

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -
PRESS
CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8. No. 1

5th January 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.

C O N T E N T S

M. N. Roy: Imperialism and Indian Nationalism.

E. Yaroslavsky: For Bolshevik Unity, for Bolshevik Discipline.

Politics.

Sirola: Overthrow of the Social Democratic Government of Finland.

J. B.: Intensified Reaction in Palestine.

China.

Manifesto of the League against Imperialism against the Terror in China.

The Labour Movement.

Arvid Hansen: The Norwegian Trade Union Congress.

In the Soviet Union.

Yaroslavsky: Ten Years of the Cheka.

The White Terror.

A. G. Bosse: A New Sacco and Vanzetti Case.

Gorkitch: Torturing of Revolutionaries in Yugoslavian Prisons.

In the Camp of Social Democracy.

Wilhelm Koenen: An Anti-Bolshevist Centre of the Second International.

Muzzo: How the Social Democrats Betray the Workers in Indonesia.

The XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

N. Bukharin: The International Position and the Tasks of the Communist International (Conclusion).

Discussion on the Report of Comrade Bukharin: Speeches of Comrades Lozovsky, Schatzkin, Lominadse Manuilsky, Melnitchansky, Mif.

Comrade Bukharin's Speech in Reply to Discussion.

The Composition of the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U. Constitution of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U.

Imperialism and Indian Nationalism.

By **M. N. Roy (Moscow).**

The annual meeting of the Indian National Congress has passed a resolution declaring complete independence to be its ultimate aim. The practical significance of this resolution is not so great as it may appear on the face of it. Nevertheless, the fact remains that for the first time, since its foundation forty-two years ago, the National Congress has made such a declaration. It is to be read only as the weather signal. Even in the stormiest days of its existence, namely in 1920/22, when the country was in the throes of a powerful mass movement, the National Congress persistently refused to define its object as the attainment of complete independence. The most radical expression of its demand was the Gandhist formula, self-government "within the Empire if possible and without if necessary" to be attained by "all legitimate means", and the cult of Gandhism tabooed any action as "illegitimate" which did not comply with its strict dictum of non-violence. Later on, Das,

who replaced Gandhi as the leader of the National Congress, definitely defined Indian nationalist aspiration as "equal partnership within the British Empire". In doing so he made the theory that membership of a great federation of free nations was a higher ideal than the isolation of national independence. In view of the fact that the National Congress, in all essentials, still remains wedded to the social conservatism of Gandhi and the political reformism of Das, its declaration as regards independence has no practical value.

Although neither the National Congress nor any of the individual nationalist parties ever declared officially in favour of independence as its goal, there existed an under-current in that direction. This was among the petty bourgeois intelligentsia who, however, idealized Gandhi and Das and followed them, although these sternly disapproved of their sentimental extravagance as regards independence and romantic inclination to

wards futile terrorism. The demand for national independence was never given the form of a political programme by the petty bourgeois intelligentsia. It was not popularised among the masses to gain their support in the struggle for it. A programme of national revolution placed before the National Congress by the communists in 1922 and persistently propagated since then, won but partial approbation of the petty bourgeois nationalists. They sympathized with the demand for independence, but did not have the courage openly to press this demand upon the National Congress; for that would require revolt against their idols, Gandhi and Das. The necessity of armed struggle as the means to national independence, maintained in the programme propagated by the communists, also appealed to their imagination; but they did not agree with the communist exposition of the cult of non-violence as counter-revolutionary, believing in the superiority of the "spiritual culture" of India which was able to accomplish something different from the experience in the "materialist West". They did not understand that armed uprising must be connected with a revolutionary mass movement. As a matter of fact, they entirely disagreed with the communists as regards the social programme of the national revolution. Consequently their demand for independence never entered the realm of practical politics. It could be dealt with summarily by the bourgeois leaders in every annual meeting of the Congress behind the scene.

This year the bourgeois directors of the National Congress have allowed the chorus of petty bourgeois intelligentsia to sing out of tune. Considered as an act of the Congress, a feat of bourgeois nationalism, the resolution is a mere stage-show put up with the object of terrorising the imperialist rulers. Even as such it is naive; because imperialism cannot be terrorised so easily. A resolution was adopted declaring that independence is the ultimate goal of the National Congress; but not a word is said as regards how this goal will be reached and what will be the nature of the independent national state. Thus it is but an expression of wish. The bourgeois leaders made this much concession to their petty bourgeois followers, because the latter's services are needed in the constitutional game of boycott of the Royal Commission. The boycott will be a very poor show, if it is practised only by those who will be asked to appear before the Commission to express their views as regards the constitutional progress of India. The number of those directly concerned with the work of the Commission does not exceed a couple of thousand — the representatives of the landowning and capitalist classes. A considerable portion of these have declared against boycott. Some of those, who are now talking of boycott, will climb down eventually. So the prospect of boycott, as such, is not very bright. Imperialist rulers know it, and have taken a rather indifferent attitude towards the threatened boycott. For example, a few days before the National Congress formally passed the resolution to boycott the Royal Commission, the British governor of a province, addressing the provincial parliament, advised the nationalists to take a realist view of the situation and pointed out that the proposed boycott would not hinder the work of the Commission.

On the other hand, past experience leaves the nationalist masses very lukewarm about boycott. The fiasco of the Non-co-operation movement is still fresh in their memory. But to give the boycott the appearance of the expression of a national protest, it is necessary to secure at least some wordy demonstration of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia. Besides, if necessary, their services may be utilised to stir up the masses, but to sabotage the movement whenever it will threaten to exceed the desired limit, as was done in the previous occasion. By the resolution of the Madras Congress the bourgeois leaders recover the confidence of their petty bourgeois following, thus obstructing their deviation towards revolutionary alliance with the masses. At the same time, the petty bourgeois intelligentsia, thus saved from revolution, will lend some mass appearance to the boycott by their enthusiastic noisiness. The boycott, however, will fizzle out in a fiasco, as the Non-co-operation, unless it is used as the lever for developing a revolutionary mass struggle against imperialism; but this cannot be expected from the nationalist bourgeoisie, who are not serious even about the boycott.

By the insolent policy of imperialism the bourgeois nationalist parties are placed in a very uncomfortable situation. They must make a show of opposition in order to save their

face. Not only the big bourgeois parties of the right, but even the petty bourgeois Swaraj (Congress) Party during the last two years adjusted its activities to prepare "a favourable atmosphere" for the grant of a further instalment of reform by the early appointment of the Statutory Commission provided for in the Reform Act of 1919. The general policy of bourgeois nationalism was to hold up the olive branch expecting that imperialism would meet it half way. The revolutionary mass movement, which had lent such a potentiality to the boycott of the first reforms seven years ago, was destroyed by a consciously counter-revolutionary policy. Every form of revolutionary activity was discouraged and condemned. Mass agitation was replaced by parliamentary obstruction as the main method of nationalist struggle. Even parliamentary obstruction was gradually abandoned so as to create an atmosphere of peace and good-will. The revolutionary workers' and peasants' movement was denounced as "Bolshevik conspiracy". All these counter-revolutionary preparations were made on the speculation over a further instalment of reform which would save bourgeois nationalism from utter bankruptcy and give to the native bourgeoisie some political rights in addition to the considerable economic concessions already made. But they miscalculated the situation. The policy of imperialism is economic concession, but political suppression. Imperialism can afford to make some economic concessions to the Indian bourgeoisie (it is forced to do so by its internal crisis) only in case it maintains the monopoly of political power. Failure to understand this fundamental principle of imperialist policy created in the Indian bourgeois nationalist movement the illusion of "equal partnership inside the Empire". Now it has become brutally clear that the reformist programme of bourgeois nationalism is not realizable. The petty bourgeois Congress (formerly Swaraj) Party, which for several years veiled its programme of compromise with imperialist domination in return for some concessions to native capitalism, in parliamentary obstruction, stands exposed in its native impotence. The resolution of the Madras Congress is only a stratagem to hide this total political bankruptcy.

The crux of the situation lies elsewhere. It is to be found in the remarkable left-ward swing of the Trade Union Congress. This has also declared in favour of boycott. In view of the fact that the working class have no direct concern with the Royal Commission; since as a class their views will not be consulted, the decision of the Trade Union Congress has but one implication, namely, that the working class enter the struggle against imperialism as an independent political force. This gives the new boycott movement potentially much more a revolutionary significance than the previous, when the working class was used by the bourgeoisie as a pawn in the game, and was misled and betrayed by the reactionary petty bourgeoisie. When, six years back, the revolutionary upheaval of the workers' and peasants' masses made the nationalist movement a powerful challenge to imperialist domination and brought it nearly down (the bourgeois nationalist leaders themselves testify to this), there did not exist in the country a revolutionary political party to lead that upheaval. Today the situation has changed essentially, if not entirely. The appearance of the working class as an independent political factor in the present critical situation is due to the fact that they have found their own party which leads them for the promotion of their class interests. Apart from the Communist Party, which could develop but slowly owing to imperialist terror aided and abetted by the hatred and hostility of the nationalist bourgeoisie, there has come into existence the Workers' and Peasants' Party. The activities of the Workers' and Peasants' Party and the revolutionary consciousness created thereby among the masses have pushed the Trade Union Congress to the left and have contributed largely to the resolution of the Madras National Congress.

Nearly a year before the petty bourgeois left wing of the National Congress could have the courage to express its desire for independence, the Workers' and Peasants' Party had placed before the country a comprehensive programme of national revolution. Its representatives on the Congress Executive repeatedly brought this programme for adoption by the Congress, only to be rejected. It is again the Workers' and Peasants' Party and the Communists who from the very beginning pointed out the insufficiency of the slogan of boycott, and proposed that this negative slogan must be supplemented by positive demands. They have begun the agitation for the election of a Constituent

Assembly which should decide the political future of India. If the National Congress and the individual bourgeois parties accept this proposal, a very broad anti-imperialist front will be created and the boycott will not fizzle out as in the previous occasion, but will be the lever to develop a mighty mass movement to realise the desire expressed in the Madras Congress. But there is sufficient reason to doubt that the bourgeoisie will participate in such a revolutionary struggle. Even the petty bourgeois intelligentsia cannot be fully relied upon. Apart from the lessons of the past, the statements made by bourgeois nationalist leaders inside and outside the country warrant such doubt. For example, the Congress leader, Motilal Nehru (who, by the way, stayed away from this year's session obviously in order not to commit himself one way or the other) appeared before the General Council of the League against Imperialism held in Brussels on Dec., 9—11, to express bitter disappointment at the behaviour of the British Labour Party. But at the same time, to disassociate himself from any possible revolutionary significance of his action, he took great care to explain that he did not belong to that section of the Nationalist movement which desired separation from the British Empire. When at

the end of the same month, on the motion of his son, the National Congress declared independence as its goal, the old Nehru sat in England looking out for an opening to begin negotiation with Birkenhead with the object of tiding over the crisis. Whenever such an opening will be available he will tell British imperialism: "don't take the young chaps at home seriously, I will know how to manage them."

But the real struggle is not held up by the compromise-seeking bourgeois politicians. The workers have begun it. The **Municipal Workers' Union of Bombay** (where the Royal Commission will first touch Indian soil) has decided to strike on the day of the commission's arrival. The British authorities instantly challenged the legality of the strike, but in remarkable contrast to previous experience, the head of the Union, who belongs to the Workers' and Peasants' Party, declared that the workers would strike disregarding the threat of dismissal and prosecution. Very likely the harbour workers and eventually the railwaymen will follow the lead, beginning a real struggle in spite of the counter-revolutionary bourgeois nationalist parties.

For Bolshevik Unity, for Bolshevik Discipline.

By E. Yaroslavsky

On all questions the resolutions of the 15th Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. were adopted unanimously. This unanimity of an enormous Congress convened after two years of fierce struggle against the Opposition, two years of sharpest attacks on the Party, on its leadership, on its principles showed extraordinary Party solidarity and Leninist firmness. We had no doubt whatever but that the Opposition would make some manoeuvres or other both before and during the Congress. These manoeuvres were, as always, intended to confuse some of the Party members, to foster vacillations on the question of various determined measures in relation to the Opposition, the question of organisational conclusions in particular.

Precisely because the struggle was carried on by the Party on the basis of sound principles the ideological insolvency of the Opposition has become clear to the whole Party since the XV. Congress. This was the reason why the demand that the Opposition should completely disarm ideologically met with such unanimous support on the part of the whole Party. But the Opposition did its utmost to convince the Party that it must be completely disarmed not only ideologically but also organisationally. However, when it is a question of determined organisational deductions in relation to several scores or hundreds of Party members, who at times played an important role in the life of our Party and the Soviet Government in various periods of our history, — hesitation would be possible in any other Party, but not in Lenin's Party, not in the Bolshevik Party, resulting in a rotten compromise. Apparently, the Opposition looked forward to such a rotten compromise in making various statements every time the Party demanded a reply, which resulted in such declarations as that of October 16, 1926 and August 8, 1927.

Before arriving at such determined conclusions which the Party arrived at the XV. Congress in relation to the Opposition, the Party tried absolutely every other method of settling the question. What for instance, did the Party demand from the Opposition on the eve of November 7th? It merely demanded the preservation of Party discipline, abandonment of the idea of street anti-Party and anti-Soviet action, cessation of illegal meetings, renunciation of carrying the inner Party controversy outside of the Party. The Presidium of the C. C. C. asked the Opposition whether they agreed to submit to this Party demand or not. Yes, or no, was the question. Instead of giving direct answers the Opposition gave indirect answers twice, —

both times, as they themselves said, at the point of the revolver, i. e. when the Party threatened them with expulsion.

The anti-Party and anti-Soviet activities of the Opposition resulted in the fact that many of their prominent active leaders were found to be outside of the Party at the time of the XV. Congress. Their fate depended on their behaviour at the Congress. The Congress could not formulate any other demand from the Opposition but one, namely, their complete ideological and organisational disarmament. It was clear to the Opposition that this formula, given by Comrade Stalin in his report, was the demand of the whole Party. On December 3rd, the Opposition, aware of what the Party demanded, sent a statement to the Presidium of the XV. Congress which naturally could not satisfy the Congress. The special commission in charge of the Opposition affairs had at its disposal material which incontrovertibly bore out the fact that the Opposition created an apparatus of another Party. Instead of recognising this fact, instead of recognising the existence of the Trotzkyist central, regional, provincial and district committees, instead of dissolving them immediately, the Opposition tried to obscure this main fact by all kinds of reservations and to picture it as a comparatively innocent affair. The Opposition said:

"In the struggle for our views we have entered the path of factionalism, which sometimes assumed extremely acute forms and in several cases resorted to methods countering Party discipline."

As if the entire Opposition activity since the XIV. Congress was not pure mockery over Party discipline and was not directed towards the creation of a second Party! Instead of condemning openly and in a Bolshevik manner this anti-Party activity, the statement reads as if the Party is to blame for the fact that the Opposition selected this anti-Party path. The Party, you see, put "obstacles" in the way of the Opposition in advocating their anti-Party views; the Party advanced against the Opposition "accusations unbearable for Bolsheviks". At that moment, the Opposition still had the chance to take an open and sincere step towards condemning their whole anti-Party line and anti-Party activity, and those steps would perhaps have influenced the Congress to refrain from the determined organisational deductions which it drew later. Instead of doing that the Opposition declared:

"We cannot renounce our views in the correctness of which we are convinced and which have been outlined by us in our platform and theses to the Party!"

The Opposition reserved for themselves, the right:

"To defend our views within the strict limits of the statutes and decisions of the Party."

This, the Opposition said, was their "firm decision". But on what question did the Party vote at the numberless discussion meetings if not on the question as to whether it regards the Opposition views as Party views? Was it not on the question that the Opposition views should be rejected as anti-Leninist and anti-Party views that more than 99% of the Party membership voted during the pre-Congress discussion? The Congress had to give and did give a firm rebuff to the Opposition claims for further defense of their anti-Party, anti-Leninist and Menshevik views within the Party. No Party rule, as many Comrades correctly pointed out at the Congress, gives anyone the right to advocate Menshevik ideas in our Party. The Congress quite correctly evaluated the Opposition ideas on December 7th saying:

"The ideology of the Opposition, who formed an open alliance with the renegades of International Communism (Maslov, and others), has now taken the form of Menshevism in its peculiar Trotzkyist formulation."

The XV. Congress declared:

"Membership of the Trotzkyist Opposition and propagation of its views is incompatible with membership of the Bolshevik Party."

The question was formulated in such a categorically clear form that there was only one way out for those who wanted to remain in the Party, namely, the complete organisational and ideological disarmament. Any further evasions of that decision became simply intolerable for the Party.

On the 10th of December the Congress Commission in charge of Opposition affairs received two declarations, one signed by L. Kamenev, I. Bakhiev, I. Avdeyev and G. Avakimov. In the declaration, the ex-Party members said that they undertake "to comply with the decisions of the Congress prohibiting the propagation of our views", but at the same time the signatories of the statement considered it necessary to emphasise that they are convinced of the correctness of their principles. Of what principles do they speak? The principles of the Opposition were laid down in the statement of the 83, the statement of the 15 and the platform of September 3rd signed by 13. The same ex-members of the C.C. and the C.C.C., L. Kamenev, I. Bakhiev, I. Avdeyev, G. Avakimov, said at one time that the platform of the 83 and the platform of the 13 contain a systematic outline of their principles. Can anyone imagine anything more unnatural than their statement that they considered the views outlined in these platforms absolutely correct, that they are "convinced" of their correctness, and their simultaneous statement that they undertake "to comply with the decisions of the Congress prohibiting the propagation" of these views? What the Party wants to know is whether they recognise the Party decisions as correct and not as to whether they agree to refrain from advocating Menshevik ideas in the Party. Can people who pretend to be Party leaders imagine that they can honestly carry out decisions of the Congress of the incorrectness of which they are convinced and keep to themselves their own views in the correctness of which they are more firmly convinced? It was clear to the Congress Commission and to the Congress that such a statement does not and cannot satisfy the Party. The Congress had even more reasons to ignore another statement signed by N. Muralov, C. Rakovski, and K. Radek. Anyone can see that that statement contains a direct declaration of war on the Party.

The Trotzkyists declare that they will continue to advocate their Menshevik views within the Party. The Party cannot allow anyone such a thing. That is why the Congress Commission in charge of Opposition affairs proposed to the Congress to expel from the Party the active leaders of the Trotzkyist Opposition, who signed the statement of the 121 (some of them were expelled from the Party before the Congress) and also to expel the Saponov group as avowed anti-revolutionaries. The Congress adopted this resolution unanimously.

Kamenev declared at the session of the Commission that such a decision is a blow to the Party and the international movement and that he and his comrades would appeal to the Congress against the decision. Rakovsky seconded that statement. The submission of two statements, one signed by "pure" Trotzkyists and the other by Trotzkyist adherents since the XIV Congress, showed that a "breach", which the heads of the Opposition carefully tried to conceal, proved sufficiently wide to make its concealment impossible. The clear formulation of the question at the Congress, the unanimous rebuff which the entire Party gave the Opposition raised before the Oppositionists the question: what next?

The Opposition leaders tried in every possible way at the beginning to prevent individual Opposition members or groups from taking firm steps towards breaking with the Opposition and towards its complete liquidation. The Safarovs, Tarakhanovs and others tried to persuade the vacillators to refrain from completely liquidating the faction: it may come in handy. The statements which the Opposition made on December 10th, both the one and the other, were intended to shake the public opinion of the Party. Their intention was to show the Party that they go a great distance, even to the extent of "renouncing" the right to advocate their views which they consider correct. If Kamenev and the others had declared at the Commission session that they condemned the views outlined in their platform, that they submit to the Congress decisions concerning their complete ideological and organisational disarmament, the Congress decision might still have been different.

However, when Comrade Ordzhonikidze reported about the Commission's decision, neither Kamenev nor Bakhiev nor the other signatories of the statement of December 10th nor those who solidarised with it spoke at the Congress, although they had a full opportunity to do so and although they said at the Commission that they will "appeal to the Congress" against the ruinous decision.

Smilga took the floor, reading a statement signed by Rakovsky, Smilga, Muralov and Radek. Smilga declared the views, condemned by the Party as Menshevik, as "Bolshevik and Leninist" views.

Smilga said that they cannot renounce their views because the trend of events proves their correctness.

That statement contains a thesis which differs in no way from the Saponov thesis that the Party is perpetrating a coup d'etat, that the expulsion of the Oppositionists from the Party "turns the Party policy to the Right, strengthens the classes and groups within the country hostile to the proletariat and intensifies imperialist pressure from without" (!).

Whereas the unanimous Party decision condemns the Opposition, whereas about 100,000 workers are joining the Party in reply to the slanderous statements of the Trotzkyist Opposition, Smilga had the "courage" to declare at the Congress that the voice of the Bolshevik workers "corresponds with our voice"!

There was nothing left for the Party to do but confirm the decision of the Commission in charge of the Opposition affairs to expel both the Trotzkyist and Saponov Opposition from the Party. And when that decision had already been made, where through the radio, the Opposition made a belated statement signed by 23 that they undertake "to comply with the demands of the Congress to disarm ideologically and organisationally", that they regard the views which they advocated in the course of 2 years as "wrong" and condemned them, in harmony with the resolution of the Congress, as anti-Leninist.

They condemned rather late that which they should have condemned when the question of their fate was being decided.

The Congress gave a severe and just reply to that statement. It decided not to consider it, "in view of the fact that the XV Party Congress has already settled the Opposition question in the resolution of December 18th". The Congress applauded Comrade Rykov's statement concerning the motives guiding the Presidium in making that proposal to the Congress.

The entire Party appraises this firm Bolshevik decision at its true value. Every Party member will understand that the

Party is not inclined to treat as a joke attempts to shatter the unity of the Party, that it will not allow anyone to make such attempts. Every Party member will understand that the Party decisions must be respected and that the Party must be held dear. The Party cannot change its decisions every day. It has been too indulgent in the past to make any compromise or any concessions today.

Of course many expelled members sincerely confess the tremendous harm they brought to the Party by their activities, and their expulsion will affect them very badly. The Party does not close the doors to those who sincerely and thoroughly recognise their mistakes. The Congress authorised the C. C. and the C. C. C. "to take all measures of ideological persuasion of the rank and file members of the Trotskyist Opposition with the object of convincing them." Many facts go to show that this will enable those who sincerely and thoroughly break with the Opposition to return to the Party.

