really possible — parliamentary activity and all kinds of reform work can be carried on, one can and should issue slogans somewhat more radical than those of the Social Democracy, but for the time being (from this standpoint) there is no room for genuine revolutionary work.

But what should be the purpose of our work among the masses, and, what is the purpose of the work of the Social Democracy? I would answer in this way: the aim of the Social Democracy is the hindrance of the revolutionisation process in the working class. Our aim is the contrary: the acceleration of this process, the revolutionising of the working class. How does this process go forward? In my opinion essentially through the new revolutionising experiences of the workers, through the overcoming of the old retarding conservative traditional experiences.

You will remember, as Lenin emphasised, that the power of tradition, of habit, constitutes the most fearful hindrance to the

masses on the road of their revolutionisation. In the proletariat and often in the head of an individual worker, there is a conflict between the revolutionising and the hindering experience, e. g. with regard to the State. The worker has traditions, as well as personal experiences, of a conservative nature. The class character of the State does not always appear to him in a clear form. In his day to day life, e. g. through court verdicts in a number of ordinary criminal (not political) trials he often gets the erroneous idea that the State is after all something which stands above the classes, and that it issues "just" verdicts over the members of the various classes. Through the practice of formal democracy the worker may get the false impression of a classless democracy, and he might also have various other petty-bourgeois prejudices, e. g. national prejudices, etc. On the other hand he receives revolutionising experiences, in the factory through exploitation, as well as new experiences in the class struggle, in the labour movement. These revolutionising experiences can, however, be partially crowded out by others, e. g. by his being terrorised by wage pressure, by the threat of unemployment, by experiencing defeat in class struggles, and by the feeling of helplessness in the face of the splintering of the forces of the labour movement.

It is our task to bring revolutionising experiences to the consciousness of the workers, to help with all our power to raise their revolutionary activity, their revolutionary standard. The role of the Social Democracy is the reverse.

During recent years a new international experience, e. g. and one of highest revolutionary importance, has been given to the workers of capitalist countries in the visible object lesson of the Russian Revolution. The great question for every worker is after all this: whether the victory of the proletariat is possible, and whether it will be able to keep power in its hands and to build up Socialism? By means of the Socialist Soviet Union, the Workers' Delegations who have come here, as well as the proletariat of the whole world, have received a visible object lesson to the effect that victory is possible, and that the proletariat is able to keep power in its hands and to build up Socialism.

The Social Democracy desires at any price to take this international revolutionising experience from the workers. It is, e. g. very characteristic to see how the "Vorwaerts" in Germany carries on the anti-Soviet campaign. The "Vorwaerts" can no longer deny that the workers are in power in the Soviet Union, but it now maintains that the state enterprises in Russia are not Socialistic, they are capitalist enterprises, that there is no freedom of opinion in Russia, that bureaucratism reigns there; and consequently that it is not worth while to wage a revolution for "achievements" of this kind. Is it futile on our part to correct such falsifications for the workers and to clear up the matter? No, it is by no means futile, it is one of our most important tasks.

Comrades, I am altogether of the opinion that it is useful for us to follow up the Social Democratic press in order to observe how these people carry on, often with great skill, their counter-revolutionary agitation. One need look through only the "Vorwaerts" supplements to be compelled to recognise that a really counter-revolutionary art is frequently expressed there. How, one describes, e. g. the "Socialist family" which is alleged to be something fundamentally different in Germany from what it was in the "pre-revolutionary times" (i. e. pre-war times). The workers need only join the Social Democratic Party and they will have in the family "the Socialistic present which is so often missed". How the "Vorwaerts" feeds its readers with big displays concerning the gambling hells of Berlin, how the housewives are given advice on housekeeping, how one writes about "the lovelorn women", etc. Just take furthermore, the court reports in every issue, which are sensational for the petty-bourgeois. There already in the dishing up of facts, the bourgeois orientation is completely and fully expressed. The court appears as a State bar of justice standing above the classes, the impartiality of which should not be doubted, or at most, if any sort of "mistake" might happen, it is after all only an accidental mistake of an individual judge. Occasionally, the "Vorwaerts" will actually dare to go so far as to dedicate a veritable hymn to the police:

"Now we have all been able to convince ourselves, by means of the Police Exposition, how well satisfied we really ought to be with our police."

Since the "Vorwaerts" readers might remember how the police often mishandle those whom they arrest, this is immediately taken care of:

"To be sure there are still cases in which prisoners are mishandled in the stations; for unfortunately there are still officials possessed of the divine-right notion, who, especially with people of an unsympathetic colour, like to let themselves go. But from other quarters there is a constant sifting in process in order to remove these unfit people, because every police expert knows that it is just they who embarrass the work of the police with an unbearable ballast — with the distrust of the public. The public is still inclined blindly to take the part of the prisoner, because not yet all of these recollections of an old bad time have been eradicated" ...

There are still workers who let themselves be fooled in this way. Of course the Social Democratic leaders also have other methods than that of press propaganda for putting it over the working masses.

For example, Otto Bauer has told how in Austria, in the time of greatest need, when the ascent of the revolutionary movement threatened, the fatherland was saved: Inside of a few months the Social Democratic municipal administration had 60,000 small cottages built for the workers in the vicinity of Vienna, gave credit and organised the whole affair in order to colonise 60,000 workers' families which, from that day on until further notice, were of course lost to the revolutionary movement.

In this appeal to the petty-bourgeois experiences and instincts of the workers lies the power of Social Democracy. The roots of reformism constantly sprout anew in a bourgeois environment. We must understand this, for otherwise it is incomprehensible to us how we are to approach the masses. We must listen to the masses in order to be able to make their revolutionary experiences come to life. In my opinion our central task in capitalist countries still remains the liberation of the masses from the leading strings of the II. and Amsterdam Internationals. This cannot be done through an opportunistic or through an ultra-Left policy, nor can it be done by a mechanical combination of partial demands with our basic slogans; the art of organic combination is something that we must learn.

The weak side of our Party is still its relative isolation from the broad masses. The weak side of the Social Democracy is the Leftward development of the masses. We must know how to push this Leftward development also in cases where the radicalising masses are not immediately in a position to come into our Party, which is now often the case in many countries. Where the relative stabilisation is the strongest it is often the rule with the non-Party and Social Democratic Left inclined masses. In a certain sense we can say that in these countries we have two kinds of supporters, first, conscious supporters or at least those who are not afraid to vote for the Communist Party and to acknowledge themselves as its supporters, and second, such semi-revolutionary working class elements as are afraid to support the Communist Party directly.

This is one of the features of the present time. We must realise that there are also "unconscious supporters of communism". There are workers, who e. g. honestly sympathise with the Soviet Union. They might even be ready to go to the front if the defence of the Soviet Union was involved. But they are not yet ready to join the Communist Party. In some cases they might even be more radical, more ripe in a revolutionary sense, than are certain members of our Parties; for after all we have, to speak frankly, e. g. some co-operative functionaries who are far less revolutionary "uncles" than many Left non-Party workers. We must be able to take hold of these Left workers organisationally, in proper forms, and to influence them so lastingly that we can be sure of their further development Leftward, so that we shall not have them expressing their sympathies for the Soviet Union one day, and supporting Social Democratic politics the next.

Do you believe that the intensive incitement which the Social Democratic bourgeois press has carried on against the Communist Parties for years in such countries as e. g. Germany, has had no effect? It has spiritually terrorised a large section of the masses, it has deeply rooted the impression with many that the Communists are not only weak, but that they do not know how to conduct practical labour politics. It is therefore very often

readily understandable that these masses can come directly over to us only with difficulty. Again, in the White Terror countries, the fire that is directed against us is still more apt to terrorise the masses. It is not easy to declare oneself for Communism. It often demands a great political courage. So it is very easy that a dividing wall forms between our movement and the ranks of Social Democratic and non-Party workers. There forms a no man's land across which the reformist and non-Party workers do not venture to come to us. But our task is to carry on such a policy towards these workers that will make it easier for them to come to us.

There are times when the masses have no fear in declaring themselves for us, for the avowed revolutionary party, times in which there is even a turbulent demand for Communism. These are periods of an open revolutionary situation. In some countries there is a custom that on the wedding night a crowd gathers around the home of the bride in order to call her out upon the balcony. But everyday is not wedding day. At present, in the period of relative stabilisation, the demand for revolution among non-Party and Social Democratic masses is not lively. We must also help them to find their way to us, at last, even by means of by-paths.

The wall between our ranks and the non-Party and Social Democratic workers must be broken through at any price. It is not equally strong in all countries. In Germany, e. g. it is still rather strong. There it often happens that if a Social Democratic worker hears what a Communist says, he probably thinks to himself: "It might be so, but because you say so I am not coming along." In France the case is somewhat different. There the reformist workers gladly listen to the Communist speakers. There it is easier. There no one asks who is speaking, but what is it that he says, and what is to be done. And then our Party must show them what is to be done. In certain other countries it is still easier. In Sweden e. g. the workers have no fear whatever of listening to a Communist. But there where the dividing wall has formed it is to the highest interests of our movement that we break it through. Fraternisation between our workers and the Social Democratic workers is necessary. Fraternisation with their leaders — never, but fraternisation between the rank and file on both sides of No Man's Land, that is necessary. We must know how to carry on a matter of fact discussion with the Social Democratic workers, to argue with them in a business-like way. The discussion need not be launched immediately on the highest questions of principle, on the final goal; one can discuss, e. g., about the situation in the Soviet Union and about various practical every-day questions. One can say: we are Communists, we want to discuss this or the other question with you, in order to come to a joint conclusion on these practical questions.

Much every-day detail work is necessary for the purpose of winning the masses. This work is in absolutely no conflict with the great political struggles that we must lead, which, through the sharpening of class antagonisms, also in Western Europe, will again and again come to the foreground. The work in the various great mass organisations of the proletariat is becoming ever weightier. Left wing strategy has not yet become superfluous in many of these organisations. In this period, experience shows, it can often be applied with great success, but of course only on condition that our Party does not lose its own Communist face in the process, that our Party keeps the firmer grip on itself the greater the masses that it must influence. These great masses cannot be led through the application of a mechanical control, but only by conviction and intellectual authority.

It seems to me that our Parties do not always recognise the necessity of indirect methods of leadership of mass movements, that our inexperienced comrades often have a certain amount of fear of an outwardly independent Left movement, of an outwardly non-Party activity, etc., that they are afraid of a certain competition or that they look upon such activity everywhere as dangerous opportunism that must be severely combatted. Yes, of course there are Left organisations and "Left" organisations. There is for instance in Saxony a so-called Left Social Democratic Party. Should we fraternise with this Party? Such an idea is absolutely absurd. Such a Party is on the road back to the counter-revolutionary Social Democracy. But, comrades, there are also other Left organisations, such as the Red Front League in Germany, the revolutionary factory councils, etc., in which we can and must work.

That there are serious dangers in this work, we know, and we must always recognise this clearly. In this work we must know how to **combine the highest solidity of principle with the ability to manoeuvre**. In this we must clearly see the danger — that we would very easily fall into a tail-end policy. But if we see this danger clearly we are justified in having no fear of this work.

Comrades, after these general remarks I shall proceed, in order to throw better light upon these ideas, to the question of our trade union work.

First a special question. Here and there among our ranks, an erroneous view has arisen, especially in such countries where we have Red trade unions, but also in other countries it has become noticeable, that there is a certain mixing of the conceptions of **Party and Trade Union**. They want to politicise the trade unions. Certainly, if this is done rightly, it is all to the good. The political raising of trade union consciousness, the raising of the revolutionary activity of the trade unions — this is necessary; but to try to transform the trade unions into a Party is a mistake. Such political slogans are proposed as are really pure Party slogans which obviate all contact with the real trade union work and which are looked upon by the workers organised in the trade unions as Party slogans with which the trade unions should not concern themselves. To be sure, the trade unions are a school for the Party, but they are not the Party, and every attempt to transform a Red trade union into a Party is only inclined towards isolating us from the masses. And even if such an effort were to succeed, we would thereby attain but a poor substitute for the Party.

Especially in White Terror countries, but also in others, we can in most cases content ourselves with demanding, for the immediate future, **energetic activity in the economic struggles and in all trade union questions**. For the immediate future we do not demand from them any purely political activity; it is sufficient if they ably and, from a revolutionary standpoint, correctly carry on the economic struggles. The workers as a rule think this way: if we attend our trade union organisations we want to speak there about wages, working day, and other conditions of labour, we want to devote ourselves entirely to trade union questions. And if a Communist in an unwarranted manner demands the adoption of purely Party slogans he thereby antagonises the workers.

I shall not discuss the movement for trade union unity in detail at this time. The question of how this movement is to be carried on further is to be dealt with in the Trade Union Commission. In my opinion this movement must be developed in all directions, and we should not only carry on propaganda for unity through our organisations. **Weighty and necessary is the concretising of our tasks in the trade unions**. What we need is, so to say, a **specialised strategy for trade union work**. This is not always recognised. One often believes that it is enough to have policies that are adopted for the general Party policy, that no special concretised strategy for trade union work is necessary. It is often forgotten that already after the III Congress it was decided:

"It is easy but fruitless to preach continually only the general principles of Communism, and thereby to fall into the negative attitude of vulgar syndicalism on concrete questions. This only makes easier the game of the Yellow Amsterdam leadership.

Instead, the Communists should raise their revolutionary attitude according to the actual contents of every question that arises. For example, instead of contenting ourselves with the theoretical-principal opposition to all wage-agreements, we should fight the agreements proposed by the Amsterdam leaders on the basis of their actual contents. Every shackling of the militancy of the proletariat is to be condemned and to be combated decisively. It is notoriously the aim of the capitalists and their Amsterdam agents to bind the hands of the fighting workers by every wage agreement, for this reason it is of course the duty of the Communists to expose this aim to the workers. But the Communists can, as a rule, effect this exposure best by proposing such a form of agreement that constitutes no shackles for the workers.

The same attitude is e. g. desirable towards the benefit funds and mutual aid funds of the trade unions", etc.

Of course to trade unionists this seems to be A. B. C., that should be unnecessary to mention, yet I have the impressions that in our trade union work this A. B. C. has not yet soaked into the blood of our active comrades, that we still work too much with general slogans. What was said at the III. Congress is now of course to some extent antiquated in detail, and not particularly fitted to the present period. We must now concretise this.

In this concretisation we come to the question of **rationalisation** and our practical attitude towards this question. A few remarks on this. In looking into this question I have come to the conclusion that we cannot come out against every measure for the rationalisation of production in capitalist countries. But every measure for the rationalisation of production in capitalist countries is "capitalist rationalisation", for it is carried out in the interest of the capitalists' profit and it takes place in capitalist enterprises. At the same time however, we declare war against every capitalist offensive, against every worsening of the conditions of labour and of the position of the worker, regardless of the pretext on which it may be carried out. In the earlier periods of capitalism we could probably not have said this, as long as capitalism still had advances before it. Now, it can and must be said. Therefore: **fight against every employers' offensive, against every worsening in the conditions of labour and in the conditions of the workers, as a result of the capitalist rationalisation**. Not against every rationalisation of production, but against such rationalisation of production which **worsens the position of the workers**. Such technical inventions that in no way injure the situation of the workers are none of our concern in capitalist countries, we are neither for, nor against.

The Social Democratic leaders want to stand by capitalism in the carrying out of capitalist rationalisation. They want to help the capitalists to break the resistance of the workers, to bring them under the yoke with the least possible friction. Since rationalisation in most cases signifies a direct or indirect attack upon the workers and thereby calls forth the workers' resistance, its objective effect is that of a revolutionising factor. The capitalists want to overcome this resistance partly by splitting the working class into employed and unemployed, partly by pacifying the discontented among the employed as well as among the unemployed. The Social Democratic leaders, especially the trade union bureaucrats, want to help the capitalists to carry out the wholesale dismissals, in pacifying the unemployed, in dividing them from the employed, and in winning those still at work to the side of the capitalist rationalisation.

How is this done? How does the Social Democracy carry this out? **First**, by minimising or denying the harmfulness of the capitalistic rationalisation measures for the workers. We, on the other hand, should expose the truth in this connection to every single worker. **Second**, the Social Democrats try to justify the introduction of capitalist rationalisation by its alleged economic necessity, and at the same time divert the attention of the workers by a sham battle, e. g. a sham battle for a mutual "sharing of the sacrifices of rationalisation". For instance, "Vorwärts" talks as follows: Rationalisation demands certain sacrifices from the workers, here and there workers are discharged, whereas superfluous directors are not discharged; yes, in some cases even new directors were engaged simultaneously; the Social Democracy will therefore demand that in laying off workers some directors shall also be laid off. It is entirely clear that this is only a sly diversion from the real road. Nothing of any use to the workers will ever come out of this Social Democratic demand, they can only be misled by it. And if some-one of our comrades, for instance, were to propose such a "radicalised" demand that at every discharge of the workers, a similar number of the managing staff be laid off, this would also, of course, be absolutely wrong. We are against every discharge of workers, against every worsening of their position. And if the Social Democrats say that it is impossible to assure profitable production without lowering production costs, then we will reply: economise wherever you please, you and your bosses, economise by laying off directors or in any other way you like, but you shall not economise at the expense of the workers — against this we shall fight!

Another argument of the Social Democrats is this: the workers should make these sacrifices now, because later their situation will become better: to be sure a portion of the workers are being discharged now, but later they will be re-employed. We believe that this argument must be exposed as **deceit**. We must make it clear to the workers that new mass discharges

threaten. We must make clear to the workers that it is a lie to say that capitalism has prospects of such improvement that it will be possible to give the workers betterments such as the Social Democrats promise them. We must prove all this to the workers. In addition we should demand the extension of the rights of the factory council. We can demand in Germany, for instance, that the factory council shall be authorised to investigate whether one or the other rationalisation measure, notwithstanding the statements of the management, is really harmful to the workers, and then we should fight for our views in the factory councils.

We must not imagine that our fight on this question of rationalisation will be an easy one. The Social Democracy have learned how to manoeuvre. In their newspapers they do not simply write that the workers must submit to all sacrifices that capitalist rationalisation demands. The German Social Democracy has now, for example, launched a fake campaign for the shortening of the work-day. Such campaigns on the part of the Social Democracy are, of course only deceitful sham battles which we have not yet unmasked before all the workers. Of course our participation in all real mass movements on the trade union field is primarily important. It is the most important. In certain countries, this has still always been our weakness.

In the last few days I spoke with a comrade who recently came from Central Europe, where he spoke with many non-Party workers without their knowing that he was a Communist. He asked them what they thought about the Communists. The reply was practically always in one and the same direction. These workers replied: "Yes, the Communist Party is the only Party which fights for the interests of the workers, and in general it is entirely right but the Communists do not understand practical politics." Comrades, this is an exaggeration, but we cannot deny that in many cases we are still inexperienced. But this inexperience we shall overcome in practical work.

Concerning other branches of our mass work, e. g. in the factory councils, co-operatives, sport organisations, and among the women workers, etc., — yes, comrades, what should I really say about this? You know that we have spoken a lot about this work, that we have adopted voluminous and good resolutions which, however, were badly carried out. Shall we lay these old decisions before you once more to be voted on? What shall we do in order really to get forward on this field? I wish that you would express yourselves on this question. You come from the spot where this work has to be done. You should know what obstacles are on hand, why it is so difficult to carry out our decisions. Or should we perhaps change the decisions? Or is there, perhaps, in our Parties or Party Executives a little deviation in the direction of under-estimating the significance of the work on these fields? I believe that this is the case at least on the field of work among the masses of proletarian women. I am fully convinced that the importance of this work is under-estimated by our Parties. Of course not consciously and not in principle — nobody is against this work — but in practice we are quite weak on this field. To draw the women workers into joint mass actions, to organise and activate them in the trade unions and in the factories — comrades, what have even our best Parties in the capitalist countries seriously done for this purpose? Please tell me, concretely. If we knew for certain that this or the other C. P. since the last Enlarged Executive had won even only 20 — 30 new non-Party women workers for revolutionary work, so that they were now really carrying on this work among the masses of women workers, then this would already be something, even though a very modest beginning, but nevertheless something. But can we with certainty maintain this in all countries? I believe not.

The youth movement is our hope. I think however, that we should speak very seriously, after the Enlarged Executive, with the youth comrades. I do not view the present position of the youth movement pessimistically, but also not optimistically. Our youth work is pressed into a too narrow framework; in many countries this movement is rather purely Communist. But one thing is certain; that our youth movement at present has too little attractive power, too little recruiting power with regard to the non-Party youth.

Of the non-Party organisations sympathetic to us I should like to cite as a model the Red Front League in Germany, especially since in Czecho-Slovakia, where the Party otherwise showed that it understood mass work, a similar organisation was

built up in an extremely narrow frame (as uniformed groups for the maintenance of order). This Czecho-Slovakian initiative cannot even be compared with the R. F. L. in Germany. Towards non-Party mass organisations whose executives are not 51% in the hands of Party members, many comrades still have a certain mistrust. This means too little confidence in the revolutionary leftward turning of the masses.

What else can account for, e. g. the mistrust towards such organisations as the **Workers International Relief**? Yes comrades, if I raise the question of whether this organisation is necessary or superfluous, I am afraid that the answer is not quite clear even for all the comrades in this hall. In my opinion this non-Party organisation has proven its right to exist by its successful work. From the methods applied by the W. I. R. for the attraction of non-Party workers even we can learn many things. Of course, from our viewpoint it is easy to enumerate many mistakes in the work of the W. I. R. Anyone who does much will also make mistakes, and this is after all no Communist organisation. Surely, opportunistic slips have happened, but in general the work of the W. I. R. is useful and necessary.

The best counter-revolutionary newspaper in the world; "**Vorwaerts**" recently printed a pretty tale that might be mentioned in this connection. Under the title "**Kit Inspection**" the paper calls upon the German labour aristocracy, especially the housewives "who find themselves in somewhat assured circumstances", to undertake an inspection of their wardrobe for the purpose of giving superfluous articles of clothing to the unemployed. "**Vorwaerts**" remarks in this connection that they should "liberate themselves from petty bourgeois hoarding and collecting mania", because "the change of fashion quickly overtakes apparel once laid aside". At the end is expressed the political "moral" of this appeal:

"What is involved is quick action before this suggestion again lapses into forgetfulness. Our position as wage earners, as Social Democrats, makes it our duty to help those who are not earning anything. The need is great! And if the Communists spitefully censure our appeal for mutual aid and raise the radical demand that all families of the unemployed be given new clothing instead of worn clothing, we will not permit ourselves to be misled, because after all a serviceable worn coat on one's back is better than a new one which hangs in the imagination and wishes of a long resolution." (Laughter.)

Yes, comrades, it is laughable but we should not under-estimate the effect of this agitation. The leitmotif of this camouflaged counter-revolutionary agitation is always: the Communists shout for the suffering, but we help them, we really do something. We must expose these lies to the workers in practice as lies. Of course the Social Democrats, when they write this sort of stuff, do not want to help the suffering — they only want to make it appear as if they were doing something. The above-mentioned appeal by "**Vorwaerts**" had the purpose of directing the attention of the workers to the activity of the Social Democratic "**Welfare Commission**". A year ago the Social Democracy organised this commission as a competitive parallel organisation to the Red W. I. R. The W. I. R. has of course a much broader foundation, it stands on a much firmer footing — the German Social Democratic leadership knows this and it seems that it does not under-estimate the importance of the work done by the W. I. R. Hence, it has taken counter-measures. Our Social Democratic foes unfortunately understand something more about the work of the W. I. R. than some Communists.

United front organs of various sorts, e. g. such as, in Italy, exist and are founded especially after each action in the form of "agitation committees" in which Communist, non-Party and reformist workers are jointly active — such a system of united front organs is already developing in many countries, even though not as yet to a sufficient extent. We should effectively foster this development, but of course in all this work we should not only preserve inviolate the complete independence of our Party and its Communist face, but we should also constantly, with conscious purpose and consequently put through the revolutionary line of our Party. The German ultra-Left told us: the Executive of the Comintern is now trying to introduce a new line, all kinds of "Left Wings" and Left blocs are to be formed and thereby the Communist Parties are to be liquidated. This lie should be scotched by our practice. The more that we work in the non-Party organisations and in various united front organs,

the more firm must our Communist attitude be. This is absolutely necessary. Every possible germ of liquidarism is to be met with relentless struggle. But the ultra-Left leaders in Germany who have criticised us surely represent no germs of liquidarism, they are the worse embodiment of fully developed liquidationism.

In the struggle against white terror and fascism it seems to me that our illegal Parties are applying partially antiquated methods. The bourgeoisie has already learned to apply new methods before which we stand to some extent helpless. The ultra-Leftists as well as the Rightists — this is very characteristic — are absolutely passive and helpless in questions of practical struggle against White Terror. Of individual heroism there is very much in our ranks. This is evidence that we really represent a great virile idea. But it is impossible to overcome White Terror with bare individual heroism. What matters here also is the ability to utilise the Communist Party to a correct extent, to organise the broad masses and to mobilise them against the class foe. This is especially true where there is a Fascist mass movement as in Italy. Thus far, Fascism in Italy has overcome its crises one after another, but I do not think that it will have such smooth sailing very much longer. I am of the opinion that even if Fascism can be a saviour of the bourgeoisie, under certain circumstances, if a provisional Fascist regime can render ever such great service to the bourgeoisie, it is nevertheless not a lasting system of government. Just as robbery is not a production method, so Fascism is no lasting governmental method. It is far more a disorderly bearer of a condition of lasting civil war, or a constant provoker of civil war. But capitalist production requires more peace. It is possible that the conflict between this requirement of an important section of Italian big capital and the political requirements of Fascism will soon make itself felt in a very serious crisis in the Fascist regime, especially in view of the strengthening of our movement. Mussolini has already reached such a state that he has to organise attacks against himself.

But also in the other White Terror countries is it our task to organise a mass movement against the terror régime, for only in this way can we make headway. In these countries where the Social Democracy directly or indirectly supports the White Terror our task is perhaps even more difficult than in Italy. Even opposition to the White Terror, to provocateurs and spies, does not appear sufficiently clearly to many workers. But as a rule it is entirely possible to make this comprehensible to all proletarians, only we have not explained it clearly enough everywhere. Let us take Poland, for example. Is it clear to every worker in a factory there that spying against the Communists is a reprehensible hangman service? At least a short time ago we were told that it is not yet clear to all workers, that there are P. P. S. people in the factories who even look upon it as a sort of honour to lend a hand to the police-spies in their tricks against our comrades.

The freeing of the masses from the hypnosis of terrorism can only follow from the organisation of an apt activity of the masses. For this purpose we need such partial demands that really fit the given situation in order to make the masses mobile against the White Terror; and this movement of the masses must proceed in such a way that it will not be easy for the government to hinder them.

