

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

**- INTERNATIONAL -**  
**PRESS**  
**CORRESPONDENCE**

Vol 8. No. 52

18<sup>th</sup> August 1928

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.

**SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST  
INTERNATIONAL.**

(FULL REPORT.)

**Thirteenth Session.**

Moscow, 27. July 1928 (evening).

**Discussion on the Report of Comrade  
Bukharin.**

Chairman: Comrade Sala.

Comrade MELICHAR (Czechoslovakia):

The principal defects and mistakes of the Czechoslovakian Section of the Comintern were quite properly pointed out in Comrade Bukharin's Theses. The Party suffers from remarkable passiveness and from insufficient ability for rapid mobilisation of the masses and the organisation of mass defence, from an excess of legal orientation in its practical work, from insufficient attention to the peasantry, and from an exceedingly slow pace in overcoming the defects in the trade union activity.

Nevertheless, the latest actions of the Party have revealed a far larger number of exceedingly grave defects in the whole Party, which ought to be frankly dealt with before the whole body of the Congress of the C. I.

The C. P. in Czechoslovakia, in contradistinction to most of the Communist Parties, was formed from a number of social-democratic parties and independent national sections of the Communist Party into the united C. P. of Czechoslovakia.

During the first stage of its development this Party was Communist only in name. Its whole ideology and practice were thoroughly social-democratic, owing to the exceedingly strong social-democratic traditions of the majority of the membership. It was only in 1924—25 that a sharp conflict arose between the

whole ideology and practice of the Party on the one hand and its revolutionary vocation on the other hand, causing a profound crisis in the Party, and eventually resulting in putting the Party on the road to transformation into a real mass party of the proletariat. A strong group of liquidators and outspoken opportunists, who had for a long time found support among a considerable section of the membership, was at last liquidated with the help of the E. C. C. I., and a bloc was formed which had for its starting point the maintenance of unity in the Party and whose chief political objective was to combat the opportunists in the Party and to lead the Party concretely along the line of the C. I. on the road towards Bolshevisation. The bloc has made some incontestable achievements in the fulfilment of its tasks, having well acquitted itself. The unity of the Party has been maintained and the Bolshevisation of the Party has made appreciable progress.

Numerous actions, carried out with success, have strengthened and enlarged the influence of the Party among the proletarian elements of town and country, so much so that in the 1925 elections the Party polled a million votes. This influence went on increasing in subsequent years, and this was shown last year in the municipal elections, as well as in the factory committee and factory council elections in recent months. The increased influence of the Party was also effected as regards organisation. The Party has now about 150,000 members as

against 72,000 after the crisis, and 92,000 in 1926. An entirely new apparatus was built up in the Party, a sub-division of labour was carried out, and the whole body of the Party militants took up new working methods. The Party was reconstructed on the basis of factory nuclei, which were rendered militant in the largest factories. At the same time a Leninist school was set up for members and officials and new and fresh forces were theoretically and practically trained for Party work.

Regardless of all these successes, the Party still has a large number of defects, and this was revealed by the failure of the Red Day. The most serious defect is the intolerable passiveness of the large majority of the membership, which communicates itself to the entire Party and hampers even the militants. A similar handicap to the Party is the low ideological level of the mass of the membership, and the still lingering social-democratic traditions among the members which became particularly revealed during the first phase of the campaign for social insurance, and in the practical application of the united front from below, threatening to give an opportunistic aspect to the whole action. These tendencies were revealed also in connection with other actions.

Another defect consists in that the Leninist schooling, particularly in regard to the younger forces, is neither adequate nor systematic, being deprived of a mass character and being conducted out of contact with the practical work of the Party, so that the results of this work have so far been rather meagre. Equally inadequate has been the practical schooling of the membership by attracting them to the examination and discussion of all Party questions.

Yet another serious defect exists in the factional activity of the Party in the trade unions and in the other mass organisations. Some of the opportunistic elements and those removed from Party work get into these organisations, and in view of their practical experience, are entrusted with important functions, eventually getting into leadership of the Communist factions, and instead of helping the Party towards extending its influence in these organisations and utilising it, they carry on the fight against the Party and render it difficult for the Party supporters to fulfil their tasks in these organisations.

Lately there was yet another important defect to be observed, namely a serious slackening in the pace of Bolshevisation. This was due, among other defects already enumerated, to the fact that the activation of the factory nuclei has met with tremendous obstacles, that were caused on the one hand, by increased persecution, an improved espionage service, and rapid rationalisation in the factories, with all its consequences, and on the other hand, by a number of subjective reasons. The formation of the factory nuclei and the transfer of the Party membership into the nuclei went on relatively smoothly. Nevertheless, the difficulties in activating the factory nuclei led to retrogression. A section of the members had lost the desire for activity in the factory nuclei, as the initial difficulties had taken away their faith in the expediency of the nuclei, and they returned to the residential nuclei. The same phenomena were observed in the publication of the factory newspapers, whose number has decreased in the last year. Moreover, the contact between the leadership of the factory nuclei and the factions of the factory committees could not be fully maintained. The leading organs of the Party did not promptly find the means to eliminate the dangerous phenomena by means of attentive instructions and by controlling the fulfilment of the tasks on the part of the organisations.

To all these serious defects of a general character should be added also some specific defects. The most important of them are the following:

Insufficient activity by the Party in the factories, and slight utilisation of the positions held by the Party in the factory committees; conducting the trade union work of the Party as work of a special department and not as an essential task of the Party; the work among the proletarian women is still insufficiently carried on by the Party apparatus.

Equally serious defects are observed in the activity of the Party among the young people. The Young Communist Movement in Czechoslovakia is isolated from the large masses of the working youth and has almost no positions in the factories. This

is also the fault of the Party, as it does not devote any considerable attention to the youth.

We frankly admit that the leading organs of the Party primarily bear the responsibility of these defects, because they did not take the proper measures in time to arouse the initiative of the masses of the membership and to exercise control as to carrying out the tasks entrusted to them.

As the result of the defeat of the Red Day action a discussion has been started in the Party organisations on the causes of the defeat. Its result must be not only to reveal all the defects of the Party, but also to devise the means to remedy them, so that the C.P. of Czechoslovakia might reach the highest stage of Bolshevisation and become the real revolutionary mass vanguard of the proletariat.

#### Comrade LOSOVSKY: (Communist Fraction of the R.I.L.U.)

I fully agree with Comrade Bukharin's Theses and should like to call your attention, comrades, chiefly to the trade union question.

#### Ninth Plenum of Comintern Executive Committee and the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress.

The Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress was an extremely important event in the world trade union movement, not only because of the number of new countries represented, but because of its character, the scope of its work, and the decisions adopted. The keynote of the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress was one of merciless self-criticism. We laid bare there, definitely and clearly, all our shortcomings, despite the fact that were under the bitter fire of our class enemies.

The salient feature of the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress lies in the fact that besides the resolutions of a general character covering all the countries, many practical resolutions were taken on the most important countries and most outstanding questions, and, thus, the bulk of the resolutions at our Congress took on an extremely practical, one might almost say, an instructive character.

#### Opposition to Decisions of the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress.

Despite the fact that at the Fourth Congress various Parties were represented and non-Party delegates were present, all the decisions were adopted unanimously. It would appear that with such unanimity on the part of those who participated in the Congress and the organisations they represented, they would really get down to put into execution the decisions adopted at the Fourth Congress. But no sooner had the Fourth Congress closed when it appeared that to some its resolutions had proved distasteful. This opposition to the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress decisions took on an organised character in Germany and the United States. The right elements of the German Communist Party endeavoured to challenge the truth of the decisions adopted at the Fourth Congress, while in all the districts they put forward resolutions which, openly or concealed, were directed against the Congress decisions.

What is it in the decisions of the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress that the Rights do not favour? They disapprove precisely of the fact that distinguishes the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress from the Third, and many of them have just in this fashion formulated their attacks on the Fourth Congress: "Its decisions contradict the resolutions of the Third Congress". It would seem that the duty of the International is to repeat the same thing again and again at each congress!

What are the special features of the decisions adopted by the Fourth Congress? What is the new trend that it has introduced in our tactics? This new trend can be formulated in the following points:

1. Intensified struggle against the reformist trade union bureaucrats and their international centre — the Amsterdam International.

2. The carrying out of united front tactics chiefly from the bottom.

3. Leadership of the economic struggle against the reformist trade union apparatus if the latter sabotages the fighting will of the masses.

4. To strengthen the revolutionary trade union federations in countries with divided trade union movements, not only by recruiting the unorganised, but also by capturing the reformist organisations.

5. The organisation of unorganised workers in new unions where no organisations exist in the most important branches of industry. (United States.)

6. To intensify the struggle against expulsions and to combat defeatist tendencies and tactics of unity at any price.

Such are the points that roused the ire of the Right elements in the German Communist Party. From the minutes of the various meetings we observe that those who opposed the decisions of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress put up such arguments against the decisions adopted that one involuntarily asks whether these are the arguments of Communists or of left social-democrats! Let me give you several outstanding examples of this "ideology" that found expression not at social-democratic, but at Communist meetings.

### Ideology of Right Muddlers in Germany.

"Such formulas like — 'Amsterdammers are tools of capitalism' — are extremely dangerous in our conditions", complained Comrade Smolka at the Enlarged Plenum of the District Committee in Thuringia. Comrade Poller (Jena) declared: "If it is considered necessary to use such formulas like the 'Amsterdammers are scabs and the allies of capitalism' then we can make no further headway".

Comrade Hammer, the editor of the South German workers' paper, doubts whether it is possible to say that the "Amsterdam International is a weapon of the capitalists". He is of the opinion that the "decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress will handicap our activities in the trade unions".

Comrade Tittel, the political secretary of the Thuringia Committee of the German Communist Party, considers the formula: "The Amsterdammers are tools of capitalism" to be incorrect.

But Comrade Krauss gave clearest expression to his point of view at the Enlarged Plenum of the Stuttgart Town Committee. He considered that to reinforce the struggle against the reformists would mean preparing the ground for a split. It would be a mistake to fight for strike committees and for the formation of strike committees. It would be a mistake to put forward the slogan of "fight" against the reformists, it would be a mistake to put in the forefront the struggle against the system of arbitration. The decision of the R. I. L. U. Congress on the necessity of conducting fractional activities in the Hirsch-Dunker, Christian, and other unions, is likewise a mistake.

For example, Comrade Kern, from Stuttgart opposed the decisions of the Fourth Congress, first, because of the decision to form strike committees, secondly, because of the decision regarding the necessity of organising opposition groups in the Christian and Hirsch-Dunker trade unions, and finally, because of the criticism directed against the Amsterdam International as an organisation in alliance with the imperialists. Furthermore, Comrade Kern opposes our negative attitude to the arbitration system.