Before the statement of the 23 was submitted the Congress received a statement from Ekaterina Federova who took part for over two years in the work of the Trotskyist Opposition and in the work of the underground printing establishment "on the 20 Verst Station". That Comrade said on the 16th of December that she regards as correct the decisions of the XV Congress condemning the action of the Opposition and declaring its views incompatible with membership in the C. P. S. U. Despite the leaders of the Trotskyist Opposition, and against their wishes, that Comrade broke with them, giving no consideration to personal connections, and returned to the Party. We are convinced that the rank and file members of the Party not sophisticated in the fine art of factional struggle will find the right path leading them back to the Party.

However, it would be absolutely wrong to be hasty in reinstating all expelled members. Every Party organisation must be very careful as to those whom it reinstates. The Congress put forward the demand in relation to the most active leaders of the former Opposition that their individual applications should be carefully tested as to their sincerity at least for a period of six months. The test must be put from the point of view as to whether they really carry out the pledges they have taken and whether they really carry out the pledges they have taken and The Congress passed also a separate resolution stating that anyone who will refuse to give sincere replies to questions asked by the leading Party organs concerning their activity or the activity of the people or groups they know, cannot belong to our Party. In dealing with questions on the Opposition we often heard statements from the Oppositionists that one question or another raised by the Party was unnecessary and impossible to answer. The Party declared such a state of affairs absolutely intolerable.

The Party decisions on the Opposition, which were unanimously adopted, mean that the Party overcame a great obstacle which interfered in its harmonious work. Its central institutions, as well as the whole Party (Comrade Rykov said this in his closing speech), will from now on not devote one hundredth of the time it did hitherto to the Opposition. The decisions of the Congress on the Opposition show a maximum strengthening of Bolshevik unity and Party discipline. The Party will be able to overcome the internal difficulties and the efforts of the imperialist robbers who are ready to crush the Soviet Union only thanks to such unity of its ranks, only thanks to the unshakable iron firmness and Bolshevik discipline. Therein lies the great significance of the decision of the XV Congress on the Opposition, who have become ideologically bankrupt not only in the eyes of the Party and the Comintern but also in the eyes of the broad toiling masses.

POLITICS

Overthrow of the Social Democratic Government of Finland.

By Yrjö Sirola.

When, last year, the Government of the "National Collective Party" (i. e. the monarchists) in common with the Peasant League (the bourgeois Large Peasant Party) received a vote of censure because the "Swedish Party" voted in conformity

with the Social Democrats with regard to the question of a reduction of the corn-tax, it was not yet clear whether Finland's White bourgeoisie was inclined to try the experiment of a social democratic government.

Neither was it certain whether the social democrats would have the audacity to take over the government in White Finland. The Right leaders of the party had indeed given clear expression to their readiness to enter into a coalition, the "Left" leaders however, who form the majority of the party executive, had made certain conditions on which they were prepared to join in the government, in order that this step might not be too much exposed in the eyes of the workers. Anyone might then suppose that the absence of the most important democratic preliminary conditions in the country were the greatest obstacle preventing the social democrats from joining the Government, a fact which was, as a matter of fact, hinted at by the social democrats in laying down their conditions. The White Terror still existed. The Fascist defence corps with its 100,000 members — that class guard of the bourgeoisie and large peasantry — was still officially recognised, was subsidised by the State and was terrorising the country. The political police, called the "Ochraņa", was incessantly at work. Hundreds of political prisoners from the days of civil war or detained on the accusation of "preparations for fresh riots" were still languishing in the prisons.

The Social Democrats however abandoned their own doubts, and a Social Democratic Government was bestowed on Finland. It was received by the members of the bourgeoisie with distrustful loyalty. The "Collective Party", it is true, occasionally made interpellations directed against the Government and accused it of sweethearting with the Communists — although the Communist Party was compelled to remain illegal during the whole period of the Social Democratic Government! The verdict prohibiting the "Socialist Labour Party" has not yet been rescinded. At that time, the same social democratic leaders who had kept aloof on the occasion of the revolution in 1918 or had even shown their hostility towards it although the revolution was officially organised by their own party, represented the party in the Government. The White Terror made it possible for them to take possession of the central organ of the party in Helsingfors and to get at the helm of the labour movement which was rising anew.

As a matter of fact, the reins of the trade union movement, which is even to-day outside the Amsterdam International, soon slipped out of their hands, but they remained in the possession of a huge part of the property and of the institutions of the working class.

For all that, the Social Democrats declared that their first administrative measure in the Government would be to throw light on the questions of the "Ochraņa", the defence corps, and of the political prisoners. They have been members of the government for a year, and what have they achieved? One of their first measures was that of expressing their thanks to the defence corps for "good services to the country". Some time after that, Tanner, Minister of State, and Heinonen, Minister of War, had the insolence to hold the review of the defence corps on May 16th — the day when General Mannersheim, the hangman of the workers, entered Helsingfors. The indignation of the workers was such that the social democratic Press did everything in its power to rid the party of the responsibility and, in autumn, the subsidy for the defence corps was struck off the Budget by the Government. But it did not really mean it, for the Social Democratic Government did not consider it a reason for going out of office when a section of the defensive troops was officially recognised and therefore received their pay from the public exchequer. Several social democratic speakers even expressed their sympathy with the defence corps.

The cause of the political prisoners was settled by a contemptible amnesty, restoring to a section of the workers the "civic rights" which would have been restored to them even without amnesty.

The Social Democratic Government crowned its activity by acting openly as a police government. Its "Ochraņa" caused several workers to be thrown into prison on the grounds of an accusation of their being members of the illegal Commu-

nist Party and of an accusation of "espionage", as the work of enlightenment among the army was termed. On the occasion of the arrests, the political police, with the consent of the Minister for Home Affairs, issued a communique stating that "the agitation and secret activities of the Communist Party had assumed more secret forms and a higher degree of development in the past few years", but that "the authorities were full of hope that they would be able to keep them under their control and check them in the future as they had always done".

When the representatives of the "socialist workers and petty peasants" attacked the Ochrana budget in Parliament, U. Puro, the social democratic minister for home affairs, pleaded the cause of his "Ochrana" with much warmth.

In the field of social politics, the Government rendered the bourgeoisie services which a bourgeois government could hardly have rendered them. It settled strikes and conflicts to the disadvantage of the workers and did not prevent the capitalists in metal industry from continuing the lockout of 10,000 workers which they had been keeping up for more than six months. It agreed to the infringement of the eight hour day just as the bourgeois government had done.

In the questions of taxation, it proposed a certain number of insignificant reforms but was prepared to content itself with a few meagre compromises. In the winter of 1926, its initiative made it possible for the capitalists to garner in profits amounting to many millions owing to the increase of value of the shares. It did not do anything for the small peasant farms.

In Finland's foreign policy, England's influence is very palpable. Articles in British financial papers and informations given in Parliament are evidence of the interest British imperialism takes in Finland. English experts took a share in the reorganisation of the army, the navy and the fortifications of Finland. In England's interest, Finland is fostering plans of alliance between the Baltic States directed against the Soviet Union and is trying to get on friendly terms with Scandinavia. Weighty forces are at work in order to rouse Sweden's interest in the plan of joining in the "defence" of Finland, Swedish militarists maintain that Finland was needing the help of two divisions and of the Swedish navy in order to offer resistance to Leningrad.

In the League of Nations, Finnish Social Democracy rendered important services to the imperialists. It took the initiative in the question of "financial guarantees" for any State "which were to be attacked". In autumn, Finland received a seat in the League of Nations' Council as a reward for her good services, a measure which was so obviously directed against the Soviet Union that even several bourgeois papers in Finland expressed scruples.

Formerly, Finland is asseverating her "neutrality" and her earnest wish for maintaining peace with the Soviet Union; in an interview with a German journalist however, Tanner, Minister of State, insinuated some time ago, that times might come in which it would prove "necessary to defend that neutrality by force of arms". The social democratic Press is agitating against the Soviet Union with the use of the most filthy lies of international social democracy, proclaiming that, if the Bolsheviks are "provoking war against themselves", there was no reason why the workers should defend them. The Social Democratic Government sabotaged the negotiations which were carried on with the object of making a guarantee pact with the Soviet Union. Of course it had nothing to say against it "on principle", it merely pretended that there were "difficulties" in the way.

Finland's White Social Democracy rendered capitalism most valuable counter-revolutionary services in the field of foreign policy. In view of the fact that a social democratic government existed and was actually at work, it tried to make the impression as though Finland were a "democratic" and "progressive" Republic and not the country of the White Terror. This is evident, among other things, from an article in the "Hufvudstadsbladet" (a reactionary newspaper published in Helsingfors) of December 11th 1927, from which we extract the following passage:

"When we are now looking back on the social democratic regime of the past year, the question seems justified as to whether there is anyone who is earnestly of the opinion that it would have been better not to make that experiment."

The 2nd International is thus in a position to add a fresh, black page to its historical collection of social democratic governments. One of its parties has ruled for a year in a country in which the White Terror holds sway, ruling it with the help of the Fascists and of the political police and to the full satisfaction of the bourgeoisie and of international imperialism. It is yielding its place to a Right government which is considering it its first and foremost task to shatter the class conscious labour movement.

The Communist Party of Finland characterised the Social Democratic Government, at the very beginning, as a White government and showed that its coming into being could only be explained by the preparations for war against the Soviet Union. It was necessary for that purpose to smarten White Finland up a bit and to try to achieve her international consolidation with the help of a social democratic government. The intention was at the same time to convince the White bourgeoisie of the trustworthiness of the social democratic leaders. The trustworthiness of the Social Democrats was indeed fully confirmed, the "international consolidation" however is still in a sad plight.

And now — the Moor is dismissed. He received the thanks of the bourgeoisie which were his due and the promise that it will not fail to remember him should he be wanted again. In the meantime, Social Democracy will, in "loyal opposition" strain every nerve to gain once more the confidence of the workers. It is still in a position to deceive the semi-proletarians in the country and the petty bourgeois elements among the working class. The proletariat, however, is detaching itself in ever increasing numbers from Social Democracy. The time of its rule has greatly helped to accelerate that process.

Intensified Reaction in Palestine.

By J. B., Jerusalem.)

All the hopes entertained by the Zionist Labour Party of Palestine of an alleviation of the catastrophic unemployment of August, 1927, have proved to be vain. The Zionist Congress of August, of which money and remedy were expected, did nothing but establish the utter bankruptcy of the Zionist plans and cause the formation of a new Executive which is practically saddled with the liquidation of the former Zionist concerns, or, at least, with their "rationalisation" and "restoration". The only solution found for unemployment by this new executive was: Suspension of the unemployment support in order to speed up the emigration of the unemployed. It was only after a mass demonstration of the workers that the further payment of the minimal unemployment support, at least for the time being, could be secured. But unemployment is not decreasing; on the contrary, it is increasing, for a portion of the public utility work which was begun in summer has already come to an end.

The unemployment gives the employers the possibility of making working conditions worse and worse. In the municipal enterprises and workshops, as also in the plantation colonies, labour is now cheaper than ever, while working hours are longer and exploitation is increasing.

This deterioration of the working class is naturally accompanied, apart from the fact that it feeds the steadily swelling stream of emigration from Palestine, by a growth of revolutionary feeling among the workers. The utter vanity of the hopes they based on Zionist help is becoming clear to the workers (it is further illustrated by the cynical attitude of the rich Zionist colonists in the country itself, who exploit the unemployment in order to extort greater profits out of the workers and who do nothing to alleviate unemployment). They

are contig to understand how utopian it is to believe British promises, how criminal were the tactics of their leaders, who placed them under the British-Zionist yoke and how necessary it finally is to take up an oppositional attitude towards British imperialism. At the same time, a growth of class-consciousness among the Arab workers is also observable; workers' unions have been formed in Jaffa, Jerusalem and Haifa; strike movements of Arab workers are breaking out on account of excessive exploitation (Nazareth); every encroachment on the part of the employers meets with protest and resistance.

The growth of these feelings appears so menacing to the British Government that it is exerting all its power to stifle the revolutionary labour movement. The reactionary course of the British Government in Palestine is directed principally against the vanguard of the revolutionary labour movement, the **Communists**. The British police have orders to "settle" the Communists radically and finally, and they are saving neither trouble nor money in carrying out their instructions.

In the course of the last two months, no fewer than **nine clubs** suspected of Communism have been either closed or prohibited. Among these were the clubs of the "Unity" movement, which was working for trade-union unity nationally and internationally, and has made considerable progress in this direction. Arrests and house searching are an everyday fighting method against Communists, whether they are juridically justified or only arbitrary acts.

The Courts support the work of the police by passing the severest sentences upon the Communists who appear before them. In this regard, an important role is played by the tendency to sentence Communists to deportation. They are then handed over defenceless to the police, who may do with them what they think fit. Not only the adherents of the Communist Party and of the Young Communist League but also the members of the non-party organisations, such as "Labour Fraction" (trade-union opposition) and "Red Aid" are being prosecuted most rigorously.

In addition, freedom of speech has been completely abolished. Brochures containing revolutionary ideas are confiscated, although there is no official preliminary censorship. The importation of Communist newspapers is strictly prohibited (recently the "Pravda" and the "Isvestija" have been forbidden). The Palestine Government is doing its best to rival countries of Fascist Terror in the matter of Communist persecutions.

The Zionist bourgeoisie (as also the Arabian reactionary elements who have recently advocated a policy of compromise with the British mandatory government) welcome the policy of reprisal against the Communists and are in favour of still more severe persecutions. The reformists of all shades, although at the last conference of the "Histadruth" they adopted a formal protest against the reactionary persecutions, prefer to devote their columns to the protection of persecuted counter-revolutionaries in the Soviet Union. It is characteristic that the chief newspaper of the "Histadruth", the "Davar", most willingly accepts communications from the police, while, on the other hand, it systematically boycotts information from "Red Aid".

The workers themselves, however, react in a different manner to the intensified reaction: a number of actions have recently given expression to the enhanced sympathy for Communism and for the Soviet Union. The dispatch of a workers' delegation to the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Soviet Union deserves special mention. In spite of the lively opposition of the reformists, thousands of Jewish and Arab workers participated in the election of the delegation. November 7th was marked by imposing celebrations or demonstrations in all the towns throughout the country. The revolutionary organisations are growing in number and significance, even though they are illegal. All this goes to prove that the British Government will not find the fight against the revolutionary movement in the country an easy one.

CHINA

Manifesto of the League against Imperialism against the Terror in China.

To the Workers and the Oppressed Nations of the World.

Foreign imperialism and native reaction have set up a reign of terror in China. The hatred of the workers' and peasants' movement, which alone remained true to the cause of national liberty after the treachery of the Kuo-Min-Tang, reached its height in the massacre of Canton. The sanguinary ferocity, with which the workers and peasants were slaughtered in Canton by the mercenary army of the feudal-bourgeois reactionaries, is without parallel. It was a cruel massacre in the worst sense of the word. Besides the workers and peasants killed in the fights, more than 5000 persons were arrested as Communists and were straightway shot, hanged, or beheaded in the streets, where their dead bodies lay for several days. A large part of the city is wholly destroyed.

And why this fearful drama of death and destruction? Because the army of peasants and workers, after making such heroic efforts to save the national cause from the treachery of the bourgeoisie, had occupied Canton and had set up a Government there under the slogan of "Land for the peasants and bread for the workers!" This could naturally not be tolerated by the foreign imperialists and the native exploiters, who are equally interested in keeping the Chinese masses in a condition of absolute slavery.

When the Chinese bourgeoisie was fighting against the imperialists, the proletarian masses of peasants enthusiastically rallied round the banner of the Kuo-Min-Tang. Without the support of the working classes, the nationalist Government of Canton could not maintain its position against the imperialist intrigues and armed intervention emanating from Hong-Kong. The Shanghai proletariat had acted ever since May 30th, 1925, as the courageous vanguard of the national revolution. In consequence of the revolutionary action of the Hankow workers, agreements were brought about between the British imperialists and the nationalist Government in regard to the surrender of the concessions at Hankow and Kioukiang. The enthusiastic help of the peasantry made it possible for the nationalist army to defeat the feudal militarists of the North in the Yangtse valley although the latter were most liberally assisted by the imperialists.

The working class fought and sacrificed itself for the revolution in the hope of being liberated from its thereby. The peasants demanded land; the Kuo-Min-Tang promised it them. The proletariat demanded an improvement of its economic position; the Kuo-Min-Tang promised it them. Thus a united nationalist front was formed, which threatened to sweep the imperialists out of China. The national revolution advanced from one victory to another. In the ten provinces surrounding the economic centre of the country, the nationalist authority was established. The peasants and workers demanded the practical application of the programme of the national revolution. They demanded the abolition of feudalism; they demanded wages sufficient to live on and supportable working conditions; they demanded the taxation of the rich to alleviate the situation of the working masses; they demanded the democratisation of the nationalist State; they demanded a control over the power of the generals as a guarantee against military dictatorship; and above all they demanded an inexorable fight against the imperialists.

The national bourgeoisie would fulfil none of these demands. It was encouraged in its refusal by the imperialists, who expressed their willingness to come to an understanding with a nationalist Government that should be free of "Red influence". That is to say, the imperialists intimated to the Chinese bourgeoisie that they would find a way of agreeing with one another, provided the bourgeoisie abandoned the path of revolution and suppressed the movement of the proletariat and peasantry.

By a combination of this form of corruption with a powerful demonstration of authority, the imperialists drove the first wedge into the nationalist ranks. The feudal and bourgeois elements of the Kuo-Min-Tang headed by Chiang-Kai-Shek, broke up the nationalist united front under the pretext of anti-Communist tendencies. But the imperialists were not yet satisfied. They permitted the renegade nationalist leaders to occupy Shanghai on the condition that they suppressed the proletariat in that place and thus secured the economic capital of China for imperialist exploitation. So as to show that they had completely betrayed the nationalist revolution, Chiang-Kai-Shek and his feudal generals celebrated the nationalist occupation of Shanghai by massacring the workers who for three years had upheld the banner of anti-imperialism. A reign of terror was set on foot in the centres of the Chinese revolution. The trade unions and the democratic organisations were arbitrarily dissolved. The imperialist capital invested in the cotton factories of Shanghai was accorded a full guarantee in relation to the proletariat. The nationalist bourgeoisie became a tool of imperialist exploitation.

Nevertheless, the working class continued to support that section of the Kuo-Min-Tang which had remained faithful to the national revolution, and demanded the continuation of the fight against imperialism, which was connected with the fight against the national reaction, since the latter served as a sort of social basis for imperialist operations.

The national revolution must be a democratic revolution. It must solve the agrarian problem, which affects 85 per cent. of the population of the country and the main industry of China. A peasant revolution will undermine the foundations of imperialism, but at the same time it will destroy the power and the privileged position of the reactionary landowners, usurers, dealers, and a whole number of other parasitic social elements connected with the system of imperialist exploitation of the Chinese masses. The coincidence of the interests of foreign imperialism and the native class of exploiters has become manifest and the two have combined to face the working class, which is the backbone of the revolution.

In such a position the working class has resolved to defend the revolution which was betrayed by the bourgeoisie and to continue the fight against the combined counter-revolutionary front of foreign imperialism and native reaction. When the renegade nationalist Government and the nationalist army gave up the fight against the imperialists and started a ferocious attack on the workers and peasants, the latter were forced to arm themselves and to take up the fight for power. This civil war which was begun by the landowners and the bourgeoisie, has been in progress ever since July and has destroyed untold thousands of workers and peasants.

Without the active assistance of the imperialists the native reaction would never have been able to resist this rising flood of revolution. The peasants and workers had literally to fight without arms, having no connection with the outer world since all the harbours were controlled by the imperialists. As soon as, two months ago, the revolutionary army entered the port of Swatow, imperialist men-of-war appeared on the scene to frustrate the formation of any international connections. The revolutionary army evacuated Swatow under the threat of imperialist intervention, though without having been defeated by the Chinese counter-revolutionary troops.

The counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and its generals, on the other hand, are liberally supplied with money and arms from harbours which are controlled by the imperialist Powers. A considerable part of the city of Canton has been destroyed by the counter-revolutionary army, which bombarded it with heavy guns. The South Chinese armies never possessed any such great guns as are used by the imperialist Powers. The source from which these guns were procured is only too obvious. It was the imperialists that supplied them. As long as the South Chinese army was fighting for national liberty, it was blockaded by imperialism. Now, when the South Chinese army started fighting against the revolution, it began to receive moral support and material assistance from the imperialists.

The bombardment of Canton really took place under the protection of the imperialist cannon, which were transported by ship and erected by Americans on the very day on which Canton

was taken by the revolutionary armies. The British police handed over to the bloodthirsty hangmen of the counter-revolution hundreds of workers who had sought refuge in the international settlement. Revolutionaries fleeing from the terror were arrested at Hankow and sent back to Canton. Chinese revolutionaries and Russian citizens were arrested in the French concession in Hankow and handed over to the enemy.

The Canton massacre was followed by similar sanguinary actions in other cities. Terror reigns in all the regions which a year ago were occupied by the nationalist armies with the aid of the workers and peasants. The rôle of imperialism is clearly outlined by this sanguinary drama in China. If the masses of workers and peasants in China are successful in their revolutionary fight, imperialist exploitation will come to an end. Therefore the imperialists must get the better of the fight put up by the Chinese workers and peasants for bread, land, and freedom.

The violent attack on the Soviet Consulate and on Soviet citizens fully characterises the situation. The sinister hand of imperialism is visible behind this unparalleled act of violation. The Chinese counter-revolutionaries would not proceed thus against the only foreign Government whose sympathy and friendship for the Chinese people have been so apparent, if they were not urged and encouraged by the imperialist Powers. The imperialists and their agents in China are indeed obsessed by blind fury.

To arrest the sanguinary counter-revolution in China is the duty of the working masses of the oppressed nations and the duty of all friends of liberty the world over. If it were possible to prevent the imperialists from interfering with Chinese affairs, the Chinese working class would soon frustrate the efforts of the renegade bourgeoisie at suppressing the revolution.

It is for the working masses in the imperialist countries to demand the cessation of interference with the internal affairs of China, when that country is engaged in working out its own destiny. The working masses and suppressed peoples of all countries must condemn the Chinese bourgeoisie, the so-called nationalist Governments, and the Kuo-Min-Tang as traitors to the cause of national emancipation and as agents of imperialism. The peasants and workers of China, their revolutionary movement, their army, their economic and political demands, must be accorded the fullest measure of support on the part of all that are opposed to imperialist oppression.

Down with the counter-revolutionary terror in China!

Down with imperialism and its agents!

Down with the hangmen of the Chinese revolution!