I should like to cite an example from Italy. The greatest anti-Fascist demonstration of recent times was the collection of money for the British strikers, an action which apparently had no connection whatever with the struggle against Fascism. The masses feel a vital need for some sort of independent activity whereby to protest against the Fascist régime, and the Communist Party in a lucky moment issued the slogan for the support of the British miners. This support campaign took the form of a real mass movement, and in a short time more than 200,000 lire were collected, which is quite a good deal for Italy in comparison with what was collected in other capitalist countries. This has given the impression of a certain political disintegration of Fascism, it has spurred the masses to further struggle. After this collection our Party organised a collection campaign for the "Unità" and even many peasants gave ample support to this collection of funds. It often happened that when our comrades wanted to quiet these peasants with the assurance that their names would not be published they frequently received the reply: "No, you must also publish our names in our paper, we are not co-

wards, we dare to show that we support the Communist Party." This was a symptom of the mood of the masses.

What kind of initiatives and slogans are to be resorted to in a given situation in order to mobilise the masses against the White Terror and to coalesce them into a more or less loose organisation or fighting movement? To find this solution is often a very difficult question and is not solvable only theoretically. Even the funeral of our martyrs can under certain circumstances give the occasion for that sort of a mass mobilisation; or any sort of demand for democratic liberties, or a political trial, etc., can serve as a fitting occasion for the launching of a mass movement.

The struggle against provocateurs and spies we have so far not been able to develop with sufficient breadth and effect. We are dogged practically everywhere by provocateurs and spies, in the White Terror countries as well as in others, by royalist as well as by republican provocateurs and spies. What are we doing against them? Well, we protect ourselves in White Terror countries by the requisite conspiracy, more or less skilful, — that is what we are doing. But we do not organise a mass struggle against the provocateurs and spies of the counter-revolution. Yet this is exactly what can and must be done. For instance, we could, if we wanted to, develop a real mass campaign against spies and provocateurs in the factories and in all proletarian mass organisations. That is very necessary. As long as we alone are the persecuted, as long as the spies are not morally persecuted anywhere so long will their work be easy and ours difficult. It is necessary to develop such a mass sentiment against these jailors' henchmen of the counter-revolution that they must be afraid of exposure wherever they may appear, and that they must be afraid of the indignation of the masses.

In my opinion the Communists in the ranks of the Red Aid should work in the direction that the valuable activity of this organisation will be developed on a much broader scale and in much more elastic forms.

I should now like to mention certain examples from the experiences, achievements as well as mistakes, shortcomings and weaknesses of some of our most important sections on the field of their work among the broad proletarian masses.

First, as to the C. P. of Germany. Whether the Party, in its conduct of the campaign for a referendum on the question of the expropriation of the Royal Houses made any kind of petty mistakes or not, of that I am not so sure, but the essentials of this campaign I do know, and I must say I have no desire to criticise the Party on this question. This campaign was carried through by the Party with splendid success; it is a model of how a mass action can be carried out even in the worst times of relative stabilisation and its attendant passivity of the masses. The C. P. raised itself in the course of this action into the leader of the broadest of mass movements, and has thereby raised also the revolutionary consciousness of the masses. The influence and authority of our Communist Party has risen tremendously thereby. I am of the opinion that all our Parties in capitalist countries have much to learn from the way this campaign was carried out, quite regardless of whether any sort of little mistakes were made in it. It was a test of the political forces of the Party. But the continuation of this campaign, the exploitation of its effects, was already not so good. For instance, the slogan which was put to the foreground in the "Roté Fahne" as a call to the Left Social-Democratic workers: "Out of the Social-Democratic Party, into the Communist Party!" Sure, that is good business, but it is not to be done so simply. The masses are not yet ripe enough for this. The whole problem consists in just this — how can we accelerate their ripening for this slogan. Now the slogan does not as yet correspond to the situation.

The organisation of the Workers' Congress was likewise a good idea. That this initiative on the part of the C. P. G. was correct was best evidenced by the attack of the "Börsenzeitung" the German-Nationalist organ, in the issue of September 9th.

The writer, of course, produced a lot of fake material, but simultaneously he showed that these scoundrels understand very much of the essentials. And the fact that during the whole period the "Vorwärts" tried to maintain silence on the workers' congress shows that the Social Democratic leadership likewise realises what it is all about. But our Party Executive then picked exclusively Communists as speakers at this Congress. This de-

cision was changed later, which is much to be welcomed. But this temporary mistake, even though it lasted however short a time, was not accidental. It is a definite symptom that our Party is still somewhat weak in this direction.

Yet more than that of such small mistakes is the significance of the Party's weakness in trade union work. In my opinion this is the weakest point of the German Party. We shall discuss this further in the German Commission. That a fundamental change must take place here is clear. Otherwise the C. P. G. cannot make progress. In the factory councils the Party achieved successes. In the R. F. L. it has worked well, and its own reorganisation on the basis of factory nuclei has been best carried out by the German Party.

It is a pleasure to note that in many towns the Party nuclei are really living, working, fighting. This is an important achievement. The increased mass influence of the C. P. G. showed itself in the elections in Saxony, especially in the Municipal elections. The German Party showed in its work — and this is its strong side — great energy and much initiative, it has already many fighting experiences and the general Bolshevik level of this Party is relatively high. But from such a Party is also demanded much, much more than from many other Communist Parties. It must not for a moment forget that in comparison with the German Social Democracy it is still altogether too weak. The chief task of overcoming this deficiency is in the development of Communist trade union work. About the Party press and its shortcomings I shall speak particularly later on.

A few words about the mass work of the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia. This Party is a real mass Party. It has had, first of all, important election victories, but that is not all, it also e. g. carried on a good fight against Fascism. It has known how to conduct this struggle, not through abstract propaganda, but by making it popular and successful through concrete slogans. In this struggle it has for the time being — of course not for all time — politically defeated the Fascist movement. It has been able furthermore, with regard to the national antagonisms, to maintain a correct course, which is no easy task in a country like Czecho-Slovakia.

But the Czecho-Slovakian Party also has its shortcomings. On the field of trade union work it has established too little connection with the masses that are organised outside of the Red Trade Unions. The trade union organisations as well as the Party organisations in Czecho-Slovakia suffer from a certain dullness, and also from a certain lack of political development and shortage of active cadres. The nucleus life is not yet sufficiently developed, and still more deficient is the work of the fractions in the various mass organisations.

The French Communist Party has likewise had successes recently in the winning of the masses. This is undeniable. Its mass influence has risen. But we get the impression as if this is not so much due to the Party as to the good fortune of particularly favourable circumstances. Class antagonisms are sharpening in France. The proletariat still greatly lacks experience in battle. Our Party has the leading position among the workers in Paris, to be sure, and this is not to be underestimated; this is not yet the case in other large capitalist countries. But to consolidate this position politically and organisationally by day-to-day revolutionary activity among the masses, on this our Party is still very weak. Perhaps it is directing its attention somewhat too one-sidedly towards election campaigns and parliamentary activity. And the connection between the Central and District Executives still seems to be too weak. Some comrades maintain that the Party has recently lost members during the reorganisation, other deny it — nobody knows it for certain. The membership of the Party is therefore somewhat indefinite, which is also a sign of its lack of development. The membership fluctuation seems to be rather large.

We have in France also a relatively large sympathetic trade union organisation, but its activity in strike movements has been weak. A vigorous unity mood prevails among the masses. Many reformist workers come to the meetings of the C. G. T. U. This proves that these workers really have no fearful prejudice against the Red Trade Union organisation. But we must know how to utilise better this unity sentiment in practice. Big propaganda does not help here, we must know how to carry further the unity movement in practice. How this

is to be done is a problem that must be discussed further in the Trade Union Commission.

The Communist Party of Italy has of late really gone through a high-school of revolutionary work. Aside from the Fascist party, the Communist Party is now the strongest Party in Italy. It has been able in many cases to apply a correct united front tactic among the masses successfully. Many examples of this could be cited which, however, cannot be discussed publicly at the present time. Such successes under the difficult conditions that prevail in Italy show that our Party has already learned much in the science of revolutionary activity.

The Communist Party of Great Britain is developing rapidly. The first significant act of this Party in the course of its development was the organisation of the publication and distribution of the Party newspaper. The Party has shown through its energy that a Communist newspaper can achieve a real mass circulation in a short time. The second important act of the British C. P. was the launching of the Opposition in the trade unions through the trade union work of the Communists. In a few years the English Communists, together with the Minority Movement, have created a firm oppositional position in the trade union movement and have done successful revolutionary work. The third act of the British Party is its struggle in the past year in connection with the miners' strike. If we knew nothing further than the facts concerning the circulation of the Communist factory papers during this strike, then this strike alone would be good evidence of what the young Party has done during its trial of strength. A testimonial from our foes could be read in a telegram according to which the reformist enemies are said to have stated: if the Communists had not "interfered" we would long ago have had a majority among the miners for the liquidation of the strike. Any Communist Party could be proud of such a testimonial from the foe.

But our British Party is not yet a mass Party. It must grow much, very much, stronger. And the Party also has occasion for self-criticism. We are of the opinion that the Party has recently made certain mistakes which should be discussed further in the British Commission of the Plenum. Yes, only one who does nothing never makes any mistakes, but everyone of us is in duty bound, if he makes mistakes, himself to criticise them. A few weeks ago the Executive sent to the last Party Congress of the British Party a telegram which concluded with a few sentences directing the attention of the Party to the necessity for self-criticism. The British Party Executive, however, when it published this telegram in its central organ, forgot to publish these sentences about self-criticism along with the rest*). I should like to say to the British comrades: you can see how much we love you, we love your successes and practically everything in your Party — only excepting your mistakes, and I should like to warn the British comrades: beware lest you fall in love with your own mistakes! Self-criticism is the duty of every Communist Party.

A few words concerning the Scandinavian Communist Parties. The Swedish Party has recently had to record election gains, but also election defeats, in the municipal elections. In a number of trade unions our Party has a not inconsiderable mass influence, but this influence is extending very slowly. Our foes are still very strong and do everything possible to paralyse our progress. Lately they have begun a campaign for a general affiliation of the trade unions to the Social Democratic party. In this way, they want to make impossible the further development of the Left trade union unity movement in Sweden, it wants to forbid all trade unions belonging to the Social Democracy to affiliate with the unity movement. The difficulties are therefore very great, but I have the impression that our Party has not done everything possible on this field.

In Norway our Party has taken part in big economic struggles, but it has thus far had too little success in extending, and above all in organisationally consolidating, its influence among the broad masses. The Trammæliters manoeuvre skillfully

*) In a subsequent Session the speaker declared that he was not aware that the full contents of the telegram was published in a succeeding number of the Central Organ of the C. P. G. B.; had he known this sooner, he would have considered it unnecessary to mention the non-publication of the sentence in question.

in order to paralyse the effect of the work of our Party. To some extent, our Party was also hindered by a lack of internal unity in concentrating energetically its attention upon the work of winning the masses.

Comrades, since my time has passed very rapidly, I find myself compelled to shorten the rest of my report as much as possible. After all there is a chance to discuss the individual questions in the various Commissions.

Among the illegal communist Parties there is still to be noted a certain bottling up of Party activity, which we must necessarily overcome. In many cases one of the causes of this phenomenon is that inexperienced comrades misunderstand the requirements of underground work. Not worse, but more skilful underground activity than heretofore is necessary. In consequence of poor conspiratory activity, some Parties have had too many sacrifices. But we must not conspire in such a way that our whole work is so far underground that its effects are practically nowhere to be seen. In my opinion, for the purpose of better exploiting legal opportunities, a certain change is necessary in the work of several illegal Parties. How this is to be done should be investigated by the respective Party Executives.

Our Communist Press suffers practically universally from a certain lack of revolutionary popularity. We have, to be sure, revolutionary newspapers that are not popular enough, and we also have some popular papers that are not revolutionary enough. For example, the "Humanité" has of late become much more popular, but to some extent it is trying to substitute sensationalism for revolutionary popularity. The "Rote Fahne" in Germany has its strong sides which reveal themselves e. g. in the revolutionary vigour of its presentation. But with this is bound up also one of the weaknesses of this paper: monotonous storm signals are tiresome. Such very glaring mistakes as the "Rude Pravo" made not long ago in the well-known article about Otto Bauer's speech rarely happen in our press. But this case is at the same time a symptom of rather widespread shortcoming: the lack of a sufficiently close contact between the Party Executive and the editors. This deficiency is to be seen practically everywhere; and this fact proves that what is involved is a wrong attitude on the part of the Executives. The importance of the press in the present period is being underestimated. If this were not so more attention would be given to the press, and first rank Party leaders would write for it regularly. Now this is left almost entirely to the editorial craftsmen, most of whom are too little connected with the workers in the factories since they are occupied one-sidedly in their craft. Contact between Party Executive and press must be improved everywhere.

The Central Organ of the American Party was for a time practically filled with Communist theses. In a recent session of the C. C. the editors themselves exercise sharp self-criticism on 32 points.

(Interjection by Comrade Pepper: "And the editors were right!").

They even exaggerated a little. Now there has actually been a certain improvement, but still not enough. The Party Executive has now proposed to move the paper from Chicago to New York. On this proposal I have as yet no definite opinion. But I am afraid that if the "Daily Worker" is not better edited, it will not get sufficient circulation in New York either.

We should likewise devote more attention to the non-Party press and literature sympathetic to us. Even such little things as the satirical magazines our Parties do not know how to exploit properly. A good satirical magazine has much importance, but very seldom do we see a good issue. The importance of illustrated workers' papers is best shown by the non-Party "Arbeiter Illustrierte" in Germany. And if the Czech Party Executive demands that this weekly shall not be circulated there because it competes with the Party publication, then I would like to say that our Parties should edit their own publications better so that they will really be able to compete. We should not establish high tariffs on such things.

The circulation of literature, such a simple thing, has also not been well organised by our Parties. The things we publish, unfortunately, very often do not reach the hands of the reader. In the beginnings of the Labour Movement it is well-known that many a great revolutionary leader often himself sold his papers, standing on the street-corners or going from house to house,

So with Comrade Katayama, who is here, he stood on street-corners in America and sold his papers, and we take off our hats to him for it. Of course times are somewhat different now, but I nevertheless appeal to the co-operation of our youth for the better organisation of the circulation of Communist literature and press. It must be recognised that this work is also revolutionary work, and that it is not the least important kind of revolutionary work. And if the better organisation of literature circulation cannot be accomplished in this way, then we will do it in a modern way, we will create a network of agents etc. But it must be done somehow. Certain successes can be noted recently on this field also e. g. in Germany.

An important task confronts our Parties also in the raising of the level of their theoretical periodicals. Most of these periodicals are not edited systematically enough along a uniform line, instead they are a collection of articles of a more or less casual nature. Our international organ also has the same defect. It is not long ago that we inaugurated an improvement of our magazine, and we intend to develop this still further. The Parties should do the same, and in this connection should devote serious attention to the theoretical training of the Party membership, to elementary as well as functionary training. Above all I should recommend the short-term course.

The reorganisation of our Parties on the basis of factory nuclei has justified itself. Practically everywhere we have had good experiences with it. But there are still serious difficulties in several countries, especially in France, Scandinavia and in the United States. These difficulties must, of course, be carefully studied, but if anyone says that it is entirely impossible for us to organise virile factory nuclei, then I must reply that under far more difficult conditions it has proven possible.

I could tell you of some examples in White Terror countries, where excellently functioning nuclei were organised even in the prisons, nuclei that issued papers regularly, that printed worker-correspondence regularly, etc. If anyone wishes to argue against these examples that at least nobody could "lose a job" for participation in these "factory nuclei", I can reply that not even this is true: anyone caught in nucleus work as a rule loses his place in the factory workshop. The organising of factory nuclei and their regular activity is possible. For this just a little experience is needed. It very often happens that our comrades simply do not understand how to develop this work, and for this reason we must lay greater value on the work of the instructors.

There is still much complaint about the shortage of forces in our Parties. In many cases this is due to the fact that we have not known how properly to organise the work and to distribute it. For instance, the trade union fractions are active, but the central fraction executive can be heavily overburdened because it is doing almost everything itself, so that a fraction need do nothing further than ratify the resolutions and have them read in meeting by a representative. This is not correct. The Executive must direct the work, but the fractions must carry it out. If the tasks of the fractions are carried out in Party offices away from living contact with the workers, then the fractions will die and the offices will become bureaucratized.

The task of a better development of our revolutionary activity among the broad masses, which I have been emphasising during almost all my time here, is of course in no way contradictory to our task of the inner consolidation of our own Party. On the contrary, it presupposes and urgently demands this consolidation.

In Party discussions on the problem of proper Party leadership, we can often observe two sorts of happenings. The Opposition has the tendency to criticise the existing Party leadership from the standpoint of formal democracy, and the Party Executive in turn shows the tendency to defend even actual bureaucratic mistakes, or prevalent germs of bureaucratism. But in case the opposition captures the Party leadership, and the former Executive goes into opposition, they exchange viewpoints. I mention only the most outstanding example, viz., the case of Ruth Fischer. When Ruth Fischer stood at the head of the C. P. G., she really carried on a bureaucratic clique regime and branded as opportunist everyone who even mentioned the words "inner Party democracy". But immediately she went into opposition, on that very same day she began to demand the broadest possible inner-Party democracy. This is of course a crass

example of the rarest sort. Such a thing really happens only once in a century (laughter). But, in very tiny portions, something similar can happen also to-day.

Already in 1921 we said that there is a certain inherited sin taken over from the old labour movement, a certain relic of dualism between the active functionaries and the passive mass of members who only come to meetings and pay their dues and do other detail Party work. The tendency of this dualism, and the formal attitude towards Party tasks connected with it, said Lenin, is to a certain extent inevitably inherited from the bourgeois environment. But it is our task to overcome as much as possible all survivals of this dualism and formalism, from which basis the bureaucratic deviation as well as the formal democratic deviation can develop. How can we overcome them? This synthesis can be reached only by our gathering together in a close active collaboration of comrades of various nuances, in the Party Executive as well as in all Party organs. If we not only discuss but also work together daily in the practical execution of Party tasks, we shall more readily emerge from differences of opinion and free ourselves from foreign tendencies, and the more easily escape from all unnecessary fractional struggles.

Are there such things as superfluous factional struggles? Yes, such have occurred. I do not say that all factional struggles have only a negative side; it would be an exaggeration to say such a thing. Often the clarification of the Party policy has proceeded along the road of factional struggle. In some cases it has even been impossible to make progress in any other way. This can be the case in such a situation in which the Party Executive has made very big mistakes, as, e. g. in the autumn of 1923 in Germany. In this case it was objectively impossible to go forward on a simple direct road of development. But it is absolutely unnecessary that Party development always takes place along a "dialectic" line, through the formation and clash of differences. Often, unfortunately too often, some Parties have literally followed the Hegelian scheme: Against the Party Executive is formed an antithesis. Thesis and antithesis fight one another, and finally both come to Moscow, where a synthesis is established. If after a while, this new thesis, this egg, be looked at against the sun, we already see a very tiny germ of a new antithesis of which for the time no one knew whether it was capable of development, whether it was fertile or not. In most cases it was fertile and then the dialectics began anew.

Comrades, dialectics on the history of capitalist society is a good thing, and we should exploit it. But it is not useful that the inner development of our Party proceed along this line. We must do everything possible to help our Parties to develop along the direct road of development. We must support our Party Executives in finding the shortest way. We would perhaps not lay so much weight on this, we would not need to oppose factional practices so gruffly, if we were not surrounded by enemies who exploit our inner struggles for their own advantage. Our work always suffers from factional fights. The costs are always charged against us, and they are great. We must do everything possible to avoid them.

We should in general, by various ways and means, raise the authority of our Parties and Party Executives. This is necessary to bring the non-Party masses more firmly under the influence of our Parties.

Our Russian brother Party has recently, in settling the inner Party struggle and in carrying out various tasks of Socialist construction, again given us an example of what a Communist Party should be. Of course no one would think of demanding already to-day quite the same Bolshevik capability from the Parties in capitalist countries; but in this direction, according to this example, we must try to develop our Parties.

One of the shortcomings of our international work still remains the inadequate international connection between the International Executive and the Parties. At all our meetings, we have discussed this. We must admit that even if this connection has improved somewhat in many cases, it is as yet by no means sufficient. I do not say that this is altogether the fault of our Sections, very often the fault has lain also here in our apparatus. We have not understood well enough how to organise the work so as to create this better connection with the Parties. If I spoke about the duty of self-criticism by our Sections, then this is just as necessary in the work of our apparatus here in Moscow.

Another remark. The deficient execution of our international decisions, as well as of the decisions of Party Congresses and Party Executives is a fact that hardly a single comrade will deny. How many excellent theses and resolutions have we adopted at our World Congresses and at the sessions of the Enlarged Executive — which were very deficiently carried out! One should really make a study of this in order to know exactly how the adopted decisions were carried out. This warning is for the purpose of getting each section to proceed more systematically in the carrying out of international decisions. Perhaps we should fix the decisions in a shorter, more concentrated form. For the purpose of better execution it is also necessary to organise everywhere an adequate control over execution. This was a constantly repeated thought of Lenin, that it is not enough to make decisions, but that one must check up on how they are carried out, one must organise the work in such a way that the carrying out of the decisions is controlled as automatically as possible. This is necessary for our work. As long as this is lacking, we will not have any systematic execution either.

In the recent past we had important successes, but we also had defeats. Despite the many shortcomings in our work, our prospects in general are excellent. Only we should learn to do still better on all fields of revolutionary work. Lenin told us in his last speech in this hall that we must learn, above all, to adapt the experiences of the Russian proletariat to the concrete conditions of every single country. I am afraid that if Lenin were alive to-day, he would criticise us rather sharply. I believe he would say to us: You have to study further the science of revolutionary work and of revolutionary struggle. But it is certain that he would also recognise the results of our revolutionary work.

I still remember the little slips of paper upon which Lenin communicated his instructions of various kinds to thousands of comrades in the Russian Party, small proposals and large proposals, very often extremely urgent instructions upon which he frequently wrote: This is to be done in two or three days, or, this is to be done to-day, immediately, no other task can delay it, and then at the end was written: "Report on its execution"! This happened very often. Yes, comrades, this is in practice something very important. Not only the execution is important, but also the reporting on it. Not the whole control, but an important part of the control consists in the regular reporting on how things are carried out. The reporting should not be done mechanically, or in a stereotyped form, but from everyone who has received a task, a report must be required on how he has carried it out.

I beg you, comrades, not to take offence at the rather critical remarks that I have made here. I have considered it my duty to exercise this self-criticism of our practical work. Perhaps I have been mistaken in various details, but the chief line of thought is certainly correct. Lenin's basic instruction on revolutionary mass work, viz., the work to raise the revolutionary level of the broad masses of workers, and the practical concretisation of this task for the purpose of overcoming the counter-revolutionary influence of Social Democracy and reformism, I should like to have, so to say, hammered into every comrade — not only those that are here, but into every Party member, into every active Party worker. This Leninist instruction should be accepted here and should be adopted, and not only adopted, but also carried out; and not only carried out, but also a control established over how it was carried out and then reports rendered on this execution the next time we meet here. (Great Applause.)

Homage to the Memory of Comrade Krassin

Comrade JILLEK (Chairman):

I must make the sad announcement of the death of Comrade Krassin. On this matter Comrade Skrypnik has the floor.

Comrade SKRYPNIK (Soviet Union):

Comrades, the sad task devolves upon me to inform the Enlarged Executive of the C. I. of the severe loss sustained by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and with it by the entire Communist International. To-day, at 8:40 p. m. after a severe and protracted illness, there died Leonid Borisovitch Krassin, member of the Central Committee of the Communist

Party of the Soviet Union, one of the oldest Marxists of our Party and our country, an old colleague of Lenin in struggle and in work, former People's Commissar for Foreign Trade, and until the time of his death, Ambassador of the Soviet Union to Great Britain.

At the time of the arising of the Marxist labour movement in Russia, in the years 1889-1891, Leonid Borisovitch Krassin began his revolutionary activities. At first he worked in various circles of the Marxist youth and was among the first of those active in the raising of the class consciousness of the Leningrad proletariat. Long years of underground work passed him by until after the II. Congress of our Party, when he was co-opted into the Central Committee, since which time he stood through long years at the helm of the Party. After the first months of the split with the Menshiviki, Comrade Krassin joined, as a member of the C. C., the Bureau of the Committee of the Majority; and in connection with the calling of the III. Congress of the R. S. D. E. P., and the I. Congress of the Bolsheviiki, he developed energetic activity and was elected into the Bolshevik Central Committee by the III. Congress. He carried on energetic activity on the field of literature shipment, establishment of underground printing presses, the distribution of illegal literature, and in addition, directed the preparations for the armed uprising in 1905. The energy of Comrade Krassin was inexhaustible. One after another underground printing presses were created. And the underground illegal proletarian Bolshevik word — in thousands and hundreds of thousands of leaflets, proclamations, manifestoes, pamphlets, and periodicals — spread over the whole country, calling for the uprising and awakening the class-consciousness of the proletariat. During these years up to 1905, Comrade Krassin worked at the preparation of the first uprising, the first revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in Russia of that time. At that time the first foundations of the alliance between workers and peasantry were laid. During these years, Comrade Krassin performed a tremendous work. At the IV. and V. Congresses Comrade Krassin was elected as a member of the Central Committee, and he there continued his energetic activity. In the period of reaction, when the Tsarist persecution forced him into emigration, Comrade Krassin worked in electric stations in

Germany as one of the most prominent electrical engineers of our country. Comrade Krassin was brought back by Tsarism for work in electrical stations in Russia. Here in Leningrad he continued his work. After the victorious uprising of the proletariat, when the bourgeoisie was overthrown and the workers and peasants took power into their own hands, Comrade Krassin began most energetic activity in the ranks of our Party, and as a member of the Extraordinary Commission for the Maintenance of the Red Army, he devoted his whole energy to the organization of the supply service of our armed forces, by means of which the proletariat saved its revolution.

Later he was appointed People's Commissar of Transport, and entrusted with the direction of one of the most important commanding heights of our Union, the People's Commissariat for Foreign Trade. And when it then became necessary to send to England an Ambassador who would realise the policy of the Party, Comrade Krassin was entrusted with this task.

At the XIII. Congress, Comrade Krassin was again elected as a member of the C. C. of our Communist Party of the Soviet Union. At the XIV. Congress the Party repeated this demonstration of its confidence.

As one of the oldest Leninists, one of the oldest Marxists, who through 40 years worked among the proletarians, who for long years collaborated with Lenin and carried out his instructions with tremendous initiative and energy, Comrade Krassin has done a great deal for the emancipation of the working class of our country. Comrade Krassin stands before me as I saw him during the last 20 years of our joint revolutionary activity. Sacrifice, energy, initiative, were always features characteristic of him. In him, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and jointly with it, the whole Communist International, has lost one of its most self-sacrificing members. I beg you to honour his memory by rising.

(The delegates all rise to their feet and remain standing in silence.)

The Session was then closed.

Discussion of the International Situation and the Tasks of the Comintern.

Fourth Session.

Moscow, November 24, 1926.