I could cite scores of references from articles and speeches of Comrades Enderle, Hausen, Walcher, Melcher, Streber, Stucks, Fränzel, and others, who, instead of actively working for the execution of the decisions adopted by the Fourth Congress, revealed a profound disintegrating pessimism together with a virtual refusal to apply the Congress decisions in Germany. These comrades are dismayed at the power of reformism. They cannot part with their traditions. They are used to the old methods. They are so accustomed to the role of an irresponsible opposition, that the slightest attempt to pull them out of their oppositional discussions into the arena of mass activities, to

compel them to utilise new methods in struggling against our enemies, to make use of the influence gained over the masses, to rouse them against the united front of capitalism and reformism, causes a convulsive resistance on their part. We are confronted with a special variety of Communists alarmed at reformism.

In point of fact, what is the meaning of these objections? We see that these members of the German Communist Party are infected, to put it lightly, with social-democratic poison. If the decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress are challenged in this direction, the question arises as to where these Party members are at all in agreement with the Comintern and the German Communist Party. I have no intention of repudiating all these muddlers, neither do I intend to convince them. Whoever quarrels on these questions inside the Comintern has very little in common with the Communist movement. What are the root-causes for such an incorrect and obviously anti-Communist approach to this question? Undoubtedly, these causes are due to an incorrect appreciation of social democracy and especially of left-wing social democracy, in the attitude that regards trade union organisations as fetishes, as well as the erroneous tactics of unity at any price.

### Is the Social Democratic Party a Workers' Party?

For the Right elements of the German Communist Party, the social-democratic Party is still "one of the workers' parties". Such assertions can also be heard among the Left social democrats: they always speak of two workers parties. But is this true? Does the social composition of the party determine the political outlook of the party? Do not considerable sections of the workers still support the German Centre Party and the German nationalists? Do not millions of workers still vote for the British liberals and conservatives? Do not scores of millions of workers still follow the lead of the American Democratic and Republican parties? Does this mean that they are all workers' parties? Obviously, not. The Right lost sight of an extremely important fact — they have failed to notice the transformation of the social-democratic parties into bourgeois parties, although in great measure they have still retained their former social composition. The closer collaboration between social democracy, the reformist trade union bureaucrats and the bourgeois State, demonstrates clearly that these parties have ceased to be workers' parties, and that we are faced now with a peculiar variety of bourgeois parties, distinguished from other bourgeois parties in that they still retain a workers' composition in part, with Marxist socialist phraseology and connections with considerable sections of the workers, insofar as the officials of the social-democratic parties and reformist trade unions are for the greater part taken from the ranks of the workers. Whoever considers the social-democratic party a workers' party, whoever considers the Amsterdammers as brothers who have erred, and not as enemies of the working class, whoever considers that the existence of the social democratic party and reformist leadership is still an advantage for the working class, he will oppose, of course, the decisions of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress.

But I should like to have the matter thrashed out here completely. I do not like at all the shameful diplomacy of these comrades in Germany. This unworthy diplomacy is to be seen in the fact that in opposing the R. I. L. U. they are thus concealing their opposition to the tactics of the Comintern, and this is precisely the essence of the question. Under the flag of opposition to the R. I. L. U. they are pursuing an anti-Communist policy, believing evidently that no one will realise their shrewd game at politics. In reality we are confronted with an opposition not only to the R. I. L. U. but also to the Comintern. One must have the courage to make this assertion, but it is precisely this that the Right elements in the German Communist Party lack. They are beating about the bush and in their attacks on the R. I. L. U. Congress decisions are making use of all kinds of astute comparisons, endeavouring to show that in my speeches I differ from the decisions of the R. I. L. U., while in its decisions, the R. I. L. U. differs from the Comintern resolutions, and so on. But all this is weak and rotten, and to use a Russian proverb: "Where it's weak, it Breaks."

### A Muddle on an American Scale.

Whereas the German opposition to the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress decisions was formed of individual elements, some comrades coming out openly, others in a concealed manner, some saying that they do not agree, others expressing doubts, but jointly sabotaging the execution of the resolutions adopted, the Central Committee, however, supported the Congress decisions and came out definitely against the Rights, against their opportunist reservations, against their pessimism and passivity. Things, however, are different in the United States. Here the Central Committee instigated the Opposition against the Fourth R.I.L.U. decision on the American question. Even previous to the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress there was much dissatisfaction in the Central Committee of the American Party with my sharp criticism of the erroneous attitude of the Party leadership to the Trade Union Educational League, its passivity in the question of organising the unorganised workers, its incorrect attitude to the Negro workers, and the way it regarded the reactionary American Federation of Labour as a fetish. This dissatisfaction was expressed in the protest of the American Communist Party C.C. against the R.I.L.U. appeal to the T.U.E.L. conference, held in December 1927, because in this appeal the necessity of organising the unorganised in the trade unions was stressed. This was further expressed in several articles among which Comrade Pepper's articles occupy a special place in this muddle. In "The Communist" Comrade Pepper published an article to prove that American capitalism is extremely strong, that the American working class is very poorly organised, that the Party is weak, and that there are many difficulties in general in America. This is what he said also at the Congress. Comrade Pepper sees nothing but the power of American capitalism, and discovering America anew although this discovery was made long ago, completely passed over those vital problems raised in my articles on the eve of the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress by means of self-criticism. To befuddle the question still more, Comrade Pepper launched the "theory" of the possible growth of the American Federation of Labour. Why did he do this? This was done in order to divert the attention of the Party from the immediate problem that faces us today, of organising the unorganised, to the future problems that will arise if the American Federation of Labour begins to grow again. All this tea-cup guessing had only one political meaning: to dispel the attention of the Party instead of concentrating it upon the most urgent task. I do not intend now to investigate in detail Pepper's "theory" as outlined in his nine points, but will merely say that whereas Comrade Pepper previously frequently lost his bearings in European affairs, today, as you have been able to convince yourselves from his speech here, he is all at sea in American affairs. He could be truly named: the muddler of the two hemispheres. (Laughter.)

Let us leave Comrade Pepper and take up the C.C. of the American Party. The American Communist Party C.C. declared itself to be against the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress resolution on the American question? Why did they come out against this resolution? This the C.C. is concealing. When the members of the C.C. arrived in Moscow and saw that to oppose the decisions of the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress would not be very expedient, they declared here in Moscow that they had long ago expressed support for the Fourth Congress decisions.

Now I ask you: What is the matter? Of course, every Central Committee has the right to declare its disagreement with decisions adopted by the R.I.L.U., but there must be the courage to declare this, there is no use hiding your head in the sand, neither will befuddling the question help, or to make out that everything is all right. You cannot change a negative attitude to the Fourth Congress decisions into a positive one on the way from New York to Moscow. One thing is plain that on this question a very peculiar united front has been set up between the right elements in the German Communist Party and the majority of the C.C. of the American Communist Party. Do not our American comrades consider that this kind of a united front will never serve to increase the prestige of the American Communist Party C.E.C.?

### Decisions of Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress in France and Czechoslovakia.

The decisions of the Fourth Congress were put into practice most of all in France and Czechoslovakia, but even here, things are moving slowly. Meanwhile, let it be observed, no less than 90% of the workers in France are unorganised. Some comrades are prone to explain this by the innate qualities of the French worker, but this, of course, is rubbish. Is it not true that there are no less than 3,000,000 Frenchmen in all kinds of mutual aid societies? It is not a question of the innate qualities of the French worker but of certain shortcomings, likewise innate of our trade union work in France. It is precisely in France that organisational activities have been displaced by agitational and propaganda work. A luminous example in this respect is the Paris District of the French Communist Party. Comrade Pillot accused the Central Committee of the French Communist Party of opportunism. These accusations are based only on one thing, the great temperamental qualities of Comrade Pillot. Of course, there were mistakes. The C.C. makes no claim to be without sin — only the Lord God, as we know, is sinless, and then only because he does not exist. But Comrade Pillot should have told us why it is that in the Paris district, where he claims there was not even a trace of opportunism, that things are so unsatisfactory with the Metal Workers' Union. Why is it that the Paris organisation of the Party, having many hundreds of Communist metal workers, cannot find a group of workers to undertake the organisation of the hundreds of thousands of metal workers in the Paris district? Comrade Pillot, who is inclined to come forward as a commander in regard to the trade unions, forgets, first, that you cannot command the unions, secondly, that trade union leadership means — to get the masses into the trade unions and to educate these masses; thirdly that the Party must be able to rouse new sections of workers, to attract new elements to the leadership, to awaken the initiative of the masses and not be preoccupied with petty tutelage and, finally, that the Communists must be foremost in all the struggles of the proletariat, skillfully guiding the everyday struggle of the masses. In carrying this out new hundred of thousands of workers could be drawn into these activities in the Paris district alone. Let Comrade Pillot try to act in this way. I assure you that there is no opportunism here. The mistakes in the organisational resolution were quickly rectified, not in spite of the C.C. but with the aid of the C.C., still, unfortunately, there are shortcomings in our practical work. The French Communist Party and the Unitarian Confederation of Labour have a vast field of activity before them in getting the millions of workers into the C.G.T.U. Every effort must be made to carry out this work, for only in this way shall we be able to consolidate our growing political influence in France.

With regard to Czechoslovakia, here again the question of getting the many hundreds of thousands of workers into the **One Big Union** is the most important problem of the day. Whoever does not go forward is marking time and will inevitably be thrown aside — such is the logic of the struggle.

### Questions of Strike Strategy.

On this question of strike tactics the right elements of the German Communist Party have again come out against the decisions of the Fourth Congress. But why did they not oppose the special resolution on the economic struggle of the workers and the tasks of the Communists adopted by the Ninth Plenum? What was the basic problem confronting the whole Communist movement? The problem was that the growing dissatisfaction of the masses against the capitalist offensive and the intensified rationalisation measures, etc., were forced by the reformists into the framework of obligatory arbitration and agreement with the employers' association at the cost of working class interests. The trade union apparatus, at least its basic leading section, is merely an appendage of the employers' associations in the working class, and hence we have the open or concealed sabotage of the reformists when a movement arises among the masses.

What was the slogan that several of our comrades in Germany launched? The slogan was: "Compel the trade union bureaucrats to lead the strike!" It would appear that by bringing pressure to bear it was possible to turn the social demo-

crats into real fighters. The slogan of "Compel the bureaucrats" merely spreads illusions among the masses. It results from the view that the Social Democratic Party is a workers' party, that the trade unions are being led by people who defend working class interests although poorly and that only pressure is needed to turn them into staunch defenders of the workers. This view is no Communist view, it is harmful for our Party, and consequently this kind of "tactics" must be strongly condemned by the Comintern. The trade union apparatus is now a means of oppressing the masses, a means of smothering the initiative of the workers at large, and our problem, therefore, is to oust these reformist leaders, and replace them by real revolutionary proletarians, to lead the strikes that arise spontaneously, to direct them against the bourgeoisie and the reformist trade union apparatus, since the latter is sabotaging the elementary interests of the toiling masses.