Long live the Chinese workers and peasants and their heroic fight for freedom!

The Executive Committee
of the
League against Imperialism.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Norwegian Trade Union Congress.

By Arvid Hansen (Oslo).

Between December 4th and 14th, 1927, the 12th Congress of the Norwegian Trade Union Federation met at Oslo. It was summoned by the reformist leaders for the purpose of ensuring the return of the Trade Union Federation to the fold of the Amsterdam International. In this matter, however, the leaders were obliged to capitulate even before the commencement of the Congress which then turned their retreat into a pronounced defeat. The Norwegian trade unions will not go to Amsterdam. Norway can no longer be used as a trump card against the Soviet Union and against the Red International of Labour Unions. That has been clearly and unmistakably demonstrated by the Congress.

More than ever before, the peculiarities of the Norwegian labour movement became apparent at this Congress. The Com-

munists were naturally in the minority, having sent 51 out of 224 delegates. The most vehement fighting, however, was witnessed between the Right and the Left wing of the Norwegian Labour Party. In the most important party-political questions — recognition of the organisatory fusion between the Tranmaelites and the Social Democrats as a political class formation — the two wings of the Labour Party formed a bloc against the Communists. In the most prominent trade union questions, again, there was a bloc of the Communists with the Left wing of the Labour Party against the Right wing. In these main questions the victory was gained by the Left Bloc, in the most important instance i. e. the question of international connections, by 152 votes against 84. At the election of the new leaders of the Trade Union Federation, however, the Right wing, the capitulating adherents of Amsterdam, were victorious.

There were various other characteristic traits of this Congress. One member of the Labour Party, e. g., suggested an official invitation of the Communist Party to the Congress, a suggestion which was accepted by a great majority. Among the four chairmen of the Congress there was one Communist and among the four secretaries two. Communists were elected onto all Commissions. The new Board will comprise two Communists, instead of one, as hitherto. Of the seven members of the new Organisation Committee of the Trade Union Federation, two are Communists.

A further example. On the tenth anniversary of the "independence" of Finland, the heroic fighters of the Finnish revolution were lauded in speeches and telegrams on the part of the Congress, 20,000 crowns being granted the striking Finnish metal-workers on the departure of the Finnish delegate.

A third example. The trade union leaders had refused the motion of the Communists to treat the question of unemployment as a separate item on the agenda. The Congress, however, passed this motion by a great majority.

A fourth example. The Congress resolved by a great majority to deprive the leaders of their votes at conferences save in the case of such leaders as are entrusted by the organisations with a mandate for the Congress.

Yet another instance. The Congress received and heartily welcomed a deputation from the Conference of the Red Aid.

A sixth instance. The Congress declared against the policy of capitalist stabilisation.

A seventh and last example. The Congress supported the resolutions of the World Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union, condemned the policy of the imperialist Governments, and called upon all true friends of peace to defend the Soviet Union against all imperialist attacks.

The Communist Party of Norway achieved a considerable victory at this Congress. This finds expression not only in the above-mentioned examples but before all in the resolutions of the Congress in regard to trade union tactics and the question of international connections. These resolutions are to some extent also of international importance. We shall therefore go into somewhat closer details in regard to their material contents and to the presumable consequences of these main resolutions of the Congress.

In the matter of the trade union tactics. The Congress established that the leaders should only raise demands and execute tactics in unison with the members. The Communist suggestion with reference to trade union programmes is to be taken into consideration by the leaders in connection with tariff arrangements. The trade unions must use their utmost endeavours to resist any attempt on the part of the capitalist classes at stabilising capitalist exploitation. The attitude of the trade union federation in the matter of the penetration of foreign trust capital and in regard to the rationalisation attempts is to be subjected to an examination by a special commission of the trade union federation, the suggestions of which commission are to be submitted to the affiliated organisations for treatment.

The formulation of these resolutions was the outcome of a compromise between the Communists and the Left Tranmaelites. It will be for the Communists to see that the resolution is carried out in a revolutionary sense.

In the same connection it should be mentioned that the Congress categorically condemned the existing anti-trade union

laws (compulsory arbitration and so-called prison law in defense of strike-breakers) and recommended the acceptance by the Congress of the Communist motions against blacklegs.

In the matter of international connections. The Congress rejected the Amsterdam policy in international questions, advocating the fusion of the international Federation of Trade Unions and the Red International of Labour Unions in the form of a common world organisation, as also reciprocity agreements with the trade union federations in Denmark, Sweden, Finland, the Soviet Union, and other countries. The various professional unions are called upon to do likewise. Various reciprocity agreements between professional unions of Norway and the Soviet Union, respectively, have already been concluded. The Norwegian trade union federation is to invite the trade union federations of Finland and the Soviet Union to a common conference for the purpose of discussing the settlement of reciprocity agreements and methods of united activity on an international scale. This conference is to take place in the very near future.

The trade union leaders have elected a permanent international committee with Tranmael as its chairman and Madsen as its secretary. One of the five members of this committee is Volan, a member of the Communist secretariat.

The entire resolution is a remarkable defeat of Amsterdam and an important step forward for the international efforts towards unity on the part of the Red International of Labour Unions and the trade unions of the Soviet Union. The presence of the trade union delegates of the Soviet Union at the Congress very naturally contributed to this favourable result. But most essentially it was an outcome of indignation on the part of the members of the trade unions at the weak reformist policy of the last few years.

At the new election of the leaders, the failure of the vacillating centrist policy of Tranmael was only too apparent. Neither before nor during the Congress did he pursue a consequential line of procedure. In important questions he went arm in arm with the Right wing. In view of this vacillation, he was not elected as chairman. This result is an important lesson for the Left wing of the Tranmael party. At the same time, the Congress most clearly and effectively proved the significance and necessity of the Communist Party from the trade union standpoint.

IN THE SOVIET UNION

Ten Years of the Cheka.

By J. Varošlavsky.

The ten years of the existence of the Soviet State are inseparably bound up with the numerous attempts of our class enemies to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat. These attempts varied according to the different periods, from the open, wide-spread White Guardist and Kulak revolts, amply supported with financial means by the bourgeoisie of all countries of the world, from the numerous attempts at intervention to terrorist attacks, to the breaking off of political relations, incendiarism, the spreading of provocative rumours, the production and distribution of forged paper money, political and economic espionage, malicious speculation, sabotage etc. In its struggle against all these machinations, the proletarian dictatorship organised even in the first months of its existence, the Cheka, later the G. P. U.

It is not without good reasons that the said names rouse passionate hatred in the hearts of the class enemies. For them, the organisation of the G. P. U. has, for the last ten years, been the merciless sword cutting into the secret plans of the enemy of the proletarian State, following the tracks of the conspirators and striking them down at the very moment when they were raising the arm for striking the death-blow at the working class and at the peasantry. The most experienced conspirators such as Boris Savinkov and Rikey, the British agent, were naive children in comparison with the powerful, annihilating organisation, their most artful conspiracies fell victims to the sword of the G. P. U. so suddenly and overwhelmingly that the name

of the well-tryed G. P. U. alone is enough to frighten any enemy of the Soviet State whosoever he may be.

The importance of the G. P. U. for the Soviet Union which is surrounded by capitalist States, will last so long as the danger of external and internal counter-revolution exists. This is the reason why the Social Democrats utter pacifist wails about the terror of the G. P. U. Those complaints are, taking everything into account, nothing more nor less than a disguise of the forces of that external and internal counter-revolution, which is prepared to mask itself with a democratic cloak in order to disarm the proletariat and to deprive it of the possibility of settling things with all the enemies of the proletarian dictatorship, of the proletarian revolution, in a "plebeian manner". So long as it is urgent to steer clear of the dangers threatening the existence of the Soviet State, to brush away the refuse with an iron broom, to remove the pus which has affected a few parts of the Soviet organism, the Soviet State cannot renounce the help of the G. P. U. The existence of the G. P. U. in itself is, in the present period, a guarantee that such diseased parts will become more rare, that the development of organisations which are so harmful to the proletarian dictatorship, will be impossible in the future.

Especially one side of the work of the G. P. U. should not be passed over in silence. We have taken over remnants of counter-revolutionary organisations of espionage which are far from being liquidated, dating from the times of Tsarism and of the Kerensky Government. There are only too many agents who have been members of the Ochrana, provocative agents, who have kept concealed in various bodies of the Soviet Union up to the present day. They are being hunted out step by step by the G. P. U., the country thus being cleansed from that putrefaction.

What clamour did the bourgeois and social democratic newspapers raise on the occasion of the shooting down of twenty White Guardists after the murder of Comrade Voikov! Even the Trotskyites (Maniuri in Holland and others) expressed their regret that the G. P. U. displayed such a lack of humaneness. But the workers were those whose voice ought to have been heard in those days. The writer of this article had an opportunity to observe the attitude of mind of the workers in Dnepropetrovsk. "That is how it is, comrade", they said, "to-day we realise especially clearly that we have a proletarian dictatorship; those military executions show that the resolution to carry on a relentless fight, to keep up a determined resistance has not abated".

In recent times, the G. P. U. has been the object of extremely malevolent attacks on the part of the Trotskyites and of the Sapronov Opposition. Those attacks roused the sympathy of all the class enemies of the Soviet State; the foreign White Guardist and social democratic Press maliciously snatched up those attacks. Is not that a proof that the Opposition is actually taking up counter-revolutionary positions? Is not that the best evidence of the fact that, in its struggle against the illegal printing works and against other actions hostile to the Soviets, which are covered up with the flag of the Opposition, the G. P. U. is fulfilling its fundamental task, the task of combating counter-revolution, of combating any organisation which is endeavouring to shake the proletarian dictatorship?

The proletariat of the Soviet Union, the workers of our country, are glancing back at the heroic way they have travelled, at the results they have achieved. They do not doubt for a minute that an even more heroic task is awaiting them, the task of completing the socialist construction of their country, of putting into effect the world revolution. They will complete these tasks under the lead of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They know that they are surrounded by a faithful and watchful guard which is following every step of the enemy, they know that that guard strikes down with its merciless sword anyone who dares to run into the way of that powerful movement.

This is the reason why the Party has always devoted its earnest attention to that organ of the proletarian dictatorship which ensures to it a firm control exercised by the Party. This is the reason why the Party should continue to concern itself with the thorough political training of the members of the G. P. U. and with selecting them carefully from the political

point of view. This is the reason why, on the tenth anniversary, the Party proudly greets all the collaborators in the G. P. U. who are carrying on their shoulders the burden of the struggle against counter-revolution.

THE WHITE TERROR

A New Sacco and Vanzetti Case.

By A. G. Bosse.

While the Sacco Vanzetti campaign was at its height, Comrades Calogero, Greco and Donato Carillo were arrested and charged with murder. The case is remarkably similar to that of Sacco and Vanzetti in many respects. The New York district attorney, McGeehan, who is prosecuting the Case, has threatened that he "hopes to have Greco and Garillo in the death-house by Christmas". These comrades are prominent in the Italian labour and radical movement, being members of the anti-Fascist Alliance of North America, and of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union. When we know that the Italian Government is directly behind the prosecution, and has the support of the American Government and New York legal authorities, we realise the gravity of the case.

On May 30th, 1927, an American patriotic holiday, a band of Fascists, dressed in their uniforms, were on their way to march in the parades. As two members approached the elevated railway station, an unknown assassin sprang out from his hiding place and murdered them. The murdered Fascists, Carisi and Amoroso, were prominent members of the "squadrista", the punitive squad of the Fascists. The murder was perhaps the result of a personal feud, but the following explanation is the more likely: After a struggle for power in the Fascist League of North America, one faction broke away and formed a new organisation, Il Duce Fascist Alliance, last December (1926). Its leader, Caldora, was often threatened with murder by the older group, and on the day of the murder, he was only ten feet behind one of the men who was murdered. He has since stated a number of times that the assassination was directed against him and another member of his organisation, but the two murdered men were mistaken for him and a friend.

Six weeks later, on July 11th, city-wide raids were made by the New York Police in conjunction with the agents of the Italian Secret Service. Fourteen prominent anti-Fascist leaders were arrested and the officers of the Socialist "Il Nuovo Munde", Anarchist "Il Martello", and Communist "Il Lavatore" were raided. Greco and Carillo were arrested at their homes in Brooklyn, and since they are workers and anti-Fascists, were held as suspicious characters. During the official "questioning", members of the New York Fascisti were asked to identify the prisoners. The usual procedure even in New York, is for the witness to select the suspects from among a group. In this case Greco and Carillo were led into a room where five Fascists sat, and the district Attorney asked, "are these the men?" Of course they were "identified" by the five "squadrists". Caldero has stated to reporters, "I saw Amoroso killed. The man who killed him did not look like Greco or Carillo. If I ever see him again, I will know him; I could pick him out of a million men. Greco and Carillo are innocent".

The Fascist League of North America is headed by Count Di Reval, who was imported from Italy to take charge. He claims a membership of 12,000—14,000. But the American section of M. O. P. R., the International Labour Defence (I. L. D.) states that this is untrue, and cites the following facts. The Sons of Italy, the largest Italian fraternal organisation in the U. S., refuses to have anything to do with the Fascists. In Newhaven, Connecticut, where the Sons of Italy have 12,000 members, they refuse to pay any attention to communications from the Fascist League of North America. Columbus Day (an Italian holiday) parades usually have ten thousand participants in that city. This year the Sons of Italy did not participate because the Fascists marched, and only 400 persons marched. In the city of Danbury, the same State an attempt to sell Italian oil stocks was unsuccessful, as was also an attempt in Passaic, New Jersey, to sell government loan bonds.

The "squadrista", referred to previously, in New York is made up to a great extent of gangsters and gunmen from the East Side of the city. They parade, salute, and utter the barbaric Fascist war-cry exactly as in Italy, and walk around armed with steel-tipped whips and leaded walking sticks through the streets of "democratic" America.

Caldora, who was a friend of the two murdered Fascists, states that three weeks before the murders, a number of Fascists invade his office and threatened to kill him if he did not leave the country at once. On the day of the murder he was at the hospital to which the bodies were taken and was there told by Di Reval that he must identify a certain prisoner as the murderer. When he refused he was told that he must not say anything to the American press, and must work with the Fascist League. He was also told to say the prisoners came from the automobile of Dr. Fama, an unofficial anti-Fascist leader in New York, and when he answered that he could not recognise the car, was told he would be given the number and a description. Di Reval also tried to implicate other prominent anti-Fascist leaders, such as Carlo Tresca, head of the anti-Fascist Alliance, but Caldora refused to be a party to these attempts at frame up, and later stated that he would testify for the defence.

Soon after the arrests the Greco-Carillo Defence League was organised. The I. L. D., the Civil Liberties Union (a legal defence organisation of liberals and radicals, dominated by the Socialists), etc., supplied lawyers, and later Clarence Darrow, one of the foremost criminal lawyers in the country, was drawn in. Darrow is a member of the National Committee of the I. L. D. The Defence League announced that the I. L. D. was the first organisation to volunteer its support. The Socialists and Liberals have also formed an "American" Defence Committee.

The I. L. D. and the Defence League are planning a powerful defence campaign, utilising the nation-wide machinery built up during the Sacco-Vanzetti campaign. At the Third Annual Conference of the I. L. D., held in New York, beginning November 11th, a special report was made on the Greco-Carillo case, and the 350,000 members of the I. L. D. are being mobilised for the campaign. A number of large protest meetings have been held at which some of the speakers were J. Cannon, National Secretary of the I. L. D., R. Minor, editor of the "Daily Worker", other Communist leaders, N. Thomas of the Socialist Party, Tresca, members of the Civil Liberties Union, Giovanitti, a well-known Italian poet and labour leader who was tried some years ago on a similar murder frame-up, etc.

Torturing of Revolutionaries in Yugoslavian Prisons.

(By M. M. Gorkitch.)

During the last two months arrests have taken place in Yugoslavia among the workers and especially among young workers. In Belgrade alone over 60 persons were arrested within two weeks. All the prisoners are accused of belonging to the Communist Party and to the Young Communist League.

All the people arrested are now being thrown into the Belgrade jail, which has been well known since the Turkish regime in Servia. Conditions in this jail are more than terrible: in most cases 40 to 50 persons are packed into one small room, so that all of them can hardly sit at the same time. Political prisoners are lodged together with criminals.

For the Communists there is in this prison a special "regime". In general they are examined between the hours of 12 and 2 in the night. For such "examination" the prisoner is taken to a special room belonging to the chief of the Belgrade political police, Fimitch, who conducts the examination personally. In this room the prisoner is awaited by three police officials, in addition to Fimitch, provided with fetters, truncheons and thick blankets. First of all the prisoner is requested to report on his work and on the work of his fellow prisoners.

After he has refused to comply with this request, a regular inquisition begins. The police fall upon the prisoner; he is compelled to clasp his knee with his fettered hands, and below the knee and above the hands stout sticks are thrust, so that the prisoner is almost unable to move. His shoes and stockings are then removed, his head is wrapped round with the blankets to deaden his cries. Thereupon the soles of his feet are beaten savagely until he loses consciousness. The blows are dealt on the soles of the feet, because this causes great pain and does not leave specially deep traces.

When the prisoner again recovers consciousness, the "examination" is resumed. In the morning the "examined" prisoners are taken to a special room, where they "rest" for a day or two, until the worst marks of the torture have disappeared. Such "examinations" are repeated several times in the week.

It is mostly the young revolutionaries who are tortured, also those who are not so well known among the workers. The better-known functionaries of the Labour Movement are simply arrested and, on the ground of the "confessions" extorted by the inquisitors, condemned to long years of imprisonment.

Lately the police have been giving special attention to extorting confessions regarding the composition of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League and of the Politbureau of the Party and have employed all kinds of tortures in examination, in which questions were put as to whether the arrested revolutionary leaders, Comrades Sima Markovitch and Lasar Stefanovitch, are members of the Politbureau of the Yugoslav Communist Party.

Most of the prisoners send to their relatives their washing blood-stained from the torture. The prisoners are never permitted to receive visits, for they are in such a condition that the police consider it advisable to keep them out of sight.

Comrades Labud Kusovatza and Rada Vuiovitch have been "remanded" in this fashion for more than six months. Thanks to their heroic fight against the tortures, but particularly because they succeeded in smuggling out a report of conditions, they were a few days ago transferred to another prison. The youths, Pavlo Kovalevitch, Olda Sdravkovitch, Uroshevitch, Dushan Popovitch, Briyadshek, Tzasin, Oboren, Nikolitch, Nikola Kotur, Golko Samardshitch and Ottokar Karshovani were all subjected to the most shocking tortures. Comrade Gregor Vuiovitch, the brother of Rada, who is under arrest, has been beaten twice and thrown into a special concrete room, built for political prisoners. This room has no windows, no light and no heat. In the morning water is poured onto the concrete floor of the room, so that it freezes during the day and then our best comrades are locked in the room without bed and without warm clothes. Through living in this cell Comrade Gregor Vuiovitch was in grave danger of losing his life.

* * *

These are the facts. The immediate cause of the arrests was the growing activity of the Yugoslavian Party and of the Young Communist League. The police are particularly energetic in their efforts against the Young Communist League, which, in spite of repeated loss of the illegal printing works, still publishes systematically its newspaper "The Young Bolshevik".

The Servian bourgeoisie is preparing a huge anti-Communist trial and desires, if it is possible, to combine it with the revolutionary fight of the Macedonian nation against Servian rule, also to declare that the C. P. is the organ of a "foreign" State, to intimidate the petty bourgeoisie with the Communist danger and thereby to "justify" the sharp measures taken against the workers and against the national revolutionary movement.

Hundreds of Yugoslavian proletarians, who now languish in the prisons of Belgrade, Macedonia and Zagreb, are waiting for the help of the international proletariat. A broad campaign of solidarity and of protest against the torture and against the White Terror is necessary, for the fate of our Yugoslavian comrades depends in a large measure on the strength of the international solidarity of the working class.

IN THE CAMP OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

An Anti-Bolshevist Centre of the Second International.

The "Commission for the Investigation of the Condition of Political Prisoners".

By Wilhelm Koenen (Berlin).

The Social Democrats have again systematically organised their international campaign against the Soviet Union. Whereas hitherto the calumnies directed against the one and only workers' State in the world represented merely an occasional activity for the Social Democrats of all countries, the Second International has now created a special organisation for this purpose. The Social Democrats gradually arrived at the recognition that their outcry at the alleged violation of Georgia was merely ridiculous, for which reason they determined to make a systematic search for similar terrible atrocities. It is more and more apparent that this is the true and actual task of the "Commission for the Investigation of the Condition of Political Prisoners", established by the Second International.

In the few months during which this commission has been operating, the whole world has had ample occasion to recognise that it is by no means the noble task of this commission to protect or liberate the proletarian political prisoners of the capitalist countries of Central and Western Europe and the United States. Only occasionally do the communications of this Commission of the Second International contain an attack on bourgeois class justice and bourgeois jailors, while the entire means and forces of the Commission and of its wire-pullers are concentrated on constant and repeated attacks on the Soviet Union.

In the form of a supplement to the "International Information" of the so-called Socialist Labour International, the Commission has for some weeks past published "Information as to the Situation of Political Prisoners". From this publication, the press of the Socialist parties of all countries has now learned a new and particularly base method of discrediting the Soviet Union, consisting of the publication of every report on bourgeois class-justice and the misdeeds of the white terror accompanied by remarks to the discredit of the Soviet Union.

Again and again the agents of the imperialists of all countries come across a new arrest, or a death sentence for a serious crime, or at least a new appeal in regard to the imprisoned Mensheviks. Or else, in the absence of anything particular to report, they invent — as the "Vorwärts" most shamelessly did a few days ago — that Moscow requires a new coup to settle its reckoning with the Opposition at home and that it is only for this reason that it sacrifices thousands of Communists in Canton to the swords of the white guards. This hair-raising method of arguing can only aim at detracting the attention of the European workers from the white guardists and crippling the proletarian resistance to the reaction.

This spirit is confirmed by all the six issues of the "Information as to the Situation of Political Prisoners" published by the new "investigatory commission". In issue No. 6, now to hand, a page and a half are devoted to the complaint that an old Socialist imprisoned in Roumania, whose liberation — by Bratianu of all persons — is looked forward to. His condemnation, however, is laid at the door of the Bolsheviks with their civil war tactics, for which the Roumanian judges revenge themselves on the Socialists. There is not a single word against the Roumanian class justice and the Fascist regime of the Bratianu brothers. The sober statement of facts is followed by no accusation, no outcry, no alarm signal to the international proletariat.