The Session was opened by the Chairman, Comrade SEMARD (France), at 6:0 p. m. The first to speak in the discussion on the reports of Comrades Bukharin and Kuusinen was

Comrade TREINT (France):

Capitalist stabilisation shaken by the Chinese national revolution, the British strike and the Indonesian revolt, has not yet disappeared.

The world situation should be examined in relation to its two poles: Moscow and Washington. Bukharin does not sufficiently emphasise the weight of American imperialism.

The objective bases of the growing rivalry between Europe and America are: 1) the regime of contributions imposed by the debt payments, 2) capitalist resistance to American political and economic control, 3) unprecedented accentuation of competition caused by the fact that the American home market is approaching the point where it is unable to absorb any more goods, which compels American industry to flood the world markets with its commodities.

Capitalist Europe is becoming conscious of its interests as opposed to the revolutionary forces (the proletariat, the U. S. S. R. and the Colonial movements) and as opposed to the United States. This is manifested in German, French and British big capitalism by the following factors: the Rechberg letter, the Stinnes Plan, Stresemann's policy, Loucheur and the economic conference of the League of Nations, debt quarrels between Great Britain and America. Great Britain and America are in agreement for the return to the gold standard and against naval disarmament in anticipation of their future struggles.

Locarno, though brought about in agreement with the U. S. A., nevertheless has its edge directed against the U. S. A. In spite of the American Republic (withdrawal of Brazil from the League of Nations, the Houghton Report, the quarrel over debts) Germany enters the League of Nations.

A large number of trusts have been formed or are in process of formation. This process has a tendency to take place on an Anglo-European scale. Great Britain postponed her adhesion to the steel cartel owing to the miners' strike, the delayed process of trustification within the country, and her negotiations with the Dominions at the Imperial Conference.

The Bankers' manifesto which was valid for Europe but not for America, signifies the opposite of an Anglo-American bloc.

No-one will deny the development of antagonisms between the various European imperialist powers, and no-one will deny the development of antagonism between Europe and America. But the question is to know which of the two processes is developing more rapidly and tends to come to the forefront, subordinating the other.

Two perspectives are possible:

Either an approaching revolutionary development in Europe, in which case there will be a coalition of all the imperialist states of Europe and America against the revolutionary peril — or else a retarded revolutionary development, in which case there will be an Anglo-European alliance against the United States and against the revolutionary forces which will end in bringing us nearer to a new imperialist war from which the workers will only be able to save themselves by new revolutions.

The Social Democrats represent the trend towards an Anglo-European alliance, a trend towards peace under the capitalist regime. In reality they are marching towards reaction, counter-revolution, war against the U. S. S. R. and the Colonial peoples, and an imperialist war between Continent and Continent. The Social Democratic theory of super-imperialism must be ruthlessly combated.

As Trotzky represents Europe as being irremediably divided

in face of colossal America, there is only a choice of two conclusions: either to march towards super-imperialism under the American hegemony or else the imminence of forthcoming revolutions.

Trotzky, rejecting the trend towards super-imperialism is obliged to draw the conclusion of coming imminent revolutions, considered as the only possible perspective. The Opposition which shares Trotzky's point of view is also led to adopt a completely erroneous policy: withdrawal from the Anglo-Russian Committee, denial of the possibility of constructing Socialism in the U. S. S. R.

In reality, America is not yet so strong that she can prevent the move towards an Anglo-European alliance. Her trade balance is fragile. She will export less capital.

The fantastic theory of durable imperialist blocs inside Europe must be abandoned. It is only a question of temporary groupings with a view to negotiating compromises. Great Britain is seeking to play a leading role thanks to her financial supremacy.

Lenin, in his article of 1915 showed the possibility of a United States of Europe considered as a reactionary capitalist alliance against the United States and against socialism. The reasons for admitting this possibility have increased and not diminished since 1915. If Bukharin denies the possibility of an Anglo-European alliance he changes Lenin's conclusion without valid motive and offers a revision of Leninism on this point.

These are, in short, events which can only be decided upon as perspectives.

The danger of an alliance of the Anglo-European imperialist powers threatens the U. S. S. R. and the Colonial peoples with new aggression; it threatens the standard of living of the European proletariat and the European and American proletariat with a new imperialist war.

To underestimate this danger means objectively playing into the hands of the Social Democrats, who, on the basis of this policy of imperialist regroupings on an Anglo-European scale, seek to develop new pacifist illusions. Geneva and the League of Nations must be ruthlessly denounced and combatted.

The United States of capitalist Europe must be counterposed by the alliance of the U. S. S. R. with the Chinese revolution and the world proletariat as well as the struggle for the United States of Socialist Europe.

Comrade PEPPER:

The study of imperialist contradictions is presented here by Comrade Treint with a gesture of a discoverer. The question is an essential one since imperialist contradictions not only include the question of future wars, but they also determine in part whether the economic struggles of the proletariat are to be transformed into political conflicts, or, finally, into revolutionary battles. Despite his pose as an inventor, Comrade Treint has no monopoly in the raising of this point. Comrade Bukharin in his report dealt with the questions of imperialist contradictions in their fullest depth and extent. The only difference is that Treint's thesis is wrong while Bukharin's thesis is right. Treint cites my pamphlet "The United States of Socialist Europe". He even headed his article in "Cahier du Bolchevisme" with a few sentences from my pamphlet. He cites what I wrote about the first weak signs of a bloc-building against America. But he forgets to cite the second half of my analysis, however, in which I establish that: "The antagonism between America and Europe is growing, which, of course, contrary to the claims of the prattler Breitscheid, does not exclude, that the contradictions between the various European countries are likewise growing".

Comrade Treint claims that Pepper formulated objective conclusions identical with its own. But at the same time he

writes: "In any event one should not fight a theses just because it is original". I must state that I have nothing whatever to do with Treint's theses, and I am not fighting it because it is original, but for the one tiny reason that it is wrong.

Comrade Treint's thesis can be divided into three parts: 1. he maintains that the contradictions in Europe are declining and that a certain levelling process is going on in Europe; 2. that at the same time the antagonisms between Anglo-Europe and America, and, 3. the formation of the United States of capitalist Europe either against America or the Soviet Union or both, — are absolutely inevitable.

Within the Communist International there are found many false theories also in connection with the question of the relationship of Europe and America.

The first of these faulty theories was formulated by Comrade Trotsky. He maintained that the relationship between Europe and America would take such a form that European economy would more and more become a sector of American economy, that Europe would be put on rations by America. This theory is false. World hegemony has gone over from Europe to America economically and in part also politically, and American predominance will continue to grow, but the assumption of Trotsky that Europe will not resist is wrong, one-sided, and does not reckon with the imperialist nature of the European powers.

The second faulty theory about America-Europe was formulated by Comrade Radek. Beginning with an assumption of a co-operation between England and America that is not merely temporary, but permanent and holding good for a whole period, he has built up the theory of a general coalition of all capitalist powers. He even sees in this eventuality the only possibility for a grouping of world powers in the immediate future. It is of course a tremendous exaggeration if one overlooks the most important clash of present-day imperialism, the antagonism between America and Great Britain.

The third of these faulty theories was hatched out by Comrade Treint. If Comrade Radek advocates the theory of "Anglo-American capitalism", then Comrade Treint formulates the theory "Anglo-Europe". For Treint "Anglo-Europe" plays the role of the Siamese twins. (Interjection by Bukharin: "That is the famous French two-children system!")

Comrade Treint is completely blind to the antagonisms within Europe, which, in his opinion are in process of vanishing. On September 15th, he wrote in the "Cahier du Bolchevisme":

"Differences in the level of conditions have become weaker in the larger countries of Europe: England, France, Germany, and Italy. A proof that the internal antagonisms in Europe are giving way to the antagonism between the United States and Europe, is the energy and ease with which the League of Nations has dealt with the Greco-Bulgarian conflict".

This is absolutely wrong. Treint maintains that a levelling process is proceeding in Europe, (Bukharin interjects: "Especially in France and Italy!") that the antagonisms in Europe are giving place to the antagonism between America and Europe. And what does Treint play as his chief trump, as his proof? The fact that the League of Nations settled the Greco-Bulgarian conflict with energy and ease. What is the political significance of this claim he sets up? Nothing less than that the League of Nations is able — with energy and ease — to settle Europe's conflicts, in other words, the possibility of a lasting peace in Europe, a tranquil ultra-imperialism in Europe.

In an article written in October, viz., after Thoiry, Comrade Treint even went so far as to deny the possibility of rival bloc-building by the imperialist powers in Europe, since the organisation of "Europe as a whole" was commencing. And this Treint writes after Thoiry, in the face of the fact that it showed, on the one hand, the Franco-German bloc, and on the other, the Anglo-Italian. In the face of the disintegration of the League of Nations, the disintegration of the so-called "European unity", the revival of hostile bloc building inside of Europe — Treint comes and declares all reality null and void — in the name of his erroneous theory.

These theories must logically lead to a revision of the Leninist analysis of imperialism. These theories of Comrades Trotsky, Radek and Treint are wrong because, deviating from

the Leninist conception, they seek to isolate abstractly the struggle of the imperialist powers for stabilisation, viz., the universal historic interest of the bourgeoisie, from the concrete forms of this struggle, i. e. the struggle for stabilisation that can proceed only in the form of these imperialist powers' struggles against each other. To claim a levelling process in capitalist Europe, as is put forth in the theories of Trotsky, Radek and Treint, is to contradict the Leninist conception of the law of the inequality of capitalist development, the concrete application of crisis and prosperity periods, and, politically, the fragility of imperialist group-building in the post-war period, hence, concretely proving the increasing irregularity of development.

For one cannot deny that the United States of Capitalist Europe might come into existence as a "temporary" and reactionary structure. But it would be fundamentally wrong to reckon with the United States of Capitalist Europe as a permanent phenomenon. In a Leninist sense such a coalition of capitalist powers could only be a "breathing spell between wars", and this not only in preparation for wars against America, but also as a preparation for wars between the European Powers.

Treint's theory is closely related to the allegations made by Comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev at the XV. Party Conference, according to which the irregularity in the development of capitalism diminishes during the regime of finance capital. Strangely enough, the passage in Lenin's book on imperialism which emphasises in the sharpest manner the intensification of the irregularity, was not referred to at the XV. Party Conference. I should like to cite this classic sentence:

"Kautsky's talk about ultra-imperialism feeds upon a false idea that brings grist to the mills of the imperialist apologists, that the rule of finance capital diminishes the inequalities and contradictions in world economy, whereas in reality, it strengthens them. Finance capital and the Trusts do not mitigate the differences in the tempo of growth in the various sections of world economy, but they intensify them."

It is fundamentally necessary, theoretically, that Stalin and Bukharin again bring to the foreground the Leninist theory regarding the law of unequal development. They thereby render the same service to Leninist theory that Lenin rendered the revolutionary State theory of Marx, which for a long time was pushed to the background by the opportunist attitude. The Zinoviev-Trotsky theory must be combatted because it is bound up with the Pacifist illusions of the Social Democratic working masses of 1924 who were then promised the realisation of pacifism by the Social Democracy then at the helm of government in a number of European countries. By 1926 the Social Democracy has sunk so low that it expects the realisation of the "pacifist ideals" from the bourgeoisie itself. The Social Democracy now substitutes for the Communist Manifesto of Marx, the Manifesto of the Morgan Bankers.

Comrade HAKEN (Czechoslovakia):

Czecho-Slovakia is a Central-European State so small and of so little importance for world economy that it can play no leading role in the present imperialist struggle for power, it can participate only in the political and economic train of the great Western powers, particularly the French bourgeoisie. In the service of the imperialists it can play an important role only as the tool of their counter-revolutionary and imperialist designs, for instance against the Soviet Union. For this reason, and also because of the strength of the Communist Party, Czecho-Slovakia is not without importance for us.

Soon after the war, Czecho-Slovakia took a most prominent position in its consolidation endeavours in Central Europe.

The bearer of the consolidation endeavours was the so-called all national coalition, the Government composed of the Czech-bourgeois parties and the Czech reformists.

If, under the pressure of the revolutionary waves, the coalition at first had even Socialisation in its programme, it soon dropped these things as the stabilisation and consolidation of the bourgeoisie progressed. It no longer needed these declarations and adopted a more and more reactionary orientation, in which it was consistently supported by the two reformist parties.

It cannot be denied that the stabilisation endeavours achieved certain successes even though they were only partial and transitory.

The Rasin finance plan led to an impoverishment of the small investors and strengthened bank capital considerably.

The whole stabilisation took place at the expense of the toiling strata whose standard of living was frightfully reduced.

The insecurity of the Czecho-Slovakian stabilisation already showed itself this year. The State wrestled continuously with tremendous financial difficulties. The debt payments, the expenditures for militarism, gendarmerie and police meant an already unbearable burden.

A terrific market crisis made itself felt, this signified a virtual catastrophe in over-industrialised Czecho-Slovakia.

To the coal crisis, which is chronic, the crisis in all important industries has been added: textiles, glass, wood, metal, leather, and clothing industries are all fellow sufferers in this crisis.

The Ghent system of unemployment support, that was introduced upon the proposal of the Social Democrats, is approaching bankruptcy because of the catastrophic unemployment. The workers social insurance, which came into effect six months ago, broke down because the employers refused to meet the assessments levied upon them, and the unemployed or part-time workers are unable to meet them. By the introduction of agricultural taxes upon country produce the high cost of living is going up from day to day.

Rents are going up and tenants' protective legislation is being pushed aside; pensions for war cripples and invalids are to be reduced despite the fact that the war victims in Czecho-Slovakia are worse cared for than in almost any other country in Europe. The soldiers' pay was cut down considerably.

The dismissal of State employees, the cutting down of schools and class-rooms, has created unemployment also among the ranks of the intellectuals. In Czecho-Slovakia alone there are 4000 unemployed teachers.

The tax burden is fearful. The Government is preparing a tax reform which, while bringing alleviation to the big industrialists, will mean a new burden upon the labouring elements. The financial position of the municipalities is fearful and will be made still worse by the tax reform.

It is obvious that the bourgeoisie will have to exploit the working class still more in order to overcome this crisis and in order to undertake further attempts at stabilisation.

For this purpose, the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie of all the nations in Czecho-Slovakia, have formed an alliance and created a bourgeois governmental majority.

The stabilisation has bankrupted the previous policy of the Social Reformists. Their leaders know no other slogan than that of the rationalisation of production. On the question of rationalisation we hold to the viewpoint expressed in the reports of Comrade Bukharin, and the Party has already begun agitation along this line.

Despite the fact that Czecho-Slovakian industry is of enormous size for so small a country, so far as the technical and economic side goes it is not able to compete with the industries of America, Germany and France. This inability to compete is to be remedied now by intensified exploitation of the workers, by the remittance of taxes to the big industries, and the shifting of the tax burdens to the poorer strata of the population, thereby resulting in increased struggle for foreign markets.

The stabilisation crisis in Czecho-Slovakia has shattered the faith which the reformist workers formerly had in capitalist stabilisation, and thus it also becomes a crisis for reformism. A leftward turn of the workers is the result. The slogan of the united front, and of trade union unity, finds support among the proletarian elements of the reformist parties. That is why the correct emphasis of these two slogans and their application to concrete questions is of great importance.

This we have actually succeeded in doing in a whole series of actions in Czecho-Slovakia, e. g. in the campaign against the high cost of living and the campaign against the agricultural taxes in the course of which we succeeded in winning a part of the workers of the reformist parties for a joint campaign, despite the prohibition of their leaders.

It is necessary to develop in every State a disciplined, ideologically and organisationally Bolshevised Communist Party that is able to act, a mass Party not only according to its structure, but also according to its leading role over the whole working class. The confidence of the masses that is requisite for this can be won only by a consolidated Party with a firm leadership. The constantly repeated internal crises and factional splits cannot have an attractive and confidence breeding effect upon the masses.

The correct application of the united front slogan on concrete questions has brought the Czecho-Slovakian Party noteworthy successes. In addition, we have carried on a systematic activity towards the separating of the peasantry and middle class from the bourgeois front. The carrying out of the land reform which was not beneficial to the small peasants, the high taxes upon the poor strata and on the other hand, the tax exemptions and concessions towards the rich agrarians has not only resulted in disillusionment among the rural poor and small peasantry, but has also led to considerable shifting of land ownership. The introduction of the agricultural taxes contributed still further to the strengthening of the financial position of the big agrarians.

Although we cannot talk of an agrarian crisis in Czecho-Slovakia, it must be stated that signs of a crisis among the poorest rural strata are appearing, and they are being further strengthened by the flight from industry back to agriculture — since there can be no thought of overcoming the industrial crisis. This fact confronts us with the task of carrying on systematic work among the rural poor and the peasantry.

Comrade Bukharin deploras the insufficient activity of the C. P. Cz. membership. It must be mentioned here that last year's inner Party crisis destroyed neither the unity of the Party nor its mass character. Immediately after the crisis, the parliamentary elections were carried out with a tremendous success for the Party. Except for an isolated attempt at factional work on the part of Comrade Neurath, the opposition in the C. P. S. U. found no foothold among us. The whole Party stood decidedly upon the platform of the majority of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U.

Without a recognition of these successes the reproach of Comrade Bukharin is out of place. However, we take it as an encouragement to still more intensive work in the activisation of our membership.

Comrade KATAYAMA (the delegates rise to their feet and applaud):

Comrades! We all know that from the contradictions of capitalism there issued the World War, which, in turn, resulted in still deeper conflicts between the workers and peasants on the one hand, and the capitalists on the other. This conflict found expression in the Russian Revolution. While at one time we saw all Europe being swept by the world revolutionary movement, at the present time we must recognise that there is a certain stabilisation of capitalism.

But the movement which started in Russia did not stop at its boundaries, it swept on towards the East. Since capitalism started out from the West to the East, these two great forces clashed against one another, in the Far East.

The Chinese Revolution, as we all know, is a National Revolution. Yet of course the Communist Party of China must cooperate with the Kuomintang in a united front of all revolutionary forces. To attempt to isolate the Communists from cooperating with the Kuomintang is a childish idea — we must help the national revolutionary movement to victory. But the National Revolution there is a very advanced one, because of the international character of the national problem there.

The situation in China is very complicated. For instance, in the big towns like Shanghai, Canton, and Hong Kong we have large armies of industrial workers, while in other parts of the country the industrial revolution is only just beginning to be felt. The Chinese revolutionary movement must therefore organise its forces along many different lines, it must form merchants' guilds, peasant leagues, workers' trade unions, etc.

The Chinese Revolution differs in many features from the revolutions of the past. It is, first of all, under the immediate influence of Soviet Russia, and it has become the representative of all the other revolutionary peoples of the East. It faces a great

task as the liberator of the East; it will kindle the spark in India, in Indonesia, in the Philippines, and many other places in that part of the world.

Coming now to conditions in Japan, I will say that there capitalism has become stabilised. Industry, which had faced a crisis, has recovered. But this stabilisation is only a temporary phenomenon.

As regards relations with the Chinese situation, the Japanese militarists are afraid to help Great Britain in its imperialist designs in China because their interests are contrary to those of the British. Of late the Japanese politicians have been trying to win the friendship of the Chinese people, but they will never succeed in this until they give up the 21 points.

Fifth Session.

Moscow, November 24, 1926.

The Session was opened by the Chairman, Comrade Roy, at 10—30 a. m.

Comrade ROY:

We shall continue with the discussion on the reports of Comrades Bukharin and Kuusinen, the first speaker will be Comrade Metcheriakov.

METCHERIAKOV (U. S. S. R.):

Bukharin in his report characterised the period we are passing through as a period of a certain temporary, unstable, and relative stabilisation of capitalism. While, completely in agreement with this characterisation, I think that Bukharin's analysis, mainly dealing with industry and the class struggle of the proletariat, should be supplemented by certain conclusions on agriculture and the peasant movement.

1. According to the figures of the Agricultural Institute at Rome the world agricultural production is approaching the pre-war level. If we take the world grain production, the world indices for the area sown and the harvests give us 100.7% and 100.5% respectively in 1925-26 when compared with 1913. We see the same phenomenon in cattle raising. With regard to technical crops production has surpassed the pre-war level. Hence, it may be considered that while the process of agricultural restoration on a world scale has not yet finished, it is already about to be attained. But the process of restoration has been and is very irregular in the various countries. During the war agriculture developed extensively on the other side of the Atlantic (Canada, U. S. A., Argentine, etc.) at the expense of the agriculture of the European belligerent countries. Today the same superiority of the above-mentioned countries may be observed and the same irregularity in the process of restoration in the various European countries.

This is the source of the instability of the present stabilisation of capitalism in agriculture. In accordance with the restoration of the areas under cultivation in the European countries devastated by the war, and the increase in the crops in these areas, the quantity of agricultural products should also increase. But this quantity of products will be thrown into a market where consumption has been greatly reduced as a result of the decreased wages of the workers. The U. S. S. R., which is working intensively for the restoration of its agriculture, will play a big role by increasing its exports of agricultural products. There should thus be expected in the near future a new crisis of over-production in agriculture and a reduction of the prices of agricultural products. The present irregularity of capitalist development in agriculture makes this crisis inevitable. Consequently, in the agrarian sphere the stabilisation of capitalism is relative, temporary and unstable.

2. The stabilisation of agricultural production in the period we are passing through is the stabilisation of capitalist agricultural production. Just as capitalist stabilisation in industry is brought about at the expense of the proletariat and the peasants, stabilisation of agrarian capitalism is also effected at the expense of the toiling peasants and the workers on whom rests the whole burden of the restoration process, a burden expressed in the rapid and excessive increase of taxes. These taxes provoke growing discontent among the peasants, who are thus drawn into the political struggle.

As to the labour movement in Japan. The Workers and Peasants Party there wields great influence; it has more than two million supporters and today it is controlled by the unions. A few weeks ago it arranged a monstrous demonstration in which more than 400,000 organised peasants took part. Soon the workers and peasants will be openly co-operating against their oppressors.

Long live the Chinese Revolution!

Long live the revolutionary Chinese movement — the Kuomintang!

Long live the Chinese Communist Party!

(Stormy applause.)

The session was thereupon adjourned.

3. In industry we see that the process of stabilisation is characterised by rationalisation. We see the same process of rationalisation in agriculture (use of tractors and other agricultural machinery). This rationalisation diminishes the work of agricultural labourers and the semi-farm labourers and causes great unemployment. Owing to the reduction of emigration this stream of unemployed finds it very difficult to find refuge in other countries. The great majority flock to the towns and increase the number of unemployed, thereby greatly contributing to the reduction of wages.

4. The present stabilisation of agriculture is a stabilisation of capitalist agriculture under the aegis of finance capital. Monopolist finance capital holds increasing sway over present day agriculture. The monopoly of various syndicates and trusts plays a tremendous role in establishing low prices on agricultural products and high prices on industrial products. This policy of the trusts and syndicates is one of the most effective means of shelving all the expense of the process of restoration into the back of the peasants.

On the other hand finance capital enslaves the peasants through its bank credits.

The role of agricultural co-operation is of interest when examining the process of subjection of the peasants by the banks. Agricultural co-operation takes upon itself to collect the farmers' agricultural produce into one centre; it standardises their produce; it enables the farmers to reduce the cost of production. This enables finance capital, through the trusts, syndicates and banks, to intensify its exploitation and pocket everything the farmer has been able to economise with the aid of co-operation. Agricultural co-operation, from a weapon of struggle against capitalist exploitation, becomes a weapon of finance capital.

Many Canadian co-operatives at a certain stage in their development transformed themselves directly into capitalist enterprises by issuing shares. In the U. S. S. R. agricultural co-operation embraces isolated peasant farms in the system of socialist economy and is a weapon of socialist construction, and in the same manner also in capitalist countries agricultural co-operation incorporates isolated peasant farms into the capitalist economic system. It becomes an important weapon enabling finance capital to embrace agriculture, subordinate it and exploit the farmers atrociously.

5. The historic period we are passing through is characterised by an intensified introduction of capitalism in the colonies. This penetration of capitalism, for the time being, is mainly effected by extracting from the colonies the raw material necessary for industry (rubber, oil, coffee, cocoa, tobacco, etc.). The cultivation of these products is undertaken at the expense of the cultivation of rice and other products of peasant consumption. In place of the old self-sufficing or, semi-self-sufficing peasant farms we see the creation of capitalist plantations with wage earners. Hence the elimination of the old agriculture and the old forms and relations. All this ruins the peasants in the colonies, smashes the old customs and living standards and evokes a growth of the revolutionary spirit amongst them. This constitutes one of the principal causes of the revolutionary peasants' movement in the colonies (Indonesia) and the Eastern countries (Egypt, Morocco, etc.) as also the development of the peasant movement in the countries of Latin America.

Thus, the stabilisation of capitalism in general, and the stabilisation of agrarian capitalism in particular, which we now observe, signifies the intensification of the offensive against the

peasants and increased ruin of the peasants by finance capital. The latter is to-day the main enemy of the peasants. The big landed proprietors are becoming the agents of bank capital. The more the process of capitalist stabilisation develops and capitalism penetrates into the agrarian countries and the colonies, the more will bank capital show itself to be the main enemy of the peasants, and the community of interests of the proletariat and the peasantry will grow all the more in the struggle against their common enemy. Furthermore, the discontent of the peasantry will still more increase and become transformed into a series of revolutionary movements.

The tremendous importance of the work of Communists in the peasant movement is clearly demonstrated by these facts.

Comrade DUBROVSKY (U. S. S. R.):

I shall deal with questions of agriculture and the peasantry, just as Comrade Meschtscheriakov has done. In order to be able to understand the present day "stabilisation of capitalism" one must be clear as to its effect upon the peasantry and agriculture.

First of all two questions must be answered here. The first question involves the extent to which "capitalist stabilisation" has become a lasting phenomenon on the field of agriculture. The second question concerns the effect of capitalist stabilisation upon the class struggle in the village i.e., whether this is intensified or ameliorated by stabilisation.

The first of these questions has already been answered by Comrade Meschtscheriakov. If we consider the chief indices on the field of agriculture and of industry we will see that on a world scale (I emphasise this specially) the approach to the pre-war standard is practically the same on both fields. In 1923 the restoration process of agriculture was further advanced than in industry, hence a definite over-production made itself felt in agriculture, and an under-production in industry. The so-called "scissors" of 1923—24 was a consequence of this. In 1924—26 the re-establishment of industry took on a more rapid tempo so that in 1926 industry as well as agriculture on a world scale had practically reached the pre-war standard. This is the basis of a certain capitalist stabilisation on the field of agriculture.

On a world scale production has already been so far re-established as to liquidate the under-production crisis, and with it also the high prices. Yet the expansion of agricultural production, especially in comparison to industry, has not yet gone so far as to permit of an over-production crisis at this time. The over-production of grain in the overseas exporting countries is balanced by an under-production in the European countries.

One result of this transitory, relative and extremely unstable balance is a reduction of the scissors on a world scale. The unevenness of productive development has led to an unevenness in price movement, and even to a "scissors" in the overseas countries, and in Europe to the liquidation of the "scissors" in the direction of higher agricultural prices in comparison to industrial prices. To the extent, however, that the cultivated land increases in the European countries involved in the war, and that the production of the overseas countries mounts, a new agrarian crisis is entirely possible.