I ask you, therefore; in present-day conditions is it wrong to put the question in this light? The experience of the general strike and the miners' struggle in Great Britain, of the recent conflicts in the Ruhr, the Metal workers' strike in Central Germany and the many strikes in France and other countries, must be taken into account. The right elements of the German Communist Party do not favour our strike strategy. But what do they propose? What line of action do they propose instead of the one outlined by the Comintern and the R.I.L.U.? Their tactics are very simple indeed: nothing is to be done against the will of the reformist trade union apparatus. We must wait until that apparatus is captured. These comrades furthermore regard the capturing of the trade unions not in the light of replacing the reformist apparatus by a revolutionary apparatus, but as a result of the transformation brought about by education of the reformist trade union bureaucrats, a transformation of these bad reformists into staunch fighters for the proletarian cause.

I believe that such a passive policy would prove suicidal for the Comintern and all its Sections.

From the decisions of the Ninth Comintern Plenum and the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress the following must be noted: We must always be with the masses, we must take careful cognisance of the growing dissatisfaction of the masses, the masses must be organised and led if necessary without the trade union apparatus and against it, no fetish must be made of the trade unions, the reformist organisations must not be transformed into objects of worship, whilst it must always be kept in mind that the reformist organisations are tools in the hands of the bourgeois state and the employers' organisations to crush the revolutionary wing of the labour movement and to enslave the broad proletarian masses.

#### For Unity not at any Price. Struggle against Expulsions.

For many years past the R.I.L.U. and the Comintern have decidedly advocated trade union unity on a national and international scale, but neither the Comintern nor the R.I.L.U. have ever made a fetish of unity. Unity is no end in itself but only a means to an end, and therefore the question of the existence and formation of the opposition, the question of our Communist tactics in the trade unions cannot be made dependent upon unity. Meanwhile, we have Communists, in Germany in particular, who regard unity above everything else. Have we not seen Communists who together with the social democrats have signed resolutions condemning the tactics of the Communist Party in Germany? Have we not seen Communists who in the name of unity were ready to renounce their own line of action?

I shall not cite here all the numerous references with regard to this. But let me refer to a couple of examples of recent activities of those who want unity at any price in Germany. At the Congress of the **Leather Workers' Union** held in Germany in June, 1928, the members of the Communist Party put forward the standpoints that "it was possible to be a good Communist while not sharing the Communist point of view on 'purely trade union questions.'" At the Congress of the **Boot and Shoe Operatives' Union** of Germany held in July, 1927, Communist Schiffer from Cleve declared that he "disagreed with several slandering articles of the Communists". The Communists at this Congress asserted that the "trade unions acted correctly when they expressed their support for rationalisation".

Without quoting any further examples I ask you, why did the Communists at these Congresses express themselves in this manner? Simply because they placed unity in their union above all else. The German comrades can cite here scores of similar examples, but I believe this will suffice. I assert that this is not a Communist way of acting, and that such an outlook has nothing in common with the theory and practice of the Comintern. It is therefore quite natural that comrades who advocate unity at any price, who place unity of the trade unions above all else, that such comrades remain passive when Communists are expelled from the trade unions. One very frequently hears among these elements the assertion that one should not allow oneself to be provoked. In the main this is undoubtedly true, but this correct standpoint is being literally used by the right elements to conceal their own passivity. It is well known that the German Social Democratic Party in its tactics in regard to the bourgeois state and Hohenzollern Germany for a long time put up the slogan of "Don't let yourself be provoked". Of course one must be a perfect idiot to allow oneself to be provoked, but we should remember what the German Social Democratic Party did with this slogan. This formula was used not only to conceal their passivity, but to renounce the struggle, while afterwards it served to cover its conciliation with the Hohenzollerns and later with the bourgeois state.

The struggle against expulsions is a question of life or death for the Party. And here we find the Right, instead of reinforcing the struggle against the splits and mobilising the masses against the crimes of the trade union bureaucrats, pouring out all kinds of theories to conceal their passivity and defeatist tendencies. Not desiring to struggle against expulsions, they are beginning to look in our own midst for the guilty ones for the split. All the Right assert that the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress is now out for a split, thus justifying with these assertions the reformist policy of expulsions. Those who bring forward the accusation that the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress is out to bring about a split, really should be put into an asylum. The Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress said never a word about the necessity of a split. On the contrary it demanded that disruption be combated. In England we find that revolutionary workers elected by referendum in Scotland cannot get down to work because the trade union bureaucrats, with the support of the bourgeois State, are ousting the representatives of the majority. The **Swiss Trade Union Federation** expelled the Basle trade union cartel because it came out against fascism, because it urged support for the Chinese revolution and in general supported the class struggle. Thus according to the adherents of unity at any price the British comrades must bow down to the will of the trade union bureaucrats because otherwise a split will be brought about. Our Swiss comrades must comply with the wishes of their trade union bureaucrats. Our American comrades must give way to the agents of Wall Street only for the sake of unity! The Comintern will never agree to this kind of capitulation. If the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. upheld this point of view then all the Parties and both the Internationals should be disbanded. We must struggle against the disrupters, but even more we must struggle against the capitulators, who regard unity as an end in itself, that in the name of unity we must renounce our duty, indeed our very right to win over the masses for the class struggle.

#### Our Immediate Task is the Organisation of the Unorganised.

In this connection there rises before us in all its importance the problem of the organisation of the unorganised. It is most important for the United States and for such countries as Japan, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Mexico, Yugoslavia, Greece, Bulgaria, Roumania etc.

If the question of the organisation of the unorganised is very clear in those countries with a split trade union movement (Japan, France, Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Yugoslavia, Greece, and others), i. e., where it is necessary to draw the masses into the revolutionary trade unions, the question with regard to America, where there is no parallel trade union federation, must be discussed from another angle. The overwhelming majority of the American workers are not organised. There are millions of workers in the steel, textile, rubber industries, water transport, etc., not organised. Many years were needed to dispel the

illusions entertained by our American comrades with regard to unity. Many years were needed to get the formation of new unions amongst the unorganised. There are 24—25 million unorganised workers and employees, civil servants; there are millions of Negroes, who present a great potential revolutionary power. And up to the present we have not succeeded in getting Negro unions organised in America in those industries where the white unions do not accept Negroes. It needs no saying that in the new unions the workers of all races and countries will have equal rights.

But if the question with regard to the United States is now quite clear, it is not quite clear for several other countries. Let us take, for instance, **Poland**. In the Dombrow Basin several years ago there were tens of thousands of unorganised miners. For the least 3 or 4 years an insignificant P. P. S. union with a few hundred members has managed to keep going there. I ask myself: why do not our comrades, who have colossal influence in this district, attempt to organise these 95% of the miners who are not members of the P. P. S. Union? Are we supposed to dance round the P. P. S. skeleton in the Dombrow district? It is time all Parties ponder this, for otherwise we will renounce to organise the masses, for the sake of unity at any cost, we are not going to rally tens of thousands of proletarians around the militant banner of the class struggle. Of course, the supporters of the tactics of "unity at any price" are going to kick up a row over this. They will say that this is splitting, it is better that these tens of thousands of miners remain unorganised than organise them in a new union. But as you and I are not amongst the supporters of unity at any price, this row will not alarm us. We are for unity, but not at any price. That we are for unity we have proven by all our decisions, by all our actions; we replied to the **Finnish and Norwegian unions** that we agreed to an international conference. The Amsterdam International rejected the proposal because the leaders of the Amsterdam International think that even now they are the salt of the earth. Let them console themselves with such illusions — we will continue the struggle for the establishment of a united all-embracing International founded on the basis of the class struggle.

### On Unity Groups.

On this point I would like to dwell shortly on the question of unity groups and in general on the movement for unity. You all know that the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern are for unity. You know that a considerable number of left reformist elements gathered a short time ago under the slogan of unity, whilst the greatest development of this movement was during the period of the existence of the **Anglo-Russian Committee**. With the break-up of the Anglo-Russian Committee a differentiation between these groups took place. Some of the groups, which were founded on the platform of the Anglo-Russian Committee, broke up (Holland), some split (Belgium), some still show very weak signs of life (France, Austria, Czechoslovakia), while some groups (in Germany) if they do exert any activity, exert it only in the sphere of literature. But on the other hand, the movement for unity was joined by the trade unions of **Norway and Finland**, and the **Soviet-Finnish-Norwegian trade union conference** was one of the stages in the struggle for unity.

Putting aside the question with regard to the **Norwegian-Finnish-Soviet trade union conference**, I would like to dwell upon the unity groups only. There is no need to hide the fact that these groups are at present very weak.

Let us take **Germany**. The weakness of this Unity group consists in the fact that it is a purely literary group, it has no practical programme of action, all its work is built on talks of unity only.

In the first place, things in this group are not quite right on the question of the struggle against expulsions. It would seem that a unity group should come out with the greatest energy against the expulsion of Communists from the trade unions. But this is not to be noticed. This question does not seem to concern the editors of "Unity". It does not find a serious response on the pages of this organ. But if a unity group, which has no definite platform on other questions, does not even fight against expulsions, then it is permissible to ask, what is the task of this

group? Can this group count upon the growth of its influence? It is very doubtful. Influence can only grow in the day-to-day struggle. Its influence can only grow if the unity group will occupy a position of class struggle on all the most important current questions. Its influence can only increase if it will conduct a ruthless struggle against every expulsion and split, otherwise its influence is going to decrease. The unity groups have become weak, and some of them in a whole series of countries have broken up, because they have no concrete programme of action, and when matters reached the struggle for unity, the struggle against splits, they limit themselves, in the best instance, to a few protests only. Such a danger threatens the German unity group also.

Further I would like to point out a few peculiarities of the "Unity" journal. "Unity" is published by Communists and social-democrats. We are unable, of course, to demand from the social-democrats writing for "Unity" that they express our point of view of the struggle. But we are in the right in demanding from the Communists who work there that they defend the point of view of the Party, the point of view of the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern in those questions which are disputed by our social-democratic partners. We are in the right in demanding from the members of our Party that while struggling together with the social democratic workers in the unity group, they do not furl up their banner and that they do not surrender their right to criticise mistakes, obscurities, hesitancy of those social democrats who write in the same organs. I think that in this regard the workers in the editing offices of "Unity" do not manifest sufficient activity and firmness.

I could give several quotations from "Unity", but owing to lack of time, I will only remind the comrades that on the pages of "Unity" such articles are published which speak of the "ridiculous boasting of some Communist leaders, who seem to think that they are called upon and capable of being leaders of the working class". There are also to be found words of the "childish mania of the Communists for first place", phrases such as "the Communists are infected with narrow-minded Party egoism", that "they are unable to think of anything better than intensified libel of the left leaders and social democracy", and so on (see "Unity" No. 14, July 9th, 1927). Of course, we cannot demand of the social democrats to have a good opinion of the Communist Party, but we must demand from those Communists who work for the "Unity" that they give a worthy reply to such unworthy attacks upon the Communist Party under the flag of the united front.