The entire balance of the publication, about six pages, is filled with attacks on the Soviet Union, against which no trick of hatred or calumny is too base to use. This time the gentlemen of the commission are in sorry straits, having made fools of themselves in attempting to make use of a letter by

that well-known pacifist in the British Independent Labour Party, A. Fenner Brockway. The anti-Bolshevist phrase-monger Arthur Crispian, who, together with that kindred spirit Friedrich Adler, has been entrusted with the dirty task of conducting this very equivocal commission, is now obliged himself to take the floor in an attempt to make good the blunder.

Fenner Brockway, allowed himself to be induced by the agitation of the Second International to refuse an invitation to the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the October revolution, seeing that "during all the triumph hundreds of Socialists are languishing in your prisons". Thus wrote Brockway to Rykov, though of all the "hundreds" he only mentioned ten actual cases by name. On the basis of immediate inquiries, the press service of the International Red Aid was able to establish at once on November 28th, that even of the ten cases named only one still remained in prison while one other had freely chosen to be sent to Siberia.

After more than three weeks' pains, Arthur Crispian has compiled an answer with the help of Abramovitch, the leader of the Mensheviks, and his whole hate-inspired company. So as to get out of the embarrassment, the Menshevik reply preserves silence in regard to the fact that out of the ten Socialists alleged by Brockway to be languishing in prison, eight are actually not in prison at all. There are several pages full of descriptions of prisons and places of exile, where it is asserted, not hundreds but thousands of Mensheviks are languishing. But Abramovitch and Crispian do not even attempt to establish how many still remain out of the eight cases in regard to which Brockway was mistaken. The ten cases were particularly drastic ones and had therefore certainly been chosen with some care. If of these ten only one is actually in prison, even the most generalising propaganda and an exaggeration to the thousandfold will not make the tenfold lie any whiter.

This new Menshevik fraud must end in the same way as the reports spread abroad for years in regard to atrocities in the Georgian prisons. That this agitation had finally to be given up is recognised even by the "Vorwärts", which on December 8th, 1927, writes under the leading "The Truth about Russia" as follows of the impressions of the Socialist Pichocki, the first chairman of the third workers' delegation:

"In regard to the prison of Tiflis he reported that he had found both the prison in general and the cells of the prisoners in particular in a very clean condition, while none of the prisoners, not even the Mensheviks, complained of bad or insufficient food, let alone of ill-treatment."

What Dr. Friedländer, the latest crown-witness on the situation of political prisoners in the Soviet Union, had to report also showed unmistakably that there was no question of "languishing in prison" or "pining away", but only of careful measures of precaution on the part of a greatly threatened State of workers against persons who thought themselves obliged to demonstrate their political intentions against the dictatorship by attempts at murder and by organising a forcible overthrow of the proletarian rule. In the Soviet Union the working class has conquered for itself a privileged political position. He who desires to wrest this position from the working class in favour of a bourgeois democracy by acts of violence, must, even should he still erroneously designate himself as Socialist, be treated as a reactionary, counter-revolutionary enemy of the proletariat and of the peaceful Socialist development of the Soviet Union.

This is absolutely in keeping with the political opinions of our pioneers Marx, Engels, Lassalle, and Liebknecht, the founders of the Marxian theory and practice.

To deny the right of the proletariat to the consolidation and defence of the power only just acquired was a task for the renegades of the Second International. They have made a truce with the imperialists, they have a working community with the capitalists, and they form Government coalitions with the bourgeoisie, in return for which they are obliged to keep down or deflect any militant instinct on the part of the workers. Men like Vandervelde, Thomas, MacDonald, Noske,

Wels, or Severing, are aiders and abettors of the bourgeoisie; hence their spiteful fight against the Soviet Union, which, the only Workers' State in the world, is at the same time the only foreign political danger to the capitalists of all other countries. The new publication of the Second International for the purpose of clever systematic organisation of the spiteful agitation against the Soviet Union is therefore a pronouncedly anti-Bolshevist centre in the spirit of big capitalist interests.

How the Social Democrats Betray the Workers in Indonesia.

By M. Muzzo.

In a colony like Indonesia where the workers are totally deprived of any rights, the position of the social democrats is rather difficult. They are appealing to the colonised people to unite under their guidance. Along a peaceful and evolutionary way, avoiding all barbaric violence or bloodshed, after a certain time Indonesia will get its emancipation from the Dutch domination. The social-democracy in Indonesia, being a semi-governmental party, used the above phrases to counteract the revolutionary propaganda of the Communists. There, where the conflict between labour and capital is also aggravated by the hateful race and colour prejudices, the social democrats, of whom most are Dutchmen, without hesitation, stand on the side of the oppressors. During the uprising, when they knew that the workers could not get the victory, they stated that it was the duty of every loyal worker, to back the government by breaking the Communist influence among the workers. The communists intend to destroy the existing authority and to disturb the peace of society. Therefore the Indonesian Social Democratic Party (I. S. D. P.), co-operating with its brother party in Holland, fights with might and main against those who intend to make Indonesia free from Dutch domination.

The social democrats in Indonesia being Dutchmen, most of them are high officials of the Government and well paid employees of capitalist concerns.

Nowadays after the uprising (November 1926) when the government is getting very aggressive against all organisations which have the slightest aim to act against the existing authority or against the imperialists, the social democrats are entirely driven to the side of the ruling class. From many reactionary quarters the proposals were made to purge the government's apparatus from all officials who had socialist tendencies. Not only the communists but also the social democrats were marked as those who were considered as being dangerous. The capitalist press in Indonesia without distinction heatedly discussed this question. Both the social democrats and the Communists are opposed to the monarchy. But the practice is quite different. Social democracy in Western countries and in Indonesia can co-operate with the ruling class, but this is not the case with the Communists. But another conservative paper, "The News van Den Dag", the organ of a catholic group in Indonesia, stated that the social democrats when they get the opportunity, can be as dangerous as the Communists. Therefore not only the Communists but also the social democrats must be kept out of government departments.

To Indonesian social democracy this proposal was like a bolt from the blue. Real consternation reigned among the social democrats, because most of them were functioning government officials. In order to prevent this, the Executive of the Indonesian Social Democratic Party made an application to the municipality of Meester Cornelis.

Here below is a summary of the request of the Executive Committee of the I. S. D. P. printed in "De Indische Courant" of August 20, 1927:

"The Executive Committee of the Social Democratic Party of Indonesia has learned of your proposal to the effect that no member of the S. P. D. of Indonesia or of the C. P. of Indonesia can be employed either in the State or municipal service. Should this proposal be adopted, then all social democrats

who are members of the State administration or are State officials will be deprived of their posts. The motive and the tendency of this proposal lie in a misunderstanding regarding the character of the Social Democratic Party.

The social democracy shows by its participation in parliament and other organs in Indonesia, Holland etc., that it aims solely at carrying out constructive work. The loyalty of its character is proved by its participation in the government and other institutions in various countries.

That this character is also acknowledged by the government is shown by the appointment of two social democrats as members of the Volksraad (People's Council). The exclusion of the social democrats from the municipalities and government apparatus is based on a wrong idea as to the conception of the social democracy. Moreover, it would be in contradiction with the ordinance of the Indonesian Government No. 193 issued in May 25th, 1926, etc., etc."

The above quoted statement of the Indonesian social democracy is further evidence that the social democracy in general, when the fight between labour and capital has reached the culminating point, is becoming an integral part of the capitalist clique. Fortunately the majority of the colonised Indonesian working class is already awakened and understands very well the hollow phrases of the lackeys of the bloodsuckers.

Owing to the fact that the leaders of the social democracy in Indonesia belong to the class of the oppressors, the influence of the I. S. D. P. has reached only the Dutch population. Even native intelligentsia and native high officials are immune from the influence of the yellow socialists. Up to the present time the social democrats have succeeded in attracting Dutch postal and railroad workers and some well-paid native officials. In leading the trade unions of the Dutch workers the social democrats have shown distinctly that they are willing and conscious servants of the imperialists. Last September the People's Council discussed the abolishment of the exorbitante rechten (the special right given to the governor general to banish everyone who is suspected of being a dangerous element). On the basis of this Exorbitante Rechten, after the uprising there were more than 2000 communists and leaders of trade unions exiled to the malaria smitten district of Boven Digul amidst the jungle in New Guinea. The social democrats declared earnestly that for the time being (a score of years to come) the Exorbitante Rechten was necessary. This was not only because they wished to deceive the workers, but also because they knew, although in illegality, there was in Indonesia still a great number of communists whose influence was still predominant among the workers and the peasants. The social democrats were glad that they, by means of the government, could get rid of their antagonists, the communists, who had fought courageously shoulder to shoulder with the oppressed and exploited workers of Indonesia.

TO OUR READERS!

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

England	2 sh.
America	50 cents
Germany	1,50 marks
Austria	2 (Austrian) Schillings
Norway	1,50 crowns
Sweden	1,50 crowns
Denmark	1,50 crowns
U. S. S. R.	1 rouble.

The subscription rate for other countries is three dollars (or equivalent in local currency) for six months.

These subscriptions include all Special Numbers.

XV. PARTY CONGRESS OF THE C. P. S. U.

The International Position and the Tasks of the Communist International.

Report by Comrade BUKHARIN at the XV. Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.

(Conclusion.)

IX. THE COMINTERN AND ITS SECTIONS.

The next question we have to examine is that of the situation of the Communist Parties as the individual sections of the Comintern. It is all the more necessary that we should raise this question, since we can now not only survey our own development during a number of years but since quite lately there have also been signs of a certain expansion.

During the last few years, about till the middle of 1926, the membership of the foreign Communist Parties fell almost uninterruptedly. Whereas the years of revolutionary advance in the West were accompanied by a tremendous influx of new members to the ranks of the Comintern, so that we were forced to erect certain barriers in the form of the 21 conditions so as to prevent our ranks from being swamped by many undesirable elements, a series of defeats of the proletariat in Italy, Germany, and some other countries and immediately afterwards the inception of stabilisation gave rise to a decrease in the revolutionary wave and a substantial falling-off in the ranks of the Communist Parties. True, this diminution of membership was made good in certain cases by an increase of the influence of the Communist Party on the working masses, but as a numeric fact the constant decline cannot be denied.

Since 1926, in connection with the process of radicalisation within the working class, of which I had occasion speak, we have been able to register a decided growth of the Communist Parties in various countries. Thus the Party in Germany had about 100,000 members in 1925 as against 128,000 members at present; in France the number of members rose from 50,000 in 1926 to 60,000; in Czechoslovakia it advanced from 98,000 in 1926 to 138,000.

At the same time our parties on the Balkans were destroyed by means of the white terror. In Bulgaria, Roumania, and Yugoslavia the number of party members receded greatly. In Italy the illegal Communist Party has grown in spite of the Fascist terror, but it is quite obvious that this Party, which works under conditions of quite exceptional persecution and is exposed to the most furious attacks on the part of the entire State apparatus, cannot rapidly grow into a party on a broad basis. Nevertheless, the Italian Communist Party is the only party of the Opposition which operates in the country itself. The Reformists, the Catholics and others have ceased to exist, their leaders emigrating, turning Fascist, or being done away with. The Communist Party of Poland likewise operates under a system of the severest persecution, but it is a vigorous party and continues to win over more and more workers from the ranks of its rival, the Polish Socialist Party.

In Great Britain we must admit that, in spite of the heroic fight put up by the Communist Party during the general strike and the miners' struggle, there has been a falling-off of members. This is mainly due to the fact that such Communist workers as are members of factory nuclei and the like are exposed not only to political but also to economic pressure, being hounded out of the works, black-listed, and victimised in every possible way. They are deprived of their means of subsistence and so it comes that the ranks of our British Communist Party are thinning. In most of the northern countries, with the exception of Sweden where the Party is advancing, the Communist Parties are numerically weak.

In the most important European parties we can, nevertheless, record an increase of numbers. In the two great illegal parties, in Italy and Poland respectively, there has been an improvement of the position. In Great Britain there has been a recession. It must be remembered, however, that, even in spite of this diminution in its ranks, the Communist Party of Great Britain is larger than it was before the general strike and the miners' fight.

At the same time it should be recorded that the changes in the numeric strength of our parties do not by any means go hand in hand with the growth of political influence. That is to say, the political influence of our parties grows infinitely faster than their ranks, and in some countries the political influence of the Party has grown without any increase in membership at all. This may be explained by the fact that a whole number of larger and smaller Communist Parties have not yet learned to maintain organisationally the political results achieved. I repeat that we can observe this phenomenon in a whole number of our parties, even in the Communist Party of Germany.

This is, however, in connection with the fact that the Communist fractions in the trade unions, those strongholds of the Social Democrats and of the Amsterdam International, still act insufficiently, a fact which also applies to the most important and most extensive organisations of the working class, while it is just this work that is the foremost duty of the Communist Parties. But for all that, the increase in the influence of the Communist Parties is undoubted, and this growth considerably surpasses the numeric increase in membership.

This circumstance is owing to the fact that our parties have of late entered upon a number of political campaigns, in which they succeeded, as they did on the occasion of strikes, in comprehending broad masses of the working class. In Great Britain the Communist Party appeared as a party supporting strike movements and as the only party consistently demanding the defence of the Chinese revolution, i. e. as the only party boldly opposing war, as the devoted and only friend of the Soviet Union, as the only party consistently defending the working class against the Trade Union Bill, as the party which supported the miners undeterredly from beginning to end. The recent march of the miners to London, which was effected under the guidance of the Communist Party, was carried out against the wishes and in face of the resistance of the leaders of the Labour Party, the trade unions, and the like. It constituted an important event in the public life of Great Britain.

The Communist Party of France also carried out a whole series of important political campaigns and conducted a number of strikes. In various places it conducted a very well organised anti-militarist campaign, a campaign in favour of the Soviet Union, and a campaign against Fascism. You will all remember to have read in the newspapers of the demonstrations at Clichy in connection with the parade of the American Legion in France. In connection with the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti, the Communist Party effected a brilliant demonstration, in the course of which there was some street-fighting.

The Communist Party of Germany likewise succeeded in mobilising considerable masses of workers by means of great political campaigns. You probably all remember the campaign

organised in connection with the princes' indemnification and the plebiscite held on that occasion. The Communist Party of Germany not only mobilised broad masses of workers, but also forced the Social Democracy into a corner and compelled it to follow the Communist lead. This campaign must certainly be booked very much to the credit of the German Communist Party. In the same connection a great campaign was organised for the convocation of a Congress of Workers, which you certainly know all about. Furthermore, there was a campaign for the support of the Chinese revolution, and the fight for higher wages.

All of you will still remember the fight put up by the Communist Party of Germany, when it brought considerable numbers of workers out on to the streets in the fight against Fascism. You will remember how the German working class opposed the Fascist parade in Berlin, on which occasion the leading rôle played by the Communist Party was apparent to all. You will remember the Red Front Fighters' Day and the oath of the Red Front Fighters to defend the Soviet Union. That day was a day of historical importance in Germany. You must all be aware that the Red Front Fighters are under the lead of the Communist Party.

The strike of the miners in Central Germany was also greatly under the influence of our Party. From what I have already said you will have gathered that the outcome of the elections bear witness to the growth of the political influence of our German section. In connection with the tenth anniversary of the Soviet Union there was a great work accomplished in Germany, with delegations, mass demonstrations, and the like.

In Italy a very peculiar position is developing. I have already pointed out that despite its illegal status, our Party is the only active revolutionary oppositional party in Italy. The Social Democracy is annihilated. Attempts were also made to destroy the Italian Communist Party, but it succeeded in preserving an illegal apparatus which continued the fight against Mussolini's powerful State apparatus most vigorously. Nay, more than that. You will know that the reformist trade union federation broke down completely under the assault of the Fascists and their trade unions. Some of the leaders of this federation fled abroad, others actually went over to the Fascists, but none of them had the courage or fortitude to champion even the most elementary rights of the trade unions. Our Communist Party stands alone in its fight for the revival of the free trade union organisation. In this direction it has achieved great success. In spite of the terrorist regime, the Communist Party of Italy has conducted a series of strikes, which have characterised the last few months. It carried out a great campaign in the open country and gained political influence in a whole number of rural districts.

The illegal Communist Party of Poland likewise strengthened its general political influence in a number of political campaigns. In spite of the white terror and in spite of the quite extraordinarily embittered hostility of the Polish Socialist Party (which forms part of the Fascist apparatus notwithstanding the oppositional attitude of many of its members against Pilsudki), in spite of various occurrences of armed conflict with flying columns of the Polish Socialist Party, the Communist Party of Poland has on more than one occasion conducted demonstrations on the part of the Polish workers in general and those of Warsaw in particular. It must be said that at critical moments which also affected the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of Poland, which is in this respect in a particularly exposed position, did excellent work and earned much credit. You will certainly remember the demonstrations organised after the murder of Comrade Voykov. A highly characteristic case occurred recently. A workman of our way of thinking painted words in favour of the Soviet Union on a wall. He was shot. The health insurance elections and the municipal council elections reflect the growth of the political influence of the Polish section, which has succeeded in gaining over part of the peasant movement, especially among the national minorities.

If we pass from these important Communist Parties of Europe to the United States, we cannot but recognise that in spite of very unfavourable conditions attending the fight of the Communist Party there, the latter succeeded in organising a fairly significant movement which arose in connection with the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti. In New York alone from 200,000 to 300,000 workers went on strike. There was even

street-fighting. The Communist Party headed this movement and fought on various fronts, inter alia also against the Liberal Anarchists. In so doing it managed to increase its political influence, though it would be wrong to attach too much importance to this fact.

Of late can also record a series of achievements in regard to the inner-party consolidation of our sections, in the sense of a greater activity of the members, progress in the work effected in the trade unions, in the accumulation of greater experience in illegal struggle, and finally also as regards the growth of the influence of the Communist Party among the broad masses of workers. This process is based on the revolutionising of the working masses, to be recorded in Europe in connection with the development of the internal differences of capitalist stabilisation. These are the most important results attained by the Communist International.

I must, however, also enter quite frankly into certain questions which bear witness to errors and shortcomings on our part and which both the Communist International and our Party must take to heart with a view to their correction. Only thus can we ensure further success and the consolidation of what we have attained.

In the first place, I must say a few words about such faults as are common to all sections of the Communist International. Firstly, the international spirit of the Communist Parties is still insufficiently developed. Thus our experiences in the struggle in Great Britain showed us that a whole number of the most important sections of the Communist International did not respond with the requisite speed or in an adequate measure to the appeal for the support of the general strike and the miners' fight in Great Britain, as we can see by the corresponding resolutions of the Communist International.

Secondly, the Communist Parties do not succeed as well as they should in the organisatory consolidation of their political successes. We may observe this almost without exception in all parties. Any political campaign of the nature, e. g., of the anti-war campaign in France or the anti-indemnity campaign in Germany, is carried out with vigour and spirit. Then some time elapses. The political achievements are not confirmed by measures of organisation, so that the result in regard to the growth of our Party, for instance, is not very great.

This shortcoming is closely connected with the third fault I have here to discuss, which is the weakness evinced in the conduct of the Communist fractions in the trade unions and also in the other non-party and semi-party mass-organisations. For a long time we have counted the problem of work in the trade unions among the most important and urgent of problems demanding our attention. Nevertheless and in spite of certain achievements that we can record, it must be frankly admitted that this problem has by no means been solved in anything like its entirety, and that it still remains the most important problem of the Communist movement, a problem which is now again facing the Communist Parties most ominously. It is only by means of a further development of our organisatory capacity that we shall succeed in capturing the trade union apparatus, which is at present still controlled by the Social Democratic Party and the Second International. Then only shall we be able to record a radical movement along the entire front, whereby the growth of the Communist Parties will be undoubtedly secured.

Finally I must make mention of a fault which is common to practically all the Communist sections, i. e. their low theoretic level. This is mainly due to the fact that a series of crises ensuing in the Communist Parties, commencing with the ebb of the revolutionary wave, took effect principally on the intellectual leaders. As a matter of fact, there are, as you will know, very few intellectuals in the Communist Parties. Both as regards the social position of the predominant mass of their members and in respect of the social composition of their leading formations, our parties are at present parties of workers and almost exclusively of workers.

At the same time our Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, is, together with its leaders, tremendously overcharged with work and is therefore almost wholly unable to devote itself to theoretic matters. This does not mean that our theoretic level has sunk; indeed, it has risen, but the entire position has grown considerably more complicated and the

demands with which the party leaders are faced have grown enormous.

This brings us to speak of yet another shortcoming, the weakness of the party press in general and of the central organs of the Communist Parties in particular. Even in the most extended publications, with a circulation of several hundred thousand copies, as the "Humanité" for example, there are numerous serious mistakes.

Permit me now, briefly, to elucidate the shortcomings, or at least a few of them, which characterise the individual sections, so that you may at least be furnished with a general outline of these various Communist Parties. I repeat that I shall mention only the most salient shortcomings, in the analysis of which we must not for a moment forget that the respective parties have of late achieved a great measure of success. Before all, I should like to discuss the Czechoslovak Party, which is one of the largest sections of the Comintern.

It must be admitted that during the fight in Great Britain, during the rising of the Vienna proletariat, and during the campaign for Sacco and Vanzetti, this section was fairly inactive. We can register a number of separate lapses towards the "right", for instance in regard to the draft Bill on Factory Councils, which was drawn up by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and in which a number of items recall the "economic democracy" of the Social Democrats. A number of errors of an opportunist character were committed in the "Rude Pravo", the central organ of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. Added to this, our Czechoslovak Party very nearly made a mistake from which however it was warned in time by the Comintern, when it intended to put up Masaryk as a presidential candidate against Krámar and to benefit by the differences between these two, in which connection the Party very nearly voted for Masaryk.

Quite recently a small right wing has formed in the Czechoslovak Party under the leadership of Hula and Skala, the latter being an excluded member. This wing, together with the group consisting of Michalec and Neurath, sympathises with our Opposition.

As I am just speaking of Czechoslovakia, I must tell you something which is of interest from the standpoint of our differences with the Opposition. In Czechoslovakia there is a Trotzkyite, a certain Dr. Pollack, who recently published a pamphlet on the international situation. The "Rude Pravo", the central organ of the Czechoslovak Party, cited this pamphlet in its issue of November 25th. Inter alia, Dr. Pollack discusses the foreign policy of the Soviet Union as one of the problems forming a matter of dispute between us and the Opposition. He furnishes a really striking illustration to the utterances of Comrade Rakovsky about war, utterances which Rakovsky subsequently tried in vain to disown. This Dr. Pollack, who also recently published all the documents of the Opposition, called upon us actually to go to war in support of the British strikers. I have here an exact quotation from his pamphlet. Listen to this:

"Let us suppose that Soviet Russia allowed itself by its defence of the striking British workers to be involved in a military conflict with Great Britain and its lackays. Let us see what the result would be. At best a very considerable expansion of the Soviet Union; at worst a military (!) defeat in a proletarian, revolutionary war, which would in a historical and dialectic sense represent a grand victory of the proletariat and great progress for the cause of world revolution."