I shall not devote much time to the question as to the extent to which the present "capitalist stabilisation" of world economy proceeds not only at the expense of the masses of workers, but also at the expense of the peasantry. Comrade Meschtscheriakov has already spoken fully enough on this.

Now as to the second question, whether stabilisation sharpens the class struggle, or on the contrary, ameliorates it. In order to be able to correctly answer this question, we must first of all be clear as to the general course of capitalist development in agriculture and the influence of capitalistic advances upon the class struggle in the village. A study of the history of the peasant movement shows us that it breaks out always at the turning points in the economic development of the countryside, and this at a time when one economic form is replaced by another. Thus, for example, the great peasant uprisings, the peasant revolution, took place during the transition from feudalism to capitalism, from serfdom to free labour. But even far less significant economic transformation often result in peasant uprisings, even if only a partial dislocation within an economic system takes place. Since the replacement of an economic system by another was determined by the development of capitalism (trading, industrial

and finally finance capitalism), the old social relationships changed in direct ratio to the rapidity of capitalist developments. From this follows the revolutionising significance of the period of economic advance for the peasantry in countries that constitute a part of the capitalist system.

In this is found the explanation of the fact that the greatest revolutionary peasant uprisings break out after periods of economic advance. It is sufficient to point out that the first big Chinese peasant uprising took place at the beginning of the 20th century immediately after the first great advance of foreign capital upon China, and consequently also upon the Chinese village. The first Russian peasant revolution of 1905—07 also took place at a time of stormy capitalist development, after the transformation of Russian industry (end of the 19th century). The same may be said also concerning the second Russian revolution, the October Revolution. The peasant uprising of 1917 broke out on the heels of the second stage of the development of Russian capitalism, after the stormy development period of finance capital, after its extensive penetration into the field of agriculture (as a result of the so-called Stolypin reform). The revolutionary effect of capitalistic advance can also be observed in examples from present-day revolutionary movements. It is by no means an accident that the most recent peasant uprising in Japan took place after the war, when capitalism had embarked upon an extraordinarily rapid tempo of development. In India, the peasant movement likewise begins in those sections of the country in which capitalism has made the greatest progress. The same can be said also about the peasant movement in Indonesia.

We must make an end to the one-sided conception of the development of capitalist relations in agriculture as one of the factors that depress the revolutionary spirit of the peasantry. In this the process of capitalist development is generally confused with its final result.

In fact, had capitalism developed to its logical conclusion on the countryside, had the peasantry split into two classes — bourgeoisie and proletariat — then this would actually have meant the end of the peasant revolution and the beginning of the proletarian revolution in the real sense of the word. However, as Lenin specially emphasises, along the road of this capitalist development there is a whole series of peasant uprisings and peasant revolutions.

Upon this very lack of comprehension of the revolutionising significance of capitalistic development rests the social-democratic underestimation of the peasantry, rests the social-democratic misunderstanding of their revolutionary role.

From the standpoint of the conditions for the development of the revolutionary peasant movement, countries may be divided into the following main groups: 1) Colonial and semi-colonial countries containing relics of serfdom and feudalism; 2) agrarian countries containing relics of serfdom; 3) industrial countries with developed capitalism, where semi-feudal conditions have already been liquidated, or else where serfdom never existed.

The foregoing statements concerning the overthrow of the semi-feudal and semi-serf relationships by capitalism are fully applicable to the first group of countries — Japan, Korea, China, Indonesia, India, African countries, parts of South America, etc. The same is true of all that we have said concerning the rise in rentals determined by the gradual transition to capitalist economy, etc. according to the local conditions in each of the various countries.

Thus for example, in Japan and China, we see a quite considerable change in rental relationships — and as a result the "lease question" is one of the chief problems of rural Japan. It is likewise by no means an accident that the principal peasant demands are directed against the constantly augmenting lease terms.

In all these countries we see a powerful development of planned economy which is constantly taking on more capitalistic forms, and which leads to the expropriation of the peasants' land under all sorts of forms and pretexts. Capitalism uproots completely the existing land tenure, e. g. the peasant communes as a form of land use. The development of capitalist relations sharpens most extremely the struggle against the various kinds of payments in kind, labour dues, etc., which is especially characteristic of the revolutionary struggle in Indonesia.

I shall spend no more time on the features of the situation of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. For us the conclu-

sions are unshakable that the more rapidly capitalism develops there, (and this in its most contradictory form, as capitalism in its last stage of development), the more sharp becomes also the class struggle on the countryside. "Stabilisation" in these countries by no means postpones the peasant revolution into the distant future, but on the contrary it brings them nearer to us. There can be no doubt that a period of big peasant revolutions is beginning in the East. The vanguard of this movement is formed by the Chinese peasantry.

Now a few words about the situation in the agrarian countries containing survivals of serfdom. Here the following countries may be considered as typical: the **Baltic countries, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Yugo-Slavia, Austria, Hungary, Roumania, etc.**

The **Balkan countries.** The ruling class in most countries was forced, under the influence of the October Revolution and the revolts in a number of other countries, to make a beginning with the so-called agrarian reforms. In the whole of Central Europe, from Scandinavia to the Balkan Peninsula, from Finland down to Greece, agrarian reforms were undertaken in one form or another, viz., in the Baltic countries, in Poland, in Czecho-Slovakia, Austria, Hungary, Roumania, and in the Balkans, a total of 14 countries.

In order to understand whether the possibility of new peasant revolutions confronts these countries, this central question must be answered: **Whether by means of these reforms the weightiest contradictions on the countryside are solved, whether the old order which is half-way founded on serfdom is liquidated, whether the tasks of the democratic revolution have been removed from the agenda by it.**

As Comrade Bukharin has stated in his report, the weightiest contradictions on the countryside are by no means solved through the agrarian reforms.

The process of carrying out the reforms sharpens the class struggle because, basically, it travels the road of the transition from semi-feudal economy to capitalism upon the way most painful to the peasantry, because it overturns the present status of agriculture and the existing land tenure, primarily in the interests of the big peasants and of the new agricultural bourgeoisie. Even though the poor peasants and the agricultural labourers receive a portion of the soil, the differentiation of the peasantry increases, etc. The inability of the bourgeoisie to carry out purely bourgeois peasant reforms to their logical conclusion — still more, its endeavours to pull them back, to sabotage, to hinder their actual execution — all this leads inevitably to a revolutionisation of the peasant masses. The agrarian reforms are only a means of adapting the serf relations to capitalism, they only ameliorate, but do not liquidate them. **The weightiest contradictions on the countryside are not solved, the task of liquidating the feudal survivals in a revolutionary manner remains in full force. These survivals can be completely liquidated only by the victorious peasant revolution under the leadership of the proletariat.**

Now a few remarks about the capitalist countries. Comrade Metscheriakov has pointed out that the development of capitalism itself in the capitalist countries signifies an offensive against the peasantry. It signifies the extension of finance capital to agriculture with the aid of a ramified credit system, with the aid of the cooperatives. Monopoly capital seizes possession not only of the market sales but also of the purchases of agriculture, and this to the disadvantage of the peasantry. Furthermore, capitalist development in agriculture means a growing differentiation in the peasantry, worsening of the competitive position of the small farm in comparison to the big farm. **We must not forget that in the small farm's struggle against the big farm, the former loses out, we must not fall into an evolutionist standpoint on this question of large and small enterprises and on the question of the differentiation under capitalist conditions.**

In all countries having a developed capitalism, "stabilisation" proceeds — just as in other countries — not only at the expense of the broad masses of the peasantry. The direct as well as indirect taxes have of late gone up very considerably. **The burden of the ever increasing militarism must also be borne by the peasantry.**

We might mention the radicalisation of the German peasantry, the mounting oppositional mood of the American farmers, etc. as examples for the rising dissatisfaction of the peasants on the basis of the development of finance capital.

This all implies a negative reply to the questions raised in the beginning. By "capitalist stabilisation", the class struggle in the rural districts by no means becomes milder, but on the contrary it is intensified, the peasant revolutions are not postponed, but on the contrary, are brought nearer.

The role of "capitalist stabilisation" is also to be emphasised in the formation of a workers' and peasants' bloc.

To the extent that the proletariat and the peasantry find themselves within the frame of a single economic system, and are simultaneously influenced by capitalist development even though in varying forms, the premises are thereby given for a more or less simultaneous activity. The history of the democratic revolutions, beginning from the great French Revolution, the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917, clear to the present movement in the East, shows us as a rule a simultaneous activity of town and country, even though with a certain tardiness and backwardness of the latter.

Prior to the Russian Revolution one spoke only of two paths of rural development: of the Prussian and of the American, as Comrade Lenin defined them. This applies fully to capitalist relations. If peasant uprisings coincide in point of time with the workers' revolution, with a socialist revolution in the towns, then these peasant revolutions become a premise for a new non-capitalist path of development. The U. S. S. R. gives us an example of this. Therefore, in addition to the Prussian and the American paths of development, there is still another, a third, a Russian.

In conclusion I should like to note that one must not conceive of the revolutionisation of the peasantry fatalistically, one must not think that it will revolutionise itself of its own accord. I should like to emphasise especially the extraordinarily great role which is played by a correct direction of the peasantry and the peasant movement.

The question of leading the peasant movement gradually becomes the central question of the whole revolutionary movement and of the tactics of the revolutionary Communist Parties.

The question of leadership was solved by Lenin in his teachings on the hegemony of the proletariat and the revolution.

The hegemony of the proletariat in the present situation means the direction, the leading of the peasantry. Quite aside from the advanced countries with a numerous proletariat and a sustaining peasantry, where proletarian hegemony is quite a matter of course, we shall find that even in those countries in which there is practically no proletariat, or in which it is numerically weak, every revolutionary movement of the oppressed masses, above all of the peasant masses, will inevitably be drawn into the general international struggle — into that international struggle in which, under the conditions of imperialism and a nascent socialist revolution, the hegemony falls unchallengeably to the proletariat.

In this the proletarian hegemony presupposes an active policy on the part of the Communist Parties, their vigorous work on the countryside, their energetic struggle for the drawing in of the peasantry.

Only under these preconditions will a really powerful and firm workers' and peasants' alliance come into being, which will guarantee the victory of the revolution not only in single countries, but in the final end, the victory of the world revolution.

Comrade GALLACHER (Great Britain):

Comrades, my first word is with Comrade Kuusinen. After his speech I was approached by comrades who asked me why, we refused to publish the telegram that was sent across to our Party Conference, or why we published the telegram and left out the last sentence. When the telegram arrived it was in the midst of our Party Conference and without hesitation, without thought of any kind, we immediately read the telegram at the Party Conference and then handed it over to be published in the next issue of the "Workers' Weekly". You will realise that at such a time as we were going through — with all our work and with our heavy Party Conference — our editorial staff was seriously over-worked. Our reporters at the Conference prepared a summary of the speeches and of the letters and telegrams that were read. That summary appeared in the issue of the "Workers' Weekly" following the Conference. The following week the telegram appeared as it was sent from the Communist International. There never was any suggestion, any thought, any

attempt of any kind to publish part of the telegram. The telegram was published in full by the Party and the telegram was read at the Conference.

Now as to the report. I want to confine my attention to the question of rationalisation. It is an exceptionally important question, and one that all of us have got to face in our respective countries. It is one that we have come up against very sharply in Britain. Over in Britain there has been serious trouble in the mining industry for many years. The mineowners come out and tell the miners that it is utterly impossible for the mines to pay decent wages. They engaged experts to show this. Brought up against such a situation we have to show to the miners that the mines could pay a decent wage, but in order to do so the mining industry had to be rationalised. We have carried on a campaign in favour of rationalisation of the mines; we have continually kept that question before the miners. Now we find the Government Commission drawing up a report in favour of a rationalisation that will give all the advantages, economic and political, to the capitalist class and all the economic and political, disadvantages to the working class. This is something that we cannot permit. We have got to face that situation. We do not stand in the way of rationalisation — we recognise its necessity but we are not prepared to accept rationalisation at the expense of the workers. Therefore, we say: as against the rationalisation of the government commission we stand for a rationalisation of the mining industry that must include, from our point of view, the elimination of the royalty owners, the elimination of the profit-mongers, elimination of the private control of the mines.

Right here we are face to face not with a hypothetical question, not something we have to face in the future, but something that we have before us right now. You have two opposing proposals for rationalisation. It is very important that all of us are clear on that.

Some years ago in the early days of the war, in the Clyde district we were faced with a situation where the government wished to introduce rationalisation. It was in the form of dilution of labour, the introduction of women and unskilled or semi-skilled labour. Now we were not against dilution on principle, we had already foreseen and recognised it as an essential and inevitable process of development of capitalism. But nevertheless we refused to accept dilution and we used all our power to fight the government on this question. Why? Not because we were against the principle, but because the method of rationalisation at that time, as at the present time, was to place all the economic and political advantages upon the employing class and all the disadvantages upon the working class. And we took up the very firm stand that we would only allow the process to operate if the economic and political advantages came to the working class instead of to the employing class. Our proposition now, like our proposition in 1915 was — we are prepared to stand out of the way of this process of rationalisation if the industries are taken out of the hands of the employers, and the workers are given control of production.

Rationalisation will be forced on us in certain industries, in certain countries. Why? Because we are not strong enough to combat the employers. Why are we not strong enough? Because we have not carried on sufficient work in the trade unions. Therefore we come back to the elementary question for the Communist International, — how are we to get control of the trade unions, how are we to get down to this job?

We must develop the unions. We must get such a well organised mass movement of the workers as will enable us to combat the form of capitalist rationalisation. But while we are at it this rationalisation goes on. The capitalists are strong enough in many industries to force rationalisation, and so we must fight against the consequences of rationalisation which bring disadvantages to the workers.

Now, the fight against the consequences does not only apply to the unemployed. It applies also to the workers. We must not take rationalisation as one thing and the working class as something else — the working class is a part of the processes of rationalisation. Rationalisation may apply to technique, or it might apply to the question of reducing the workers' standard, increasing working hours, or in many ways intensifying the exploitation of the workers.

This has to be recognised — that capitalism develops along the line of multiplying contradictions. At the present time the

contradictions are growing thick and fast and this rationalisation is one of the most dangerous for capitalism; it is driving capitalism towards further concentration and at the same time towards bankruptcy. Out of all this effort to combat capitalist rationalisation, out of all the evil consequences that arise from rationalisation, comes an opportunity to press forward. Our task is to gather the masses of the workers for the complete overthrow of the capitalist class. Rationalisation is forcing the widening of the gulf between the classes and is going to give the revolutionary parties in each of the countries the greatest possible opportunity, and I hope that our Parties will take full advantage of it.

Comrade DOMBAL (Poland):

Undoubtedly the most important and weightiest phenomenon on the field of the present revolutionary movement is the peasant movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. As Comrade Bukharin specially emphasised in his reports, we are at present experiencing the beginning of real peasant revolutions, the beginning of an actual civil war in these countries.

In the modern revolutionary movement in the Orient two essential stages, and two essential features of the revolutionary movement must be distinguished from one another; first, the struggle for national liberation against modern imperialism, and secondly — the struggle for the emancipation of the peasantry from the local feudalism.

The latter is substantiated, e. g., by the course of the revolutionary struggle in China.

We also observe the peasants' struggle against local feudalism in a whole series of other countries, e. g., in Japan, where an extremely powerful movement of tenants is developing, in Korea, where the struggle against large land holdings, against the high rents and colonisation policy of the Japanese government is being carried on.

We have an extension of the peasant movement also in India, where peasant uprisings break out from time to time in various districts.

Finally, the greatest among the peasant movements is in Indonesia. Here it is directed against foreign imperialism as well as against the despotism of the native feudal powers.

That we are actually entered upon a phase of peasant mass revolutions in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is shown also by the fact that aside from the countries already mentioned a movement is already beginning in such countries as Algiers, Tunis, Morocco, Egypt, Asia-Minor, and especially in Persia.

A weighty fact in the field of the modern revolutionary movement consists also in the beginning of peasant uprisings in so-called Latin America.

All this shows that in certain colonial and semi-colonial countries we already have an actual revolutionary situation and the beginning of civil wars, in other countries a sufficiently rapid ripening of the revolutionary movement that under favourable conditions may evolve into mass revolutions.

Let us now pass to a consideration of the peasant movement in agrarian countries containing feudal survivals. Of these the most important at this time are the countries of Central Europe, such as Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Roumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Greece, etc.

It must be stated that in practically all of the countries enumerated, among which the Baltic states also should be included, there was, during the post-war years, a revolutionary peasant mass movement as an immediate result of the post-war movements in Europe and particularly of the Russian October Revolution. The bourgeoisie and the big landowners were able to choke off the peasant movement, more than that, the bourgeoisie and the big landowners tried by means of reform from the top partially to liquidate the semi-feudal land tenure, and to build up the nucleus of a reactionary wealthy peasantry from among the rural bourgeoisie as well as from the wastefully landed officials, officers, etc.

After the temporary post-revolutionary decline, and after the disorganisation of the peasant movement we now have a certain consolidation of the revolutionary peasant movement, a growth of the revolutionary mood of the peasantry. The bourgeoisie has not been able to carry through its agrarian reforms in any country. The semi-feudal order is far from obliterated. The big landowners, in alliance with finance capital, have gone over to the attack and are taking back the agrarian reforms.

Simultaneously there is a growth of the differentiation of the peasantry, partly under the influence of the agrarian reforms and partly due to general capitalist conditions, and the position of the great masses of peasants, the petty bourgeois and middle bourgeois sections, is becoming worse. This also furnishes the premises for the Leftward swing of the peasant masses and the growth of revolutionary activity among the peasantry.

Among the causes of the latter, national oppression must be added. An example of this sort of oppression is given in the serious situation in the Polish border states, in Carpatho-Russia, in Slovakia, and especially in the national territories of the Balkan states.

The revolutionary peasant movement in the agrarian countries follows the line of direct action to a much less degree than in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, although this line retains its importance. For instance we have a quite strong partisan movement in Western White Russia, in Western Ukraine, in Carpatho-Russia, in Bessarabia and the Balkan Peninsula, in Macedonia and in other districts.

Under present conditions the peasant organisations and peasant political parties in these countries attain much greater significance. The toiling peasantry is gradually beginning to free itself from bourgeois-junker and big agrarian leadership, and in the peasant organisations Left groups, centrist and Rightists are forming.

The growing struggle of the peasantry against fascism must be emphasised particularly. Emerging from the period of post-war decline and relative stagnation the peasant movement in recent years has again entered upon a phase of vitality along the line of economic as well as of political struggle.

There are a number of quite big changes in the peasant movement in the industrial countries. In this respect Germany is a good example. We have here, in connection with the general attack of capitalism, a gradual crowding out of the middle peasantry and a serious worsening of the situation of the small peasantry, especially in the Southern districts of Germany, in the garden and vineyard districts. Here the Left peasant movement is beginning to consolidate on the basis of the struggle against the high taxes and excises.

In France the beginning of the deflation policy, has unquestionably called forth an intensified differentiation among the peasantry.

Considerable changes are taking place at present also in the overseas countries, political activity and Leftward orientation is noticeable among the farmers of the United States of America and of Canada (Coolidge's defeat in the recent elections).

As a general phenomenon of the revolutionary peasant movement, all the way from the colonial and semi-colonial countries to the highly-developed industrial lands, it must be established that in practically every capitalist country a more or less rapid dissolution process of the middle-peasantry is noticeable. The temporary stabilisation of capitalism ruins the middle peasant, drags him more and more down to the condition of the small peasant. We must make all efforts to draw this strata, or a part of it, into active struggle.

The growth of the peasant movement raises the question of its leadership very sharply, and the question of how to switch it into the channels of the general revolutionary struggle led by the proletariat.

The leftward swing of the peasantry forces the bourgeoisie to greater and greater efforts to maintain its influence upon the peasant masses. For this purpose it applies the most varied forms and methods of ideological influence.

The foundation of the Junker-big-peasant-black-green International this year in the Rome Agricultural Institute, the participation of the big-peasant Green International of the International Agrarian Bureau in Prague in its formation, the agrarian orientation of the II International and of its various Sections, the agrarian programmes of Lloyd George and others, all this proves that the fight for the peasantry is even assuming organisational forms international in scope.

It must be emphasised here that the Black-Green International is closely tied up with the League of Nations through the Rome Agricultural Institute, that it is the instrument of the League and thereby the agent of finance capital for the enslavement of the toiling peasantry.

Another extremely important phenomena of recent time is the agrarian orientation of the Social Democracy, which was called forth by the necessity of stiffening their position which had grown shaky in the towns, in order to be able to continue their role of agents to the bourgeoisie. But it would be a mistake to assume that the Social Democracy is able to give up its hostility with regard to the peasantry. Proof of this is found in a speech by one of the leaders of German Social Democratic activity among the peasants, Georg Schmidt.

The inability of Menshevism to take a correct position on the peasant question is also to be seen from the proposal of the German Social Democratic Labour Party (Czecho-Slovakia) at the Marseilles Congress.

This proves not only the necessity of waging a struggle against the bourgeoisie and their agent allies in order to win the peasantry as allies of the proletarian revolution, but it also shows the objective possibilities of success, if only the Communist Parties understand how to approach the work among the peasant masses.

The Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties and the assimilation of Leninism means primarily the assimilation of Lenin's teachings on the alliance of the working class with the peasantry, and on the hegemony of the proletariat in the leadership of the peasant movement.

This leadership requires first of all, the working out of programme demands and slogans that are fundamental for the peasant movements at the given level of their development. The peasantry can be led only if they are given correct and exact slogans that are adapted to the degree of development of the peasant movement.

The Communist Parties are confronted with the extremely complicated task of working in the non-Party peasant organisations. Everything that Comrade Kuusinen said with regard to activity of the Communists in the mass organisations must also be applied to activity among the peasant masses, subject of course to adaptation to peasant conditions.

The International revolutionary peasant movement is growing and extending. Only with correct leadership on the part of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party, can we assure the victory not only of the peasant revolutionary struggle but also of the world proletarian revolution, the victory that is impossible without a firm and close alliance between the working class and the peasantry.

Comrade BOSHKOVITCH (Chairman):

The following proposal for a change in the agenda has been submitted:

In view of the fact that the documentary material on the report of Comrade Stalin on the question of the C. P. S. U. could not yet be furnished to the delegates, the Presidium has decided to change the agenda so that the second point (report by Comrade Stalin on the questions of the C. P. U.) shall come up as the sixth point.

Also, the British question, on the request of the British comrades, is to be dealt with in the Plenum only after the discussion in the British Commission.

Hence, the Chinese question is to be taken up as the second point on the agenda.

(The proposal is adopted unanimously.)

Comrade SMITH (Great Britain):

Comrade Kuusinen in his report referred to a very serious problem facing a number of Parties in our International at the present time — the problem of the relative isolation of the Parties. In spite of the fact that many of them have tens of thousands of members, the process of emerging from that isolation is more difficult than we should like it to be. This is a situation which we, the British Party, have been experiencing very acutely, and for that reason the British Delegation thinks it worth while to acquaint the comrades of the brother parties with some of the methods we adopted in order to cope with that situation.

The workers come to our meetings, support us, do our work, but will not join the Party. Why is this? The root reason for delay was of course the particular phase of historical development we were passing through, but we could not be satisfied

merely with that explanation. Again, doubtless in Great Britain and in a number of other countries one of the most powerful factors we have to face in our united front tactics in approaching the masses — is the influence of reformist leaders, who have control of the trade union and official labour machinery. They turn the whole force of that machinery against our Party, attacking us as disrupters, as attempting to break away from the official movement, and thereby frightening the workers away from the Party when they begin to sympathise with its aims.

But even that would be cold comfort, — to sit down and say that it is not merely a general historical situation, but the particular expression of it — the influence of the reformist leadership in the labour movement.

The Parties of the International themselves have not done everything possible to insure that the whole Party, individually as well as collectively, has gone to the workers to explain to them the value of the Party. That process involves a number of political changes in our methods and it involves a number of organisational changes in our methods such as we reported to the last Plenum.

I want to add something about some of the latest steps our Party has taken, and which may prove of value to other Parties. We had, for example, in one very important district of the Party, a district committee of extremely loyal, energetic active Party workers, — yet the Party membership remained isolated from the trade union movement. We found, on investigation, that in a district committee of ten members, we had not a single active member of a trade union. We adopted extreme measures, we insisted upon six additional members — two from each of the principal industries, and in the case of the mining members, in view of the fact that we had influence over something like 300 miners, we actually waived the principle that a man must have some standing in the Party to be a member of such a responsible body as the district committee.

The reason why I mention this is that we camp up against resistance on grounds of principle from a number of devoted comrades who said that these people are not Bolsheviks, they know nothing about Communism, they have not been long in the Party — since when has it been a qualification for members of guiding committees that they must be trade union officials, etc.? But this situation which we are passing through, which other parties are also passing through, makes it imperative that we should exercise a little elasticity and that we should be prepared to make concessions of that kind.

Another striking example is that our Central Committee, after the last Party Conference, took this decision: that five members of our Central Committee, including three leading members of our political bureau, should be sent back to the factories immediately; to bring into the Party work in the trade union movement not merely the general Party prestige, but their personal prestige as leading representatives of the Party. Of course, that is going to have a very big effect in our trade union work — at least we hope so.

At our last Party Congress we increased the size of our Central Committee. Out of six — four were leading trade union officials. The object of this method, I want to stress again, is to make clear that the Party means business when it goes into trade union work. This seems a little drastic, and involves considerable readjustment and difficulties in the leadership from the point of view of the distribution of work, but it makes the whole Party feel that the trade union work is the first and primary avenue to the hearts of the masses. We believe that this policy has assisted us to win the effective leadership we are modestly claiming today, a leadership of the British miners; and we believe this policy could be, with advantage, adopted in other countries.

Another phase of the same question is the question of the changes in our political slogans, in our political agitation. On the one hand, we are faced with the need for raising the political consciousness and widening the outlook of the workers in the trade unions. On the other hand, we are faced with the fact that the trade union meetings which are anxious to discuss wages, hours, piece rates, etc., are not in a mood to hear high-flown theoretical subjects. We say that there is no deadlock here, it means only that we cannot impose our political slogans upon workers ready made. We have to seek out ways and means of making the individual worker feel that this particular political problem affects him individually, and I just want to give three short examples.

First, on the question of imperialism. In Great Britain, of course, this is a question the clarity of which is vital for the victory of the working class. We approach this problem from the standpoint of showing the practical effects upon the individual workers which the oppression of the colonial peoples involves. In the case of China, we took the textile workers. We showed how it reacted practically on the textile workers in Britain. In the case of India and Egypt we did the same. In the case of the Dawes Plan we showed how an attempt was being made in Germany by the Dawes Plan to transform Germany into a colonial country. We took up the line that the cost of British production i. e. wages would have to be lowered in order to compete with the production of the German workers, whose hours were being lengthened and wages cut. This of course should be supplemented later by a theoretical explanation.