We work together with social-democratic workers in the Unity Groups in order, jointly with the best workers of the social democratic parties, to fight against class collaboration, for trade union unity, in order to transform the trade unions into democratic organisations, etc. But if this is so — and undoubtedly it is — then the question crops up, why does not "Unity" bring up the question of a united front with the trade union opposition of Germany, but writes: "We do not in the least support all the actions of the oppositionals ("Unity", March 3rd, 1928), without stating exactly what it does not support. Why does not "Unity", — even though only as information — make any statement on the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress and its decisions? Is it possible to remain outside of the most burning problems of the German Labour movement? What sort of an organ is it which desires to keep outside of the struggle and above everything? In my opinion it is precisely this lack of contact with real life, which is the chief reason for the weakness of the German Unity group.

From the aforesaid the following is clear: In order that the unity groups exist, develop, win over new strata of workers, it is insufficient to repeat "Unity" day and night and to defend inadequately this unity when expulsions take place. It is necessary to have a practical platform of actions, to organise the masses against the splitting policy of the reformist leaders, to take note of the everyday needs of the workers, and to go into the struggle hand-in-hand with the Communists when the Communists lead the masses against the treachery of the reformist leaders. Otherwise, the Unity groups will remain small literary groups, and will never become serious factors for the unification of the working class on the basis of the class struggle.

### Should the Communist Parties Carry through Decisions of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress?

We cannot say that the Communist press is conducting a systematic campaign for the R. I. L. U. decisions. Many comrades think that if they publish one or two articles, three or four informational notes, and the contents of this or that resolution — they have carried out the campaign. I must point out that this is no campaign, but getting rid of the question in a bureaucratic manner. It is high time that you knew that a passive attitude with regard to the popularisation of the Fourth Congress decisions can only be to the advantage of the right defeatist tendencies, which we have, true, to a very small extent; in our own ranks. In general, not all Communist Parties have yet learned to organise real campaigns, especially of an international character. In the theses there is pointed out quite correctly the lack of internationalism, and a certain provincialism, of several Parties. This defect was especially vividly manifested during the Chinese events. Take for instance the **international fortnight of aid for the Chinese labour movement** organised by the R. I. L. U. The International Fortnight has not been carried through with such enthusiasm and to such an extent as the heroic Chinese proletariat deserves. If we add to the inability to organise long campaigns, an insufficient understanding of the real meaning of the international experience summed up by the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress, it becomes quite clear why the Communist Parties in many countries have not yet taken up the serious popularisation of the Fourth Congress decisions. Such a passive attitude in the first place may harm these Communist Parties and the whole international Communist movement.

#### Conclusions.

We have now sufficient experience to be able to say which methods are useful and which are no good. We have sufficient forces to develop mass activities, to penetrate everywhere where there are working masses and to direct the day-to-day struggle. We have not sufficient forces in all countries, not everywhere are we able to direct strikes and struggles against the will of the reformist leaders. But only in the struggle for the leadership of the masses, only in the persistent and careful day-to-day work, with a careful consideration of the mood of the masses, can we transform all our Parties into mass organisations.

We have against us the united front of the employers, the bourgeois State, and international reformism. International reformism accuses us of splitting, but you well know what this accusation is worth. I will only give a couple of facts. When the **Pan Pacific T. U. Secretariat** was formed, instead of supporting this federation of workers of the Pacific coast and its struggle against American and Japanese imperialism and against new wars, the Amsterdamites came out against it, accusing the Pan Pacific T. U. conference of being Moscow's child. When thanks to our initiative the foundations of the **Latin American Trade Union secretariat** were laid, the Amsterdam International, instead of calling upon all labour organisations of Latin America to join this organisation, is making attempts to set up its own organisation for Latin America. For this purpose they gathered a few people from Latin America in Geneva, who under the protection of the Amsterdamites set up a Bureau of Connections of the Argentine Trade Union Confederation. A Bureau of connection, which only connects a few Argentine reformists with a few swindlers of Venezuela, Uruguay and Cuba.

The united front of the bourgeois States, the employers and the reformists still represents a potential power. The revolutionary wing of the labour movement has suffered defeats in many struggles, but we learn from these defeats. The theses and discussion on the first point of the agenda are imbued with deep faith in our victory. This faith in our victory is based on a sober Marxist analyses of the situation of international capitalism and the correlation of forces between the working class and the bourgeoisie and within the working class itself.

International reformism is still strong, for capitalism is still strong. But compare our forces during the Fifth Congress and at present. Compare the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern four years ago — in 1924 and now in 1928. In 1924 the Chinese proletariat

had not yet come out upon the arena of history. In 1924 the Chinese proletariat had not yet shaken the still powerful imperialism of England, Japan and the U. S. A. In 1924 there were not yet hundreds of thousands of strikers who have now come forward in the industrial centres of India. At that time the labour movement of Latin America was still for the greater part under the power of anarcho-syndicalist and reformist ideologies, while now most of the workers of Latin America are coming nearer to the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern. Our forces are growing — this is why we are convinced of our victory over capitalism and over its reformist lackeys.

(Applause.)

#### Comrade LI KYANG (China):

Comrades, the betrayal of the Chinese Revolution by the bourgeoisie was no accident. Chiang Kai-Shek had already previously, namely on March 20th 1926, carried out a treacherous manoeuvre of this kind in Canton. Our Party gave warning at the time, unfortunately only in words, about the impending counter-revolution. In reality, it did not take any practical steps to counteract it. The Pol. Bureau of the Party was in a state of wavering and indecision. The then responsible leader of our Party, **Chang Tu-Sao**, has not yet openly admitted his grave mistakes, and the Comintern has therefore advised all the members of the Chinese Party to be on their guard against opportunism.

At the meeting held in August 1927 a resolution was finally passed upon this question, as well as upon the agrarian revolution, the armed insurrection, and the capture of power.

The political line adopted since the August Conference of last year was essentially correct, but a number of crude mistakes were committed in carrying it out. In the **Wuhan Province** there was already a desire for an insurrection at the close of August 1927. The Central Committee of the Chinese Party urged the need of better preparation before starting the insurrection, nevertheless there were no preparations made until the 10th. of September. Similar mistakes were committed also in **Hupei**. The **Nan-Chang revolt** ended in a defeat, because it had no agrarian programme and because the peasants were not drawn into the insurrection.

In the **Kwantung Province**, too, the peasant army was mobilised for an insurrection in the Autumn, but the large masses of the peasants were not attracted. After the Swatow defeat came a series of risings in **Haifang, Lufeng, Haiman** and other places in the Kwantung Province.

After this period the Kuomintang intensified its repressive measures, closing down the trade unions and cancelling the agreements between workers and employers, whilst workers were imprisoned and shot with greater brutality than ever. **Wan Tin-Wei** drove from Hong-Kong; the workers who had been fighting against imperialism for a period of 16 months.

The Canton workers could now plainly see that the Left Wing Kuomintang people were the same hangmen as the militarists.

Between April and December 1927 numerous political mass demonstrations took place in Canton. The revolutionary mood reached a high pitch. At the same time a war broke out between the militarist **Cheng Fak-Kwai**, believed to adhere to the Left Wing Kuomintang, and **Li Chi-Sen**. The workers realised that now the time was come to overthrow this reactionary leadership. Thus the Canton workers seized power on December 11th. of last year by means of a revolt. The thundering of that revolt reverberated throughout the East and found its echo among workers throughout the world. After the Canton revolt it was realised by the Chinese working class that the armed revolt was the only way to lead the workers, peasants and soldiers to power.

After the Canton revolt the peasants rose in arms in various parts throughout China. The agrarian revolution was now to become intensified. Mistakes were committed by many comrades in the course of the Canton revolt; nevertheless the Canton revolt can by no means be described as a patch.

Now I am going to speak of the tasks which confront the Party. The XI. Plenum of the C. I. had emphasised the fact that the Chinese Revolution was a stage of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Our task is essentially to enroll the masses of the people in their millions around our Party. The slogan of the armed revolt is merely a propaganda slogan as long as it does not raise a new wave of revolution. Our present tasks are the following:

1. To increase our struggle against imperialism, and to organise the workers, the peasants and the petty bourgeoisie around this movement.
2. We must unfold the agrarian revolution everywhere.
3. We must strengthen the trade union movement in the cities.
4. We must combat both opportunism and putschism. I must add that sufficient anti-imperialist work has not yet been done.

The agrarian revolution is gathering strength. It shatters the foundations of the reactionary domination and it also hinders the designs of the imperialist exploiters.

So far we have not sufficiently worked in this direction, whilst numerous mistakes have been committed. In the course of agrarian revolts we must also take steps to strengthen the workers' organisations in the cities. We must avoid such mistakes as joining the reactionary fascist trade unions which have no masses behind them. We must combat the mistakes which arise from the slogan of the united front as applied in our country.

Our task is to get among the masses and to gather them around the Party. We must constantly devise new methods for organising the workers and for attracting them to militant participation in the trade union movement. Nevertheless we must keep the Party organisation and the trade unions distinctly apart from each other.

A new revolutionary wave is inevitable, and our task is to make new preparation for it. We must combat both putschism and opportunism. Quite recently there were still a few comrades in China inclined to launch such slogans as: convening a national assembly, restoring the mass movement of the Kuomintang, free speech, etc. Comrades, this is a striking example of pure opportunism.

One word about the Kuomintang and the Third Party. Both of them are hangmen of the working class. We must finally grasp the meaning of the three principles of Sun Yat-Sen. They are petty bourgeois and reactionary by their character. Firstly, the principle of Nationalism. This nationalism aims at strengthening one class of the people and submitting all the other classes to the hegemony of this particular class. Secondly, the principle of Democracy. It repudiates the class struggle and insists upon dictatorship of the most reactionary kind. Thirdly, the principle of Socialism. It is of the reformist kind, based upon deceiving the workers. The Kuomintang now wants to join the II. International which has openly stood upon the other side of the barricade since 1924, and this shows quite clearly its reactionary character.

The same as to the Third Party. We should cherish no illusions on that score.

One word about the white terror. The white terror has exacted a toll of 310,000 workers and peasants, including 20,000 Communists. The white terror has not yet abated in China, and we must therefore fight against it in the most energetic fashion. It is a grave mistake when such things are not properly described in the labour press of the West, because this allows the imperialists to circulate their false descriptions everywhere.

A word about the relations between the Chinese Communist Party and fraternal parties in other countries. Greater attention must be devoted to the Chinese Revolution. More vigorous movements must be inaugurated against imperialism and against the despatching of imperialist troops and warships to China, as well as against the white terror employed by the militarists and the imperialists. Concrete measure must be taken, and closer con-

nections must be established. We ought to receive more thoroughgoing information.

Comrades, I must say that we have been absolutely inadequately instructed. Under such conditions we cannot fight victoriously against imperialism. Steps must be taken, above all, to secure to us the quicker receipt of information and resolutions. We therefore insist upon the establishment of better and quicker communications.