I have cited this passage to show how far from casual the well-known remark of Comrade Rakovsky about war really was. The master-strokes of international oppositional strategy are revealed. The Opposition, which imagines us to be wallowing in the mire of "Thermidorian" deterioration, would be glad to involve us in some military conflict or other, so as to exploit it for its own purposes and in this manner to extricate the country from the alleged "Thermidorian swamp", to dispel the "political dusk", and so forth.

As regards the actual contents of the confusing nonsense written here, I believe, it speaks, nay screams, for itself. To demand an offensive war of us at this juncture, to speculate as to our defeat, to call such a defeat a "military" one (as though a military defeat had no political aspects!) and then to add that a defeat of the Soviet Union would represent a "brilliant

victory", points to more than donkey's ears on the part of the writer. (Applause.)

I pass on to speak of the faults and shortcomings of the French Party. It seems to me that I ought in the first place to point out that in certain circles of the French Party there are remnants of a purely "parliamentary" orientation. In this connection the French Communist Party, which has done and is still doing brilliant work in the anti-militarist sense, has at the same time committed a number of unquestionably opportunist errors.

The Party did not at once respond politically to the most important moment in the political life of France at the time of the transfer of power from the Left Bloc to Poincaré. It delayed both in publishing its slogans and in mobilising the masses. We can also observe certain mistakes in the application of united-front tactics. Latterly, in connection with the repressive measures of the Government, the leaders of the Party made a very significant mistake. When the Government undertook a number of repressive measures against the Communist Party, our party members, among whom were such as belonged to the political bureau, observed a certain "loyalty" to the laws of the bourgeois State and would very nearly have gone voluntarily to prison: They subsequently condemned this attitude of theirs, but the very impulse was symptomatic in a certain sense.

Upon the whole it may be said that the fighting instincts of the working class are not given sufficient guidance. It has happened frequently that the Party failed to scent these instincts at the right moment. In this connection we may mention the poor work done in the trade unions and the weakness of the "Humanité", although this paper has a circulation of 200,000 copies. There are deviations to the right, led by men like Souvarine, Rosmer, and Monatte, and others to the ultra-left (Suzanne Girault, Treint, etc.), inclining to form a bloc with elements outside the Party. To show you the type of man Souvarine is, I need but cite a passage from his "writings" referring to our disputes. With reference to the deception of the Party by the declaration of the Opposition dated October 16, Souvarine states:

"Since when has it been incumbent upon any one to keep a promise given under duress? All the civil and penal codes of the world provide for cases of signatures thus exacted and for the punishment not of those thus coerced but of the coercers."

This means that the Party is a blackmailer, and that according to the "penal code" it should be indicted, whereas the Opposition is perfectly justified in deceiving the Party, since they allegedly acted under a threat. Of no less interest is the estimation of the Party altogether. "The Party", writes Souvarine, "is no party, but a mob." ... "The degeneration we foretold in 1924 is taking its course." This is how we are characterised by this ultra-right renegade, who hobnobs with our professedly "left" Opposition.

A few words about the English section. The English section, like the French, has done some good anti-militarist work. The work among the soldiers, the sailors, and especially the expeditionary forces sent to China, was very well performed by the Communist Party, when regard is had to its small strength and slight opportunities. This is work of an openly revolutionary and very dangerous nature. But at the same time and alongside of this good anti-militarist work, the party leaders and certain party members continue to commit pronouncedly opportunist blunders. When the A.U.C.T.U. scathingly attacked the T.U.C. in its manifesto, many of the British comrades were of opinion that our criticism was too severe, and failed to agree with the manifesto of the A.U.C.T.U. Now that the Comintern discusses the electioneering tactics of the Communist Party of Great Britain, there are certain misgivings within the Party as to whether these tactics are right, as to whether the turn to the left is not too pronounced, and so on. We may here again witness such a paradoxical situation of a party fighting with determination and fighting well, but at the same time committing substantial mistakes in a "right" direction. Nor were the tactics of the representatives of the Party at the British Trade Union Congress entirely satisfactory. The line of action was not pronounced enough, the criticism of the trade union and Labour Party leaders was weak, there was too much "loyalty" towards these leaders, and the like. Such vacillations, which

were in connection with the tremendous pressure exercised of late by all enemies of the Party and with a certain psychological depression among the workers, were also apparent on the occasion of the recent Party Congress. It is for the Comintern to correct all these mistakes and to ensure a greater stability of the Party's political directives.

As regards the Communist Party of Germany, the reason of its weakness is still the lack of adequate connection with the masses, although a series of achievements may be recorded in this direction. The internal life of the German Communist Party is experiencing a consolidation. The so-called Right group has now less influence than was formerly the case. It is significant that at the Conference of Communist Trade Unionists recently held, there was **only a single vote** in favour of a mitigation in the policy to be observed towards the Social Democrats, especially in the trade unions. This attitude was isolated and called forth a decided refusal on the part of all the other participants. Neither did certain suggestions regarding the control of production, which smacked of a deviation to the right, meet with any amount of sympathy, in the ranks of the German Communist Party, but rather with decided rejection.

As to the so-called "ultra-left" opposition, that part of it which is outside our German Party forms the nucleus of a new party which is neither more nor less than a branch of our Trotskyist Opposition. I shall not enter into this matter any further, seeing that you have already been inundated with quotations in this connection culled from the writings of Katz, Maslow, Korsch, and Ruth Fischer. But I should yet like to cite one passage from the last issue of the Maslow publication, which is at the same time the central organ of "our" Trotskyist Opposition. I do not quote this passage in connection with the well-known phrase regarding "degeneration" or "Bonapartism", since you all know that any amount of such counter-revolutionary phrases may be found in every issue of the said publication. At one of the last plenary sessions of the Central Committee I had occasion to state that the organ of Trotsky and Maslow had not shrunk from denouncing illegal collaborators of the Comintern. Although Zinoviev "justified" this action by stating that not a hair of any of these comrades had been touched, that is by no means the merit of Comrade Zinoviev.

In the latest issue of this publication there is a criticism of the **foreign policy** of the Soviet Union. Under the guidance of Lenin we once made the suggestion of a general disarmament. You all know that in this respect our policy is no new departure but the consistent continuation of a direction pursued in the lifetime of Lenin. But do you know what Messrs. Maslow, Trotsky, and Company write about Litvinov's action in Geneva? Listen to this.

"These quack suggestions have nothing whatever to do with Marxism. The silly assertion that this is a way to "unmask" imperialism at a time of feverish armaments is not only stupid but downright treacherous." ("Fahne des Kommunismus", 1927, No. 38.)

That is how the main organ of the Trotskyites writes about the action of Litvinov in Geneva. I ask you, is this **stupidity**? No. It is much more than mere stupidity. It is the other side of the same tactics that were preached in Moscow in regard to the war by Dr. Rakovsky and at Prague by the "defaitist" Pollack. It is part and parcel of the "clever" strategy of these miserable generals who have already got into a blind alley but are ready to ruin their heads against the stone walls of our Party, only so as to be in a position to lead our proletarian country into the same blind alley and thereby to secure it a "military" defeat, which in their own translation means a "brilliant victory". (Laughter.) That is the platform with which the Opposition desires to render the working class happy.

I shall not here enter upon the subject of the Communist Party of China, since I have partially dealt with this subject, which is, moreover, sufficiently well known to you all from all that has been published in this regard. Throughout the period of discussion it has continued to play an important part.

I must, however, say a few words about the Communist parties of **Japan and Poland** respectively.

The Japanese Party is very small, although the situation in **Japan** affords all the premises for our work and for the formation of a proper Communist mass-party, and that despite the cruel persecution which the police has of late exercised against

the Communists in Japan. In this Party, which has to work under very difficult conditions, it may be seen what troublesome problems plague the minds of the Communists. It may likewise be seen that a number of ideological products introduced from the West have given rise in some cases to quite extraordinary theories, which act as **obstacles** to the development of the movement. For example the theory of Comrade K., who was for a time at the head of the Party. This theory may be summed up as follows:

According to Hegel, we must assume the standpoint of a "self-developing subject", in this case the **proletariat**, but it must necessarily develop subject to contradictions. That is to say, it must divide and reunite. Therefore it is our task constantly to divide with the object of reunion. On the other hand, Lenin stated in his book "What is to be Done?" that the working class itself could not work out a Socialist ideology, and that in the early stages it was for the intellectuals to provide the proletariat with such an ideology, as also that it was essential to have an organisation of "professional revolutionaries", i. e. "revolutionary intellectuals". Therefore, intellectual "Marxist" groups should be formed in Japan and the doctrine should not yet be carried among the masses, although there is already a mass-movement in Japan!! This is how Comrade K., who has meanwhile come to abandon not only the propaganda of his opinions but even these opinions themselves, put together a sectarian law out of Hegel and Lenin, which law long continued to impede the development of the Party.

On the other hand, the **working class** portion of the Communist Party of Japan felt instinctively that this theoretic abracadabra was by no means commensurate with the actual needs of the mass movement. And therefore the working part of the Party instinctively protested, but encumbered as it was with the "self-developing subject" and similar matters, it could not formulate its own "theory", so that some groups resorted to the other extreme and very nearly deduced the necessity of a liquidation of the Communist Party as an independent party of the Japanese proletariat.

The Comintern helped our Japanese comrades to overcome their ideological and political distortions and to lay down the right line of action. If it is possible to realise this line of procedure, we may look for important and satisfactory developments. For Japan affords the premises both for an agrarian and for a proletarian revolution. The masses are already beginning to mobilise; the mass organisations of the peasants and workers are on the increase. Thus we have the presumption for a development of the Communist Party of Japan into a revolutionary mass-party of the proletariat.

The Communist International has made tremendous efforts in order to overcome the internal dissensions in the **Polish** Party. You will remember that the Communist Party of Poland with all its groups and fractions made a great "opportunist" mistake at the time of the Pilsudski coup and ended by siding with Pilsudski, not from any desire to see him victorious, but because it had failed immediately to **oppose** him, at the time when it was necessary to do so. I shall not weary you with all the conceptions which arose in connection with the discussion of this fact. In its general import, this mistake has now been **made good**, in the consciousness both of the broad masses of party members and of the party leaders. The Executive Committee of the Comintern had to employ much effort to attain the restoration of a certain degree of satisfaction within the Polish Communist Party, as also for the purpose of drawing the attention of the Party to the solution of the most urgent questions, worthy of a party occupying one of the most exposed and important positions as can well be imagined. The last Party Congress turned the political line of the Party in the right direction, and, in spite of the resistance of the "right" and "left" fractions of the Party, it set a limit to the differences of opinion then and even now existing within the Polish Party.

It is to be hoped that in time the internal struggle within the Communist Party will be overcome, particularly in connection with the tremendous events approaching and the colossal tasks confronting the Polish Communist Party.

A survey of the work achieved will show an **undoubted** growth of the political influence of the Comintern and its individual sections, a growth of the most important European

sections of the Comintern, and their ideological consolidation. If we ask ourselves what are the prospects for the development of the Communist parties, we can reply with absolute certainty that the objective basis exists for a further expansion of these parties. In Europe this basis consists of the "radicalisation" of the working class and in the undeniable accentuation of the class struggle. In the East, too, there is a basis for further development. It lies before all in the rise and intensification of the great Chinese revolution, the development and intensification of class differences and the fight against British imperialism in India, and the rise of revolutionary movements in other colonial or semi-colonial countries.

We can reckon with the fact that the basis for the development of the Communist parties, as also for a further expansion of our political influence, will continue to grow and that therefore the question of the defence of the Soviet Union will now come radically to the fore. Therefore the well-known thesis of the Trotsky Opposition in regard to a "shrinkage" of the labour movement is just as little in keeping with real facts as their thesis concerning the "approaching decline" of the Soviet Union. Beaten and destroyed by our Party and repelled by the broad masses of the workers of the Soviet Union, the oppositional leaders tend more and more to the West and indiscriminately rally around them all elements that are opposed to the real Leninist programme. They are now carrying on a campaign against the Soviet Union, against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and against the leaders of the Comintern, a campaign which is yet more desperate and obstinate than that waged against us by the Social Democrats. There is no baseness that these emissaries of a bellicose Trotskyism, who are ready to ally themselves with any anti-Bolshevik "stranger" or "adventurer", are not capable of publishing against the Comintern and against our Party.

The party of Trotsky is undoubtedly fashioning its own "International", for which Zinoviev has already prepared his 21 conditions by "remodelling", according to the example of Trotsky, the conditions elaborated by Lenin. The party of Trotsky rallies around it elements that have far more to do with Buddhism and with the Pope than with the teachings of Lenin. Because of our fight against the Opposition, Henriette Roland-Holst recently quitted the Communist Party of Holland; some time ago she wrote to her Russian colleagues, imploring them to safeguard the liberty of our Opposition and to defend all its tenets, since the "fight for truth" was the most important matter in the world. There followed a very remarkable argument:

"For the truth of Communism is its justice and humanity, and that truth no Marx, no Lenin, no Christ, and no God can tell us. It lies hidden in the balance of human passion and human ideals." (Laughter.)

That is how one of the most honest adherents of Trotskyism writes! She puts Marx and Christ, God and Lenin on one level; she seeks the truth of Communism not in the Marxian analysis of social development, but in the "balance" of human passions, and thus attempts to defend Trotskyism. Isn't that just too rich! It certainly deserves a place in the platform of the "Bolshevist-Leninists"! Perhaps Dr. Pollack models his tactics of offensive war out of the "balance" of human passions?

The same writer, Roland-Holst, in collaboration with her colleague Mannuri, is responsible for the following sentence:

"We greet you in the name of the departed, we love you in the name of the living, and we appeal to you in the name of the yet unborn." (Laughter.)

This sticky-sentimental phraseology, which is foreign and repulsive to the spirit of Marxism, reminds us surprisingly of the old German "pure Socialism" which Marx and Engels called the ideology of old women. These sentimentalists, however, are not altogether innocent. On July 18th, 1927, the very same Mannuri wrote us a declaration, which was communicated to the Party Conference with the consent of the Central Committee of the Dutch Party. In this declaration he writes as follows:

"The executions carried out in Moscow in consequence of the murder of our lamented comrade Voykov seem in my opinion to surpass those limits which divide the right to existence of human society from the right to existence of an individual personality.

I fully recognise the justice and the necessity of the terror for the defence of the walls erected by our Russian comrades for the protection of Communism. But I beg to add that he who yields to the temptation of extending retribution for the crime committed to such as were not guilty thereof, is thereby permitting himself to be carried away by a feeling of revenge which is absolutely foreign to Communism, and is thereby also harming the fundamental theses he professes to defend.

"Starting from this conviction, I consider it necessary to turn to our comrades of the G. P. U. with the following word of warning: "The truth of Communism lies in its justice and its humanity".

I am fully aware of the consequences of such a procedure, but I am of opinion that even in the thick of the fight we should not forget the ideals for which we are fighting."

Here you see the practical political conclusions. One step further and we shall be counted to the "barbarians", to the enemies of "truth", "justice", and "humanity".

It will hardly do harm to remember in this connection that at the same time, obviously inspired by a "balance of passions", Roland-Holst suggested a union with the Second International. This gives us a charming picture: Maslow and Co. accuse the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Comintern of Bonapartism and treachery; Pollack calls upon us to plunge into an aggressive war; Souvarine defends the "freedom of thought" and the freedom of lies and calumnies; Roland-Holst and Mannuri accuse us of breaking the laws of humanity and justice and demand union with the Second International: Trotsky and Co. libel us by declaring that we are inclined to comply with the wishes of this very Christian Dutch lady, and all these together are united under the cloak of Trotskyism. A happy family. A fine "Fourth Trotsky International". And yet we must admit that these "versatile" people represent a serious danger.

That may be seen by the article in the "Vorwärts" on the Opposition platform. This is what the central organ of Noske, Scheidemann and Co. finds to say about that platform:

"The platform of the Russian Opposition, which has appeared in print in the "Fahne des Kommunismus", is an appalling document, showing up the state of affairs in Russia. The reader thinks, especially in regard to the passages describing the situation of the agricultural workers, that he is perusing the description (as given in the English blue-books and also furnished by Marx) of the inhuman lot of the workers at the time of the first wild upgrowth of capitalism."

That is an "appalling document", which is supposed to "unmask" the whole Soviet Union, which as an exploiter of the working class — only think — even surpasses the abominable regime in England in the last century.

Do you understand now, comrades, how the Opposition defends the country of proletarian dictatorship? The Opposition is the chief source of the most disgusting calumny in regard to the Soviet Union and the Party. It has become the "court purveyor" of these high-class calumnies, working to the "social orders" of the international Social Democracy and its masters.

As regards the international connections of the Opposition, they were formed with a whole series of different groups which were never in the ranks of the Communist International.

Thus, e. g., the Dutch "N. A. S." group and the semi-anarchistic elements among the Italian emigrants. All sorts and conditions of men that can in any way harm us flock to the standard of the Opposition, and I must say that our Opposition really does harm the cause of our defence. For it is no matter for joking if the former leaders of the Communist Party start copying the lies of the Mensheviks. (The "Socialist Messenger" declares in No. 23 quite openly: "A truthful picture, which loses nothing by the fact that it repeats the words of the "Socialist Messenger" verbatim." That is where they have got to.) I may add that foreign members of the "Friends of the Soviets Union", some of them outside the Party, have told me that there is no more harmful anti-Soviet force at work than the Opposition with its "revelations" and "sensations". And the Party Congress was fully right in maintaining that such a "defence" of the Soviet Union is incompatible with membership of the Party. (Applause.)

X. THE COMINTERN AND ITS APPARATUS.

I now come to the question of the apparatus of the Comintern and of a few tasks of organisation.

On the occasion of the last Party Congress, the report of the delegation in the Executive Committee of the Comintern led to a resolution, charging the delegation of the C. P. S. U. in the E. C. C. I. with the task of ensuring a collective conduct of the Communist International by a greater participation of the foreign Communist parties in its immediate leadership.

Was this resolution of the Party Congress executed? I must admit, comrades, that this resolution was to a great part not executed, to the detriment both of the leadership and of the apparatus of the Comintern. We have not succeeded in bringing about a full and permanent representation of the Communist parties. The foreign comrades have been forced to return to their countries and have been whole taken up by their internal affairs. The basis of leadership of the Communist International is still very narrow. To ensure the existence of a sufficiently broad basis is a task that must be solved, whatever the cost.

We must ensure a permanent representation here of the most important Communist parties and also a consolidated group of leaders here in Moscow, while at the same time I consider it my duty to say that our Party must provide an adequate number of collaborators for the support of the Comintern apparatus.

The same thing must be said most emphatically with regard to the R. I. L. U. I began my report by speaking of the shortcomings of the Party and the shortcomings of this matter in our case. I exposed these shortcomings ruthlessly. But I assure you that, whatever resolutions may be passed (e. g. that the work in the R. I. L. U. must be increased, that we must ensure a more amicable and co-ordinate activity of the R. I. L. U. and the A. U. C. T. U., that an active participation of the latter in the former must be rendered possible, and that all work which the A. U. C. T. U. conducts in the West European countries must be increased), whatever resolutions, I say, may be passed, all this will to a great degree be but a vain wish, if we do not strengthen the **organisation** of our apparatus, for in spite of the greatest accuracy in our political directives we shall always have to suffer in their execution.

Very often we responded too late to a number of important events. Added to this, the representatives of our Party have of late been charged far more than formerly with work in the C. P. S. U. itself. We have no guarantee at all that we shall be able to devote more time to the matters of the Comintern, for the situation is very complicated and it is not easy to be active on all fronts at the same time. Therefore I consider it necessary clearly to face the questions of a permanent representation here on the part of the most important Communist parties, and secondly of our very modest demand for more workers. The same applies to the R. I. L. U., which cannot be expected to increase its work if its organisatory apparatus is not also strengthened. Altogether the problem of the leading cadres of the Comintern deserves our closest attention. Something is already being done in that direction. We have the International Lenin School, where people are trained. But the formation of our leading cadres and the choice of the right people are matters that call for considerable attention.

We must, indeed, pay all the more attention to these matters, seeing that some of our forces have been directed towards the West. (We adopted a resolution to form a West European secretariat of the Comintern.) Finally, I must draw your attention to a matter which calls for an effort on the part of our Party. I mean our preparation for the next international Congress of the Comintern, which will demand more of us than any other congress. For there we shall for the first time tackle such a vital and tremendous question as the colonial problem. We shall also draw our conclusions on such a gigantic problem as that of the Chinese revolution. We are entering upon a new phase, a turn to the Left on the part of the entire West European movement. We are entering upon a phase of increasing war dangers requiring of the Communist International the investigation of all questions in such a connection. Finally, we must leave that Congress at all costs in possession of the completed draft of a programme of the Comintern. This confronts our Party with the necessity of remodelling the Party programme. We cannot postpone the adoption of the programme for the third time. The Social Democratic parties have at their last congresses worked out their several programmes, and we must confront them with ours, with the programme of the Comintern. That calls for additional work. We must make adequate preparations for the next Congress of the Comintern, which will take place in May next.

Conclusion.

I now draw to a close. If we review the main conclusions we have been able to draw from what has been said, we must in the first place make mention of the fact that we are entering upon a new phase of international development, which is **favourable** for the Comintern. In West Europe we see the development of contradictions in capitalist stabilisation, in connection with which there is a decided turn to the Left of the broad masses of the working class. We see the internal differences of stabilisation, especially as regards economy, reflected in social class antagonisms. We see how, after its defeats of the last few years, the working class is beginning to revive, to close its ranks and to hold up its banner; we see it developing towards the Left, revolutionising, once more emphasising the problems of the class struggle, and thus preparing the way for mass action by the Communist Party. We are entering not upon a phase of pacification, but upon a phase of **colonial** struggles, for the great Chinese revolution is not dead but lives and develops, engendering with its powerful breath the revolution in India, which is at present in a state of fermentation and must inevitably enter into the great historical arena of a fight against imperialism.