Again, in the case of militarism, we simply took the concrete cases of the use of soldiers in industrial disputes. We simply put forth the slogan of: Tell the soldiers the truth about the industrial disputes, in which they are being asked to intervene. We found that such simple slogans we can later on supplement with slogans of a more theoretical character; but first we must have this approach to the masses.

And finally, the question of rationalisation. Our method is, not only "for rationalisation under a Socialist Government" but "no measures of rationalisation under capitalism without such safeguards for the workers as equal pay for equal work, maintenance of unemployed at trade union rates, etc. We must show the workers that rationalisation must not take place at their expense, but at the expense of the capitalist class, the struggle for the immediate demands helping to mobilise the workers for greater struggles.

I believe many lessons may be learned from our fight that could be valuable for other Parties, and we offer this as our contribution to the discussion.

Comrade VARGA:

Comrades, a few weeks ago at the Congress of the Austrian Social Democracy, Otto Bauer declared that it was impossible to give an analysis of the present phase of capitalism in the new programme of the Austrian Social Democracy. In essence this signifies a declaration of bankruptcy of Austro-Marxism as a theory.

But perhaps the reason why Otto Bauer and the Austrian Social Democrats refrained from a real analysis of the present phase of capitalism is that such analysis would lead to the possibility of exposing the untenability of their present opportunistic policy before the entire working class.

Nevertheless an analysis of present capitalism is a difficult task.

But I believe that we can nevertheless take note of certain important structural changes that differentiate the present epoch of capitalism quite sharply from that of before the war. By structural changes I mean such changes as reveal no imminent counter-tendency of a return from the changes that have taken place.

The most important are the following:

A world capitalism no longer exists. By the creation of the Soviet Union a breach has been broken into the whole world wide system of capitalism. This fact is of great importance in its effect upon the Labour movement. It is clear that before the war the problem of the overthrow of the bourgeoisie confronted the workers as something in the dim and distant future, but this original scepticism has been swept away by the existence of the Soviet Union. Every worker knows today that he can do without the capitalists, that under certain conditions they can be overthrown, and that after this overthrow there will follow not chaos, not chronic famine, but on the contrary, improvement.

This is the decisive effect of the existence of the Soviet Union upon the labour movement: the whole psychology of the labour movement can never return to the stage it occupied before the war.

The second great structural change is the victorious liberation struggle of the colonial peoples. For the labour movement it means that the alliance between the bourgeoisie and the labour aristocracy on the basis of the diversion of a portion of colonial extra-profits to the labour aristocracy is in process of vanishing.

The third great structural change is the loss of the economic predominance of Western Europe. Economically, this means that the income which Western European capitalism drew from this position of predominance, is now lost to it. The effect upon the labour movement is the same as that from the loss of the colonial extra profits.

Much has been said here about the law of uneven development. One might say that perhaps Western Europe could win back its position. I do not think that this will be the case, because it is improbable that new sources of raw material and power to serve as the basis of new technical inventions — and only the combination of this new technique and the new sources of raw material furnishes the possibility of a speedy improvement — will be available everywhere in Western Europe. I believe that West European capitalism will not have a lease of life long enough to enjoy such a general improvement of this sort.

Contemplating these three big structural changes we must say:

A simple continuation of the pre-war development of capitalism is inconceivable for Western Europe.

I now come to the question of how the crisis of European capitalism, and of world capitalism in general, shows itself at present. This crisis now takes the form of a chronic over-production, a chronic mass unemployment, a chronic shutting down of the means of production.

In capitalism there is always a tendency to a disproportion between productive capacity and opportunities of utilisation. This results from two basic facts that are inseparably bound up with capitalism. The first is that the capitalist class strives for a constantly greater exploitation of the proletariat whereby the purchasing power of the proletariat is weakened, while on the other hand competition inside the country and between the various countries forces the capitalists to distend the productive capacity of their enterprises in order to reduce production costs. This contradiction always expressed itself in periodically recurring crises which thus far, however, have always ended with an extension of the capitalist world market.

This fact is looked upon very often as a discovery of Rosa Luxemburg, but this is entirely incorrect, because in all the works of Marx, — to mention only the Communist Manifesto — this fact is predicted and established.

What is the difference between the present capitalist crisis and the periodically recurring normal crises of capitalism, what is the kernel with which — I think — we must concern ourselves? In his printed report Comrade Bukharin pointed out that the intensification of this situation is a result of the war, and he then correctly tried to bring the (as he called it) hunger-crisis, or (as I formerly tried to call it) the under-production crisis of the post-war period into relationship with the present conditions of capitalism. I believe, however, that his argumentations are inadequate in the sense that they establish only the fact, without presenting clearly the restrictions of the domestic market according to classes. In my opinion this is necessary even if only to enable us to distinguish our own from the Social Democratic under-consumption theory.

I will endeavour to make clear on a class basis how the narrowing of the purchasing power of the various classes, i. e. a reduction of income, came into being. Let us take, first of all, the proletariat. It is a fact that the actual standard of living of the proletariat in the inflation countries is decidedly lower than before the war.

Why is this so? The value of labour power, as a result of the long drawn out war, as a result of the actual degradation of the working class, has gone down. To this must be added, of course, the conscious efforts of the capitalists to reduce wages.

The peasantry during the war lost very much of its property, secondly, during the inflation period, as a result of the scissors, it suffered a constant loss of purchasing power and property since it received in exchange for its products a much smaller value in the form of industrial commodities than before the war.

The petty bourgeoisie was expropriated in the inflation countries. The war and inflation periods brought an extremely abnormal centralisation of property, not an accumulation but a heaping up of existing properties into the hands of the largest war profiteers. This means that the industrial profits are today

distributed among a much smaller circle of the population than before the war. The purchasing power of this petty bourgeois strata is thereby very much reduced.

Now another thing that is of particular importance. In the inflation the rentier strata almost disappeared, so that we can say the following: the income of all elements: workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie, rentiers, as a result of the war and the inflation, has shrunk severely and the values that are produced by industry find no purchasers. This shrinkage of the internal market therefore furnishes the basis of this chronic unemployment and chronic over-production thesis.

Matters stand somewhat differently in England because it is not an inflation country. There we find that the purchasing power of the internal market has been maintained as the result of the deflation policy. The English people up to 1926, on the average, lived better than before the war. It consumed more food supplies, it was better clothed than before the war. This is the point on which the crisis in inflation countries differs very sharply from the crisis forms of the deflation countries.

The problem of British capitalism consists today not so much in the small absorption power of the internal market, as in the condition that British industrial capital will not be in a position to carry the whole burden of rentier capital (which I estimate in England at about £ 450 million annually) and in addition also maintain the British working class in the position of a labour aristocracy. That is the problem for the British bourgeoisie, either to expropriate the rentier class through inflation and in this way save nine to ten milliard marks annually, or to degrade the British working class from a labour aristocracy to a working class with an average European wage.

If it is true that the chief problem of European capitalism is the question of the market, the question of how to widen market opportunities then the Social Democrats have the following answer to give: Yes, the capitalists really ought to raise the wages in the interest of capitalism, if wages were raised the purchasing power would be greater and consequently capitalism would work its way out of its crisis, — and in this they refer chiefly to the example of the United States where with very high wages, capitalism is developing on an upward curve.

Very little knowledge is necessary to say that this proposal of the Social Democracy is, from a capitalist viewpoint, pure nonsense. No one can expect that the capitalists should pay out of their share a part in money to the workers so that the commodities can then be sold to the workers for their own (the capitalists') money. This would be the most stupid business that could be imagined. But if one connects up the higher wages with an increased productivity of the workers, one does not escape from the vicious circle. In this case the total mass of surplus value which the capitalists receive has again become greater and the market opportunities have not changed at all.

We can see what the capitalists are actually doing: wage cuts, rationalisation, this means that they are trying to get for themselves a still greater share of the values produced, by which means they of course still further cut down the possibilities of the internal market. This is evident also from an extraordinarily interesting confidential letter from Borsig, the chairman of the German Employers' Association, to the textile industry in which he advises them to effect a general reduction in wages, saying that if we skin off one pfennig per hour this means from 400 to 500 million marks per year additional profit. But this at the same time means a shrinkage of the absorption power of the internal market by the same amount. And how do the capitalists think they are going to escape from this situation? They want to dispose of their goods on the world market, not to our own workers, but to strange foreign customers.

And from this it follows that an extraordinarily sharp struggle for markets must result.

To be sure, we are told that this is countered by international agreements, international cartels. But international cartels in no way avoid the struggle. The battle continues inside of the cartels and is directed against those states not included in the cartel. As far as the forming of cartels is concerned, however, these mean exactly the same thing: artificial raising of the prices of commodities, viz., the narrowing of the absorption power of the internal markets. So we see that it travels right around in the same circle.

I should like to mention one point in the printed report of Comrade Bukharin, and which is also contained in the thesis —

it is the expression "agrarianisation". I believe that this expression will lead to great misunderstanding, and we should avoid it. What is it that is involved here? It is this — that Europe's industrial productive apparatus is too big for its market opportunities. It must be reduced here and there, and this reduction takes place at the places politically and economically weakest. This is not an agrarianisation, but a decimation of industrial centres of production that have become superfluous, which proceeds anarchistically at the spots where capitalism is weakest.

Now I will try, very briefly, to summarise the whole picture, beginning with the situation before the war. The starting point was the disproportion between productive and market capacity. There came a chase after markets, which began to be monopolised. The world war was a battle for markets. The war itself caused a severe restriction of the internal market and in consequence all the phenomena that we have described here, as well as those structural changes which I dealt with in the beginning. The stabilisation has temporarily put a barrier against further structural changes. But the contradiction continues to reproduce itself through and within the stabilisation. As a result, unless the proletarian revolution makes an end to this trend of development sooner, it must automatically lead to a war, a war against Soviet Russia or a war between various imperialist groups. And as a result this whole circuit will again be introduced but with the blasting away of fresh sections in the course of this clash. In this I presuppose that a war against the Soviet Union would not be successful, because I assume that all Communist Parties would in this case have to be reckoned with, and if they were to do everything that in the present mood of the working class they can do, an attack against the Soviet Union could not be successful. So I believe, comrades, that no reason exists for any kind of pessimism even though we recognise stabilisation in the sense that at this moment no acute revolutionary situation exists. The whole mechanism of capitalism is such that there is no such thing as a way out from the intensification, no escape from the contradictions as conceived by the Social Democrats in the form of super-imperialism, or however they may call it. There can be only the question of time, of whether a longer or shorter period will be taken up, but the development towards the end proceeds compulsorily even though not in a straight line.

Comrade KURELLA:

Since Comrade Pepper has already dealt with the most important fundamental errors in the conceptions of Comrade Treint, I should like to speak on just one point — on the definition of Comrade Treint's conceptions as a petty bourgeois tendency, for this formulation has won chief disfavour with Comrade Treint and other comrades.

The chief thesis of Comrade Treint states that the capitalist contradictions in Europe itself have a tendency to diminish relatively, whereas the antagonism between the United States and the Anglo-European imperialist system becomes more and more sharp.

Later, Comrade Treint mentions two possibilities: either a rapid revolutionary development in Europe, in which case we meet with a general capitalist bloc against Soviet Russia — or a slow revolutionary development, in which case we come to a political and economic European bloc against the United States of America. This means that in any case we arrive at a **capitalist unification**.

Considered purely theoretically it is entirely possible that various imperialist coalitions will come into being, but only as **temporary** coalitions of a political and predominantly **military** nature. What we deny is the possibility of economic and political bloc-building for any lasting period, whether it be in Europe or whether it be for the whole world. The temporary military coalitions which we allow for are not the immediate danger for us in Europe.

At a time when the antagonism in Europe are sharpening, at a time when America tries to play the various European groups against one another, at a time when the League of Nations is in a certain sense disintegrating, Comrade Treint comes with the theses of the necessary foundation of a new European economic-political bloc.

There are two ideas involved here:

1. The foundation of any sort of European bloc;
2. The foundation of a European bloc against America. As to the first side of the problem: at a given moment, when antagonisms are growing in Europe, when there is a new menace of war, the petty bourgeois press advocates the thesis that we are approaching European peace. And what does Treint do then? Objectively he blows in the same horn as our petty-bourgeois opponents.

He apologises by saying: Yes, these petty bourgeois slogans are today the reflection of the real intentions of the bourgeoisie. The statements of the petty bourgeoisie that Europe is approaching peace, that the building of a bloc is possible — this, according to Comrade Treint's thesis, corresponds with reality. He thereby still further supports the position of the petty bourgeoisie that a European unification is possible.

Comrade Treint says finally: If we stand up and say today that the chief antagonisms lie inside of Europe, then the Social Democrats will come and say that the Communists are crying about war, when actually there is peace. The working masses would thereupon go to the Social Democrats. Hence, to avoid this **eventuality**, that the masses of workers go to the Social Democrats, to bring it about that they follow us, Treint proposes that we shall say the same thing as the Social Democrats, namely, that in Europe there is the possibility of a unification, of a bloc building.

Here also Comrade Treint demands that we shall surrender our own line and do as the Social Democrats do, because otherwise the masses would run to them.

I am of the opinion that the role of the petty bourgeoisie and of petty bourgeois ideology is even today the same as it was before the war. It is not true, as Comrade Treint maintains, that petty bourgeois ideology expresses that which the capitalists really want. Today also the petty bourgeois ideologists serve to camouflage that which the big bourgeoisie wants, they express what the bourgeoisie wants the masses to believe.

The second side of the problem: Comrade Treint brought to the fore in his speech in Lille the European bloc against America which is said to be in process of preparation. He wrote an article under the title: "Europe and America" (not "Europe and Russia"); hence he is clearly of the opinion that the formation of an anti-American bloc is the immediate perspective towards which the intention of the working class must be directed. And this is done at a time when England is intensifying her efforts to bring about a temporary military alliance of European states against Soviet Russia; at a time when we must say that the present immediate menace of war which confronts us is directed against Russia, and when we must destroy the camouflage manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie, great and small. This will suffice to show that the ideas that Comrade Treint expresses lie along the same line as do the camouflage manoeuvres of the petty bourgeois in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

Comrade Treint has been telling us here that while sending its milliards to Europe, American finance capital has not had time to establish a control over the enterprises in which the capital was invested. Yes, that it even tolerated a number of the enterprises so financed to work against America. This is really a remarkable affair that finance capital sends its milliards to Europe and does not bother about whether the milliards are used for or against it!

I believe that for the present situation we should stick to the sharpening of antagonisms in Europe and intensification of the attempts to form a military alliance against the Soviet Union, and an increase in the attempts to camouflage, that we should decisively combat every tendency that supports these camouflage intentions.

Above all we cannot permit comrades to ride around on their special hobby horses before the Party and confuse it; the ideological training of our young Party cadres is far too responsible a task for us to tolerate such side trips.

In conclusion I wanted to say a few words about the training of these young Party cadres. We have here a new phenomenon before us which is to be noted of late in the labour movement. The training of new, active, young forces, predominantly from the working class, who have grown up during the war period and who have developed and grown strong in the factional and political struggles of the post-war period, especially on the

basis of the reorganisation of the Party into factory nuclei — this is a fact that is characteristic of most of our larger Parties. It can imbue us with the greatest optimism in viewing the future of our Parties. It is a guarantee that we are on the right road. Our enemies of the Social Democracy are also perturbed when they see that all the good young forces that emerge from the working class are with the Communists, and that none are with them.

We must direct our attention to the further development of the young cadres in our Party more than has hitherto been done. We must not forget that our press is directed not only towards the mass of readers, generally non-Party members, but that our central organ is today still the most important means for the training of our own Party cadres. Our papers do not give this enough consideration. The functionaries, young comrades who have developed from nucleus work and have then gone higher, are overloaded with functions, and after a short period they are so overburdened that they have no further opportunity to develop theoretically. At best these functionaries are given further training in their special field, but their theoretic-

cal training generally ceases the moment they get a job. Here is a point at which the Parties are confronted with very big tasks. One must not be content with considering them as theoretically "broken in", but special arrangements must be made for their further theoretical training.

On the whole I believe that we can establish the following: We have behind us in the Parties a period in which Bolshevism was considered almost exclusively from the standpoint of organisational questions, the reorganisation of the Parties into the factory nuclei. Today we are entering a period in which the Parties must reckon more with the ideological side of Bolshevism. We need but look at the statistics on the development of educational centres, theoretical organs, etc., in order to establish that our Parties are on the job in giving more attention to the ideological side of Bolshevism. At the birth of the C. I. we were no more than an organisation for general propagation of the ideas of Communism. We then became a Party of action. Today we can go a step further, and, while maintaining our character as Parties of action, we must take up the propaganda of Leninism in our own ranks to a greater extent.

Sixth Session.

Moscow, November 25th, 1926.

A. Bernard (France), as Chairman, opened the Session at 7 p. m., for the continuation of the discussion on the reports of Comrades Bukharin and Kuusinen.

Comrade SEMARD (France).

Comrades, the French Party will submit a written report on the situation in Europe and the major imperialisms of Great Britain, Germany and France, on the iron cartel and on the tasks of the Parties. At this time I shall analyse the situation in France more in detail.

The thesis of Comrade Treint, which was first presented to the Congress of Lille, and later to the Plenum, was rejected by our Congress. Since then, political events, especially in Europe, have proven its total incorrectness. The numerous contradictions, the new system of alliances (establishment of the big cartels such as e. g. the iron cartel and the potash cartel), the problem of the Mediterranean, the imperialistic practices of Italian Fascism which have mounted to the point of open threats of war against France, completely dispose of the thesis of our Comrade Treint. We believe that at present the axis of the revolution passes through England and China, that the menace of a world war lies sooner in the Far East and in the problem of the Pacific Ocean; that, on the other hand, the antagonisms in Europe between Italy and France are sharpening, and it is an utopia to view the war menace as a conflict between an Anglo-European bloc and America. We therefore very categorically reject the theses proposed by Comrade Treint.

We intervene in the Plenum in order to settle with an incorrect appraisal contained in the thesis of our Comrade Bukharin, namely at that place in which our Party is charged with making a serious mistake at that most critical moment in France when Poincaré took power. Our Party did not wait until Poincaré had taken power before exposing the capitalist "stabilisation offensive", nor did it wait in making clear the danger which this project of the Caillaux-Rien Government signified for the working masses. Likewise our Party exposed in time the so-called Experts Plan which in its main features was revived by the Government. At the Lille Congress we very clearly underlined the disintegrated state of the Left bloc and emphasised the impossibility of a re-establishment of this bloc. Have, perhaps, events given the lie to these presumptions?

To a certain degree, yes, because the Caillaux Government was overthrown only a few weeks after its formation, and because for 48 hours the possibility existed for, if not the Left bloc itself, at least the rebuilding a Left bloc government under Herriot, or a republican concentration Government with a Left majority. At this moment, i. e. during these 48 hours between the fall of the Caillaux Cabinet and the taking of power by Poincaré, the Party showed a certain indecisiveness; it did not quickly enough analyse the situation and did not immediately issue the proper slogans.

In a Manifesto the Party declared: "Left Government, Herriot Government, just as you please; but the Communist Party will fight the reaction with all its forces; and, under certain conditions it will support this new Left Government. It will support it on condition, mark it well, that it fulfil demands of the proletariat". But this tactical decision made by the Party leadership was obviously not taken up quickly enough by the lower organisations, and since the Government existed only 48 hours, we were forced to change our tactics immediately when Poincaré took power.

The overthrow of the Herriot Government was only the continuation of that big bourgeois policy which our Party had exposed promptly as a policy intended solely for the purpose of assassinating the franc. I would recall to you that at the time of the Herriot Cabinet the pound sterling rose to 249. This was an organised panic to bring about Herriot's overthrow and to call Poincaré to the helm.

In the thesis of Comrade Bukharin we are charged with failure to mobilise the working masses, it is said: "The working class knew how to mobilise neither its own forces nor the forces of the petty-bourgeoisie, nor in fact how to offer any resistance whatever." I believe that the Communist Party and the C. G. T. U. must be the organs which must mobilise the forces of the working class in such a tremendous time. If the C. G. T. U. and the C. P. do not mobilise the working masses, then one must look for reasons and correct the mistakes that were made. This is all the more necessary since it is said in the report of Bukharin that "the Party did not correctly size up the bourgeois offensive because it had turned its attention to the various parliamentary combinations and because it was not sufficiently prepared for the mobilisation of the masses of workers and petty-bourgeoisie".

Those who were in France at that time and who know the role which Parliament plays in our parliamentary State, those comrades realise that one cannot simply judge according to the make-up of "Humanité", a paper not only printed for the Communists, but a paper of general information. This is precisely what forces us to give a prominent space in our paper to the happenings in Parliament. I have the impression that in the International the habit prevails of simply judging us according to our newspaper "Humanité".

To be sure, comrades, we did, all of us, occupy ourselves with parliamentary combinations, but at this same moment we also mobilised the forces of the workers against the Poincaré Government by drawing up a political line which I intend to discuss before you now.

Beyond doubt, due to the weak Party cadres in certain districts of France, and due to a certain weakness of our directing apparatus, the mobilisation of the masses of workers proceeds but slowly with us. This is a shortcoming of our Party that we can correct only when we improve our cadres, and in this consists the whole problem of the development of our Party.

Bukharin says: "At this moment an intense excitement prevailed among the working class and the petty-bourgeoisie". Let us first look into this argument, comrades. It is true, there prevailed in the working class — while not a great excitement, nevertheless a great uneasiness. But in this moment of crisis, we did not feel that a strong desire for resistance prevailed on the part of the proletariat. There was also a certain antipathy against the Left bloc people who had not kept any of their promises. At this moment the popular slogan was: dissolve Parliament, and elect another that will finally carry out the policy that was promised but not carried out by the Left bloc.

We have been reproached: "But look, the Fascists did mobilise". They stood in front of parliament and in front of the Elysee." Undoubtedly! This mobilisation was a part of the programme of the big bourgeoisie and their charted offensive. We also could have mobilised our Paris organisations. But no one knew as yet whether the Government would fall!

But really to this demonstration has been ascribed a significance that it did not possess. But now, what were the forces of the petty-bourgeoisie and what were their possibilities? Was it possible to mobilise the petty-bourgeoisie through the Party? Could the Party, through a correct tactic, have marshalled the forces of the petty-bourgeoisie behind itself?

I say — No! In this moment of the crisis the petty-bourgeoisie was muddled. The attitude of its leaders made it incapable of immediate action. It was ready for any concessions if only France and its francs were saved.

Poincaré's entrance into the Cabinet completely neutralised the petty and middle bourgeoisie.

What was actually the situation of the working class?

I must again emphasise that, in the moment when Poincaré took power, our Party sized up the situation correctly. After a few days we sounded the alarm and this throughout the whole working class as well as in our Party.

We have been accused of working too superficially, but I must say that the organisation of this work was thorough. In agreement with the C. G. T. U. it went forward above as well as below in our Party.

The inactivity of our factory nuclei is also stressed, and this in a moment when we are proceeding to the creation and organisation of street nuclei. I must say that we have not neglected this work either.

What is the present situation in France?

For the moment the bourgeoisie has its man at the helm. He is heading a "Cabinet of national unification", in which Left bloc ministers are also participating but he executes the policies of the big bourgeoisie.

The deflation policy followed by Poincaré still encounters great difficulties. On the other hand one must note that this deflation policy really shows itself as a masked inflation. New treasury certificates of national defense are being issued, the gold reserves of the Bank of France are being replaced by banknotes.

Finally, the Government likewise has certain successes with regard to its foreign policy. It has turned towards Germany. The Thoiry agreement shows us Poincaré's intentions. The formation of the big cartels (potash, steel), teaches us how to comprehend the political operations of the Government. Poincaré seeks to tap internal as well as foreign sources of financial and other assistance in order to be able to effect the stabilisation of finances under the best possible conditions.

There is, however, a dark cloud on the horizon. It is the economic crisis. In this period of economic crisis the cost of living rises automatically. In this there appears certain phenomena to which we call attention: on the one hand each month the index of retail prices rises by ten points, and on the other hand a very marked price reduction is to be noted on various products.

And finally the darkest but most important point for the Poincaré Government is the activity of the proletariat. I believe that we have somewhat underestimated the action of the French

proletariat. We can point to strikes in France lasting 4 to 8 months, such as the strikes in Dunkirk, Chateau, Regnault, Larroques d'Olmes; the two latter being victorious. These strikes were led during the entire period by the C. G. T. U. with the support of our Party.

Furthermore, I must bring to your attention also the big movements such as the National Congress of the Railwaymen, the Factory Congress of the Paris Metal Industry, and finally, the Party's agitational campaign which lasted an entire month, and the National Congress of the C. G. T. U. In all these campaigns our Party and the C. G. T. U. were at the head. What we might be charged with is that we did not treat this movement systematically enough, and that we did not exploit it sufficiently. We did not gain any benefits from our activity, but here we have seen a tendency to minimise our work.

Let us now look into the situation in the Party.

At the Lille Congress the French Party presented a united Executive which supported theses and resolutions in full agreement with the International. The Right, which with Souvarine and Loriot at one time gave us a lot of trouble, and which threatened our Party with disruption, was completely beaten at the time of the Lille Congress.

On the other hand we had to contend with a Centrist tendency whose "political platform" was Party democracy. This "Centre" disintegrated of itself, and its chief elements took part in the work of leadership either in the districts or in the centre.

We had — furthermore, Left elements whom we had defeated already at our Conference of December 1 and 2, 1925, and at Lille, these voted for the resolutions which condemned the activity of the ultra-Left and which ratified the Party's line.

The Party Executive had not only been united, but the whole Party stood behind its leadership.

At present the Right shows no more signs of life. The Centrist elements continue to work with us, and the extreme Left gave no sign that they did not enter upon the internal political problems with us. Not until the Russian Discussion did they form into a small kernel that spoke up for the Opposition, this included especially two members of the Central Committee, Jacob and Susanne Girault. I must say that this Opposition had no support, that no workers grouped themselves around it, and hence we shall without difficulty defeat it by good ideological work.

To summarise we may say that the Party has consolidated itself from the foundation to the head, that the relations with the trade unions are very good and that the last agitational campaign has nourished the influence of the Party, its numerical strength and its authority among the masses.

Kuusinen has said: "That the times were hard and that we can record success thank to events rather than to Party activity". I do not believe that Comrade Kuusinen thinks that only the political events moved the workers to enter our Party. I maintain that it was the work of our general activity and particularly the work of the Party nuclei.

Comrade Kurella tells us: "your cadres are not sufficiently trained. The cadres that come out of the Social Democracy and those that are new must be trained, and for this purpose every ideological confusion must be avoided". With this we are in complete agreement. In our Party we do not need any ideological confusion. The thesis of Comrade Treint cannot cause such confusion because we are able to discuss and smash the thesis in the nuclei, and this can only raise the ideological level of the membership. But one must not do as Comrade Kurella has done when in the "Bolshevik" he gave a bad analysis of the situation in the Party and the composition of its Executive. If a comrade, who is known also amongst the French comrades, writes such an article, then the ideological level of the Party will not be raised nor will its power be increased.