#### Comrade LENSKI (Poland):

Comrades, on the whole I am in agreement with the Theses submitted to the VI. Comintern Congress. We are going nevertheless to submit an amendment to the Commission, urging the need of emphasising the connection between the fascist tendencies and the monopolist character of modern capitalism. The chief elements of this are already contained in the Theses, nevertheless they ought to be enlarged and stated in a general form. The failure to realise the close connection existing between the fascist tendencies and the monopolist character of capitalism is at the bottom of the mistakes of the **Kostrzewa group**, and these mistakes are continued by comrades **Lapinski** and **Thalheimer**.

Further stress should be laid upon the internationalisation of the fascist methods of oppressing the working class; this was already pointed out by the Plenum of the E. C. C. I. in 1927. In all the European countries — in Germany, France, England — we see the fascist methods of oppression employed in various forms, and comrade **Thälmann** has quite correctly pointed to the social-democracy as the tool for the internationalisation of the fascist methods of oppression. He said that the social-democracy has developed from a social-reformist into a social-fascist party. This hits the eye particularly in **Poland**, where the Socialist Party is becoming more and more fused with the fascist apparatus of the State.

Finally, a more precise characterisation ought to be given of the fascist methods which are not limited to a system of terror, but include also a system of gulling the masses. Our Party has gathered a vast amount of experience on this subject, which it would like to impart to the Comintern.

Now I am going to deal with Polish matters. It has been repeatedly pointed out here that the C. P. of Poland is now standing upon a highly responsible post in the international revolutionary movement. It has constantly received the greatest attention of the C. I. The latter has helped it in overcoming some big mistakes (e. g. Trotzkism in 1923, the mistake of May 1926), and it has helped it in making progress towards Bolshevisation in the teeth of tremendous difficulties. From the C. I. a whole series of fundamental rulings and instructions were received by our Party, which have determined its tactics in the most important mass campaigns, as for instance, in the Sejm elections. Similarly the IV. Conference of our Party, which thoroughly criticised the past mistakes and drew up a clear political line for the future, was under the guidance of the C. I.

Nevertheless the tasks which confront our Party, as well as the inner situation, entitle us to even greater attention on the part of the C. I. In the course of the intensification of the contradictions of capitalist stabilisation, which have been characterised here by Comrade Bukharin, there are events maturing in Poland which are going to exercise a tremendous effect upon the whole course of the international revolutionary movement, as well as upon the further constructive work in the U. S. S. R. We have in Poland — as already repeatedly emphasised here — a serious increase in the war tendencies, whilst the whole of the political life in Poland is marked by militarist and ideological preparations for a war against the U. S. S. R. To this end the whole of Pilsudski's internal and external policies are directed.

In the international market the Pilsudski Government is turning the country more and more into the debt slave of foreign capital. Poland is becoming more and more the consumer of foreign-made goods, and the purveyor of raw materials and semi-manufactures. Suffice it to mention that the export of manufactured goods in 1923 amounted to 5/6 of the imports,



today it has dropped to  $\frac{1}{4}$ . Even the export of semi-manufactures has lately been falling off on account of increased competition in the foreign markets.

The intensification of the internal contradictions of capitalist stabilisation is accelerating the process of dragging Poland into war.

The war preparations are going on at a heavy pace. The 38% increase in the army budget, the militarisation of a whole number of organisations, the feverish training of young recruits, the development of industries for war purposes, the extension of the net of strategical railways, — all these are the outstanding features of these preparations for war.

Similarly, the foreign policies of the fascist government are subordinated to the militarist tasks. By the side of the most brutal terror against the revolutionary movement, by the side of using the social-fascist troops against the vanguard of the labour movement — the Communist Party, there are frequent attempts made by Fascism to penetrate into the ranks of the working class and the peasantry, not only in Warsaw, as mentioned by Comrade Bukharin, but also throughout Poland. Attempts are made to corrupt those elements of the national-revolutionary movement that are least capable of resisting. The whole system of fascist measures in the domain of labour legislation are calculated to bind the working class hand and foot, to submit it to the fascist hierarchy, and to compel it to give up the class struggle. The persistent fascisation of the trade unions constitutes a grave menace to the labour movement.

In the same direction, if by different means, are working the compromised parties like the P. P. S. and the "Wyzwolenie". Along with a campaign of unscrupulous calumny against the U. S. S. R., these leaders ostensibly utter radical, democratic and oppositional phrases in order to keep the masses away from the revolutionary fight against the Fascist regime. The discontent of the masses grows from day to day and finds frequently vent in violent outbreaks. The recent Sejm elections have shown that our Party has captured the decisive majority of the working class in important industrial districts such as Dombrovo, Warsaw and Lodz, and that it has also extended and consolidated its basis among the working and exploited peasants not only in West Ukraine and White Russia, but also in Poland proper.

After the V. Congress which was of particular importance to the Bolshevisation of the C. P. of Poland, the elimination of the contradiction of its Bolshevik slogans and its practice, the Party has considerably developed as leader of the revolutionary movement of the workers, peasants and oppressed nationalities. By overcoming Right and ultra-Left deviations the Party has become stronger ideologically. Thanks to the correct directions of the IV. Congress, the Party has carried out with considerable success, although not without errors, a whole series of campaigns and has been able to mobilise the masses in spite of its relative weakness.

One of the greatest obstacles to a more rapid development of the Party and its activity, is the crisis in the Executive before and after the IV. Party Congress. Opportunist mistakes and deviations from the lines of the IV. Congress which impeded the consolidation of our Party and accentuated the internal struggle, are the cause of this crisis. The dissolution of the Bureau of the Warsaw District Executive and of the C. C. of the Y. C. L., which was subsequently reinstated in its rights by the Presidium of the Congress, was a sad finish to the anti-consolidation policy of our Executive. The theses laid before the VI. Congress point out correctly that "the bitter fraction struggle in our Party has not the justification of serious divergences of opinion". Comrades, we think that the differences which exist in the Party cannot and should not be overcome by fractional means. However, after the IV. Party Congress they were not discussed even in the theoretical organ of our Party. These divergencies of opinion relate to the main tendencies of Polish Fascism and the tactical tasks of the Party.

The first group of questions is connected with Comrade Brandt's pamphlet on the economic features of the May coup d'etat, and with the policy of the present Government. This pamphlet is in reality a translation of the conceptions of the Belvedere-economists into Marxist phraseology. Comrade Brandt describes the programme of the Fascist bloc in Poland as fol-

lows: "Development of Capitalist agriculture, coercive promotion of agricultural export, defensive on the industrial front with regard to Europe, concentration on the internal market and getting up strength for future expansion in the East."

This means that capitalism is concentrating on the internal market and is not carrying on at present an expansion policy to the East.

In the chapter on perspectives Brandt refers to the efforts of the Polish industry to break down the Eastern barrier, and says frankly: "These are only historical tendencies, and not yet present reality."

Brandt is of the opinion that the Polish industry does not yet want war against the U. S. S. R. By denying the economic motives of Polish imperialism, Brandt takes up objectively the standpoint of petty-bourgeois pacifism which covers Pilsudski's aggressive plans. Moreover, Brandt puts the Leninist theory of imperialism upside down by discoursing about the defensive of countries with "retarded capitalism" on the industrial front, "utilisation of antagonisms between the more powerful countries by these States" for the upkeep of their economic independence.

Brandt's pamphlet differs from the resolutions of the IV. Congress which declares that in Poland "the development of the internal market cannot be the basis for effective capitalist development", and that objective conditions "are gradually driving and will drive the Polish bourgeoisie to an accentuation of expansion to the East".

The other group of contentious questions is connected with the crisis in the C. P. of West Ukraine caused by the national-opportunist policy of its former Executive. In spite of the resolution of the IV. Party Congress concerning the necessity of energetic struggle against the national-opportunist deviations of the former leading Vassilkov group, the majority of the C. C. denied a long time the existence of a nationalist policy in this group, and could not make up its mind to submit it to thorough criticism. Such an attitude to an obvious form of the Right danger has intensified and accentuated the crisis in the C. P. of West Ukraine, and has finally led to a split which Bukharin has also mentioned.

The third category of contentious questions relates to the appreciation of the role of reformist and opportunist parties. It amounts to failure to understand the true meaning of the opposition manoeuvres of the social-reformists, to over-estimating the internal frictions in their camp, to estimating the so-called Left attacks, as well as high revolutionary actions. For instance, Comrade Kostrzeva's group represented the viewpoint that the Polish Socialist Party is at present between two fires — the C. P. of Poland and Polish Fascism. This group asserted and published on behalf of the C. C. that Daszinski, a well known social traitor, one of the most active supporters of Pilsudsky's Fascist government, has been elected Marshal of the Sejm owing to the indignation of the reformist deputies at the illtreatment of our Sejm fraction by the fascist police. We come across such errors not only in manifestoes but also in the Sejm speeches of Comrade Varski, who also lays stress on the indignation of the reformists and teaches the social traitors how to fight for parliamentary democracy. Just as in the right group of the C. P. G., we have also an erroneous attitude to the so-called Left leaders of the reformist Parties. For instance, Comrade Varski asserted lately in his speeches that under the influence of this Left the P. P. S. has put a stop to the illtreatment of Warsaw workers. Comrades, it was said here that we have incited against the Sejm fraction. This is not true to facts. We do not relinquish criticism of mistakes made by individual deputies. We have criticised Comrade Varski's speeches before 1927 and will do so also after 1927 if we find errors in them. The correctness of our criticism was acknowledged by the IV. Party Congress. I will give you a fact which is the best political answer to such demagoguery. When the Fascists made a bodily attack on our fraction our Warsaw organisation organised in a few hours a protest against the illtreatment of our Sejm deputies. Comrade Kostrozeva's group misrepresent the mistakes of the C. C. Minority. These mistakes were submitted by us to timely and frank criticism. The main error after the Fourth Congress was: that a few minority comrades did not

exclude the possibility of the united front from above during the election campaign, so as to expose the Reformist leaders and the so-called Reformist bloc. But they soon withdrew this proposal mostly owing to my influence and that of other Minority comrades. In the Comintern Commission I spoke against this error from the first. But here, from this platform, Comrade Kostrozeva made the false assertion as if the former Minority had proposed to have an election bloc with the P.P.S., etc. At the same time the majority group is endeavouring, with the help of its formal authority, to paralyse all criticism of its mistakes which as a rule lead the Party to opportunist deviations. Of course no group is guaranteed against opportunist mistakes. However, every one will admit that those who try to avoid self-criticism are least guaranteed against mistakes. Comrade Kostrozeva has conveniently kept silent about her mistakes and those of her group. The new mistakes of this group are a perpetuation of their old mistakes. They all show that this group has not yet quite overcome the conceptions which were criticised by the IV. Party Congress. It should be pointed out that at the IV. Party Congress this group did not acknowledge the correctness of the criticism of its mistakes by the Comintern.

The **Right group** wants to change the correlation of forces in its favour by means of mechanical pressure. Today, it is in opposition to the Party majority, the most important Party organisations such as **Warsaw, Upper Silesia, West White Russia**, not to mention the **Y. C. L.** It makes war on nearly all the departments of the **C. C.**, and places the monopoly of its fraction above the collective authority of the Executive of the Party.