We see how European capitalism is attempting to corrupt the working class by new methods, to which end it has allied itself with the Social Democrats; but at the same time we may see that European capitalism affords no good ground for such methods and that, despite a temporary increase of prosperity, it is confronted by the prospect of renewed differences, accompanied by an ever increasing class struggle. We can see how,

in spite of pacifist illusions, and in spite of the camouflage of the Social Democrats, tremendous conflicts are ripening within the womb of capitalist society.

Let the Social Democratic Philistines and the petty-bourgeois elements comfort themselves with their illusions as to the advent of a new age of peace under the capitalist regime, which professes to free the whole of humanity from war. The sober Marxian analysis ruthlessly reveals the fundamental reality of our times. The capitalist regime is inevitably leading humanity into gigantic disasters, which will even surpass the war of 1914 in their extent. At the same time this Marxian analysis shows how within capitalist society itself forces of resistance are ripening against the destructive catastrophes of the imperialist period. The future promises us no renown, it promises a hard fight. But in this fight the Communist worker will no longer appear, like Liebknecht, as an isolated champion. He will enter the fight as an organised force which has formed its first communist ranks, which are entering with full consciousness the new period of conflict in the history of humanity. And though we cannot guarantee that the **entire** mass of workers will rise at once at the very first shot fired against the Soviet Union, we may be sure that the first shot will call to arms all the best forces in the labour movement, and that, in many hard fights and after passing through various stages of doubt and vacillation, we shall eventually arouse such an oceanic revolutionary wave as will sweep away the barbarity of capitalism to its very last remnants. (Prolonged Applause.)

The Discussion on the Report of Comrade Bukharin.

(Full Report.)

Comrade LOZOVSKY:

On the whole I am in agreement with Comrade Bukharin's statements; I shall only deal with two points which do not appear to me to be perfectly clear, and require serious discussion: State capitalism and the slogan of nationalisation.

If the starting point of Comrade Bukharin's report, with regard to the shifting of economic centres, is right — and without doubt it is —, this implies, as our experience teaches, a simultaneous shifting of the centres of the labour movement. Whilst Europe is losing its industrial and financial hegemony, the European or so-called West European labour movement is losing its hegemony in the international movement of the working class, and this hegemony is concentrating at two opposite poles: On the one hand at the pole of the Soviet Union, representing the revolutionary wing of the labour movement, and on the other hand at the pole of America, representing consistent and systematic reformism.

The period through which we are passing is characterised by the enormous growth of the labour movement on the coasts of the Pacific. It suffices to remember China, Japan, India, the Philippines, Java, and Australia, to realise the extent of the labour movement which has sprung up. And in this labour movement neither European-American reformism nor the Amsterdam International possesses the hegemony, but the Red International of Labour Unions.

What process has been going on in European reformism during the last few years? It may be said that it has been a process of almost complete nationalisation of the reformist trade unions and social democratic parties. Comrades Stalin and Bukharin have commented on the turn to the Right among the reformist leaders.

Comrade Bukharin rightly emphasised the necessity of the further expansion and firmer establishment of the R. I. L. U. What is the greatest weakness of the R. I. L. U., where are the weakest points of the activity of our organisations? It must be admitted (and this applies equally to the Comintern) that there exists a wide disparity between our political influence and the organisatory effect of this influence.

What do we see, as a matter of fact? We observe the same course of events in almost every country. A gigantic struggle among the British miners, general strike, growth of the Communist Party and spread of the Minority Movement — and then ebbtide again. After the execution of Sacco and Venzetti, and after a series of great economic struggles, we observe the same strange result: No definite result in either the Communist Parties on in our Red Trade Unions. This is the weak point, both in the work of the Comintern and the R. I. L. U., and serious attention will have to be paid to the organisation of work in this direction, and with this of course of political work.

Comrade Bukharin has described the present situation, chiefly the situation of European and American capitalism, and drawn attention to the fact that a period of state capitalism is setting in. Here he sums up the forces of the growing trusts, syndicates, and combines, the increasing powers of the private monopolist organisations, under the general designation of state capitalism. I am of the opinion that this mode of expression is not quite correct. Is there a difference between private monopolist and State capitalist undertakings? Hitherto this difference has existed. What has happened? The trusts and other combines, private monopolist organisations, rule by means of the bourgeois States. That is true. This dominion has extended, that is again true. What has happened has not been so much a nationalisation of combines and trusts, as a certain trustification (Bukharin seems to refer to this) of the State apparatus. Can this be named State capitalism? I do not think it can. I believe that such a mode of expression may lead to a certain theoretical confusion, and with this to political confusion.

Neither do I agree with Comrade Bukharin that the slogan of nationalisation is out of date, and cannot be further proclaimed. Let us take Great Britain. The struggle between our Party and the Labour Party, in the mining question, has been carried on for many years on the following lines: The Labour Party has declared: „Nationalisation of the mines with compensation for the mineowners“; and the Communist Party has replied: „Nationalisation of the mines without compensation“. I ask Comrade Bukharin: What is there opportunist in the slogan of: „Nationalisations without compensation“? Can we renounce this slogan in Great Britain after 6 years of struggle? Has anything changed in Great Britain? Was the situation revolutionary there at one time and is no longer so? This is not the right way to regard the matter. We throw our Parties into confusion by doing so. The case is different when we speak of workers' control. The slogan of workers' control is one issued immediately before the revolution, and can only be proclaimed on the crest of a rising revolutionary wave.

It would be wrong to proclaim the slogan of workers' control in Germany at the present time for instance, as a practical and immediate slogan, since at the present juncture there is no upward revolutionary surge. When the revolutionary tide rises again this slogan will once more become absolutely necessary.

The next question is what is to be done to strengthen the R. I. L. U. The R. I. L. U. is strong and weak in proportion to the strength and weakness of the Comintern. What must be done to extend and develop the work of the R. I. L. U.? A trade union secretariat of the countries of the Pacific has been formed. This has opened up a connection between the trade union movement of the Soviet Union and the labour movement of the Philippines. The trade union secretariat of the countries of the Pacific has gathered together the whole of the trade unions of Australia. It is true that these organisations are still permeated with the old reformist traditions, but in some of the fairly important industrial regions (New South Wales) some of these unions possess a vanguard which is not only organisatorically connected with the R. I. L. U., but shares its ideology.

The next step must be joint work for the formation of a trade union federation in Latin America. Here there is a young and energetic labour movement, corroded however on the one hand by anarcho-syndicalism, and on the other by that Gomperism which still prevails in sections of the labour movement of Latin America. Our influence in this movement is considerable, and we must direct our next efforts towards the creation of a South American trade union federation. The preliminary work has already been accomplished, and within the next few months the federation will come into existence.

Not long ago the „Pravda“ published a mile-long article by Zinoviev with the title: „The 21 conditions of the Leninist Comintern“. In this article Zinoviev protests against our having recommended the C. G. T. U. to strike out the paragraph on the dictatorship of the proletariat from its statutes. He considers this to be an error, and a concession to syndicalism. He declares:

„The Leninist wing of the Comintern (the Opposition) not only repudiates all responsibility for such concessions, but condemns them decidedly. (Discussion supplement No. 2.)“

Is this really an opportunist deviation on the part of the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern — for in this question we act at one with the Comintern —? Is it really an opportunist deviation for which Zinoviev here refuses to „undertake the responsibility“?

At the II. Congress of the R. I. L. U. the C. G. T. U., still headed at that time by the anarcho-syndicalists and some few communists of an anarcho-syndicalist tendency, demanded that we cross out paragraph II from our statutes. This paragraph states that the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern work on the basis of mutual representation. I remember that doubts arose on this:

question. Comrade Zinoviev for instance was in doubt, but Lenin had none. He asked me where they were going, towards us or from us? I replied, towards us. Then let us make this concession. We made this concession on the question of mutual representation in the Comintern and the R. I. L. U. at the time when Zinoviev was president of the Comintern. But now he declares solemnly that the Left, Leninist, and so forth Opposition declines all responsibility.

Very well, the Opposition refuses this responsibility. But for what does it undertake responsibility? I may adduce a few instances. At the Shanghai Pan-Asiatic Conference, where the representatives of the Japanese and Chinese bourgeoisies, and of the bourgeoisies of a number of other countries were present, the Japanese placed on the agenda the question of the proscription of Communism and the communists from Asia, and after this the whole Conference elected to its honorary presidium Senator Borah, the pacifist and parson-like Bertrand Russell, and the Left oppositional Trotzky. On the one hand the Conference wants to drive Communism and the communists from Asia, and on the other hand it chooses as its honorary presidents the buffoon Senator Borah, the sanctimonious Bertrand Russell, and the "Left" oppositional Trotzky! Not the "Right" Bukharin nor the "Right" Stalin, but the "Left" Trotzky. Why? Does Zinoviev undertake the responsibility for this or not?

Second fact. In France a newspaper appears under the name of "Proletarian Revolution". There is however nothing either proletarian or revolutionary in it. The number appearing on 15th November contained an article entitled: "The First Consul Stalin" (from Thermidor we have already reached the Consulate stage). The leading article follows up a series of observations on Thermidor by this passage:

"The new period on which Russia is entering will have the unhappy privilege of combining two epochs: its form will be that of the consulate and the imperium, its essential character that of restoration."

I ask Zinoviev: Does he undertake the responsibility for this article, written by his supporters in France? Yes or no?

Third instance. Shortly before our Congress a periodical appeared in France, entitled "Against the Stream". A strange title, you will say, but this need not disturb us. The name is "Against the Stream", followed by the description "Organ of the Communist Opposition". One article is devoted to the position of the C. P. of the Soviet Union. It points out that the C. P. of the Soviet Union has run off the rails, is degenerating, and so forth. This "Organ of the Communist Opposition", headed by Loriot and a number of other Communist Philistines, writes as follows:

"The difficulties of the struggle, the tragedy of the situation, everything reminds us of the no less dark and no less dangerous turning point in the history of the working class: the world war.

The analogy is impressive; now, as thirteen years ago, we see leaders who are not up to their tasks, we see the masses deceived and confused. Now as then we see decay, falsehood, and fanaticism. And again we see a mere handful of human beings fighting determinedly against the danger, in the face of calumny and persecution. As the Bolsheviks did in 1914."

Against what did the Bolsheviks fight in 1914? They fought against social patriotism and chauvinism, but here a comparison is drawn between them and people fighting against Communism. It would be interesting to learn whether the "Left", "Cominternists", "consequent", and other groups of the Opposition will undertake the responsibility for this attitude on the part of their ideological and political adherents? We have heard nothing in the press of their drawing any line of demarcation between themselves and these would-be communists; the only line of demarcation which they have drawn is between themselves and the Comintern and the R. I. L. U.

What are our first tasks?

The labour movement in the countries of the Pacific Ocean, especially the labour movement in China, India, Indonesia, Japan, etc., must be given the greatest attention.

The labour movement in Latin America must be closely followed, and aid given towards the formation of a South American trade union federation uniting all the revolutionary elements of South America, both those in the R. I. L. U. and those not yet members.

The continuation of the determined fight against the Amsterdam International. It must not be forgotten for a moment that this International unites half Europe's protectors of capitalism among the workers.

The tactics of the united front and of unity, chiefly from below, are to be continued, and the fight against the reformist leaders carried on more energetically.

The R. I. L. U. must receive more decided support from the Comintern and the trade unions of the Soviet Union, enabling it to win over larger masses of the proletariat.

The revolutionary unions belonging to the R. I. L. U. (in France, Czechoslovakia, etc.) are to be extended.

In places where the reformist unions are falling to pieces in consequence of their tactics and the workers are deserting them, the initiative must be taken towards the formation of trade union organisations for reaching the masses. We must not shrink from the great difficulties which may no doubt arise in every country.

And finally, our utmost endeavours must be exerted to remove the disparity between the political influence of the Comintern and the R. I. L. U., and the organisatory effect of this influence. (Applause.)

Comrade SCHATZKIN:

Comrade Losovsky rightly pointed out that the indubitable growth of the trust, and of its influence on the State, does not yet imply the growth of State capitalist tendencies. I too am of the opinion that Comrade Bukharin does not judge quite correctly in this question, so important for the formation of an estimate of the present international situation. The point is that while the growth of the trust and its influence is characteristic of imperialism, and of all monopolist capitalism, it represents no specifically State capitalist peculiarity, no symptom of a State capitalist tendency, although it creates the prerequisite for the existence of State capitalism. In America, for instance, there was colossal concentration of capital even before the war, and a government controlled in actual practice by the two great trust and banking concerns of Morgan and Rockefeller. But in spite of that no one mentioned State capitalism. Up to now we have thought of State capitalism as something new, a new form of capitalism growing on the soil of monopolist capitalism, but representing a step forward, something new. We — and with us Comrade Bukharin — have hitherto understood under State capitalism an interference of the State in economic life, direct State influence on production and distribution, either by means of State ownership of the separate undertakings, or by some other form of State control.

Seen from this standpoint, the thesis of the tendency to State capitalism cannot be applied internationally; it is only right with respect to separate countries.

Comrade Bukharin substantiates his argument with a reference to the rise of a "corporative state" in Italy. It must be observed that the question of the difference between the early stage of development of capitalism and State capitalism is by no means decided by the form of bourgeois power. It is not a question of how the bourgeois dictatorship is organised, but of the relations between the State apparatus and the economic apparatus of this dictatorship.

During the war we had Parliamentary governments — or at least they were such according to their formal origin — both in Germany and in England, and yet these were much more State capitalist in character than the "corporative state" of Mussolini. The Fascist government of Italy, straining every nerve to regulate export and import, the distribution of raw materials, credit, etc. etc., considered the idea, only three years ago, of denationalising the telephones, the tobacco trade, etc. But it is a well known fact that the State monopoly is one of the most important instruments of State capitalism.

Neither can I accept Comrade Bukharin's second argument. The economic activities of the municipality of Vienna do not differ in principle from the activities of other communal bodies, but merely in "socialist" demagoguery. The Viennese municipality does not control or regulate the industries of Vienna. It is true that its undertakings have a greater specific weight

in Austrian economics than in parallel cases in other countries. But this is explained by the fact that since the peace of Saint Germain nothing is left of Austria but the capital and its environs.

In Japan we may find true elements of State capitalism. But, in the first place this is not new, and cannot be taken as a symptom of a fresh movement in the international situation, and in the second place, as Comrade Bukharin himself recognises, it is the result of Japan's peculiar transition from feudalism to capitalism, and cannot be brought forward as evidence of an international tendency.

In Italy a certain advance of State capitalist tendencies may be observed. But if we look at France or Germany, we see the opposite process going on.

In Germany, for instance, before the partial stabilisation of capitalism, there was at least a State control of export and import, a State regulation of the export and import of currency, a State coal distribution, and even in 1924, after the establishment of a fixed currency, an attempt on the part of the German government to regulate market prices from above. Now there is nothing left of all this. And most important of all, the railways of Germany, the basis of its national economy, have passed into the hands of a private company.

In France the bourgeoisie is fighting fiercely for the abolition of the State monopolies. Since the Swedish match trust has been permitted to carry on its activities in France, the match monopoly has been practically destroyed.

We come to the following conclusion. In some countries there is a growth of State capitalist tendencies, whilst in others we see the contrary process of the liquidation of the last relics of State capitalism. Hence we cannot speak of a development of State capitalist tendencies on an international scale.

To the question of the main danger threatening the Comintern we must reply: The main danger is the Trotskyist Opposition and its international bloc. Is this a Right or a Left danger? Both ultra-Left and ultra-Right elements combine, but the danger is essentially Right. This danger is the greatest danger, for the reason that the Opposition is against the Soviet Union, against the proletarian dictatorship, and represents the social democratic standpoint; indeed it is even more injurious than social democracy, for open Menshevism is less dangerous to us than Menshevism under a cloak of Communism.

The question of the Opposition does not however exhaust the question of the inner situation of the Comintern. We shall liquidate the Opposition, but the Comintern and our Communist Parties will remain, and we must follow carefully the processes going on in these Parties.

What are the deviations and dangers most conspicuous during the last few years? I believe: the Right danger. Compared with the time of the V. World Congress, the Right danger has doubtless lessened, but in comparison with the period of the XIV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. it has increased. This does not mean that the Bolshevisation has not been successful. We have been successful, but not entirely, and one of the greatest failings is the increase of Right deviations.

Comrade Bukharin has already mentioned here that the C. C. of the English Party opposed the appeal issued by the Soviet trade unions on the occasion of the English general strike, and has further referred to "individual vacillations", as he expresses it, in connection with the changes in tactics towards the labour government and the Labour Party. In the English Party we have a group — in the minority however — which regards work in the army as unnecessary. The minority of the C. C. adopts a rejective attitude towards the slogan of the general strike against the trade union bill. The vacillations with regard to the changes in our present political course in England are, unfortunately, not merely the vacillations of separate individuals. At the last Party Congress of the C. C. of Great Britain the general slogan proposed was that of the replacement of the Baldwin government by a labour government under the control of the working class. In my opinion this slogan is a wrong one in the face of the experiences of the MacDonald government, of the Labour Party betrayal and of the General Council, etc. What does the Party Congress understand under the control of the working class? Nothing more than that "the next labour government is to be controlled by the executive of the Labour Party". That is, MacDonald is to

correct himself! In my opinion this is more than vacillation, it is pure opportunism. This same Party Congress resolved to issue the slogan of the reconstitution of the Anglo-Russian Committee, whilst the Communist International has issued the slogan of the United Front from below, thereby superseding the period of the Anglo-Russian Committee, the slogan suitable at the time when it was issued.

Comrade Bukharin has further drawn attention to many of the errors of the French Party, but he has omitted the greatest of these. In France today the question of election tactics is identical with the question of the relations of the Communist Party to the petty and middle bourgeoisie. And yet there is a strong and considerable group in the C. C. of the C. P. F. (though not a majority), composed of fairly well known leaders of the French Party, which is opposed to the standpoint of the C. C., and which insists on supporting the radicals at the elections all along the line, saturated as this is with Parliamentary cretinism. This is particularly dangerous in the French Party, in which the Parliamentary deviation is a tradition.

What was the attitude of the Austrian Party to the rising in July in Vienna? A large section of the C. C. did not even recognise for some time that it was a rising at all. The Austrian Party opposed the slogan of Soviets during the Vienna insurrection. Even after the insurrection the C. C. of the Austrian C. P. issued the slogan of the municipalisation of the police, that is, of the transference of the police from the hands of the central government into those of the Viennese social democracy.

At the last elections the Communist Party of Bulgaria helped the social democrats by communist votes to obtain seats in parliament, although the Bulgarian social democrats are notoriously the most despicable in the whole Second International. The Party helped them to form a great Menshevik Party. It has refused to recognise this error up to now, in spite of the criticism of the Comintern.

The Communist Party of Poland acknowledged unanimously at its last Party Congress that the Right danger continues to be the greatest danger threatening it.

The same applies to the C. P. of China. There the C. C. has succeeded in clearing itself to a certain extent of the opportunist elements, but there are still many of these among the Party functionaries.

Germany is often cited as an instance in which the ultra-Left is the greatest danger. It need not be said that it is the Opposition which represents the chief danger, here as in all other countries. But in Germany the Right, crushed by their defeat in 1923, had not ventured by 1925 to raise their voices again. Since the Essen Party Congress we see, however, a definitely Right group pressing forward again, not only issuing the slogan of workers' control but demanding the revision of our relations to the Left social democracy, and holding the opinion that we must not deem this to be our chief enemy, that we must take into account its subjectively revolutionary trends, etc. As the ultra-Left danger lessens in the German Party, in the same proportion this Right group inevitably advances to the offensive against the C. C.

The chief danger is the Opposition; but none the less the Right danger in our Parties is exceedingly great. We must recognise this fact, and take energetic measures against the Right danger.

The Opposition lies when it accuses the Comintern of failing to combat the Right danger. Every case which I have mentioned here has been individually and even severely criticised by the Comintern. At the present juncture we have to intensify our combat against the Right danger not only on a national scale, not only to criticise from case to case, but to take up a line of international action.

The Young Communist International can boast of considerable success of late, both in anti-military work and in the struggle against the youth organisations of the enemy, but there are still many difficulties in its path. Many of the organisations have been dispersed, their members scattered; in other countries we find a numerical stagnation of membership, and it is only here and there that a gradual increase in the number of members may be recorded. The Opposition has less influence in the Y. C. I. than in the Comintern. There is no section in which an opposition of any significance is to be found. (Applause.)

Comrade LOMINADSE:

I fully agree with all that Comrade Schatzkin said on the Right dangers in the Comintern.

The ultra-Left current in the Comintern, and our Opposition, represent a new Menshevism differing very little from the old. But we must not confuse the ultra-Left deviation with the Right. These two deviations are merely two aspects of one and the same phenomenon, only that the "ultra-Left" current winds its way among the shallows of Left phraseology. We have always made a distinction between the Right, undisguised Menshevist deviation and the ultra-Left deviation. Many comrades believe that in the European Communist movement an amalgamation of these two extremes is going on. (Varga and Lozovsky: "Right!") That is only right to a certain degree, and it would be wrong to state it flatly.

We have a number of Right groups against which the Comintern is fighting. These groups have nothing to do with the ultra-Left, and we have every reason to believe that they will be overcome within the confines of the communist movement, and that there will be no necessity to combat them with the severe measures required against the ultra-Left. We must at least admit, when we eliminate the question of our Opposition and the question of the ultra-Left opposition — as Comrade Bukharin says — that the errors committed by the Parties in every country during the last two years have been Right errors (Lozovsky: "Yes, if we eliminate like that, but that is not the way to eliminate"). During these two years no Party has committed Left errors, and we must give attention to this fact. The ultra-Left have not the leadership in any Party. Left errors may be observed in individual sections of the Parties, but the errors of the leaders have been Right errors (Tomsy: "And the under-estimation of the work in the trade unions, is that not an arch-Left error?").

Nobody defends the standpoint of denying the importance of trade union work. The fault lies in ignorance of the right way to go to work, and that cannot be called a Left error. If you did not understand how to work in the trade unions, Comrade Tomsy, would that transform you into a Left? (Laughter.) Tomsy: "In that case it is simply a stupid deviation." (Laughter.)

Lominadse: To be sure. (Laughter.) Comrade Lozovsky defends the slogan of the nationalisation of the English coal mining industry. This slogan has always been retained by the Comintern for England, in view of the special historical conditions of the English labour movement, whilst at the same time the Comintern has been perfectly well aware that this slogan is quite unsuited to other capitalist countries. But comrade Lozovsky has here defended this slogan for every country. He says: The slogan of nationalisation with compensation must be opposed by the slogan of nationalisation without compensation. It is entirely wrong to put the question in this way, for how can the nationalisation of separate branches of industry or separate undertakings be demanded when a capitalist dictatorship rules, and not a proletarian?