Comrades, I would also cite among the credits on our ledger that we worked actively on the field of the colonial question and anti-militarism. More and more we are penetrating the barracks and the navy — our Communist press is read everywhere. In the barracks we distribute 16,000 copies of our paper "Caserne" (Barracks), and 4,000 copies of the paper "Jean

le Gouin" (twice a month). In the majority of strikes the soldiers refuse to serve as strike-breakers. The artillery-men of the 8th regiment and the sharpshooters of the 26th refused to attack the demonstrators in Nancy. During the Morocco campaign 300 sailors on the battle-ship "Metz" refused to work as long as they were stationed near the Rif. When recently the Sultan of Morocco came to France 250 marines on the cruiser "Lievain" refused to present arms. We have at present 19 soldiers and sailors who have been sentenced to a total of 84 years imprisonment. These are facts that we bring to the attention of the Plenum in order to put an end to this idea that the French Party is carrying on only superficial work.

Comrades, in conclusion, I should like to present certain tasks that may be also the tasks of the other Parties:

1. We must intensify the mobilisation of the big masses against the capitalist policy of stabilisation, we must more clearly expose the consequences of stabilisation, the Party programme must be brought to the masses and the slogan "Workers' and Peasants' Government" must be popularised.

2. The debacle of the Left Parties who have allied themselves with reaction and the treason of the Social Democratic leaders must be exposed.

3. The Party organs on all stages must be strengthened. The activity of the nuclei must reach maximum, we must get them to work on the basis of the Party slogans so that they will develop in influence and numerical strength.

4. Trade union work must be raised to a maximum. The united front tactic must be applied on the basis of a programme of direct demands; these demands must also take into consideration the bad situation of the foreign workers, so that a workers' bloc can be formed; we must energetically proceed with the formation of mass trade unions and direct our work especially towards the big enterprises.

6. Struggle against the economic crisis which will intensify the class struggle, the whole Party and the trade unions must be directed upon the coming struggles against the bourgeoisie! We must work in such a way that the Communist Party is always the advance guard and the dependable leader that directs the proletariat to victory.

Comrade BIRCH (America):

Comrade Bukharin's report is a valuable contribution to an understanding of the present situation and the tasks of the Comintern. I welcome the decision to give a special section to America in the thesis.

To understand America's role today, we should keep in mind first of all three fundamental features of the present condition of American imperialism. 1. American capitalism is not yet at the height of its development. 2. It has not yet fully exploited all its colonial resources. 3. American imperialism has not yet fully exerted all its military and naval strength.

To illustrate our first point, if we examine the main features of the first nine months of American export of capital in 1926 we find 1. an unusual proportion of new capital; 2. an unusual proportion of large blocs of capital export in flotations of ten million dollars or more; 3) more than 2/3 of the capital exported has gone into the industrial corporations.

Rationalisation in Europe is child's play compared with the development in the United States. America has more than 600 research laboratories working to improve mass production, scientific management, industrial technique, elimination of waste and promoting of company union and welfare schemes. A basic feature of rationalisation for Europe will be the introduction of a new relationship, not only between man and machine but between man and man, employer and worker, an attempt at new class relationship — company unionism, employers' welfare schemes, class collaboration.

American capital is interested in the manufacturing industries of 25 countries, public utility works of 16 nations, railroads of 30 lands and mining industries of 25 countries. To a large extent rationalisation for Europe translates itself into Americanisation. Against this rationalisation slogan of the bourgeoisie we must place that of the bolshevisation of the working class.

Premier Baldwin saw this clearly when he urged workers to go to New York and not to Moscow for their inspiration.

The key to the proper estimate of America's international role today is to be found in its relations with Europe. Here I will analyse Trotzky's criticism of my attack on his theory of a Europe on "rations".

I maintained and still do that America can put Europe on rations only under either of these two conditions 1. after a war in which the United States has vanquished Europe, 2. after a complete basic Anglo-American accord and understanding. It is obvious that the first has not happened. Recent months especially have shown multiplying signs of increasing effective resistance of European capitalism to American imperialist encroachments. We cite: 1. rising hatred of American capitalism by the English, French and Italian capitalists. 2. The extension of the continental trust system. 3. The new attempts, especially by the British capitalists, to make fundamental changes in the Dawes Plan. 4. The resistance to America's terms of debt payments, etc.

America's reaction to this is similar. Notice 1. the rebuff given to Stresemann by Coolidge in the American opposition to the Treaty arrangements; 2. the new literature on American foreign policy propagating the idea that it was a mistake for America to go into the war and that the United States should prepare for a show-down struggle with England for world supremacy; 3. the strengthening of American commercial, military and naval machinery.

In the United States there is no longer a glorification of Anglo-Saxon peace and unity. America is fighting England on many fronts. 1. Witness America investing more than a hundred million dollars in Italian water power resources to undermine British coal sales to Italy. 2. Struggle against British influence in Poland. 3. American opposition to British plans in the Far East, especially in China as indicated by the American report blaming Shanghai massacres on foreign police and making financial demands on Wu-Pei-Fu while he was being hard pressed by Canton forces. America blames England as a stumbling block to complete European debt settlement. I can cite many other instances of the sharpening conflict of interests between America and England.

Trotzky's theory of Europe on rations really is an extension of his theory of "permanent revolution", because it really means the following; 1) no Socialism is possible in the Soviet Union without a European proletarian revolution; 2. but if America is placing Europe on rations then no European proletarian revolution is possible without there first being an American proletarian revolution. If one accepts the theory of Europe being put on rations by America, then especially does the likelihood of a successful building up of Socialism in the Soviet Union fade away into an impossibility. Perhaps this accounts for Trotzky's pessimism as to the development of Socialism in the Soviet Union. Of course Comrade Trotzky is wrong in his theory of America putting Europe on rations. The objective logic and the conclusions of this theory are equally wrong. Europe is still alive and effectively resisting American capitalist encroachments. Socialism is being consistently and systematically developed in the Soviet Union.

Comrade Treint is wrong in his contention that there is a likelihood of the establishment of a United States of Capitalist Europe against the United States of America. There are too many contradictions and conflicts of interest rending apart the various European countries to make possible such a United States of capitalist Europe against America. There may be a possibility of a temporary military coalition of sections of capitalist Europe, of a temporary bloc against the efforts of American imperialism for world domination. (Applause.)

Comrade BOSCHKOVITCH (Yugo-Slavia).

Comrades! If the winning of the masses is our chief slogan then we must emphasise more concretely that the realisation of this slogan is inconceivable if we do not work among the peasantry. After the V. Congress most of our Parties began to direct their attention to the peasant question. I should like to discuss a few concrete examples from the work of the Communist Parties in the rural districts.

The experiences of the Communist Party of Poland in its work among the peasantry has shown that the slogan of the unity of the peasant parties has enjoyed greatest popularity among the peasantry. Especially noteworthy is the coalition in the struggle of the various nationalities, the formation of a federation of Left peasant organisations: the Ukrainian Peasant League, White Russian League of Workers and Peasants, and the Independent Peasant Party. On the whole we may say that the policy of the C. P. P. with regard to the peasant movement was a correct one.

The Communist Party of Italy fosters the work among the non-Party peasant organisations that have sprung up. The III. Congress of the C. P. (Jan. 1926) devoted serious attention to the peasant question. The activity of the agrarian section of the C. P. I., is, in general, to be characterised as good.

In Finland our comrades have likewise been able to find the correct approach to the peasant question.

In Czecho-Slovakia we are able to note great events on the field of the peasant movement: this year the land reform was completed; the new taxation policy is directed against the interests of the small peasantry. Although the C. P. Cz. carried out big campaigns among the peasantry, certain shortcomings are nevertheless to be noted: 1. a lack of any connection with the opposition groups which exist in practically all the peasant parties, 2. insufficient attention devoted to the peasant question by the Communist press, 3. the lack of an organisational apparatus for the Department for Rural Work.

In Sweden a National Peasant Congress was called at the end of November for the purpose of founding a national peasant league. At this Congress statutes and a programme were worked out, but a distinct lack of experience can be felt in the whole activity of our Party among the peasantry.

The Workers (Communist) Party has done important work among the farmers of the United States. Its approach is in the main a correct one: by penetrating the non-Party farmer organisations it influences the farmers and their Left leaders. Practically in all of the agrarian States there are Left organisations known as Farmer Labour Parties.

During the last elections (Nov. 1926) the C. P. included in its election platform a number of demands in defense of the most important interests of the farmer masses: legislation, tax reduction, distribution of land among the toilers, fight against the "scissors", etc. The C. P. supported the Left Farmer organisations and declared officially that it would not put up its candidates in those States where Farmer-Labour tickets were in the field. The Communist press devotes much attention to the farmer question and gains numerous readers among the farmers.

The C. P. of Canada worked more actively in 1925 than it did in 1926 for the establishment of connections with farmers' organisations. Yet the Party's work in 1925 is also not to be characterised as successful because of the lack of support from the broad farmer masses and the inability of the C. P. to base itself upon them. In 1926, the C. P. gave less attention to the farmers. The election platform (Sept. 1926) contains not a single "farmer point". The Party has done very little to strengthen the Left Wing in the already existing organisations.

The peasant organisations in China are organisations of small proprietors, tenants and agricultural labourers. The influence of the Communist Party is rising. The C. P. of China and the Kuomintang have at present made it one of their immediate tasks to direct the peasantry in their struggle against the reactionary landlords, their struggle for land and for the liquidation of the relics of feudalism in China. Thereby our Chinese comrades have recognised that the Peasant Question is the Central Problem of the Whole Chinese revolution.

The C. P. of Korea, which works under extremely difficult illegal conditions, has for the time being won contact with very few peasant organisations. Its tasks in the immediate future are: the exposure and disruption of all sorts of opportunistic "black" agrarian organisations, and the increase of its influence on the peasant and national revolutionary mass organisations.

With regard to Japan, we must note the efforts of the Communist Party to make contact with the peasant masses, especially with the tenant-farmer movement. Our experiences in the formation of the Workers' and Farmers' Party prove that

despite the mistakes that were made the road towards the formation of a legal revolutionary party was a correct one. The immediate task of the Communist Party of Japan consists in overcoming the shortcomings of its agrarian work, as well as the extension of this work to include also the peasant proprietors and the middle peasants now threatened with ruin.

In general it is to be said that all those Right and Left deviations in the trade union movement of which Comrade Kuusinen has spoken, are present in a still higher degree on the field of the peasant movement.

We may say that in our work among the peasantry, three Phases of Development are to be noted. The first phase, in which our Parties completely ignored the peasant question, is almost liquidated. Most of our Parties are now in the second phase, in which great importance is ascribed to the peasant question, but in which very little is really done among the peasantry. Only a few of the Parties are in the third phase in which work on the countryside is carried on in Leninist spirit.

The chief mistake of many Parties consists in that they adopt a course of creating numerous little revolutionary peasant organisations, instead of making use of the already existing peasant organisations for the radicalisation of the peasant masses.

In order to mobilise the masses of the peasantry around the Communist Parties, the Peasant Press must be made use of. Our comrades have made attempts to create a peasant press with their own forces, but with the exception of a few countries, — Poland, United States, etc. this press is nothing else than a collection of Communist agitational leaflets and abstract compositions incomprehensible to the peasant masses.

In the future we must carefully study the methods of work among the broad masses of the peasantry. We are very glad to note that at this Plenum a number of our comrades have raised the peasant question in its full extent and have tried to get the Plenum to give concrete directions on work among the peasantry. The chief thing is that after this Plenum we shall be able, through our practice, in all countries, to make the slogan of the worker and peasant bloc a slogan not only of the labour movement, but also of the peasant movement. I am firmly convinced that in the immediate future we will be able to realise Lenin's teachings with regard to a world-wide workers' and peasants' movement.

Comrade KOLAROV (Bulgaria):

Comrades, I shall deal with three questions: 1) the specific character of capitalist stabilisation in the Balkan countries, 2) the danger of war, and 3) the White Terror in these countries.

Is there a capitalist stabilisation in the Balkan countries? Yes, there is. No one can deny the existence of a relative, partial and in the main, intermittent stabilisation. Only, it is even more relative and partial and intermittent than in the other capitalist countries.

The economic foundation in these countries is agriculture. To a certain extent agriculture has been restored in the Balkan countries. But after the war marked changes took place, with the effect that national economy falls more and more into dependence upon foreign capitalism.

Industry in the Balkan countries is very weak, and it is important to note that there is virtually no chance for the development of a native industry, first because of foreign competition, and, secondly, because of the lack of native capital.

These facts confine the Balkan countries to just one prospect: their complete agrarianisation and transformation into colonies of foreign capitalism.

The methods by which foreign capitalism is penetrating the countries are the methods of colonisation. They lay hands upon natural resources and agriculture; concessions are secured gratis, banks established which concern themselves only with speculation and the buying up of food products; and all this is done in a manner that results in converting the countries into colonies of foreign capitalism.

Under such conditions is it possible to speak of a capitalist stabilisation in the Balkan countries? Certainly. The bourgeoisie

has succeeded to a certain degree in again stabilising its power, but this success has been due only to the financial and political support on the part of international imperialism. Without the intervention of the imperialist powers the Balkan bourgeoisie would not have been able to choke off the revolutionary movement of the post-war period.

But, comrades, if in order to hold the masses of the population under its yoke the bourgeoisie is forced to resort to the support of the foreign powers, it must obviously pay dearly for this, for it becomes transformed into their vassal. It enters the retinue of foreign capitalism, and this in a manner that reveals the characteristic features of the stabilisation in the Balkan countries — coalition and subjection.

Comrades, I now come to the second question. Is there a menace of war in the Balkans? Yes, this danger exists, and I think that while no one can just simply deny it in generalities, we are not sufficiently informed of its weightiness from an international viewpoint.

It is known that the war of 1912 was the curtain-raiser to the World War, and that the first shot that set the big war into motion was likewise fired here. Today also, with regard to the menace of war, the Balkan countries constitute a very complicated point of danger. The antagonisms between the Balkan countries are at this moment more numerous and more intense than they were prior to the world war. Look at the names of a number of the Balkan provinces: Albania, Macedonia, Saloniki, Eastern and Western Thrace, Bessarabia, the Dobrudja, etc. These provinces are certain to be talked about in connection with the coming World War.

But I should like to emphasise still another point — it involves the position of the Balkan countries in the strategic plans of the imperialist powers. What is the aim of French imperialism in these countries, in this corner of Europe? It is this: to erect a wall, from Saloniki to Danzig, from the Aegean to the Baltic. One side of this wall is turned against the Soviet Union, and the other against Germany, and also against Italy. French imperialism persists stubbornly in this aim, but it comes into conflict with the vital interests of British and Italian imperialism. British imperialism, which holds the hegemony over the eastern Mediterranean, is becoming uneasy over France's buffing in. French imperialism has found a way, via Yugo-Slavia, of getting access to the Aegean Sea. But here it clashes also with the vital interests of Italy in the Mediterranean and in Asia-Minor. We know very well that the young Italian imperialism is greedy for the Turkish province of Adalia. Well, the road to the conquest of this province lies through the Balkans. Italian imperialism can lay hands on this province only by marching through the Balkans.

Comrades, these Italian war plans against the Republic of Angora are no fairy-tale. It is no invention to say that Italy is persistently at work to entrench itself economically and politically in the Balkan countries. Italian capital is penetrating into the Balkan countries. It is even assuming first place in Turkey, second place in Bulgaria, and it is making equally rapid progress in the other Balkan countries.

I need not add, here, that this policy of Italian imperialism is being very energetically supported by Great Britain.

Comrades, what is involved here is the menace of war. You will remember that Turkey mobilised a part of its army and concentrated it in the province of Adalia when, about a half year ago, Mussolini made his demonstrative trip to North Africa.

A few days ago a rumour raced through the press about a Quadruple Entente between Italy, Greece, Bulgaria and Great Britain, for the purpose of waging war against Turkey. If, for the time being, this rumour was only a rumour, we must nevertheless recognise the objective reality that this plan, even though not as yet perfected, nevertheless can at any moment be perfected. So, finally, I put this question: in the great Mediterranean conflict between French and Italian imperialisms — who is there that does not comprehend the weighty role of the Balkans as the gateway to the Italian hinterland?

I believe that the seriousness of the war menace that can emerge from the Balkans is not exaggerated. This corner of Europe always remains a great powder-keg that may at any

moment explode and cause a general conflagration the extent of which cannot be foretold.

It is true that the dependence in which the Balkan countries find themselves to the big imperialist powers permits the latter to act as a sort of guard over the powder-keg. We saw this, for example, in the case of the Greco-Bulgar conflict in which British imperialism fulfilled its "pacific mission" via the League of Nations. We must recognise that only for small states like Greece and Bulgaria, which are entirely in the hands of their masters, can the League of Nations still exercise a certain authority in questions of peace. This was also the case in the recent Bulgar-Yugoslavian conflict in which, under the pressure of British and Italian diplomacy, the Yugoslavian government had to beat a retreat and content itself with an ordinary diplomatic note.

One might therefore be tempted to believe that the imperialist powers are carefully watching over this powder-keg in order to smother all threatening sparks. But the question arises here as to whether they will always do so; and, above all, whether they will always be able to do so. That is the question.

Comrades, the danger of war in the Balkans puts upon the Communist Parties of the Balkan countries, as well as on the Communist International, very special tasks. The task of the Communist Parties consists in finding ways and means of coordinating their actions in case of a clash — and from this we must conclude that they must consolidate and strengthen their Balkan Communist Federation. As far as the Communist International is concerned, we must point out that it must give greater attention than heretofore to the menace of war that may emerge from the Balkans.

I come to the third question, to the White Terror. Comrades, we have spoken of the Balkan countries' relapse into barbarism after the war, and this is correct. The Balkans are going into barbarism. It seems to me that this is the first time that the Balkan countries are marching at the head of capitalist "civilisation". But what is the cause of this? Whence does this fact come? The primary cause is the economic, political and social crisis, a very sharp and lasting crisis, that holds sway in the Balkans. As a result of this crisis we find a tremendous despair among the masses of the population, and we see how an ever-deepening chasm opens up between the ruling class and the class of the exploited. How else than with the bayonet can the bourgeoisie hold the respect of these masses? It knows no method than that of the White Terror.

But there is a second cause, and this concerns the Communist Parties of other countries: it involves the political and financial support which the foreign powers furnish the Balkan bourgeoisie. The imperialist powers are helping the Balkan bourgeoisie completely to smother the revolutionary movement, for this means a grave menace to their own interests in the Balkans.

If the international bourgeoisie supports with all its power the Zankovs, Pasics, Averescus of the Balkans, even though their hands drip with the blood of their peoples, then I believe it is but an elementary task of the international proletariat, and of the Communist Parties, to come to the aid of the Balkan Federation, to support the Communist Parties of the Balkans, by endeavouring to cancel the anti-soviet and counter-revolutionary actions of their bourgeoisies in the Balkans.

I shall conclude by giving the shortest possible formula for capitalist stabilisation in the Balkan countries. Here the stabilisation means: Colonisation and subjection, plus the danger of war, plus White Terror.

Comrade BELL, England:

Comrade Bukharin has said that chief amongst the tasks of this Plenum are the Bolshevisation of our Party and the winning of the masses over to Communism under the new conditions and the new forms that confront us today. We, in the British Delegation, quite agree with Comrade Bukharin on the importance of these tasks and consider them of primary concern to all our Brother Parties.

As to rationalisation — this is an accentuated phase of the present temporary stabilisation of capitalism. All the highly developed capitalist powers are being compelled to reorganise

the whole of the forces in the labour process to maintain their respective places in the world economy of capitalism.

There are two chief factors at work — first, there is the intense world competition; and second, there is the internal contradiction of capitalist economy in the home market. In the former we see a regrouping of forces going on. America has emerged from the war crisis the wealthiest and most powerful industrial country in the world. Britain has lost her former status of world monopolist, and I can cite statistics to prove that Great Britain is yielding ground to America, not only in the world market generally, but within the British Empire itself. I will take Australia, New Zealand and South Africa to compare the decline in the trade of the United Kingdom with those respective colonies of the British Empire, with the increase of the imports from America. Imports from the United Kingdom into Australia in 1913 represented, 57.8%, in 1924 45.2% and 1925 43.9%; New Zealand in 1913 — 59.7%, in 1924 — 57.1% and in 1925 — 52%, in South Africa in 1913 — 56.8%, in 1924 — 57.5% and in 1925 — 50%.

But the imports from the United States to Australia, New Zealand and South Africa in the same years are as follows: Australia 1913 — 13.4%, 1924 — 24.6%, and 1925 — 24.6%; New Zealand in 1913 — 9.5%, 1924 — 15.6%, and in 1925 16.4%; South Africa in 1913 — 8.9%, 1924 — 13.9%, and in 1925 — 14.7%. Thus we see in figures that Great Britain has lost her monopoly not only in the world generally, but in the British Empire.

World competition forces rationalisation on all the competing countries and the problem, therefore, is not a German problem, just as Fordism and the Fordisation of industry spoken of by Comrade Bukharin is not an American problem. It is the problem of capitalism moving in the direction of newer and higher forms of its own economy.

Now, what is the attitude of the Communist Parties toward this rationalisation? Here, I say, it is necessary to distinguish between rationalisation under the dictatorship of the capitalists, and rationalisation under the dictatorship of the proletariat. So long as the capitalists control the instruments of production, the question of technique in industry is subordinate to the class relations and to the class struggle. In fact rationalisation will render the class struggle even more acute than it has been up to the present time. It may be that in the struggle of the working class certain forms of rationalisation will be held up, postponed and even destroyed, — with that we Communists are not concerned. What we are concerned with is the utmost mobilisation of the working class for the possession of the instruments of production. So long as these are in the hands of the capitalists every new method means but a greater intensification of exploitation. What is essential for the workers is that in the process of rationalisation the living conditions and standards of the working class shall not be worsened.

This therefore brings us up against the question which most of our brother Parties are confronted by: greater trade union activity, the casting off of old methods of organisation, the broadening of the bases of our labour unions and organisations, the planting of our roots in the factories and workshops. Then another question confronts us. The bourgeoisie finds in the trade unions and in the labour organisations their most inveterate enemy, the most formidable obstacle to their introduction of rationalisation in industry. They try to overcome our labour organisations by introducing company unions, joint councils of employer and workmen, welfare institutions and all kinds of class collaboration schemes that are calculated to win the workers away from the labour organisations, i. e. from the class struggle. This is one of the most important dangers our brother Parties will have to overcome. It means for us more intensive activity amongst the working class, not only in political parties, not only in general propaganda, not only in the national trade unions, but more and more through activity inside the plants, factories, workshops, mines, railways, wherever the workers are employed.

The problem of the unemployed masses will be a vital question in those countries where rationalisation is now the dominant question. To organise the unemployed to maintain the standards of living generally, to carry forward our general political education to the masses in winning them over from the Social Democratic organisations, to foster the growth of the trade unions, to carry them along in the general political

struggle for power — these are the essential lessons which we think important for our brother Parties to consider in this great question of rationalisation of industry.

Comrade BITTELMAN, America:

Comrades, Comrade Bukharin in his oral report dealt with America very briefly. In my judgment the developments of the United States, the recent developments, are of such tremendous importance not only for the American Party, but for the Comintern as a whole as would justify a much more elaborate and detailed treatment of the American situation than was given.

When we speak of stabilisation it is characteristic for us to think of stabilisation as it is in Europe.

Rationalisation — well, this has been a dominant feature of American capitalism for the last ten years. One of the characteristics of the stabilisation of capitalism of the United States is its completely debauched and corrupted labour aristocracy. It is very characteristic that while European reformists are trying to fool the working class by building pacifist illusions, the American reformists do not resort to pacifism, they are openly imperialist. No other section of America, except the finance capitalists themselves, are so openly militaristic as are the leaders of the American Federation of Labour.

But, comrades, there are serious and radical changes taking place in the structure of American capital, in the relationship between industry and agriculture in the United States, to a large extent in the composition of the American working class, and also in the functioning of many of the American trade unions. All of these subjects should be investigated by the best minds of the Communist International. These problems are not too small for the best people that our movement possesses, and I am frank to say that some of these problems, the investigation of their nature and their relationship to our struggles, sometimes prove beyond the theoretical capacity of our own Party.

As regards our Party, we can say that the political directive given us by the Communist International, to establish contact with the masses and win them over for our movement, has already become an organic part of the ideology of our Party as a whole, but we have not yet found the best means for putting it into effect. We know that we are not as yet facing a direct and immediate revolutionary situation in America. We know more than that. We know that the American capitalism as yet is on the upgrade; that America is the most powerful imperialist country in the world. We have analysed and understood many developments of our country. But as yet the Communist International, and our Party, has not yet formulated the perspectives before us. This is one of the reasons why we have not proceeded as best as we might have. The Communist International must help and assist us in formulating our perspectives for the immediate future.

In the attempts to establish contact with the masses, our Party has been successful in a number of instances. But while politically the influence of our Party has been growing, our organisational strength has in no way been growing correspondingly, that is, to the extent of the growth of our political influence. For instance a very interesting and very important fact. In the city of New York, our Party was able in recent months to acquire leadership in several economic struggles of the workers, but when on election day, during the last congressional elections, we began to count the votes for our candidates, we found that they were immeasurably smaller than our direct influence among the masses would indicate.

The American conditions of development, those I have mentioned and others, must be given more attention by this Plenum of the Communist International than has hitherto been done, not only for the sake of our Party but for the sake of the Comintern as a whole. We must clear our minds as to what is actually happening in the United States. You will find in personal discussions among the American comrades, even among those here at the Plenum not disagreement but confusion on many points of political importance. This Plenum could do nothing better for the movement as a whole, than to assist us in solving these problems for our future work.

The session thereupon adjourned, to reconvene at 10:30 the following day.

Seventh Session.

Moscow, November 26th, 1926.

Comrade GALLACHER (Chairman) opened the session at 11 a. m. for the continuation of the discussion on the reports of Comrades Bukharin and Kuusinen.

Comrade JACQUEMOTTE (Belgium):

The Belgian Delegation is of the opinion that the serious question of rationalisation has, even now, not yet been dealt with earnestly enough.

It seems impossible to us — and apparently Comrade Bukharin has not done this either — to separate the problem of the "rationalisation" of capitalist industry, of bourgeois production, from the whole question of capitalist stabilisation.

I believe that we may say concerning rationalisation that it is an attempt by capitalism at the sanitation of industry, just like the stabilisation of currency is an attempt at stabilising finances.

Can this "rationalisation" be looked upon as a new form that can constitute the starting point of a progressive capitalist development? The Social Democrats give a positive reply to this question and they justify their support of rationalisation with the following theoretical argument:

"Rationalisation — so the reformists think — "will of course **deduct**. After the blood-letting of the war years, capitalism dips into the fountain of youth called 'rationalisation' and finds there rejuvenation, it finds fresh strength and new energy."