Comrade Kostrozeva emphasised here the necessity of an iron discipline in the Party. On this point, she was right. We need an iron discipline, especially at the present juncture. But the Kostrozeva group does not observe this discipline in regard to the Comintern: the dissolution of the Warsaw Executive and of the **C. C.** of the **Y. C. L.** without the knowledge of the Comintern and the **Y. C. L.** is a flagrant breach of discipline. The split experiment which was tried in the Warsaw organisation only with a one vote majority shows to what danger the whole Party is exposed. The Warsaw organisation is the strongest, most active and militant of the whole Party. It managed to get 75,000 votes at the municipal elections for an annulled list of candidates; after the assassination of **Voikoff** it brought out into the streets many thousands of workers, in spite of the terrorism of the centralised Fascist apparatus in the capital, it increased its influence during the Seim elections. The attempt to split this organisation and to destroy its Executive means a blow at the revolutionary movement throughout Poland.

Our proposal at that time was to the effect that an appeal be made to the Comintern and that the conflict be not extended to the lower nuclei. But it was rejected by one vote. In the face of such a situation, we think that one should wait till the end of the Congress. The **Polish Commission of the VI. Congress** must be convened sooner. It must take energetic steps to put an end to the unheard of incidents in our Party. We are convinced that the VI. Congress will create the necessary conditions for the consolidation of the Party, that as soon as fractional struggle ceases, the Comintern will guarantee our Party the possibility of self-criticism as the only means to overcome all deviations from the Leninist policy, the only method for the education of the Party on Bolshevik lines. We are ready to do anything to put an end to the fractional struggle which is emasculating our Party.

Comrade **Thälmann** said quite rightly that the Minority must submit to the Majority. However, blind submission to a **one vote** majority when this vote is that of a madman, a person intent on splitting the Party, would not be a Bolshevik way out of the present situation. Only a united Bolshevik Party and Executive, aware of its duties to the Party and the Comintern, will be able to repel the fierce attacks of Fascism, frustrate its criminal war plans and be a true leader of the masses in the struggle for the **Workers' and Peasants' Government**, for a Soviet Poland, for the self-determination of the subjugated peoples. (Applause.)

### Comrade FOSTER (America):

Comrades, I agree with the main line of the thesis presented by Comrade Bukharin. I wish to comment, however, on a couple of points with respect to the **American situation**.

The first one is that the thesis and the Comintern generally must pay more attention to what the thesis styles the American methods of corrupting the working class. I want especially to direct the attention of the Congress to special features of the widespread class collaboration movement in America, which is the accompaniment of the rationalisation and war programme of American imperialism and which we call **Capitalist Efficiency "Socialism"**.

Now the purposes of this movement are first of all to draw the workers into the speed-up system of American imperialism in the industries, and to liquidate generally the resistance of the working class to intensified exploitation by the employers. Its broader purposes are to liquidate all working class organisations, political and industrial; to cultivate illusions about class collaboration, and to discredit all thought of class struggle.

This intensified class collaboration movement in led by an extensive school of capitalist efficiency engineers and economists. It has produced a vast literature. The whole capitalist press is saturated with general conceptions of this movement. This movement presents a series of theories and institutions intended to meet the everyday needs of the workers in industry. They even pretend to offer to the workers the means to emancipate themselves from capitalist exploitation. First we have the movement for **company unionism**. This is the system of establishing a pseudo-democracy in the industries. The company movement is based on the liquidation of the trade unions, or their degeneration into company unions.

In connection with this general company union movement, we have proposals for the amalgamation of the trade unions with the company unions, and now this is beginning to go into effect in various sections of the American labour movement.

Then there is the so-called **welfare movement**, designed to create illusions amongst the workers that the capitalists intend to improve working and living conditions in the industries. This movement is theorised principally by an efficiency engineer by the name of **Williams**, who takes the position that the workers have no basically revolutionary grievances and demands, but that their demands consist simply of minor questions which can be removed by the capitalists through this system of welfare work, to the immediate profit of the capitalists as well as the eventual liquidation of the revolutionary movement.

In addition to these tendencies there is the movement leading in the direction of cooperation between the employers and the unions in production. In the United States it has manifested itself in a whole series of programmes, grouped principally around the basic scheme known as the **B. and O. plan, or union management co-operation**.

There is also a series of immediate aspects of capitalist efficiency "socialism", dealing with education, that is, the establishing of capitalist propaganda in the various industries; the building of fraternal organisations, benefit societies, bonus systems, etc. Besides these immediate aspects, efficiency "Socialism" puts forward many theories of Pseudo-Socialism. For example, we have the theory of **Cärver**, a leading American bourgeois economist, who comes forward with the notion that the workers, through buying the stocks of capitalist companies, can become owners of the industries and thus escape from capitalist exploitation. Then we have the theory put forward by **Gillette**, a capitalist millionaire and efficiency expert, that the whole people, not simply the workers, can buy the industries one after another by purchasing their stock, and then, after reorganising them upon a co-operative basis, gradually hook these various industries one to another in the shape of a "people's corporation". Thus, he says, capitalism can be abolished. We have the theory also, for example, of Professor **Tugwell**, one of the experts of mass production in the United States. Tugwell proposes to establish a capitalist "**Gosplan**" which will systematically overcome the contradictions of the capitalist system. He claims that through mass production, high wages, and low production costs, the position of the workers may be gradually

improved, and eventually they shall be so strengthened financially that capitalist private ownership of the industries will automatically atrophy and fall away and some sort of a system of socialism will be established.

Or we have the theories of **Veblen**, who preaches the idea of the automatic collapse of capitalism, and the reorganisation of society upon a non-capitalist basis through the activities of the capitalist engineers.

Now the common idea running all through these capitalist Utopias is to implant in the minds of the workers the conviction that they shall make no struggle, that they shall build no working class organisations, political or economic, that they shall have no revolutionary ideals, but that instead, they shall co-operate with the capitalists and in this way they will win freedom. The whole movement is directly connected with the employers' drive to smash the trade unions of America or to degenerate them practically to the status of company unions.

The American imperialists, while utilising to the utmost the social democratic political and trade union leaders, nevertheless tend in this capitalist efficiency "Socialism" to take the matter of mobilising the workers into their rationalisation schemes more immediately into hand themselves and to put their efficiency engineers directly at the accomplishment of this task. One reason for this is the weak grip of the reformist leaders and organisations in America on the broad masses of the workers.

A further reason is the American capitalists' decided tendency to still more directly subjugate and amalgamate the reformist leaders and unions into their own organisations and to more directly take control of both. Hence the prominence of the engineers in the movement. The **American Federation of Labour** leaders have succumbed completely to this capitalist efficiency programme of the employers. The engineers have secured the ideological and in many instances, the organisational lead of the conservative American labour movement. Many of the unions have attached efficiency engineers to their staffs. The trade union journals are full articles by efficiency engineers along the general line that I have outlined.

Now the tendency of this movement is manifest. It is the movement to graft the labour aristocracy into the capitalist organisations, remarked by Comrade Bukharin's thesis. It is a programme to demoralise the great masses of unskilled and semi-skilled and it must be fought. This new capitalist efficiency "socialism" movement developing in America has international implications. Mondism is a phase of this general tendency. As the Social-Democratic leaders accept the rationalisation programme of the employers, they at the same time accept the basic principles of this capitalist efficiency "socialism" as we have called it.

The next point I want to deal with, comrades, relates to the necessity for a more complete analysis of **American imperialism** in the thesis with regard to the extent and effects of its inner contradictions, for the following reasons: 1. because these contradictions constitute a basic factor making for the world war.

Second, the elaboration of Comrade Bukharin's analysis of the inner contradictions of American imperialism is specifically required also to lay a definite basis for the policy of the American Party.

Such a close analysis as I propose is especially necessary because of the wrong line, the **Right wing line** of the **Lovestone-Pepper** majority of our Central Executive Committee on this vital question. The basic mistake of the Central Executive Committee majority consists of a systematic under-estimation of the inner contradictions and an over-estimation of the reserve power of American imperialism. This gives the C.E.C. majority a Right wing line in all its Party policies. As Comrade Bittelman said aptly in his speech, their attitude amounts almost to a glorification and boasting of the power and progress of American imperialism.

It is typical of their general viewpoint that not one of their speakers has elaborated upon American imperialism's inner contradictions. They are all content if they can only show that American imperialism is forging ahead. The C.E.C. minority differs from the majority in that it refuses to content itself with

the vague and indefinite statements of the C.E.C. majority that American imperialism is still on the upward grade. It insists on the development of a more concrete perspective for American imperialism.

The C.E.C. minority, while agreeing that American imperialism is still on the upgrade (Comrade Pepper's charges that we believe American capitalism to be already on the decline are nonsense), stresses the fact that because of the growing inner contradictions of American capitalism, as well as of the greater resistance it meets on a world scale from the other imperialist powers, from the growth of the U.S.S.R. and the developing national liberation movements among colonial peoples, the progress of American imperialism becomes increasingly more difficult.

Our position is that in the face of these growing local and world scale conflicts and contradictions American imperialism cannot look forward to an extended, indefinite upward swing, as the C.E.C. majority foresees. To go further ahead it will be compelled not only to attack the standards of American workers, with resultant strikes and struggles, but also to adopt a more militant policy of imperial aggression, which brings nearer the menace of world war. American imperialism is today operating in a very different world from that of a few years ago when Europe was prostrate, as a result of the world war.

The C.E.C. majority theory of an indefinite upward swing of American imperialism contains an **under-estimation of the war danger**. It is no accident that these comrades under-estimate the independent, aggressive role of American imperialism in **China**. Last year they were putting forth the theory that America, with no militant policy of its own, was being used as a cat's paw in China by Great Britain. This year they picture the United States as the co-partner and tool of Japan in China.

Concretely, the Right wing tendency of the C.E.C. majority expresses itself by 1. an under-estimation of the extent, depth, character and effects of the present industrial depression, as evidenced by their adoption in theses and articles of the bourgeois theories of an industrial "recession" and of its "spotty" character. 2. An under-estimation of the extent of the wage cuts and the general pressure upon the workers, failure to see widespread piece rate cuts. 3. A tendency to under-estimate the force of the employers' drive to smash the trade unions, with a consequent under-estimation of the crisis in the trade unions and a tendency to rely on these old unions rather than to energetically build new unions for the organisation of the unorganised masses.

The general result is that the C.E.C. majority, failing to properly evaluate the developing mood of struggle among the masses, does not give them the necessary militant lead in their struggles. The position of the C.E.C. is marked by a basic lack of faith in the fighting spirit of the masses. This is one of the causes of its dilettante approach to the great task of organising the unorganised into new unions. Consequently, our trade union work is hampered by needless failure, such as the utter collapse of our organising campaigns in the automobile, shoe, metal and other industries.