The question of nationalisation is of profound importance. Last spring there was a dispute with the Right comrades in the German Party, because these demanded that the German communists should reply to the social-democratic demand for the nationalisation of the match industry with compensation by a slogan demanding nationalisation without compensation. The C. C. of the C. P. G. rejected this proposal.

Now to the question of the Chinese revolution.

In 1927 the Chinese revolution has suffered three severe defeats: the first at Shanghai, the second at Wuhan, and the third in Kwantung, where the revolutionary armies of Ho Lung and Yeh Ting have been defeated. The objective cause of these defeats is the fact that in China the labour and peasant movements have not developed simultaneously.

We have comrades who do not believe that the combined forces of the proletariat and the peasantry in China are strong enough to break the rule of the landowners, the Chinese bourgeoisie and international imperialism. I am, however, fully confident that the Chinese proletariat and the Chinese peasantry together are fully capable of carrying the revolution forward to a victorious termination. The characteristic feature of the present situation in China is that the growing and spreading spontaneous peasant movement is awakening an echo in the working class of China, which is taking the form of a rising strike wave and an accentuation of the political struggle.

The union of these two currents — the rising of the peasantry and the development of the labour movement — is the key to a fresh advance in the Chinese revolutionary people's movement.

A few words on the general crisis in China. Agriculture declines from year to year. The cause of this is to be found in the last remnants of that peculiar type of Chinese feudalism, which may better be called (and was so designated by Marx) the Asiatic method of production. It is a method which renders the class struggle in the village a very acute one.

According to statements compiled by "impartial" American and other investigators, 80 per cent. of the Chinese peasantry are living below the level of starvation. The constant wars, and the decay of the Chinese State, have led to the neglect of that system of irrigation and drainage upon which the whole cultivation of rice in China depends.

The decline of agriculture is accompanied by a severe crisis in Chinese industry. At the present time a considerable part of the textile and silk industry is laid idle. (Varga: "Right!") In Hankow and a number of other industrial districts almost all the factories are closed down. This constitutes a great danger to the labour movement. There is widespread unemployment in Hankow, and the workers will be scattered everywhere in the rural districts if the working class does not gain the victory in the meantime.

The collapse of the markets, and the traffic service, the financial anarchy, are signs of the coming economic breakdown and the impending catastrophe.

The economic crisis is accompanied by a political and State crisis. The bourgeoisie, after betraying the revolution, has proved incapable of accomplishing the unification of China. On the contrary the bourgeois military reaction in China has contributed to the greater dismemberment of the country. The bourgeoisie has proved a historical abortion. It had scarcely the strength to go over into the camp of counter-revolution; this done, it collapsed. It no longer represents any united political force. Its separate groups are commanded by separate militarists. (A voice: "You exaggerate!") I do not exaggerate at all.

After the coup the Kuomintang not only ceased to be a revolutionary force, it ceased to exist as party at all. Can a party be called a political party when it contains three or four organisations pretending simultaneously to the position of central committee, and when the purging of the party is carried out by non-party generals? The Kuomintang as a political party exists no longer. (Stalin: "And what is left of the bourgeoisie?") A few bourgeois were left. (Laughter.) A few groups of bourgeoisie were left.

The part played by the yellow trade unions must not be under-estimated. Comrade Bukharin has committed this error. We cannot regard the yellow trade unions in China as an American type of the corruption of the working class, etc. No, they are more than a band of good-for-nothings, officers, and generals. The majority of the Chinese yellow trade union leaders have nothing to do with production. They dub themselves trade unions, but in reality they are only terrorist punitive detachments of the bourgeoisie, seeking to suppress the workers by methods of physical force. Of late it has happened that workers intending to come out on strike first kill the yellow trade unionists and every worker who might be a strike-breaker. (Tomsy: "A peculiar preparation for a strike!")

In China the working class is badly organised, and the R. I. L. U. should be aware of this. The R. I. L. U. gives too little aid, even with respect to instructions as to how trade union work, shall be conducted.

The organisatory defects of the Chinese Party are very great. One of these defects is of great political importance. This is the fact that the C. P. of China, after removing its opportunist leaders, has not yet succeeded in bringing fresh life into the staff of functionaries establishing contact between the C. C. and the members.

This staff of functionaries is not composed of workers, nor of peasants, but of petty bourgeois intellectuals, who have brought with them into the Communist Party all their prejudices, irresolution, and incapacity for determined fighting. Even the correct decisions of the C. C. are distorted by the local leaders of the Party organisations.

Those errors which were recognised by the Chinese Party at its Conference, and openly liquidated before the whole of

the Party members, have been repeated by the intellectuals leading the Party in the armies of Ho Lung and Yeh Ting; the lack of contact with the peasantry, the failure to issue revolutionary slogans prevented the army from receiving aid from the peasantry at the proper time, and consequently suffered defeat.

Even from the purely military standpoint the matter has not been very consoling. The leaders of the army proved very clumsy at military strategy.

The Chinese Party is faced by a number of urgent tasks. In many of the provinces there are spontaneous risings. The Communist Party must place itself at the head of these risings and unite the scattered peasant insurrections into one general rising. If this task is to be fulfilled, the cadres of leading functionaries must be replaced by workers and peasants.

In his article on the 21 conditions of the Comintern, Zinoviev recently declared that the Communist Party of China would find room enough in Wang Tin Wei's side pocket. A more revolting attack on the C. P. of China cannot be imagined. The C. P. of China has made mistakes which no European Party could have recovered from at all, and nevertheless has still 20,000 to 25,000 members, working under incredibly difficult conditions. The maintenance of so large an organisation under such conditions is in itself something which has not yet been imitated.

There is no doubt that the Party is at the same time making ideological progress. One of the greatest errors of the Party has been its acceptance, without criticism, of the teachings of Sun Yat Sen. The Party is now beginning to combat Sunyat senism, and retain only that which is revolutionary in it.

The C. P. of China has been successful in avoiding of late a number of errors into which our brother European Parties have fallen. At the time of the Pilsudski upheaval in Poland, the Polish Party supported Pilsudski, and made grave opportunist mistakes. The C. P. of China, although its past contains many records of Menshevik and opportunist errors, has not supported General Chang Fa Gu, in spite of all his Left promises and phrases, but has adopted a strictly hostile attitude towards him. This is a proof of the fundamental improvement of the inner character of the Party.

At the present time the Party is faced, in Kwantung and a number of other provinces with the problems of the struggle for power and the organisation of armed insurrection. The Party is fighting under the general slogan of Soviets. It has, however, resolved to found Soviets only in such places where there is a guarantee of their permanency. The fact that the Communist Party in Kwantung has now taken steps towards the organisation of Soviets, and that Soviets already exist in five districts, is a proof that in this province the situation is revolutionary enough in order to raise the question of power, and it is probable that we shall hear of great revolutionary action in this province before long. Entire success cannot of course be guaranteed, but we may be assured that the C. P. of China, even though Zinoviev wants to slip it into Wang Tin Wei's side pocket, will in the struggles now commencing prove itself worthy of its part as leader of the Chinese workers' and peasants' revolution. (Applause.)

Comrade MANUILSKY:

I should like to deal mainly with the processes of radicalisation taking place in the European working class. I need not refer to China, for Comrade Lominadse has already done so in a most interesting manner. I must, however, observe in passing that some of Comrade Lominadse's assertions appear to me somewhat doubtful. If there is no feudalism in China, no bourgeoisie, and no trade unions, and if on the other hand hundreds of millions of the population of China have vanished somewhere, we must ask who is still left to fight there, and against whom? I fancy that Comrade Lominadse shoots somewhat beyond the mark, and that his description of the situation in China does not quite correspond with actualities. I turn from this question to deal with the European situation.

My reasons for discussing the processes of radicalisation in the European working class are, firstly: In connection with these processes the Comintern is confronted at the present time with a number of practical tasks relating to the penetration of the broad masses of the workers by the Comintern and our separate sections; secondly, it is by no means a matter of in-

difference to us in what form these processes take place, for the coming war must not be permitted to be solely an attack of world capital on the Soviet Union, but at the same time a war waged by the Soviet Union against the imperialism attacking it, a war which, with the growing antagonisms and the radicalisation of the international working class, will be a part of these revolutionary processes; and thirdly, on these processes depends the speed of the decline of that Trotzkyist neo-menshevism which has sprung up in some of our European Parties. As the fresh advance of the labour movement in our country in 1912 swept away the then ultra-Left deviation of the "Vperiod" group, so now the rising wave of the labour movement will sweep away Trotzkyist neo-menshevism. Trotzkyist neo-menshevism, the offspring of defeatism, will not stand the test in the coming great struggles.

The strikes.

The number just published of the "Party Worker" contains a detailed characterisation of the strikes in Germany. The strikes are participated in not only by the workers organised in the reformist trade unions, but by the unorganised masses, and the Fascist and Christian trade unions are also taking an active part in the strikes. It is many years since so intense a strike movement has swept over Germany. We observe the same thing in Italy, where a large number of great undertakings are affected by strikes. And we see the same again in Poland. In France, too, there are signs of an approaching strike wave. The Comintern must give due attention to all this.

The uplift of the European labour movement under the conditions imposed by the capitalist stabilisation is a complete refutation of the catastrophic theory of Trotzkyist neo-menshevism, borrowed from social democracy.

What do these strikes signify? I believe that they mean more than mere defence. These strikes develop dialectically from defence to offence, precisely as a military operation commenced on the defensive will develop in the course of successful military struggles into an attack all along the line. Here we are in the midst of a transition period. The working class has not yet adopted the offensive, but is not merely defensive.

What obstacles are there in the way of the increased influence of the communists during these strike struggles? In the first place you will be aware that in many countries the Communist Parties form a kind of unemployed society. I give a few figures from the period of 1924. In 1924 and 1925, 80 per cent. of the 18,000 members of the Berlin Party organisation were unemployed. Another circumstance hindering active interference in the strikes is the fact that in a number of countries most communists are working in small undertakings. The members of communist nuclei are systematically driven out of the large undertakings, and force to seek work in the smaller ones. This weakens their influence. These are two factors preventing the communists from utilising the present favourable state of economic affairs for an increase of influence over the strike movement.

Another weakness of the communists in the strike struggle is the fact that the largest strikes have broken out without being sufficiently supported by the international proletariat. As an instance of this I may mention the miners' struggle in England. It is universally admitted today that the coal industry of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Germany made use of the English miners' struggle for bettering its position. The working class of these countries failed to do its part. Seen from this standpoint, the development of the strike movement, and especially of the present strikes in the coal trade of North America, becomes a point of concentrated attack in the international arena. This concentrated attack on capital must not be prepared in one country only; the basis of communist influence must be extended to other countries at any price, otherwise every strike of international importance is doomed to defeat.

Winning over the Masses of the Workers.

The advancement of the labour movement raises the question of how we are to win over the main mass, the core of the working class. Today this is one of our main tasks, and one not yet solved by the international communist movement. Such a task as this cannot be accomplished between one Plenum of the E. C. C. I. and another. It requires a whole historical period, preceding the decisive struggle of the working class for its emancipation.

We possess mass parties in three important countries besides the Soviet Union; in Czechoslovakia, where we have one of the greatest mass parties, in Germany, and in France. In other countries we have at present only a very efficient fighting cadre, which may be extended on the outbreak of the struggle in the same manner as an army extends under the militia system. We have no doubt that these cadres will be reinforced from the working class during the process of revolutionary mobilisation. But at the present time they are only cadres. This applies especially to Denmark, Austria, Switzerland, and Holland. Here our Parties remind us rather of Agitprop departments than of real Communist Parties. In the circumstances, when the Communist Parties are embarking on the tremendous task of penetrating the masses of the working class, the disruptive work of the foreign friends of Trotzky and Zinoviev is most disastrous, for it threatens to transform many Communist Parties into small sects, divided into "currents" and fractions.

What is the real meaning of the formula submitted by Trotzky and Vuyovitsch to the Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. in May, to the effect that we must turn aside from the old reformist cadres and turn to new strata of the working class? This formula means that we must wait until the old generation composing the reformist trade unions has died off, wait until the next generation has grown up, and turn in the meanwhile to the anarchist groups. This is an ideology of despair and disbelief. The Opposition here confuses the reformist leaders with the masses of the proletariat. Such trends are dangerous, for they sidetrack the active workers of the Communist Parties on to the line of least resistance. It is of course easier to form an oppositional platform in the Soviet Union, and easier to combine a small group of Treint, Safarov, and Kasparova, than to win over even one reformist trade union abroad. (A voice: "Right".) Today it is easier to form ten such grouplets than to conquer from below the leading position of command in any reformist trade union.

Every communist worker must grasp that the rank and file worker who breaks with social democracy, and joins the communists in the tenth year of the proletarian dictatorship, is, despite his delay, of more value to us than those who desert the communist movement after these ten years.

Vanguard and Class.

When speaking of the weaknesses of the international communist movement, I had no intention of giving the impression that our parties are small and their influence insignificant. This conclusion is not to be drawn from my words. Above all we must remember that the criteria which we can apply to our own Party are not applicable to Western Europe. The relations between the working class and its vanguard are different in Western Europe. Among us the realisation of the proletarian dictatorship enables the working class to play a larger rôle than before. Here class and Party tend to become synonymous. But if we turn to Europe, we find that this is not the case, nor can it be. There the bourgeois State and its whole apparatus stand between the working class and its vanguard.

When our Opposition says, for instance, that at the present time we are using the state apparatus of the Soviet Union against it, then I reply: And in whose hands is the State apparatus in Western Europe? There the apparatus of the bourgeois State is engaged at the present time in the service of neomenschism. One small but pregnant instance suffices here. A short time ago Comrade Humbert Droz went to France for the purpose of conducting a discussion in the French Party. Two days after the opening of the Plenum of the C. C., Humbert Droz was arrested, in order that Treint, who was in possession of the documents of the Opposition, might be given ample opportunity of setting forth his calumnies of the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern, without encountering too powerful an opponent.

You will remember the support given by the German police to Maslow, that mysterious unknown with the enigmatic past, doubtful present, and dark future. In Europe the whole apparatus of the bourgeoisie blocks the road between the working class and its vanguard; here the still powerful Social Democracy and finally the reformist trade unions stand in the path. Here is the starting point for our tasks. Until we have secured a firm footing from below in these trade unions, we shall not be strong enough to break down these barriers. Our

very greatest hindrance is the prejudices of the social democratic workers. These regard the Communist Parties as excellent parties for storming barricades, as parties ready for heroic action in civil war, but unsuitable during a period in which the trade unions must have guidance in their daily struggles. We must overcome this prejudice by our practical work. We must further take into account that our cadres in Europe are as a general rule only cadres, and young cadres without much organisational experience. The only Party possessing old cadres is the Czech. C. P.

This is our weak point, and at the present juncture, when the strike wave is rising and we must penetrate into the trade unions, the cadre question becomes of urgent importance.

The Under-Estimation of the Radicalisation of the Working Class.

Our Parties under-rate the extent of the radicalisation of the European labour movement. Here, too, we must effect certain changes. What is the most valuable content of the reports of Comrades Bukharin and Stalin? That they lay emphasis on this new turning point. I may add a few instances characterising this under-estimation.

Not long ago the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern were faced by the question of the path likely to be chosen by the Norwegian trade union movement. To all appearances the Norwegian trade unions were about to join Amsterdam. The reformists had been carrying on energetic agitation to this end. The Norwegian unions, however, rejected the proposal. Their decision came as a surprise even to us.

Another instance. The French Communist Party, after the demonstrations following the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti, resolved to organise a mass demonstration on the occasion of the arrival of the American legionaries: But at the last moment it beat a retreat, fearing that the movement of the Parisian proletariat might assume elementary forms. The demonstration held a few days later at Clichy showed however that the C. C. of the C. P. F. had under-estimated the sympathies of the Parisian proletariat in this matter.

Yet another instance: the elections in Hamburg. Nowhere had the social democrats waged such savage agitation against our Party as in Hamburg, and the Maslov group had practically allied itself with them. Under such conditions all we hoped for was a number of votes equal to that of the election to the presidency. We did not expect the number we actually received. The Party received 110,000 votes, a number equalling that of 1924, that is, of a period in which German soil was overheated by the revolutionary events. The Maslovites had set up their own list, and received a total of 368 votes, the most crushing defeat which they suffered in all Germany.

Our Polish comrades, too, did not expect that at the elections in Warsaw and Lodz they would receive considerably more votes than the Polish S. P., which is supported by the whole apparatus of Pilsudski's bourgeois State. Poland as one of those countries where the Communist Party has already brought the leading cadres of the working class under its influence, although it has not yet organised them.

We frequently fall into the habit of counting our strength only by the status of our sections, and under-rate the influence of our ideas. This does not mean that we have anything whatever in common with the defeatist mentality so characteristic of the Maslovist neo-menschism, but we go on living in our old traditional manner. We feel and recognise the changes taking place, but often fail to draw the logical conclusions. Our Parties do not yet possess the boldness which their success justifies.

It is our task to overcome this diffidence and realise that the new strike wave opens out fresh possibilities for us to win over the masses.

The Lessons of the Sacco and Vanzetti Campaign.

The campaign for Sacco and Vanzetti is a further sign of radicalisation. In this campaign a number of errors were committed. The C. P. of France, for instance, yielded to the influence of outside elements. It was persuaded to regard the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti as a product of American conditions, of the dominion of the dollar, quite forgetting that these same conditions rule in France. The executions of the Chinese revolutionists were forgotten. A sentimental conception of the matter was allowed to take the place of an analysis of the class character of bourgeois justice. Such deviations were observable in a number of countries. There remains, however, the incontestable

fact that this campaign bore an international character such as we have not witnessed since the campaign against war in 1920.

How can we explain the fact that in 1927 the campaign against the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti assumed much greater dimensions than the campaign against war? The reason is that pacifist sentiment is still very strong among the European proletariat.

This pacifism is extremely dangerous, for it feeds the passivity of the working class.

The preparations for the imperialist war of 1914 to 1918 were carried on under the banners of "Freedom for the peoples", "justice", "Right", and so forth, and today international capital is making these same preparations with the passive aid of the pacifism of the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie is arming against the working masses under the auspices of pacifism. What other "democratic" principle can serve them so well for throwing sand in the eyes of the proletariat as all this chatter about disarmament? But it is international Social Democracy that plays the meanest and most despicable rôle in the preparations of the world bourgeoisie for war, and against the working class. The social democratic babbling on disarmament gives the bourgeoisie the opportunity to arm itself and disarm the proletariat.

A second variety of petty bourgeois pacifism is the fear of revolution. This, it is said is going to entail frightful misery. For years the social democrats have been trying to discourage the masses with tales of our real and alleged economic difficulties. This is becoming however more difficult, since facts refute them.

The workers' delegation who visit us return home with their faith in Social Democracy destroyed. It is not by accident that the Norwegian delegates' report contains the following:

"Before coming here we reproached you communists for having shot those 20 human beings. Now that we, social democrats, are returning home again, we say loudly, that all may hear: Shoot 20,000; we shall have the courage to defend your policy to the European working class." (Applause.)

The second lesson to be drawn from the Sacco and Vanzetti campaign is the application of united front tactics not only within the working class itself, but among other strata of the population. It is of the utmost importance for united front tactics that the hegemony of the movement is in the hands of our vanguard. This was accomplished in the campaign for Sacco and Vanzetti. There were aberrations here and there, but on the whole this campaign was our campaign, carried on all over the world under the leadership of the Communist Parties. For this reason this campaign must serve as a model for the use of united front tactics on a wide scale.

The Elections of 1928.

Will the elections of 1928 alter the situation in Europe in a manner lessening the pressure of European capital upon us? The elections of 1928 will doubtless bring many changes, but they will not diminish the war danger. We may assume that in England the Labour Party in combination with the Liberals will come into power, that in Germany a great coalition will be formed, or possibly a small one, that in France the Left bloc will take the helm. What will all this bring? These elections will open another safety valve for the pacifist tendencies of the masses of the petty bourgeoisie. In Europe the petty bourgeoisie is terrified of war. The greatness of this fear could be seen at the September Conference of the League of Nations, in the declarations of a number of small nations, Holland, Latvia, etc. At the moment international capital is exerting direct pressure on us. Poincaré and Baldwin are doing this with their own hands. The approach of new elections means that the pressure upon us will assume hypocritical forms; the II. International will play a great rôle as agent of the international bourgeoisie.

Since the II. International will be in the company of bourgeois states and governments, the struggle between capital and labour will resolve into a struggle between the II. and III. Internationals. It will be a struggle between the two State systems represented by these two Internationals. The one State system is the Soviet Union, the other that of the bourgeois States represented by the II. International. This period will not resemble the pacifist period of 1924. On the contrary, it will be an epoch of vast social conflicts, of acutest antagonisms between Commu-

nism and Social Democracy, of the polarisation of the labour movement. From this standpoint we may say that 1927 was the most difficult year of our development. 1928 will be a much better year for us as regards revolutionary perspectives, as regards the changed nature of the pressure against us, and as regards the powers of resistance of the working class against world capital.

In this connection the question arises: Upon what should our fire be concentrated? Comrades Lominadse and Schatzkin come forward and say that we should concentrate it against the Right. This is right in itself, only at the present moment our geography deviates from that of Comrades Lominadse and Schatzkin with respect to the position of Right and Left. Fire is to be concentrated against the Right. Our sole enemy is Social Democracy, and this must be defeated both outside our Party and inside it that is, in the tendencies influenced by Social Democracy. To deal the blow against the Right means to deal it against the renegation of Maslov and Korsch. But Comrade Lominadse does not grasp that international Social Democracy has its agent in the labour movement in the shape of neomenchevism, draped in ultra-Left phrases. (Lominadse: "You have made a discovery, haven't you?") But those deviations which exist in the European communist movement — both Right and Left — cannot be compared with this sort of renegation. Up to the present there have been many comrades who have believed that there is one ultra-Left danger, embodied in the persons of Maslov, Ruth Fischer, and others, and on the other hand another danger, the right danger, incorporated by Brandler, by Right shades of opinion in our sections, etc.