"Rationalisation — so the reformists think — will of course **demand** temporary sacrifices from a section of the workers, it results in a shifting within the working class, but this is only the reverse side of a truly actual progress. After this transition period a new time of progress will set in for the whole of the working masses."

Can we grant that this Social Democratic conception is correct? No, for rationalisation is not the expression of a progressive, but of a retrogressive capitalist development, it is a sign not of a rising but of a declining capitalism, as is proven with adequate clarity in the sagacious and detailed statement in Bukharin's theses.

We therefore state unanimously that the "rationalisation" is no crisis of capitalist growth but a crisis of its decay. It is a desperate effort of the bourgeoisie to adapt industry to the new conditions created by the capitalist war.

I know that if we view the problem of the struggle against the capitalist rationalisation in this manner the following reproach will be raised against us: "Are you opposed to technical progress, are you opposed to machinery?"

We are all united upon the standpoint that a period of decline has set in for capitalism. But it is clear that the bourgeoisie will attempt to check this decline of its regime, to hold it back.

Comrade Bukharin's formula states: "The Communists can not concern themselves with the improvement of technique, the improvement of the organisation of labour under capitalist conditions. Their task lies in another field."

We are all united on the standpoint that the Communists are not to busy themselves in support of capitalist attempts to postpone the moment of its final collapse. But this does not mean however, that we should not interest ourselves in the efforts of the bourgeoisie in this field. Capitalist rationalisation means the intensification of the exploitation of the proletariat, it means wage-cuts, unemployment, etc.

We must therefore unmask the essence of capitalist rationalisation before the masses, and counter it with a general slogan: "Nationalisation of industry and rationalisation at the expense of the capitalists."

But a general slogan is insufficient. We must formulate our slogans also for the immediate demands of the masses on this field. We believe that these slogans should be the following: Workers' control, combating of unemployment, (here the proposal of the British comrades, as formulated by Gallacher about

the support of the unemployed, should be used), combating piece work, raising of wages with the rising productivity of the factories, combating of the Taylor system, etc.

We propose that the Political Commission, which is to formulate these theses finally after the general discussion, should supplement the text proposed by Bukharin in the following sense:

It is task of the Communists to unmask the real essence of capitalist rationalisation, to counter the capitalist slogan of rationalisation with the slogan of nationalisation, and to mobilise the masses for the slogans: Workers' control of industry, maintenance of the unemployed, raising of wages in conformity with increased productivity.

It goes without saying, comrades, that we are in complete solidarity with the Bukharin declarations concerning the essential difference between "rationalisation" in capitalist states and rationalisation in Soviet Russia. Rationalisation in the world's first proletarian state proceeds in the interests of the whole working class, in the interest of socialist construction and not in the interest of the bourgeoisie for the purpose of consolidating capitalism.

Every Communist is clear on this and every worker exploited by capitalism can figure this out.

Rationalisation of industry in Soviet Russia is undertaken in the interests of the working class as a whole, in the capitalist countries however, it is carried out at the expense of the working class and for the benefit and profit of the bourgeoisie. We conclude in the hope that the Plenum will consider the proposals formulated by us.

Comrade BITTEL:

The report marks extraordinary progress in that it clears up the vague concept of a "vacillating" stabilisation, and declares very exactly what it is that has stabilised itself in the course of recent years and what has not.

Our investigations on this field are still largely in their beginnings. We should occupy ourselves more intensively in the future with the economic questions.

I should like to analyse more closely some figures that appear to me to be particularly important, the world trade figures. What is their inner structure and tendency? The report cites three stabilisation factors: 1) production, 2) foreign trade and 3) currency fluctuations. It is established that in 1924 world trade had already reached 91% and in this year 97%, of the 1913 total. One might therefore assume that on this decisive field of world trade, of import and export, we already have approximately peace-time conditions (97%). Comrade Bukharin concludes from this that "capitalism thereby completes its restoration process from the viewpoint of international trade turnover". He then makes a number of reservations, in that he says that one must certainly investigate not only the quantitative but also the qualitative side of this matter, since "a radical change in the chief directions of circulation from one country into the other" has taken place.

I am of the opinion that we can by no means designate the world trade figures as an essential factor of stabilisation. Quite the contrary. If we analyse the figures we find that on a world scale approximately the peace-time volume has been reached or exceeded but that for Central Europe, the volume for 1924 amounted to only 71% and for 1925 only 82%. Thus there is still an extraordinary backwardness.

These figures look still worse if we take the total world trade figure 105 (a difference of 23 points), and the European production figure 102 (a difference of 20 points). This figure is all the more grave since much of what formerly was internal trade now counts as foreign trade because of the many new customs barriers.

Thus the "almost healthy arm" of world trade is still for some time to come in Europe very much a bleeding wound. International economy is still very much disorganised. Europe's loss in inter-Continental trade has created the most serious dis-

proportion between productive and market possibilities. To the narrowed domestic market we must add the foreign market now occupied by America and the newly industrialised countries.

The analysis of the world trade figures thus shows no consolidation, pacification and reconstruction, but the contrary: disorganisation and the impossibility of rebuilding the old. Not stability but lability! It is precisely here that the hearth of future conflicts blazes the brightest.

I propose that of the three columns that are enumerated here as stabilisation features: production, world trade and valuta, number two be struck out and inserted into the next chapter as feature of labilisation.

One of our most decisive tasks, in order to separate the masses from reformism is to bring quite clearly to their consciousness that the social democracy, although in composition still a proletarian party, according to its policy it acts as an absolutely capitalist party. In the last few days the "Vorwärts" prints an editorial by Breitscheid in which he speaks about the necessity of a "Pacific work of socialism", but what he means is pacific work with capitalism. He says:

"We must be ready to reckon with conditions and make proposals of such remedies which capitalist diplomacy also can accept." ("Vorwärts", November 17th.)

In the struggle against reformism we will have many positive and major successes if we finally, travel energetically along the road that we have long mapped out for ourselves: more intensive work in the broad, old, historical, mass organisations, especially in the trade unions and co-operatives. Now as to work in the co-operatives; its importance and specific gravity has risen greatly within the frame of the labour movement. In recent years the co-operative movement has been developing an extraordinary activity, especially among the women. The co-operative bureaucracy — which works cheek by jowl with the II and Amsterdam Internationals — is to be counted among the most energetic and most reactionary standard bearers of economic peace. Jointly with Amsterdam it committed itself definitely in the preparations for the World Economic Conference in Geneva.

In this connection we should occupy ourselves seriously with the proposal that the Russian co-operatives made at the last International Co-operative Session, viz., to counterpose to this capitalist world economic conference a proletarian, a workers' world economic conference. There can be no doubt that also in the ranks of the Social Democratic trade unionists and co-operators, as well as in the labour movement as a whole there is a considerable measure of dissatisfaction with this economic peace and collaboration. Thus, e. g. there is a committee in the Amsterdam Trade Union International, which months ago submitted a report containing proposals for the struggle against international trustification and cartelisation. It recommends: industrial unions, public reports, control of production and trade! There is even an "extended programme" with demands for the socialisation of industry, transport, banks, sources of raw material and trade. But these commission reports remain secret, to this day they have not seen the light of day.

Nor are we by any means doing enough work on the field of Mass organisations. There the reformists still have their most solid organisational, ideological and material positions. Unquestionably this day to day detail work, this activity inside of the reformist organisations, is an extraordinarily difficult and thankless job. It is very often more difficult to find a correct line and tactics in these small questions than to write a long resolution. Therefore what counts here is to study, to give clear policies, to create cadres, to train functionaries who really work and who win successes in these day to day struggles.

From this Enlarged Executive a powerful slogan should issue anew: conquest of the masses inside of their mass organisations, primarily through the personal prestige of the Communists in this practical work!

* * *

Comrade CODOVILLA (Latin America):

Comrades, I should like to direct the attention of the Plenum upon the indirect effects of capitalist stabilisation upon the countries of Latin America. I say indirect effects since in our countries one cannot, as in Europe, speak of capitalist stabilisation, because the national economy of these countries did not suffer as a result of the war, but on the contrary, underwent a certain development during this period.

At the outset I should like to emphasise that I am in agreement with the formulations in Bukharin's theses on capitalist stabilisation, and especially on the problem of rationalisation.

But I am not in agreement with the standpoint of Comrade Jaquemotte, who maintains that at the present moment we must be against rationalisation, yet who brings forward nothing concrete through which this rationalisation might be hindered. Jaquemotte proposes the nationalisation of the factories in connection with workers' control over these factories. In this however, he forgets that in the theses we have recorded the existence of a relative stabilisation of capitalism, and that this situation is precisely an evidence of the weakness of the working class. If the working class is in a position to demand the nationalisation of the factories, then it is also in a position to embark upon a revolution; this is quite clear. Hence, if the question of resistance against rationalisation is raised, there is raised also the question of open sabotage which cannot be carried out within present-day production, or else the problem of the immediate conquest of power by the proletariat is raised.

I should like to direct the attention of the Plenum towards the Latin American countries because Comrade Bukharin, in his theses on the problem of capitalist stabilisation in Europe, dealt with the question of domestic markets, and especially also foreign markets which are positive factors of the relative stabilisation, as one of the weightiest problems of this relative stabilisation.

In the theses it is stated with all clarity that we are today witnessing a progressive decline of British imperialism and a development of North American imperialism. This decline of British imperialism reacts also upon the Latin American countries, for, as the comrades know, the struggle between the two imperialisms in progress there also has consequences of international significance.

If we raise the question of foreign markets then this involves not only markets for industrial products but also markets for financial and industrial capital. Now we find that the Latin American countries furnish to imperialism, particularly to the North American imperialism, a certain opportunity for the investment of its industrial and finance capital.

If I direct the attention of the Plenum to the growing power of this North American imperialism, to its desire for mastery over the Latin American countries, I am by no means in agreement with the theses of Comrade Treint in which he says that the Comintern has not devoted sufficient attention to the Latin American countries as a result of the under-estimation of the development of North American imperialism on the part of Comrade Bukharin. I understand that the chief question involves the struggle that must result in a European revolution, and that America in the present period can play no such decisive role. It is clear that Comrade Treint, in trying to prove that North America has turned away from Europe in order to settle itself firmly in other countries of the world, has over-estimated the role of the Latin American countries.

Let me submit a few figures to show that as a market for industrial and finance capital Latin America has so real an importance for North America, that we must give it special emphasis. Thus, e. g. in 1926, out of a total of 10,437 million dollars which North America invested in the whole world, 4,255 millions went to Latin America, viz., more than 40% of the total capital invested by North America went into Latin America. Much more interesting is the fact, however, that of these 4,255 million dollars, 3,203 million was invested in industry and only 1,015 million put at the disposal of the various governments in the form of financial loans.

In the year 1913-14 North American foreign trade with the Latin American countries amounted to 735 million dollars. In 1922, this figure rose to 1,318 million dollars, in 1923, it amounted

to 1,685 million dollars, in 1924, to 1,935 million dollars, and in 1925 it rose to 2,095 million dollars. This means that North America has trebled its foreign trade with the Latin American countries. These figures show that Yankee imperialism has the opportunity to get rid of its industrial and finance capital as well as its industrial products in the Latin American countries.

The form in which the imperialist penetration of these countries proceeds likewise plays a big role in the problem of stabilisation during the present period. For example, why is North America constantly gaining ground in the South American countries, and more and more crowding out British imperialism? British imperialism, prior to the war, concerned itself specially with the export of raw materials, with working them up in the Metropolis, and then re-selling the finished products in the same countries from which it had drawn the raw materials; with this policy British imperialism hindered all industrial or even economic development of these countries and thereby played a consequent reactionary role.

North American imperialism is more clever, more intelligent, more elastic.

A further factor likewise, worked to the benefit of America during the war. During this period England was forced to neglect the South American markets to a very great extent, in order to concentrate upon war industry, and this led to the arising and development of small national industries in practically all of the Latin American countries. During this time North America likewise busied itself almost exclusively with marketing its manufactured goods and to a certain extent filled the role formerly held by England. But the Latin American countries passed a series of protective tariff laws for the purpose of checking the importation of foreign goods, and of protecting their industries against foreign competition. And here, the cunning of North American imperialism comes to life. Since it was impossible to put over its mastery through the sale of its finished products it endeavoured to penetrate the national industries by investing its industrial and finance capital there.

What is the importance of the Latin American countries from the standpoint of raw materials? The Latin American countries contain all the raw materials necessary for the development of industry. In these countries, there is a surplus of petroleum. As the comrades know an investigation by an international commission established that almost 55% of the world total of petroleum is to be found in South America. We have in addition cotton, rubber, nitrates, copper, zinc, etc. etc., in short everything that is necessary to the development of big industry. The actual struggle that is now taking place down there must be considered in connection with the struggle on a world scale for raw materials.

The imperialists are not so much concerned about the immediate exploitation of these raw materials, they only wish to establish reserves against the time when they will need these sources of raw material. This is at stake in the struggle for raw materials in order 1) to prevent the penetration of the rival imperialism, 2) to establish for itself a reserve that can be utilised at the moment it is required by its industry.

Let us take petroleum for example, everyone knows that Mexico holds second place in the world production for petroleum. But in the other South American States also new petroleum fields have been discovered that were heretofore unknown. In Venezuela for instance, the extraction of petroleum was only begun in 1922 with a half-million barrels. Last year the production had already risen to 35 million barrels. It is very easily possible that in the next 4 or 5 years the Macaribou district will develop into one of the chief producers of petroleum. The same can be said of practically all of the South American countries. To this must be added that all of these districts are in the vicinity of the Pacific Ocean, that transport is facilitated by navigable streams, and that for this reason this petroleum can be sold to the European States cheaper than by North America. These facts show why the greed of the imperialist states is directed towards South America. The same can be said of copper production. In Chile in 1914 about 46 million tons of copper were mined. In 1925 already 207 million tons. The production of nitrates rose from 488 million tons in 1914 to 909 million tons in 1925. Capital invested by North America has risen from 25 million dollars in 1914 to 350 million dollars in 1925. From

these figures the development of certain industries, the exploitation of raw material resources, and the penetration of North American imperialism is distinctly visible.

What are the consequences of the imperialist penetration of these countries with regard to the revolutionisation of the masses of workers and peasants? Comrades, every day we can read reports in the newspapers about new revolutions in Nicaragua, Honduras, Brasil, etc. That is a fact. Formerly the revolutions in these countries were simply a result of the rivalries between the generals, big landowners, over who should govern. But now these revolutions have a social character, and are based upon the workers and peasants who are beginning to play a serious role.

In Central America we have a national-revolutionary movement of petty-bourgeoisie, workers and peasants, which aims at creating a government similar to that of Mexico, i. e., a government which aims at giving the land to the peasants and at changing the economic structure of the country. In Venezuela and in Columbia there have already been a number of revolts launched by peasants but the benefits of which were reaped by the bourgeoisie, these revolts were in the main directed against the big landowners or against the foreign enterprises in the various areas occupied by the imperialist concessions. In Chile, e. g., there have already been two attempts at social revolutions. The workers have definite organisational traditions and are unquestionably inclined to revolution, but the petty-bourgeoisie has thus far always held them back.

The situation in Mexico is known to the comrades. In this country there is unquestionably a definite social transformation in process. It is true that the present-day petty-bourgeois government is trying with all means to hinder the development of the revolutionary movement, yet it is also certain that under the pressure of the workers and peasants it was compelled to effect certain reforms, and in some cases it was forced to order the distribution of land to the peasants. Through this a peculiar situation is created which makes possible the increasing revolutionisation of the country, and which creates a base of support for the revolutionary propaganda in the other South American countries.

In summarising, I believe that the Comintern should devote somewhat more attention to the struggle that is developing in the Latin American countries. In general we must set the following tasks:

1. We must force the Mexican petty-bourgeoisie to carry out the revolutionary reforms of the programme on which it achieved power;
2. We must support the national-revolutionary development of the Central American countries, and of the northern portion of South America;
3. We must, finally, support the revolutionary movement of the Brazilian petty-bourgeoisie.

In short, we must be clear as to the position of Latin America as a potential market for the imperialist powers, especially North America.

This is the reason why, I believe, in the course of the anti-imperialist campaign on a world scale, we must keep in mind the necessity of strengthening our active front in the Latin American countries. In view of the experiences of the revolutions in the colonial countries (China, Indonesia, etc.) we can make bases of support of South and Central America in the fight against capitalist stabilisation in Europe, and against the development of the North American imperialism, we can make here bases of support for the world revolution. (Applause.)

Comrade STERN (Czechoslovakia):

I believe that in general I can speak in the name of our whole delegation, primarily because we are completely agreed in considering the basic line of the thesis correct. But I am not quite sure that I can say whether all comrades of our delegation will agree to every formulation I may make. For this reason I would request that not the delegation, but only I, personally, be held responsible.

It is a truism to say that the problem of stabilisation does not interest us from the viewpoint of philosophic love of truth,

but solely from the standpoint of tactical consequences, we must be as concrete as it is at all possible to be. It is clear that stabilisation is the basic problem and I believe that one of the most inexplicable mistakes of the Russian Opposition was that, when they were so to say, in the full possession of the militancy at the July Plenum, none of the leaders of the Opposition dared to raise the problem of stabilisation. I believe that they thereby sealed and justified their doom in advance. From the tactical significance there proceeds the full importance of Comrade Bukharin's idea that the question of stabilisation must be looked upon as a differentiated one.

Here we will find an essential difference between our position and that of the Social Democrats. We must put the weight of our consideration upon the decisive points at which capitalism is weak, while the Social Democracy first of all points to the situation in America where capitalism is strong in order to intimidate the proletariat, in order to permit the situation to appear more optimistic for capitalism. A revolutionary situation in Germany would of course be decisive in the appraisal of the picture as a whole, even if the situation were stable in America. Yet although we have a revolutionary situation in China the situation as a whole cannot yet be designated as an immediately revolutionary one, for what is involved there is not as yet a proletarian revolution, but, instead, a national revolution, of which Comrade Bukharin has very correctly said there are two possibilities, and of which the results must change the situation also in Europe.

We must also differentiate this question because it is not enough to re-state that the old thesis of the relativity of stabilisation has proven itself correct through the recent events. Certainly these recent events proved the correctness of this thesis but from a tactical viewpoint we are interested primarily in the effect of these recent events. Between the two formulations, of the last Executive and today, big important events have happened. We must put the question of whether these events have had a positive or negative effect; upon this our tactic depends. I believe that in the theses and in the report of Comrade Bukharin this question was answered very clearly, in that these events were presented as a tremendous breach in the system of capitalist stabilisation.

But I believe that we must differentiate also in another connection. The concept of stabilisation contains two sides, which however, I believe, have not been kept separate from one another with sufficient clarity. By stabilisation of capitalism we understand, firstly, a certain consolidation, but secondly, also the question of whether capitalism is on the ascent or descent. If the question is put in this way: has capitalism still a certain stability, a question decisive for our tactics, then it must be said that we still have a relative and partial stabilisation. But if we put the question this way: which tendency predominates in the so-called convalescence or decline of capitalism, then we do not for the first time today record the general tendency towards capitalist decline, even though within the frame of this general decline there is ascent and descent. We must establish whether at the moment we are to record an ascent or decline of capitalism. In this respect, after a differentiated consideration, we must strike our balance. We must of course be careful in judging such an important question, but with all due caution we may say today that for us the positive sides tremendously over-balance the negative sides. The most important of these are summarised in the introduction to the theses: the British decline, the British strike, the Chinese revolution, the Socialist ascent in Russia.

In these great events of recent times, what is there negative? America, and a certain strengthening of the bourgeoisie in connection with rationalisation. But both of these factors are themselves upon a very weak foundation from a capitalist standpoint. Even in America the situation is not all too rosy. With regard to rationalisation, enough has been said about this here, that the rationalisation is of a declining character and that it extraordinarily intensifies the contradictions of capitalism. It is not altogether correct when Comrade Bukharin says that all Social Democrats at present describe the development of capitalism very rosyly. Otto Bauer, who is notoriously one of the cleverest Social Democrats, at the recent Party Congress of the Austrian Social Democracy, tried to give a picture of the world situation, and this picture is by no means a rosy one.

In the Social Democratic "Vorwärts" of July 5th, I find the following statements: In 15 out of 28 countries during the last year imports as well as exports have become considerably smaller, in eight out of these 28 countries both imports and exports together became smaller. In only two countries, New Zealand and Norway, are both imports and exports higher. This also is no optimistic picture, and still more pessimistic is the enumeration of the reasons therefor.

As to the tactical consequences from all this I should like to remark:

In a situation such as that which confronts us today, — and this is confirmed by recent experiences — major struggles in any one country must immediately take on a much greater international significance than heretofore. We see this in the case of the Chinese revolution and we see it above all in the tremendous British Miners' Strike. I believe that it is necessary to focus our entire leadership tactics upon the hastening of the development of the Communist International into a world Party so that it will become more and more able to direct international actions. The immediate direction of an international action can proceed only from the Comintern.

I believe that it was a shortcoming on our part in that we failed to give sufficient attention to the question of the international miners' strike. There are still many workers who say, now is our chance to improve our conditions. All workers realise very well that this is a favourable situation for their own struggle.

In a number of countries, in Germany, Czechoslovakia, the demand was raised for an international miners' strike, but the international executive did not concern itself with a systematic struggle for this slogan. This was a mistake. We now see a militant movement of the miners which seeks to use the market conditions caused by the British strike. This was a necessary development which we should have foreseen and accelerated by throwing greater vigour into the idea of propagating an international miners' strike.

At this point there are in place also a few words concerning the international character of the Russian revolution. The Russian Opposition is wrong when it declares that the claim of the possibility of a victory of socialism in Russia is a weakening of the international character of the revolution. No manner of artful citation can deny that Comrade Lenin established that in Russia all of the pre-conditions for the building of socialism are at hand and the facts show that Socialism is being built up here in Russia. But this in no way alters the international character of the Russian revolution. Every success here strengthens the struggle in other countries, and every success there is an aid for the workers and peasants in their serious struggle here.

A few words on rationalisation. I believe that it is impossible for us to say that we are only against the consequences of rationalisation. In Comrade Bukharin's report capitalist rationalisation is clearly presented as an attack upon the workers, as an intensification of exploitation. It is clearly shown that the Social Democrats advocate rationalisation for counter-revolutionary motives. We cannot facilitate the intentions of the Social Democracy by taking a neutral position on rationalisation, by giving rise to the appearance that the technical improvements, the machines, are the essential things in rationalisation. Of course, it is true that we are not against new machines, new improvements in technique, but we must mobilise the masses for resistance against the real essence of rationalisation.

In conclusion I should like to declare that we need not content ourselves with the statement that we are now between two waves of the revolution, but instead we should emphasise the sides favourable to us. Of course we must avoid all the more succumbing to an ultra-Left nervousness, and we must combat such tendencies as the smashing of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and the withdrawal from the Kuomintang Party, for such tendencies originate in a false appraisal of the situation. But we need no longer apply the tactics of retreat, instead ours are tactics of gathering our forces; the recent great world events must inevitably take effect first on the economic field and then of course in political struggles. Comrade Trotzky is wrong when he puts the question of stabilisation only politically, yet in fact we have a series of political crises piling up in the capitalist countries which are contiguous to economic events and which must be taken into consideration in forming a judgement of

the whole. The whole situation demands that we expect coming struggles and that we prepare for the same.

Comrade PRUCHNIAK (Poland):

Comrades! The Polish Delegation adheres to the fundamental theses in the printed and oral reports of Comrade Bukharin as well as of Comrade Kuusinen.

In his report Comrade Bukharin counts Poland to those countries which are stabilising themselves upon a level of misery; he counts it among the countries of decaying capitalism — which is absolutely correct. Under the existing capitalist forms an industrial development of Poland is unthinkable. Not only is it impossible for Poland to keep up the present level or maintain its existence under the present general conditions as a capitalist country, but it must even shut down part of its industry. The various attempts of the Polish bourgeoisie to maintain economic independence and their own industrial development, the various stabilisation attempts of the Polish bourgeoisie have gone bankrupt. The effort, submitting to necessity, of stabilising Poland as an agrarian country, a source of raw material, a semi-colony of foreign capitalism — found its expression in the Fascist coup of Pilsudski.

But the new programme of the Polish bourgeoisie must, sooner or later, go into a similar bankruptcy as all previous attempts to stabilise and consolidate their power. Bankruptcy is inherent in the inner contradictions of this programme. Pilsudski's assumption of power coincided, in point of time, with a temporary favourable market condition. The Pilsudski Government and Polish Fascism have received, so to say, an economic breathing spell, primarily as a result of the British strike, which gave Poland a chance to export coal to Great Britain and to other countries. As a result of the favourable export conditions for grain and lumber, there was a favourable balance of trade, the currency was stabilised and unemployment reduced by a half. Thereby Pilsudski got a chance to manoeuvre inside of the country and to consolidate his power. Pilsudski has the whole army in his hands, since he has literally bought, with money in the form of increased salaries, the whole officer and non-commissioned officer corps of the army.

Simultaneously, Pilsudski raised his militia (Schützen) organisation, which numbered 50,000 men in February, to a total of more than 300,000 men, organisationally anchored in the whole of Polish territory. Pilsudski has taken to himself the entire governmental apparatus and has put his own people everywhere, while at the same time delivering the full force of his blows against those parties which got into his way in his carrying out of his role.

The smashing of the old parties, the dissolution of the Sejm, the attempts to win contact with the various classes through their economic organisations and behind the backs of the old political parties, are extremely characteristic and significant for the Fascisation of the inner life of Poland. He is trying also to Fascise the trade unions. Of course these efforts on Pilsudski's part are being supported by our social traitors, the P. P. S. The whole of these P. P. S. people, the open Pilsudski followers as well as those who claim to be Pilsudski opponents, are in fact his supporters and an inseparable section of the Pilsudski State apparatus. Of this there cannot be the slightest doubt on our part, or on the part of the Polish workers.

Pilsudski's policy towards the working class could not be anything but a policy of an offensive against the working class. This offensive was carried out in various ways, by means of direct terror as well as by arbitration courts in the economic clashes between capital and labour, or also through direct attempts at bribery.

Pilsudski's policy against the working class is the liquidation of all its political and social achievements.

Pilsudski's policy against the peasants is a liquidation of even those land reforms that were adopted in the past by the Sejm.

Pilsudski's policy against the national minorities is a policy of further persecution of the masses of the population, combined with attempts to bribe the leaders of the national minorities.

Against our Party and the revolutionary movement his policy is one of Terror, of combat for life or death. The press reports that machine guns were used against our political prisoners at Lodz.

At the present time the transitory favourable market which the Pilsudski government enjoyed for a time must be considered as approaching an end. I might indicate the systematic worsening of the trade balance due to the rising prices at home, and that the negotiations with Germany followed a very difficult course in which Germany took bourgeois Poland by the throat and made the road to foreign loans a much more difficult one than Pilsudski and his supporters at first expected.