On the other hand the C.E.C. minority, which sees the contradictions of American capitalism as well as its strength, understands the present industrial crisis not simply as an ordinary pre-war cyclical crisis, but one expressive of the growing difficulties of American capitalism and the forerunner of still deeper crises. We see the growing spirit of resentment and resistance of the masses of unskilled and semi-skilled, not only in the mining, textile and needle industries, but also in the automobile, meat packing, shoe and many other industries.

I will not make further answer to Pepper's charges that last year we contended that all the workers were bourgeoisified and this year we maintain that they are all radicalised. Comrade Bittelman has answered that empty charge very correctly.

It is the C.E.C. minority that has the correct Marxian analysis and estimation of the present situation in the United States which in many respects is a new situation. It is the

minority that is the driving force in the campaigns to organise the unorganised. The Party has one real achievement to show, that is the big struggle in the mining campaign. But the policies in this struggle were worked out practically one hundred per cent by the comrades of the C.E.C. minority. In most instances the working out of the successful policies in the mining industry was done in the face of the Opposition of the majority of the Central Executive Committee and this was also largely true when putting them into practice in the field.

I want to underline that section of the thesis which says that the main danger in the Comintern comes from the Right. This is especially true of the American Party and the thesis should specifically say so. What I have previously said about the under-estimation of the inner contradictions of American imperialism and the wrong policies flowing from these false estimations demonstrates that the Lovestone majority has a basically Right wing line in outlining and carrying out the Party's present tasks.

In the question of the Labour Party, the C.E.C. majority have systematically deviated to the Right; by cultivating and tolerating theories that the Labour Party will fight the battles of the workers, as some of the most Right elements say, even emancipate them, by shifting the basis of the Labour Party movement from the industrial workers to the farmers, by combining farmers and workers in one Party despite Comintern decisions to the contrary, by tending to rely on the trade union bureaucracy to organise the Labour Party.

In anti-imperialist and anti-war campaigns the C.E.C. majority have made the greatest Right wing mistakes, as dealt with by Comrade Bittelmann. In trade union work resistance to the introduction of slogans for new unions, denouncing all such proposals made by the minority as proposals for dual unionism, in Negro work they suffer from a deep under-emphasis of its importance. The whole Party, if it is true, must also be criticised in this respect.

In women's work, they follow an orientation upon housewives instead of industrial workers. In the united front work, they show the strong tendency to orientate upon Liberals and progressives rather than upon workers and the Left wing.

In addition, our Central Committee majority developed a wrong attitude towards the Socialist Party. This was specifically indicated by the endorsement of Panken in New York, as described by Comrades Cannon and others.

Comrade Pepper declared in his speech that the C.E.C. majority fought against the Right wing. In order to prove this he cites the election programme of four years ago, but Comrade Pepper failed to state that this programme was written and proposed to the C.E.C. by Comrade Ruthenberg, and that it was unanimously adopted by the Central Executive Committee. If Comrade Pepper wants to go back so far as four years ago to find Right wing mistakes, I think it will be well to attract his attention to the most serious Right wing mistake made in this period, namely, his theory of the third American Revolution (Applause). The theory that the petty-bourgeois forces under the leadership of LaFollette could defeat big capital in America. The C.E.C. have made no fight against the Right as they are the Right and their whole conception is that the danger is from the Left.

When I stated in the C.E.C. Committee that the C.I. letter to the French and British Parties to sharpen the struggle against the Labour Party and the Left bloc also applied to the American situation, they ridiculed this as a mechanical application to America of policies fitted only for Europe.

They constantly misrepresent and distort our position. Thus Pepper says that I denounced as a strike-breaking policy Bittelmann's proposal to call the miners' strike lost. But what I actually said was that to take such action at the time which I considered to be a mistake, would expose us to the charge of strikebreaking.

Comrade Weinstein charges that our opposition to the C.E.C. is unprincipled, and that we have shared to the full in the mistakes of the C.E.C. It is true that the minority has made and participated in some mistakes to the Right as well as to the Left, such as the Open Letter to the Socialist Party, the

under-estimation of the Negro work, etc. But nevertheless its general political line has been far more correct than that of the C.E.C. majority.

We have fought against the wrong Lovestone ideas on the world role of American imperialism. We have championed the new unions, in face of the C.E.C. majority's opposition. We fought against the Panken mistake. We fought against wrong Labour Party policies. We have made a bitter fight against opportunism in the needle trades and women's work and in this we have at all times met with the stubborn opposition of the Lovestone group. The line of the Lovestone group is far to the Right of ours. Our line, despite occasional mistakes, is essentially that of the Comintern. The records show this.

Undoubtedly we made a mistake at the February Plenum by not more sharply emphasising the growing political differences. This was partly because these differences were not yet sufficiently matured as to be clearly understood by us, and then we were undoubtedly somewhat also influenced by a desire to avoid a continuation of the long factional situation.

For the past several years we have been in opposition to the present C.E.C. majority fighting their mistakes, which have consisted mostly of a gross under-estimation of trade union work and of wrong Labour Party policies; but only in recent months, with the rise of Comrade Lovestone to control, has the clearly Right wing character of this group become definitely apparent.

We are now passing from a period of relative calm to one of more active struggle and the Lovestone group fails to understand and to meet it with a sharpened offensive. This brings its Right character clearly to light.

On May 16th, the C.I. sent a letter to the American Party. This corrected half a dozen serious mistakes of the C.E.C. All these mistakes were to the Right. That letter proves clearly that the Lovestone majority are following a line definitely to the Right of the C.I. Now the C.I. must go further than its criticism in that letter. It must take the necessary steps drastically to correct that line.

Despite the wrong policies of the present C.E.C. majority, our Party has made considerable progress in establishing its leadership among the masses. But with correct policies it could have made far greater headway. The objective situation is increasingly favourable for us. The masses under the present great pressure are beginning to stir. But we can take full advantage of our opportunities only if the present Right wing policy is liquidated.

Party unity is absolutely essential to the carrying out of the great tasks before us. But those comrades are wrong who believe that such unity can be achieved mechanically, by simply bridging over the political differences existing in the Party. Unity in our Party is dependent upon the correction of the wrong policies of the C.E.C. majority, and the eventual reorganisation of the Party leadership accordingly. Then the Party will be prepared to march forward aggressively and successfully to its great tasks as the vanguard of the American proletariat.

Comrade DOMBAL

(Communist fraction of the Peasant International):

Comrade Bukharin pointed out in his report that the Peasant International must develop its work. I must, however, point out that the question is treated in the Theses in a rather one-sided manner. Only the necessity of developing the work of the Peasant International is mentioned, whereas no mention is made of the tasks confronting the peasant movement. I think that something should be added to this part of the Theses. Very characteristic for the attitude of the Communist Party to the peasant question is: that Comrade Thälmann, the leader of one of the biggest Parties, has dealt very fully and definitely with every question, but did not say a single word about the peasant question and work among the peasantry.

The stabilisation of capitalism which is very much felt in agriculture and which makes a temporary stabilisation of the present regime possible, accentuates at the same time class differences and creates premises for a new élan of the revolutionary peasant movement. The characteristic feature of capitalist stabilisation is the development of **finance capital** which is penetrating more and more into agriculture. Bank capital, syndicates, cartels and trusts monopolise more and more supply and demand in the sphere of agriculture, which is undergoing a structural change. The tendency towards **agrarian industrialism** is developing and so does cartellisation in regard to distribution; the trustification of production is also making headway. Moreover, the State shows a greater tendency to intervene in regard to the formation of corn monopolies, etc. In countries of highly developed capitalism, capitalist and big peasant enterprises fuse gradually with the capitalist system whereas the position of the small peasantry and a section of the middle peasantry who find it difficult to compete with the more productive big enterprises, becomes gradually worse.

The poor and middle peasantry are saddled with taxes which are out of proportion with their income, whereas their share in credit and co-operative institutions is infinitesimal. The development of capitalism which is accompanied by increasing differentiation among the peasantry leads to the consolidation of the rural proletariat and the poor peasantry which forms part of it, whereas the position of the middle peasantry is becoming increasingly insecure. In countries with relics of feudal-servitude conditions, especially in **colonial and semi-colonial countries** the penetration of finance capital into agriculture, the consolidation of imperialism and the development of capitalism lead to a radical change in the social order of the countryside. Everywhere the price of land and land rent are increasing, and lease-hold conditions are becoming worse. In a number of countries, especially colonial countries, landlords are driving tenant farmers gradually from their land, (for instance in **India**). In some countries the development of capitalism is accompanied by a change in the existing land conditions, especially in regard to communal land, (**South America, Indonesia**). The development of capitalism in these countries brings with it a considerable accentuation of the class struggle in the countryside. The more capitalism develops in these countries the more rapidly the peasantry approaches a state of revolution.

The development of capitalism is accompanied by the adaptation of land laws to the requirements of the capitalist development.

**Agrarian reforms** are being prepared and even introduced lately in countries such as **Indonesia and India** (the work of the Royal Commission), partly also in **Japan** (lease hold legislation) and also in **North Africa**, etc. On the whole, all these reforms move in the same direction as the Tsarist government after the revolution in 1905 when it introduced the so-called Stolypin reform: This dependence of the ruling classes on the development of the wealthy peasantry and the consolidation of private ownership of land accompanied by the pauperisation and proletarianisation of the poorest peasantry, will inevitably accelerate the next revolutionary explosion.

The economic fusion of the rural upper strata with finance capital and imperialism is accompanied by the development of **political reaction** in the countryside.

However, it leads at the same time to a general accentuation of contradictions in the stabilisation of capitalism and especially to an increase of the rural proletariat and the deterioration of the position of the small peasantry and of a section of the middle peasantry (on the basis of the development of finance capital and imperialism), all of which creates premises for the development of the revolutionary movement in the countryside.

In colonial and semi-colonial countries, the **Chinese revolutionary peasant movement** is still playing an important role. The tasks of the peasant revolution in China are not yet solved. In spite of defeats, the peasant movements continue with unabated force. The peasantry of the countries of **Central and South America** are also joining the revolutionary struggle. Apart from the **Mexican** peasantry whose revolutionary struggle is of long duration, the peasants of **Bolivia** and other Central and South American countries are being drawn into the struggle. This revolu-

tionary peasant movement is of special international importance in connection with the struggle against American imperialism.

Comrades, the question of the **Peasant International** and its work is a question directly connected with the whole question of the peasantry and the peasant movement.

The Peasant International must be a **non-Party political mass organisation of the peasants**, which sets itself the task of organising the peasant masses for the revolutionary struggle on the basis of an alliance between the working class and the peasantry.

But in regard to leading peasant organisations and the Peasant International through Communist fractions, the Parties cannot replace peasant organisations by these fractions. Replacing peasant organisations by Communist fractions is as erroneous as would have been replacing village councils by their Communist fractions after the revolution.

The work of the Communist fraction in the Peasant International and peasant organisations must develop into a special form of work of the Communist Parties among the peasantry. It must differ from the work of ordinary Party organisations, especially village nuclei.