The weakening of Great Britain through the Miners Strike, China, etc., weakens the position of Pilsudski. If in nothing else, this is expressed in the failure of Pilsudski's plans for the formation of a Baltic Entente under Polish hegemony against the Soviet Union.

The leftward march of the working class in Poland is a fact that is expressed in the growth of the opposition in the trade unions, in the consolidation of the "Left P. P. S.", and also in a certain increase of the membership figures of the trade unions.

Particularly clear-cut is the discontent of the peasants in Western Ukraine and Western White Russia. In the last three or four months the gigantic peasant organisation "White Russian Gromada" arose with more than 50,000 members. This "Gromada" is at present being persecuted by the government and there can be no doubt that all efforts will be made to prevent the further growth of this organisation, as well as to shatter the entire peasant movement. We may observe a similar process of peasant organisations in Western Ukraine, where recently two formerly divided peasant organisations united into a "Peasants and Workers League" and now exercise a big attractive power upon the masses of Ukrainian peasants.

We believe that we are confronted with a wave of new struggles and new strikes, and it is the task of our Party to put itself at the head of these struggles.

Our mistake on the occasion of the May events have created a big crisis in the Party. A discussion is in progress in the Party for the purpose of disclosing all of the causes of our mistakes and the shortcomings of our practical work, so that we overcome them. There can be no doubt that the discussion involves a certain price that will make itself felt also in the work of our Party. Nevertheless since, on the basis of a revival among the worker and peasant masses, our Party has not lost its influence upon these masses despite its mistakes, and since it is developing in the course of the struggle, I can express the firmest assurance that we will soon overcome our internal crisis.

The task of the Party is to put itself at the head of the struggles that we are unquestionably approaching.

It is our task, despite Fascist terror, despite illegality, to find an approach to the broad masses, in first line through the trade unions and the various kinds of legal mass organisations. It is our task to conduct an agitation against the menacing danger of war against Lithuania, as well as against the Soviet Union, to put ourselves at the head of the peasants' struggle for land, at the head of national minorities' struggle for liberation and national self-determination, for the rights of the working class, and for the maintenance of revolutionary organisations of the working class and peasantry.

It is our task to take over leadership in the struggle against the P. P. S. and Fascism, for the workers and peasants government, and we are convinced that we shall be able to cope with these tasks regardless of the mistakes we have made and all obstacles we may encounter. (Applause.)

Comrade THÄLMANN (Germany):

(Received with applause.)

Comrades, if we compare the situation at the time of the last Enlarged Executive with that which prevails today, we immediately see a very big difference. When we were gathered here last time we had a relatively quiet situation. This time our meeting is held under the direct impress of a number of tremendous events in international politics. Let us consider the three

most important big events since the last Enlarged Executive: the Polish overthrow, the General Strike and coal strike in England, and the Chinese Revolution's successful break through; the fighting Chinese armies in the last months have conquered a territory whose area is equal to the whole of the West European States.

While in Germany we find ourselves in a period of relative stabilisation, in China there is not merely an acute revolutionary situation, but we might even say that in China today an actual revolution is in process. On the other hand the truly heroic struggle of the British miners shows what a terrific force and what gigantic militancy is to be found in the West-European proletariat.

With the aid of the American capitalists the German bourgeoisie succeeded in reorganising the foundations of its industry. The German bourgeoisie has entered the League of Nations in order to enrol itself once more in the course of imperialistic politics. But in this it is confronted, nevertheless, with great foreign and domestic contradictions. If it wants to compete on the world market it must cheapen its production. By depressing the wages, by worsening the conditions of labour, by the relentless oppression of the working class — only by all these measures can it attain this goal. Even if the German workers do not as yet resist this offensive in the form of actions, we can nevertheless already note the beginnings of such activity. Social conflicts will inevitably take place in Germany. Stabilisation will produce revolutionary forces also in Germany which will sooner or later break down and blast this stabilisation.

The German proletariat, which has eight years of revolutionary experience behind it, which has learned from the battles and defeats of the German Revolution, will again arise and tear asunder the chains of capitalist oppression. The time is not yet here, but by a patient, persistent and painstaking activity the Communists will bring it about. From this viewpoint we have the right to set a revolutionary perspective for Germany and Central Europe, just as the Italian Communists, even now, under the blows and persecutions of White Terror, never for a minute forget the future rising of the Italian proletariat.

Here and now, in the Plenum of the Enlarged Executive, I want to say that by its connections with the factories, by its factory nucleus work, the Italian Party was in position, despite illegality and the severest persecution, to create legal possibilities which, thanks to the heroism of the Communists and of the revolutionary Italian working class, help furnish the premises for the collapse also of Fascism.

Comrades, the primary revolutionary factor today is the Soviet Union. It exerts the most powerful influence upon the revolutionary movement, upon the proletarian class struggle. Its economic improvement and its building of Socialism are the strongest arguments against capitalist stabilisation and against the counter-revolutionary Imperialist policy of the international Social-Democracy.

In fighting to win over the Social-Democratic and non-Party workers, who, especially in Germany, are slowly developing leftward, we see every day in our practical work how strongly this argument works in our favour. The reports of the Workers' Delegations have exerted so tremendous an attractive power upon the workers that the Social Democratic Party is even forced to propose the expulsion, and actually to expel, various members of their Party, who were delegates to the First and Second Workers' Delegation: This is a proof that it fears the great influence of these report meetings upon its ranks.

Comrades, in this connection we see also the real objective meaning of our recent struggle with the ultra-Leftists in our Party. In our inner Party struggle there was involved nothing less than our Party's relation to the Soviet Union — its development for or against the Proletarian Dictatorship. Had the ultra-Leftists been victorious in this struggle, then the largest Communist Party of Western Europe would today be an instrument of the foes of Soviet Russia. I am not speaking about the petty factional struggle, the complications of which have been fought out in the Party ever since the appearance of the Open Letter, and which are not altogether overcome even yet; I speak about its great political content. Germany has today embarked full-tilt upon the course of anti-Soviet foreign policy. From the standpoint of imperialist strategy it has become one of the most

important links in the Imperialist battlefield against the Soviet Union.

In case of an intervention the attitude of the German working class is of decisive importance. Within the German working class the Communist Party is the only organised power that has written upon its banners the unbreakable alliance with the Russian proletariat, and deadly enmity against Imperialism. This revolutionary force, the ultra-Left petty-bourgeoisie wanted to weaken and destroy in Germany. But the Party as a whole has smashed this petty bourgeois ideology, for the most part it has destroyed it down to the roots, and has thrown its worst advocates out of the Party. At the last Enlarged Executive Ruth Fisher and Urbahns announced a severe crisis in the German Party, in exactly the same way as, in Germany, they announced a severe crisis in the Russian Party and in the whole Comintern. Their "analysis" today sounds like the fairy tale of the sunken bell; neither the Comintern, nor the Russian Party, nor the Communist Party of Germany are in a crisis, instead, they are marching forward and making revolutionary progress. Ruth Fisher and Urbahns on the other hand have taken flight in a joint Reichstag ticket with Katz and Körsch, against whom, only at the last Enlarged Executive, they were polemising noisily. With this they have finally turned their backs on the Labour movement. The victory over ultra-Left anti-Bolshevism was the most important success of our work during the last year. It was the most important success because the question of the life of the German Party depended upon the outcome of this struggle. Of course this hard serious struggle that we had to wage inside the Party demanded a high political price, to a certain extent it has had a restrictive effect upon the development of the Party. Thus in Berlin, since the publication of the Open Letter, we could only go forward step by step in the ideological struggle for leadership. And only through this continuous ideological work upon the members, through persistent tireless work within the Party, have we brought it about that we have a leadership today which represents the interests of the great majority and the political line of the Party and the Comintern. The result of this inner Party struggle has shown that the faith of the membership in the Comintern and in the Soviet Union, that the class consciousness of the entire Party was stronger than all the ultra-Left endeavours to disturb and disrupt.

If we consider the development of the German bourgeoisie, as it is already presented in the written report of Comrade Bukharin, it is to be noted that since 1923 a strengthening of German capitalism has taken place. The German bourgeoisie has succeeded in various things; it has blown up the Versailles Treaty, it has enrolled itself in Imperialist politics by entering the League of Nations, it is no longer as hitherto in the tow of England and France, there are today opportunities in which it already takes an independent position.

In this respect we undoubtedly see domestic and foreign political progress in the process of stabilisation. Furthermore a new Imperialism is growing in Germany which, in relation to other capitalist countries, slowly develops so as to show an entirely different feature. The German bourgeoisie today has not such high expenses for army and navy as have the other important capitalist countries. In this tremendous finance-capitalist monopolisation process and its capitalistic rationalisation methods, it has — except for the big social class struggles which disturb it — less financial expenses than all of the other bourgeoisies throughout the whole world.

In this connection, of course, the attitude of the Communist Party towards all political questions, especially towards trade union work, is of tremendous importance. We shall have to direct our attention to that struggle that can check the consolidation process of capitalism: the struggle in the factories. In addition it is our most important task that we learn how to win the masses for all serious everyday struggles which, however, must be linked up with the revolutionary final goal. The Social-Democracy, the trade union bureaucracy, are the most important aides of the bourgeoisie on all fields — they support all measures for the smashing and clubbing down of the revolutionary front, they develop a villainous incitement against Soviet Russia, and for this reason we must, to an increased extent, look upon trade union work as the most important for us. We must overcome all shortcomings in our trade union work.

I shall try to enumerate certain defects in the trade union work — defects and shortcomings from which not only the German Party but all Parties must learn.

What hindered us in our trade union work was, on the one hand, the October defeat of 1923, and the trade union crisis which followed, in the course of which a certain K. A. P. influence revealed itself in our Party in the form of a lack of comprehension of the political value of general trade union work. Our Party and our functionaries are even today insufficiently convinced of the tremendous importance of trade union work for all the tasks of the Party.

Secondly, we suffer from a certain shortage of trained forces who are able effectively to counter the craftiness of the German trade union bureaucracy, to parry this craftiness of the German trade union bureaucracy with our revolutionary instinct and the application of correct methods, tactics and policies. For this reason we must unquestionably widen our basis on this field.

Thirdly, we must note a deficient connection of politics with our trade union work. All political questions upon the agenda on a German or on an international scale, are also the tasks of trade union work. We must never forget that economics is closely bound up with politics.

Fourthly, one of the weightiest defects and shortcomings is in fraction activity. We have fractions in the various larger trade unions, and we have succeeded after the Open Letter in again gaining certain successes, whereas under the leadership of Ruth Fisher our fractions had disappeared almost entirely. We now have in the 600 locals of the Metal Workers Union, already 300 actively working fractions. From the example of the Hamburg harbour workers' strike, we have seen that only through tireless fraction work was it possible for a few comrades to win about 15 to 18,000 workers for the strike. This strike had a big political significance because it was the first step in Germany against the trade union bureaucracy, against the Social Democracy and against the employers. We did not succeed in holding the harbour workers to the strike any longer because a part of the workers themselves still laid value upon the statutory requirement for a three-fourths majority. We, as Communists, who have taken over responsibility for the launching and leadership of the struggle, at the moment that we saw that a part of the workers, fooled and betrayed by their reformist leaders, began to vacillate on the question of whether or not the strike was to continue, did everything possible to continue the strike. Later we said that the struggle is only being postponed, that it will continue. And today we can already note the fact that the workers have served notice against the general agreement and that probably on January 1st, 1927 the Hamburg harbour workers' strike will break out anew.

Fifthly, we can note that in general there has not been a sufficient utilisation of the wage struggles. This is a shortcoming that we must wipe out in the immediate future.

Sixthly, there is the weak carrying out of international trade union unity, which was particularly evident in Germany. While we did raise the problem here and there, a general centralised work with regard to international trade union unity was not carried on in the way in which it was absolutely necessary. Especially in connection with the British coal strike, we must declare at this time that we were not in a position to carry out real action on the part of the German proletariat for the active support of the fighting British miners, even though we tried to do so by all means.

Seventhly: the insufficient resistance to the trade union bureaucracy which showed itself in various meetings, conferences and trade union congresses.

At these congresses our comrades do not always offer the necessary revolutionary resistance against the reformist trade union bureaucracy.

At the Metal Workers Congress in Bremen e. g. we had about a sixth of the delegates, but our fight against the policy of the trade union bureaucracy was not altogether beyond reproach. Our policy and tactics must be sharpened also on this field.

At the Miners' Congress, where we received 40% of all votes passed, our delegates were able to make a better showing.

Eighth: the insufficient campaign against expulsions in

some organisations. In our general activity we must seek entirely different, sharper measures against the trade union and Social Democratic bureaucracy.

We should not attempt to cover over these defects and shortcomings by hunting after objective facts. Nevertheless we are compelled to mention certain objective conditions that contributed to the weaknesses and defects of the German Party.

1. Quite a large proportion of our members of the Communist Party are unemployed.

2. After a series of severe defeats in Germany from 1923 to the present time, it was extraordinarily difficult to convince even the comrades who stood unreservedly on the line of the C. C., that trade union work is one of the most important political tasks.

3. The trade union bureaucracy is crafty enough to put forward fake slogans and demands in every situation, against which our own comrades are often in no position to counter with our own slogans to a sufficient extent.

4. The Party has not yet recovered sufficiently from the reverse it suffered under the political leadership of Ruth Fisher. It can and will only recover step by step.

Despite the various defects and shortcomings our Party can record various successes. The elections in the Metal Workers' Union were a big step forward. We rallied 33% of all votes behind us, in which it must be considered that a fourth of all locals were ruled out, while at the elections to the Trade Union Congress of 1925, we polled only 23% of the votes cast.

The participation of Social Democratic delegates elected by certain Trade Union Councils and organisations to the Workers' Congress, despite all the threats of expulsion issued by the Social-Democratic and trade union leaders, shows our growing political influence. Recently we have defended a correct policy in the struggle against capitalist rationalisation and its inevitable consequences. We have succeeded in winning the broadest masses against the effects of this capitalist rationalisation in the factories. The Factory Councils, Factory Delegate Conferences, which we held on this field in the Chemical Trust, Steel Trust, Electrical Trust, can be considered as the first beginnings of our preparations for the capitalist attack. In addition we were in a position to raise also specialised partial demands in the struggle against capitalist rationalisation.

In the unemployed movement we also can record successes of late. We have succeeded in getting the leadership of the unemployed into our hands. In recent months a beginning has been made in practically all districts in Germany with the formation of unemployed committees. Along with the unemployed committees we held unemployed conferences in the various most important industrial districts; these unemployed conferences at the same time constituting the basis of the delegations to the Workers Congress.

The nation-wide Unemployed Congress, which is to take place in connection with the Workers' Congress, has the following tasks:

1. Organisation of the unemployed on a national scale;
2. The creation of organisational connections for the unemployed.
3. Close contact between the unemployed and activity in governing bodies down to the last municipality.
4. Formation of a National Committee of Unemployed which is to constitute the general central connection between the unemployed throughout all Germany.

In the campaign for the expropriation of the ruling houses we succeeded for the first time in correctly applying the united front tactic to a partial demand. If in 1924 under Ruth Fisher the Party found itself constantly in the wake of the Social Democracy, this campaign for the expropriation of the ruling houses is a proof that with the correct application of the united front tactic the S. D. P. is forced, under the pressure of the masses, to fall into the wake of the Communist Party.

The popular referendum campaign has also a special importance, because through it the Leftward development of the German workers was pushed forward.

I should like to add a few very short remarks about the activity of the Party with regard to the Workers' Congress:

1. The Workers' Congress is of importance because various political questions will be raised at it not only by the Communist participants, but also by delegates from outside our ranks.

2. We shall have to succeed at the Congress to bring together centrally the unify committees that exist, or that are still to be organised, in the various parts of Germany.

3. We shall have to try to strengthen the organising of the Left Wing.

4. The Congress has a demonstrative character, in that it will raise the militancy, the readiness for struggle, of the German workers. The work that was carried on before the Congress convened was in itself already a work of politically enlivening the masses. Of course the Congress is no cure-all for the class struggle, but it nevertheless has its definite significance, 1) in the general systematic organisation of the masses for the struggle, and 2) in that the Social Democratic workers see that at the present moment the Social Democratic Party is doing nothing for the proletariat.

Furthermore, through the preceding National Unemployed Congress and the Workers' Congress, the united front between the unemployed and those still in the factories will have to be established. The alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry and middle classes will receive support through the delegations to the Congress.

Now a few remarks about mass organisations. The mass organisations contiguous to the Party, such as the R.F.B. and the R.F.M.B., and the already long-lived IAH (WIR) and IRH (IRA), reveal a greatly accelerated tempo in their organisational growth. It is our duty to work in these organisations so that these mass organisations, under the leadership of the Communists, will win great importance in later struggles.

The Party, on the one hand, by overworking the executives and on the other hand by a lack of attention in the districts, has not given the necessary attention to the Youth and women's movements. We must try to develop in them the strongest activity because we must realise that, as Karl Liebknecht said, to the Youth belongs the future. In the women's organisation the Party must also develop greater activity.

Our general theoretical work is still very weak. After the Party Congress a central Party school is to be established which is to help overcome this shortcoming.

Our own comrades must learn how we must make progress in persistent, tireless and systematic detail work. In the trade union work, in the factory work, in the parliamentary work we must record a series of opportunistic deviations. Some of the comrades in the Party hold the opinion that in Saxony we might tolerate also a government with the Right Social Democrats. Furthermore, we found a tendency in Mecklenburg which does not correspond to the political line of the Party. Similarly in Lübeck.

In certain parts of Germany we also find new openly liquidatory tendencies, which remain entirely without influence, as e. g. in Esslingen, Württemberg and in certain other places.

We must put forth the correct Bolshevik line and carry out a really serious straight course against the Left as well as the Right deviations.

We are now confronted with the Party Congress and we believe that it must deal with two general tasks: First, the internal consolidation of the Party, second, the struggle for the leadership of the German working class.

Comrade Kuusinen, in his remarks, said that especially the German Social Democracy understands how to betray the masses by means of a counter-revolutionary science without parallel in the world. It follows that we must counter this with our revolutionary science for the winning of the masses on all the little day-to-day questions, on all economic and cultural questions of actual life. Not only in questions of high politics, but above all things in the economic struggles which confront us today will it be possible for us to win the confidence of the masses. Only in this way, and only through this method of struggling, will we realise our final slogans.

In conclusion, I want to say the following: What Comrade Bukharin has said for the Communist Party of the world, we can repeat for the Communist Party of Germany: We are, we remain, the Party of the Revolution, of the Proletarian Dictatorship. In this and only in this sense are we the Party of the Proletarian United Front, of mass work, of the day-to-day struggle against the bourgeoisie. (Stormy Applause.)

Comrade FERDI (Turkey):

Revolutionary events in the East have received special attention during this discussion and in Comrade Bukharin's report. But unfortunately, there has been absolutely no mention of the Near East, which in the East, taken as a whole, constitutes the very area where revolutionary movements have commenced and where they are still continuing.

Therefore, I think it will be useful to deal briefly with these questions.

STABILISATION.

There can, of course, be no question of stabilisation in these countries in the Near East. There is quite the opposite to stabilisation there. Nevertheless, in certain countries such as Egypt, Persia, Afghanistan, there are certain repercussions of European capitalist stabilisation in the sense that the capitalists of the big countries have been able to invest capital in these Eastern countries. This investment of capital, after a relatively short space of time, led to a certain disintegration of the middle classes in the Near East, and it is precisely there that we should seek the key to the revolutionary events in Turkey, Persia, Syria.

Indeed, certain strata of the middle, peasant or petty bourgeois classes were forced to rebel against the influence and the oppression of imperialism.

In the East, especially in the Near East the imperialists are far from agreeing with one another.

PRESENT TENDENCIES OF THE LIBERATION MOVEMENT.

If the imperialist powers do not agree amongst themselves on the question of sharing markets and influence in the Near Eastern countries, I think that they are quite in agreement when it is a question of exploiting these Eastern peoples, and of strangling by every means their struggles for liberation from the yoke imposed upon them.

This solidarity in regard to the subjection of the backward countries, despite antagonisms amongst the imperialist powers, is already quite well understood and felt by the Eastern peoples and States.

These peoples, first within national boundaries, have commenced to react against this oppression. But of late we see that this will to struggle is assuming international dimensions, i. e., that these peoples are tending to unite one with the other in order to fight with greater force against both the economic and armed attacks of the imperialist powers.

Manifestations of these acts of solidarity, of this regrouping of the Eastern peoples, are especially perceivable of late in Turkey on the one hand and in the Hedjas.

This regrouping of the oppressed peoples, is particularly interesting to observe amongst the leaders of these movements — to see Turkey, which has been considered to be inclining towards a rapprochement with imperialist powers, siding with Russia.

Until last spring, Turkey retained her anti-imperialist outlook, up to the moment she was forced to cede Mosul to the Iraq Government, i. e., to Great Britain.

Turkey was driven to this capitulation by her internal, and above all, financial situation. The financial situation was very difficult.

The Kemalists believed that by this great sacrifice they would obtain effective support from the imperialist powers, which they greatly counted on in order to put their finances on a sound footing and to enhance the value of the country's resources.

On the other hand, the imperialist powers consider they have made Turkey capitulate.

Events have shown that both sides soon realised they were wrong in this estimation.

The events which took place on the occasion of the closing down of the Foreign Chambers of Commerce and of the arrest of the Captain of the French boat "Lotus" are very significant in this respect.

This squabble between the imperialist powers and Turkey did not last for long. On the one hand, the imperialists wanted to penetrate into Turkey and participate in its economic construction; on the other hand, Turkey realised more and more that she would not be able to achieve this work of economic reconstruction without the aid of foreign capital.

Thus, after this very heated quarrel between the two parties, we see that at the League of Nations session, France, the very country that formerly attacked Turkey so violently, inspired the Kemalists with the idea of demanding entry to the League of Nations, which idea the Turks adopted with pleasure.

But Turkey's attempt to find admittance into the so-called European conclave of nations failed miserably. Turkey was refused the permanent seat she demanded.

Only after these setbacks and the subsequent resistance of the Kemalists to the free penetration of foreign capital had become evident did Turkey turn her eyes towards the East.

The Communist Party of Turkey is of the opinion that as far as Turkey's foreign affairs are concerned, the Kemalists for a long time to come will be obliged to conduct a see-saw policy between the East and West. Facts will force them to understand better everyday that the chief plank in this policy should be a definite rapprochement with the oppressed peoples and with the Soviet Union.

THE ARAB MOVEMENT.

I wish to draw attention to Mecca, where an absolute monarchy of a religious kind is in power. Already even in the countries, which are much more backward than Asia-Minor, the need for defence against the imperialist attacks is beginning to be felt.

The Moslem world, also, which looked askance at the Turkish Republic because of its anti-clerical policy, has had to become reconciled with Angora. During the Mecca Congress, which was held last summer, Ibn-Saud took the initiative in calling on the Kemalists to attend. The Turkish delegate was given a warm and enthusiastic welcome.

The idea of separating religion from State affairs is gaining more and more ground in the Arab world. The necessity of economic and political collaboration, of social solidarity in place of religious ties, is becoming clearer to the Arabs. That is already a great result.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION.

I will now turn to the questions of the perspectives of the Chinese revolution.

It may be that the Chinese revolution will evolve in the way indicated by Bukharin, that is to say, in a somewhat different manner from that of Turkey. But this possibility is very slight.

Different elements must be coped with in China, from those of Turkey. For example, during the Turkish revolution, the proletariat could not take any part in the national independence movement, because all the provinces in which the proletariat is concentrated were occupied by foreign military forces, and the Turkish proletariat had not as yet a sufficiently strong proletarian party.

In China, however, there is now a Communist Party with tens of thousands of members and strong peasant organisations. This is an important element likely to enable the proletariat to play an important role in the revolution.

But nevertheless, in relation to the area of the country and the dimensions of the movement, the Communist Party and the Chinese proletariat are very weak and undoubtedly the representatives of the middle classes at the head of the movement are much stronger.

We are thus inclined to think that until victory comes, the Chinese revolution will evolve the same way as in Turkey, with

the difference that the organised proletariat will exercise stronger influence there.

We must realise that this preponderance of the middle bourgeoisie in the revolutionary movement constitutes a disadvantage from the viewpoint of the revolution. But we want to emphasise that even in this case the anti-imperialist struggle would not be undermined to any marked extent. Even after the armed struggle stops, the liberated population will be confronted with a whole period in which the struggle will continue with hatred and vigour equal to that of the armed struggle. The continuation of the struggle in the economic field is an inevitable necessity for them.

The Chinese bourgeoisie, because of their economic inferiority, even after victory will have to conduct a very intense struggle against imperialism. In general, the national bourgeoisie is too weak to continue this struggle to a finish. They have need of allies and these allies are outside — the international proletariat and above all the Soviet Union, which is the representative of the world revolutionary proletariat. At home these allies are the proletarianised strata which are being and will be increasingly organised by the Communist Party.

During this anti-imperialist struggle, which will be of long duration, the Communist Parties will be able to extend their influence very quickly over these declassed strata, and by organising and radicalising them will be able to get the bourgeoisie (under the pressure of these strata) to conduct an anti-imperialist policy. It will also be compelled to conduct the bourgeois revolution to a finish by abolishing feudalism, and introducing agrarian reforms and a solution of the problem of land distribution.

We think that things will evolve in such a manner that the bourgeoisie, as long as it preserves power, will be compelled to maintain its alliance with the international proletariat and its own proletariat, at the same time manoeuvring with the imperialist powers to obtain their assistance. This assistance will be very insignificant, because the imperialist powers would never want to invest capital in countries where they cannot impose their political influence and control. The profound antagonisms between the imperialist aims and the necessity for the nationalists to assert their independence is bound to create continual conflicts. These manoeuvres will lead to the maturing of the proletariat; and before the bourgeoisie succeeds in constructing a solid basis for its class power and completing the cycle of its development, the Communist Party, at the head of a proletariat, sufficiently organised and involved in the struggle, and with the poor peasantry under its influence, will be able to capture power and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In conclusion, we want to recommend the Communist Parties of backward countries to lead the toiling masses and the ruling bourgeoisie incessantly in the anti-imperialist struggle, while at the same time preparing for the seizure of power by the proletariat allied to the peasantry.

I would also like to say a few words on the tasks of the International in the Near Eastern countries. The Communist International should do everything possible to strengthen the Communist Parties which have been enfeebled by the White Terror, in such countries as Turkey. It should stimulate and encourage the Communist Parties of the imperialist countries, such as France, Great Britain, Spain and Italy, to undertake more active work than hitherto in the revolutionary movement of the countries subjected by their respective imperialist governments; they should also endeavour to prepare the ground and the conditions necessary for forming national-revolutionary parties in the countries where these do not yet exist (Persia and Algeria) and for strengthening these national-liberation Parties where they already exist (Tunis, Palestine, Syria, etc.). Moreover great attention should be paid to what is happening in the Hedjas, which is a field in which the acuteness of the national-liberation movement of the Moslem peoples will concentrate in the near future.

(Close of Session.)