It goes without saying that the work of the Communist fractions in the Peasant International must be linked up with the work of the Communist International and its Sections. But the main thing is that the Communist fraction must not be a substitute for the Peasant International or any peasant organisation.

Drawing genuinely non-Party peasant leaders and peasant functionaries into the work of the Peasant International, extending the framework of purely agitational-propagandist tasks, and exceeding this framework by establishing and consolidating organisational connections with local Peasant organisations, are the main tasks in the development of the Peasant International.

In spite of all difficulties, lack of forces and cadres of functionaries — the Communist fraction in the Peasant International has done a considerable amount of work for the creation of premises for the transformation of the Peasant International into a mass organisation of the working peasantry. At present the Peasant International is on the way to this transformation into a **peasant mass organisation**.

I must remind you that at the time of the establishment of the Peasant International there were neither agrarian commissions nor rural departments for work in the countryside in any of our Parties except in the C. P. S. U. We are helping now some of the Parties to remedy this defect and to develop practical work among the peasant masses.

In regard to mass work among the peasantry we have Sections in the following countries: **Poland, Germany, Bulgaria, France, Italy, Mexico, Switzerland, Norway, the United States, Czechoslovakia, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Italy**. We have moreover, created Left currents in a number of countries. In this connection I must say that a considerable number of our Sections have been destroyed by Fascist terror. Generally speaking, the Sections are very weak. They have few members, who however constitute a basis for their development into mass organisations.

There are already non-Party peasant functionaries in a number of countries, but org. work is still very weak and must be certainly strengthened.

In regard to our other achievements, we have succeeded in this period to create our scientific basis — the **International Agrarian Institute**. Its work is developing and the attention of all Communist Parties should be drawn to it. Our main weakness is mass work, and in this respect energetic measures will have to be taken. Hitherto no work was done among the **peasant youth**; this must also undergo a radical change.

In all its work the Peasant International must reckon with the concrete situation and above all with the partial demands of the various countries and regions.

It must adapt its methods and forms of work to the conditions of the respective countries or regions. For instance, no general plan of work can be drawn up in **Yugoslavia** because every region there requires a different plan of work.

In regard to the work of individual Communist Parties among the peasantry of their respective countries, I will deal only with a few Communist Parties and will mention certain facts which show how weak their agitation among the peasantry is. I will begin with **Poland**, i. e., with a country which was and is considered exemplary in regard to work in rural districts. There are defects in Poland which bear witness that even there everything is not as it should be. I must say that the inadequacy of this work in Poland is due to the fact that it takes the form of Agitprop activity instead of aiming at direct action. There is a tendency to curtail revolutionary slogans for the sake of practical aims. For instance the attempt to abandon the slogan "land for the peasants without compensation to landlords" and to replace it by the slogan "cheap land for the peasantry" and demand for "justice in regard to pasture land", etc.

Not enough attention has been paid to work in co-operatives, economic organisations, local government institutions. At election time no attempt was made to associate the interests of the urban proletariat with those of the peasantry. The Communist Party has hardly any influence among agricultural labourers who are the main basis for the development of our activity in rural districts. The lack of steady leadership in the work was very much felt. Moreover, the Communist fraction of the Peasant International failed to establish adequate contact with the movement.

All this shows that more attention should be paid to the work of the Communist Party of Poland in rural districts.

In regard to **Germany**, I have already shown that the Executive pays no attention to the peasant question. There were, moreover, election incidents to which we must also draw attention. I am of the opinion that even the slogan "Workers' and Peasants' Government" is brought forward by the Party as a kind of holiday slogan, instead of being adapted to existing conditions. There is much discontent among the peasantry including even Communist peasants. They were offended because peasant candidates were the last to be considered in the elections with the result that no peasants were elected. Peasant organisations were indignant at such a policy.

In **France** we have at last succeeded, after four years, to convince the French comrades that the Peasant Council must be transformed into a mass organisation. We hope that this will be done and that the French Communist Party will support us.

Although the agrarian bourgeoisie is in power in **Czechoslovakia**, the Communist Party there has not yet made an attempt to develop its work in rural districts in spite of a series of agreements with the Communist fraction of the Peasant International. I must say that a very peculiar notion of this work exists there in the Executive. During the conference one of the functionaries argued that he cannot work in rural districts because he is afraid of being accused of belonging to the opposition. Another comrade "explained" that the Party has not done any work in rural districts "because it had its hands full with Bolshevisation". In the regions of national minorities, particularly in **Carpathian Ukraine**, no regular work has been done as yet. But one cannot point out mistakes without mentioning also the positive sides of work. In one district we have formed unity committees which consist not only of Communists but also of members of the agrarian party, reformists and clericals. Leadership in these committees is in Communist hands. However, I must say that the peasants had to worry the Party a long time in regard to the formation of such committees before it made up its mind to do something. Nothing has as yet been done in this direction in other districts. Therefore we should not pay compliments to the Party, but must tell it to develop this work.

In regard to the situation in **Austria**, it is characteristic that in 1927 when the question of agrarian tariffs was discussed and mass demonstrations were taking place, the Central organ of the Communist Party, the "**Rote Fahne**", wrote about all sorts of matters but said hardly a word about the agrarian question. It published poems and doggeral rhymes from the Soviet press, but had no space for serious work among the peasants. We witness the same kind of thing once more in the "**Rote Fahne**" in connection with agricultural labourers' insurance. I must say that not only in Austria but in general, the Communist press pays very little attention to work in rural districts.

In **Roumania**, we witness a strong revolutionisation of the peasant masses and a considerable development of the peasant movement. This development has not set in suddenly, it has been gradual and mass meetings were its starting point. In March 1928, before the Congress in Karlsburg which was attended by over 150,000 peasants, a peasant meeting was organised in **Bukarest** which was attended by 60,000 peasants. But the Communist Party did not take any notice of all this, — it treats the peasant movement as not an affair of its own. Moreover, it is said now, when the National-Tsaranist Party is boycotting parliament and intends to convene its own parliament, that this is merely a struggle between two fractions of the bourgeois parties. This means that the mistake made in **Bulgaria** in 1923, is repeated now in Roumania. The Communist International should bring pressure to bear on the Communist Party of Roumania in regard to increased activity among the peasantry.

In **Yugoslavia** we witness a considerable development of the peasant movement, especially in the former Serbia. For the first time the movement there is assuming a mass character and is directed against the ruling bourgeoisie. Raditch and the Fascist bourgeoisie, Pribitschevitch and others make use of this movement because the work of the Communist Party is unsystematic and inadequate although a number of comrades are active in the peasant movement. Also here attempts were made to strengthen this work through the Communist fractions of the Peasant International. The Executive of the Communist Party should be certainly strengthened, — an agrarian commission ought to be organised so that we should not lag behind the Serbian "Zemlenarodniki" (farmers) and Raditch.

In **Greece**, the movement is in its initial stage. It is only lately that comrades there have begun to work with the support of the Peasant International. A certain amount of success has already been achieved and work on proper lines can lead to the organisation of a peasant league. As yet no regular work is carried on among the peasant refugees in **Macedonia**, and last year's and this year's refugees' Congress passed almost unnoticed by us. Neither have we been able to utilise properly the insurrection of the peasants in **Crete**.

The C. P. of **Bulgaria** is one of the Parties which kept up regular relations with the Peasant International and developed considerable activity among the peasants, but even there the Party adopted occasionally a commanding tone towards the peasant functionaries. At our peremptory demand the C. C. has put a stop to this. I think that we must insist that other Parties should also help us to remove all the defects of this work.

In regard to colonial and eastern countries we were confronted with two important tasks: 1) Establishing a connection with peasant organisations which adhere to the national movement and embrace a considerable number of peasants but are still under the influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalists. 2) Supporting Communist Parties in their work in rural districts, especially, where they have secured hegemony in the peasant movement, and participating in the elaboration of Comintern directions for these Communist Parties in regard to questions connected with the peasant movement.

In **Korea**, **India**, the **Philippines** and partly also in **Indonesia** considerable sections of peasants are still under the influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalists. In nearly all these countries we have succeeded in getting in touch with the local peasant organisations, securing there a certain basis and elaborating a plan of work for them. These organisations are still very weak and have a confused notion of the aims of the peasant struggle. Nevertheless a beginning has been made in these countries.

Matters are much worse in other colonial and semi-colonial countries, such as **Egypt**, **Persia** and **Turkey** where no peasant organisations exist and where the small Communist Parties are only just beginning to work among the peasantry. Moreover, the question of activity in these countries by the Peasant International has only been brought up lately.

In regard to **China**, the Peasant International occupies a peculiar position. The powerful peasant movement in this country is entirely under the ideological and organisational influence of the glorious Communist Party of China. Except as guerilla warfare, the peasant movement in China has been driven into ille-

gality till the ascent of a new revolutionary wave. Considering that a temporary stabilisation of the Kuomintang regime is not out of the question, the creation of legal forms for the struggle of the Chinese peasantry must be considered.

As to bringing forward detailed proposals to the Theses, the Communist fraction of the Peasant International will do so in writing. I must oft course say that we need all-round support of the Communist fraction of the Peasant International. We are grateful to Comrade Kolarov that he attacked the weakest point of our work, i. e., inadequate work among non-Party masses. It goes without saying that proper measures must be taken in this direction.

It would like to say in conclusion that at present, when the activity of the big peasantry and the influence of the Social Democrats as well as their work in the countryside are increasing, when fascism has to its credit in a number of countries a series of successes in rural districts, due mostly to tem-

porary objective conditions, but also to the fact that we have not yet learned to carry on practical work in the countryside because our leaders do not pay sufficient attention to it, when the bourgeoisie and landlords are becoming very active in their struggle for the peasantry, the Congress must consider very seriously our agrarian policy. Our resolutions are all right but our work has been inadequate. It is necessary to improve the work, especially as the danger of war against the Soviet Union is very real and as this danger is a determining factor in our whole work. The peasantry will play an important role in the coming war. That is why we are turning our attention to ways and means by which the further work of the Peasant International and its Sections can be developed, by which this International can be transformed into a mass organisation. For the same reason we draw the attention of all comrades to the necessity of reinforcing work among peasants, agricultural labourers, and particularly among the peasant youth. We hope that the Congress will stimulate this. (Applause.)

---

#### TO OUR READERS!

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

<i>England . . . . .</i>	<i>2 sh.</i>
<i>America . . . . .</i>	<i>50 cents</i>
<i>Germany . . . . .</i>	<i>1.50 marks</i>
<i>Austria . . . . .</i>	<i>2 schillings</i>
<i>Norway . . . . .</i>	<i>1.50 crowns</i>
<i>Sweden . . . . .</i>	<i>1.50 crowns</i>
<i>Denmark . . . . .</i>	<i>1.50 crowns</i>
<i>U. S. S. R. . . . .</i>	<i>1 rouble</i>

*For all other countries the subscription rate is 3 dollars for six months.*

*Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39 East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent.*