This geography is somewhat out of date, Comrade Schatzkin. There are social democratic apostates against whom we sharpen our weapons, and there are other deviations, within our Communist Parties themselves, which we shall overcome inside of the Party. Had Kamenev, who begged the Party Congress to allow the Opposition to defend its views, not descended to Thermidor, he would have been able to defend his views within the Party; I believe that if our Opposition had kept even to the position of the XIV. Party Congress, if it had not resorted to illegal methods, if it had stated its views on the kulak in a comrade-like manner, if it had not fallen into Social Democracy I believe that then its right would have been admitted to defend its views on Party methods within the Party itself.

Comrade Schatzkin has spoken enough here of the Right Party deviations. But is there a Left in the Party? Take the Chemnitz organisation for instance. Its Left deviation is expressed in its tendency to exaggerate the Right danger in the C. P. G.; on this point it is solid with Comrades Lominadse and Schatzkin, for they too see nothing but a Right danger on all sides. They feel slight doubts about that consolidation of the Party carried out by the E. C. C. I. by liquidating the Opposition of the Meyer group and placing it among the leaders.

In the Chemnitz organisation there is a feeling that this consolidation is a mistake, that Meyer plays too great a rôle in the German C. P. etc. Today this organisation is inclined to place an equation sign between Maslov and Brandler.

I maintain that Brandler, in spite of the grave errors which he committed, has never been guilty of such apostasy as Trotzky, Zinoviev and Radek. (A voice: "Hear, hear!") Brandler, after his errors were condemned by the E. C. C. I., really pulled himself together; for four years he was as silent as the dead, and maintained a discipline which might well be recommended to many of our followers. It is time to do away with the legend that the Left workers consumed with revolutionary impatience gather round Maslov. The group around Maslov does not contain any Left workers; it contains weary and disappointed elements. Left workers of this impatient description exist among the revolutionary youth of many countries. There are many in Germany. This current in the Chemnitz organisation, and these Left and Right deviations, will be combated by the Comintern in the spirit of comradeship, within the Party itself.

Comrades Lominadse and Schatzkin maintain that the Right danger has increased of late years. This is not the case. Why do they assert such a thing? Because the Comintern has given closer attention to Right errors during the last two years than was ever given whilst the Comintern was under the leadership of Zinoviev. Compare the present situation with that of a few years ago. At that time we had the Bubnik crisis in Czechoslovakia, the Brandler crisis in Germany, Frossard in France.

Is it possible to make a serious comparison of the present status of our sections with that of that time? The question cannot be put in this way. These comrades want to be original, and to awaken the impression at the Party Congress that the Comintern is really exerting too little effort against the Right danger.

Comrade Lominadse treats the question philosophically. He observes that when we eliminate neo-menshevism in the person of Maslov, etc., the main danger remains — the Right danger. It is quite impermissible to treat the question in this way. It is an extremely dangerous abstract treatment.

Tell us definitely, country for country, where we are to deal the blow. At the present moment, for instance, when the C. C. of the Belgian Party inclines somewhat to neo-menshevism, should we combat this danger, or look for others? Shall we, in Germany of today, where neo-menshevism enjoys the support of the Hindenburg government, take up an effective method of combating it, or shall we continue like a parrot with the old phrases against Brandler? This would mean at bottom that we had arrived at the same position as the Maslov group. This is the reason why I believe that your position is a Left deviation. I believe that a Right danger exists, and that we must combat it; and on the other hand I am of the opinion that Left deviations, large and small, down to the very smallest, have not yet completely vanished. I count among these the currents in the Chemnitz organisation, as also the standpoint of Comrade Schatzkin from the Y. C. I. and of Comrade Lominadse in supporting him. I believe it is characteristic of youth to deviate a little to the Left; only take care that you do not become more Right when you reach the age of 45 — years. (Applause.)

Comrade MELNITSHANSKY:

Comrade Lozovsky has told us that there is a disparity between the political influence of the Red International of Labour Unions and of the Communist International, and the organisatory effect of this influence. The influence is great, but is not crystallised in organisatory form. I shall not compare the influence of the R. I. L. U. with that of the C. I. The trouble with the R. I. L. U. in our international work is that not even this disparity exists. The influence of the R. I. L. U. is not strong in the foreign Communist Parties, and it often happens that when the R. I. L. U. raises this or that question, it does not receive sufficient support to enable it to carry out its projected organisatory plans. We encounter inadequate understanding of the needs of the international trade union movement when we apply to the Communist Parties of the separate countries.

It must be admitted that the R. I. L. U. is obliged to work more like an Agitprop organisation or a publishing enterprise than as an organisatory centre for the guidance of the trade union movement. If we examine carefully into the methods and forms of work of even those united organisations affiliated to the R. I. L. U., for instance the French and Czechoslovakian trade unions, we receive the impression that the leadership of these revolutionary trade unions does not differ from that of the reformist trade unions. When we enter the premises of the reformist trade unions, we feel a deadly stillness, the want of living mass activity, the lack of connection between the leading organs and the masses. When we visit the trade union organs of France or Czechoslovakia, affiliated to the R. I. L. U., we find the same disease, the same methods of work.

The textile union in Czechoslovakia, one of the largest sections of the revolutionary movement, has lost 9,000 to 10,000 out of 50,000 members in recent times. The other trade unions in Czechoslovakia, too, are in a very unfavourable position. This is due to the fact that the revolutionary trade unions here are conducted on most peculiar lines, and do not differ in the least from reformist trade unions. The trade unions are administered, but there is no work done among the masses; not even the masses of the members, not even the leaders of the lower nuclei, are called upon to take part in the discussion of questions concerning the daily work of organisation. The same applies to the French trade unions. Here the strike movement is somewhat more active, but many of our trade unions are not even in a position to undertake any independent action, or to call their workers out on strike.

The trade union movement affiliated to the R. I. L. U. will not be able to carry on the class struggle on a broad basis, nor to grow in numbers and strength, unless it succeeds in

teaching every one of its members to take active part in his organisation, to pay membership subscription, contribute to strike funds, participate in strikes, etc. If the R. I. L. U. possessed sufficient influence in the leadership of the international trade union movement, it could do much to improve working methods, could exercise influence on the Communist Parties through the Comintern, and guide the trade unions into the right channels.

The following is a characteristic instance of the way in which revolutionary workers are trained in trade union work. In the course of the past year the number of members in the Unitarian Union of Textile Workers, Tailors, and Cap Makers (in France these are united in one union) has diminished by 9000 to 10,000. The main cause of this loss of members is the decision of the last conference to raise the subscription from 85 centimes to 1 franc 25 centimes, that is, from 15 to 19 centimes monthly.

The old trade union movement in France has been trained into the habit of paying low subscriptions.

An entirely inconsiderable increase in the monthly subscription is decided upon, from 15 to 19 centimes, which is necessary for current practical work (not even for the strike struggle), and this brings about a mass flight of members. This means that our trade unions are on a very weak footing in this country.

The R. I. L. U. must cease to be a merely intermediary organisation, and must become an organisation centre.

In a number of countries time itself is working for us, and our political influence is increasing; but we lack the capacity to utilise this influence in practical organisation. The work of organising fractions is insufficient; this is work which should be done in every separate country, in order that our influence within the reformist trade unions may be increased.

Let us take Czechoslovakia for instance. Here there are 12 to 14 trade union centres. They are split up according to various national and party standpoints. The Party has here adopted the perfectly correct line of instructing the communists to take active part in all these trade union bodies, and to organise at the same time their own organisation. There is an independent centre for those organisations affiliated to the R. I. L. U., a revolutionary trade union movement. And this same revolutionary trade union movement (at least those at the hand), is an opponent of the organisation of fractions, an opponent of our work in the reformist trade unions. It maintains the view that as soon as a communist, or anyone sympathising with Communism, appears in any trade union, he is to be fished away from there at once and induced to join the general organisations. The R. I. L. U. does not offer sufficient resistance to this point of view.

In Belgium the Communist Party has raised a great commotion, demanding that fractions must be organised in the trade unions. The agitation in favour of the organisation of fractions is increasing, and fractions of two, three, and four members are being formed. This means discussion and conflicts where it would be very well possible to tackle the matter much more skilfully, to organise our comrades semi-illegally at first, and to avoid disputes which may lead to the expulsion of our comrades from the unions. The methods adopted have already led to communists being expelled from the trade unions. The same applies to the railwaymen's and other organisations in Belgium.

At the same time the Presidium of the Brussels Trade Union Cartel is composed of unionists in sympathy with us, though not communists. The Presidium consists of ten members, nine of whom are members of the Unity Committee, which Committee is influenced by our Party. It might be assumed that when the leading centre of a powerful trade union movement is prepared to carry out our instructions, our Party must be in a position to establish contact with that centre. But when I asked the Political Bureau of the C. P. of Belgium if it did not think that we should exercise our influence upon the Presidium of the Brussels Trade Union Cartel, it replied that this had never occurred to it, it is working through the fractions, etc.

All this shows us that our comrades are not applying the most skilful of methods in the trade unions abroad. There are tens of thousands of communists in Czechoslovakia who are not even members of the trade unions, and the same is the case in France, etc.

The situation being thus in Europe, surely we must say: It is certainly a very fine thing to swim around in the Pacific Ocean and organise a trade union secretariat of the countries of the Pacific. And it is equally praiseworthy to establish a similar secretariat for Latin America. But we must not forget that we should not swim away over the Pacific, to Honolulu, and forget Europe. Our position in Europe must be more firmly established, our work here must be intensified. It is of course necessary to strengthen our influence abroad as well, and it is being strengthened. But I personally have doubts as to how the work of the trade union secretariat of the countries of the Pacific will be conducted. If the task is once taken up, and trade union secretariats for the Pacific and Latin America are formed, then these must be competent organs, led by capable workers.

The R.I.L.U. has to work under extremely difficult conditions, and we must not swim about so much, but concentrate our activities, our work of guidance, and our organisatory work, and build up a more powerful structure in the international trade union movement. (Applause.)

Comrade MIF:

I should like to supply a counterweight to the demagogy of the Opposition by a reference to the objective external and internal conditions which have come into being in China, in order to show how events have developed there, and what are the difficulties encountered by the working class and its communist vanguard.

So far much has been said on the favourable external conditions of the Chinese revolution, on the existence of the Soviet Union, on the existence of the Comintern and its sections. But we have not dealt exhaustively enough with those negative international conditions which also play a rôle in the development of revolution in China.

Not only has the Chinese revolution not had the opportunity of developing under the conditions given by the great war, when the imperialist powers were weakened by their quarrels among themselves, it has not even been able to take advantage of the post-war period, in which international capital sought with infinite pains to heal its wounds.

And yet, however strange it may sound, the Chinese revolution has done more than even the Russian, from its very initial stages, to deal blows to the fundamental interests of foreign capital in China. It is therefore easily comprehensible that the foreign imperialist powers affected have joined together in a united front against the Chinese revolution.

The imperialists have set everything in motion, economically and politically, to lay waste the camp of revolution and to secure the counter-revolutionary strongholds.

These unfavourable international conditions are still being maintained at the present time to a very great extent. The Chinese revolution has still to defend itself against a powerful world imperialism, armed to the teeth.

With respect to the internal difficulties of the Chinese revolution, Comrade Lominadse settles these with remarkable ease. First he states that there is no feudalism in China. Then he disposes of the Chinese bourgeoisie, which represents no power, not being organised in trade unions. But the matter is not so simple as it appears to Comrade Lominadse. A few words on feudalism. Comrade Lominadse has endeavoured to oppose feudalism to the Asiatic method of production, in the sense that the latter has substituted feudalism in China. (Lominadse: "Marx has done that.") Marx did not oppose feudalism to the Asiatic method of production in this sense. Marx understood under Asiatic methods of production a variety of feudalism, and expressly stated that here there was no essential difference from ordinary feudalism, but only secondary differences of an external, partially historical, and juridical character. This has always been our conception of the matter, and it was Lenin's. The following are Lenin's words:

"... the objective conditions in China, a backward, agrarian, semi-feudal country, mean that the lives of this people of almost half a milliard souls are influenced by one single, definite and historically peculiar form of this oppression and this exploitation, that is, feudalism." (Lenin: Complete works. Vol. XX. Part I. p. 347.)

It is quite understandable that in China feudalism has its distinctive features, for it originated in sources peculiar to the East, and these peculiarities have remained through the many centuries of China's history.

At the present time there is no pure feudalism in China, for it has merged into mercantile capitalism, and with the higher forms of capitalism represented by financial capital, and hereby forms in many cases the connecting link between the Chinese people and the economic dominion of foreign capital in China.

This reference to feudalism in China is intended solely to draw attention to the special difficulties confronting the agrarian revolution in China. This revolution cannot hope for the aid of the bourgeoisie. Not only will the bourgeoisie refuse to support it, but will rise in arms against it.

During the bourgeois democratic epoch in Russia it was possible to calculate on the whole of the peasantry joining, to overthrow the large landowners, but in China this is not the case. Not only must certain strata of the peasantry, the kulak elements, be excluded from the main mass of the peasantry on whom we can depend (the poor peasantry), but the Chinese proletariat and this main mass of peasantry must fight from the beginning against the Chinese kulaks, against the Chinese landowners, and against the Chinese bourgeoisie. These are the conditions under which the agrarian revolution has to struggle.

A further difficulty is the fact that Chinese feudalism is interwoven with financial capitalism, with imperialism, and that the struggle against the relics of feudalism is at the same time a struggle against the foundations of foreign capitalist rule. The Chinese revolution, in developing into agrarian revolution, must attack and undermine the main positions of foreign capital from the very beginning.

The second internal difficulty is the bourgeoisie. Comrade Lominadse has told us that the bourgeoisie has ceased to exist as a political power in China, and that all that is left is a few isolated bourgeois.

In China the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat for hegemony commenced right at the beginning of the Chinese revolution, and those comrades who simply sweep away the bourgeoisie from the scene of Chinese revolution, actually sweep away the question of the ruthless struggle for hegemony in the Chinese revolution. The bourgeois tendencies have not ceased to exist in China, and the fight against them must be continued with unremitting energy. These bourgeois tendencies, striving for the liquidation of the revolution and the triumph of reaction, are not only unweakened but are assuming aggravated forms.

These bourgeois tendencies no longer represent the purely bourgeois class in China, but take the form of a bloc between the bourgeoisie and the large landowners. This bloc now represents Chinese reaction. It has defeated the Chinese proletariat on many occasions. Our comrades believe that this bloc has no future in China. But we must distinguish between such temporary conditions as now prevail in China (the so-called atomisation of China), and the general prospect of a possible, and to some extent long lasting reaction of the bourgeoisie and large landowners in China.

The relation of forces in the future struggle will decide the course of the Chinese revolution. Up to the present, the bourgeoisie, in conjunction with the large landowners, has carried off a number of victories, but this does not by any means imply that we must regard as decisive the defeats which have hitherto been suffered by the Chinese proletariat.

The struggle continues, and is directed at the present time mainly against the Chinese bourgeoisie, against the class of the large landowners possessing their own military forces. We must not set the bourgeoisie aside, as if it has ceased to play any political part, for it is precisely the bourgeoisie which, through the channels of nationalism, can still draw in its wake broad masses of the submerged proletariat, of the petty bourgeois of the cities, of the city poor, and of a large stratum of the Chinese peasantry. The struggle for influence over these elements, the struggle for the city poor, and for those peasant elements still under the influence of the bourgeoisie, confronts the communists with the necessity of indefatigable struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat, for the isolation of these bourgeois and landowning elements, from the social forces nearest to the proletariat, and for the work of winning over the broad masses.

I pass on to the following conclusions:

Firstly, in China the agrarian revolution can only reckon on the help of the village poor, and must take up the struggle against the kulaks, the landowners, and the bourgeoisie.

Secondly, nothing but an unwearying fight for the hegemony, a bold and determined struggle on the part of the Chinese proletariat for the democratic dictatorship of the Chinese proletariat, can lead to victory.

Thirdly, the Chinese proletariat must strive to tear the mask of national reformism from the reactionary bloc, must strive to prepare for the armed struggle against the bloc of the large landowners and the bourgeoisie, and to fulfil those same tasks which confront us, in different connections, in India and other countries of the colonial East where the bourgeoisie has gone over to imperialism.

Fourthly, the proletariat must draw up the most radical programme of agrarian revolution. The Comintern must rescind the lame compromise resolution passed on the agrarian question by the V. Party Congress of the Chinese C. P.

Fifthly, the situation in China remains revolutionary, in spite of the cruel blows which have been dealt the Chinese proletariat. The Comintern must increase its practical guidance of the movement, and must reinforce the communist leaders of the Chinese Party as a means of preventing possible further Menshevist aberrations.

A few words on the criticism exercised by the Opposition on the Chinese question. During the last few years the Trotskyist Opposition has predicted a number of defeats in various spheres of activity, and has continually croaked about economic crises, crises in our international relations, etc., whereby it has laid special stress on the inevitable overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The forecasts of the Opposition have invariably proved false. At the present time the Chinese revolution has just suffered severe defeat, and as might be expected, the Opposition cannot resist the temptation of seizing the opportunity of casting the whole blame on the leaders of our C. C. and of the Comintern. The Opposition hurls one malicious calumny after another against the Comintern.

I should like to point out that the Opposition, in the Chinese question as in others, fails to observe the real and profound achievements which have been accomplished. It fails to realise that dozens of millions of Chinese workers have undergone the severest course of training in political consciousness. The Opposition attaches no importance to the fact that in the course of one single year enormous masses of Chinese workers have organised, and have developed into revolutionists with incredible rapidity. The Opposition does not even make an attempt to inquire into the causes of the temporary defeats of the Chinese revolution, which it should do, if only that the experience thus won may benefit the revolutionary progress of the Comintern.

The Opposition offers a number of recipes for use in the Chinese question. Only a year ago the Opposition made with-

drawal from the Kuomintang one of the main points of its programme. Other points were added later, formulated in the latest utterances of the Opposition, and showing the Opposition to be opposed to the bloc with the national bourgeoisie, to participation in the northern campaign, and to participation in the national government. The Opposition imagines that in taking this line it defends the purely class line of the Chinese proletariat. But this is not so.

The Opposition demands that the communists renounce the coalition with the Chinese national bourgeoisie. This demand was brought forward at a time when the national bourgeoisie was still a revolutionary power, bearing the standard of fight against foreign capital; at a time when the national bourgeoisie was not preventing us from organising the workers of China in the spirit of revolution; at a time when the Chinese bourgeoisie was fighting against international imperialism. To have renounced all coalitions and all understandings with the bourgeoisie, would have been to serve the ends of foreign capital, and weaken the forces of the Chinese revolution. It would have been playing into the hands of international imperialism.

The Opposition declared the northern campaign to be futile, and said that this campaign was only grist to the mill of the Chinese bourgeoisie. In the opinion of the Opposition, the communists should not take part in, not support it, and not begin it. The campaign was not begun on the initiative of the communists, but by the bourgeoisie led by Chang Kai Shek. The communists were placed before the alternatives: Either to aid the campaign, take part in it, endeavour to raise it to a higher level, or to leave the initiative to the bourgeoisie which had commenced the campaign, and thereby to relinquish all the results of the campaign to the national bourgeoisie. It is obvious that action in accordance with the views of the Opposition would have best pleased the bourgeoisie, which would have retained the initiative and guidance of the Northern campaign. The non-participation of the communists would have meant the renunciation of the attempt to raise the movement to a higher level, and would have practically involved the actual betrayal of those workers and peasants being trodden underfoot by the iron heel of the reactionary militarists (Wu Pei Fu and Sun Chuan Fang).

In this manner the Opposition has issued a series of recipes, not one of which would have actually strengthened the position of the fighting proletariat, the working masses of China, but would have hastened defeat and reinforced the position of imperialism and the Chinese bourgeoisie. The Opposition now seizes with characteristic demagoguery on the defeat of the Chinese proletariat to discredit the Comintern and the C. C. of our Party. Our Party must not permit this demagogic exploitation of the temporary defeat of the Chinese revolution. In spite of the Opposition, the Chinese revolution will continue to advance, and will march forward to victory under the banner of the Leninist Comintern. (Applause.)

Comrade Bukharin's Speech in Reply to Discussion

(Full report.)

I. THE ANALYSIS OF CAPITALIST ECONOMY AND THE QUESTION OF STATE CAPITALIST TENDENCIES.

On the question of State capitalism: Did I speak of State capitalism as a fact? No. I spoke of a tendency in the direction of State capitalism. Did I not say that here I did not lay the greatest emphasis on formal State capitalist organisation, that is, not on the direct interference of State power in economic life or on the nationalisation of economic organs? Yes, this I did. More than this, I said that I considered it necessary to attach special importance in a number of countries to the tendency which I should like to designate as a tendency towards the trustification of State power itself. Did I state the

question as if any process new in principle were going on here, something which has not existed up to now? Nothing of the kind. I stated clearly that here there is nothing new in principle, but that this process has advanced quantitatively with such speed of late that it must be regarded as one of the very most important phenomena of the economic life of today, and at the time I made the necessary reservations.

This is what I said. Comrades Lozovsky and Schatzkin now seize upon this thesis. As these comrades have declared that this question is of the utmost theoretical and tactical importance, and that its false solution may cause serious confusion, I must deal with it in detail. I begin with Comrade Lozovsky's

speech. Comrade Lozovsky commented as follows on my speech (I quote from the stenographic report):

"Comrade Bukharin, who has here drawn a picture of the present status of European and American capitalism in particular, points out that at the present time a period of State capitalism is beginning or advancing, a period of expanding syndicates, combines and trusts; he comprises the whole growing power of the private monopolist organisations under the general designation of State capitalism."

If I had really said that which Comrade Lozovsky ascribes to me, then I should be wrong all along the line. But Comrade Lozovsky polemises against assertions that have originated in his own brain, and which he attributes to me. Did I ever say that a "period of state capitalism" (!) is "beginning" (!) or "advancing" (!) "at the present time" (!)? I said nothing of the sort, and could not have done so. On the contrary, I said that there was nothing new in principle in the process taking place. I said further that the process was one of "tendencies in the direction of State capitalism" since the tendency is observable from below, that is, out of the midst of the economic organisations of capital, towards the amalgamation of these organisations with the organisations of State power. This is by no means equivalent to comprising these tendencies "under the general designation of State capitalism".

Comrade Lozovsky goes on to observe:

"What is going on? It is true that the trusts and combines, these monopolist organisations, lead the bourgeois states. They are doing this to an increasing extent. If we may so express ourselves, it is not a nationalisation of these concerns and trusts which is going on, but a certain trustification (it seems as if Bukharin speaks of this) of the State apparatus, which may theoretically be called State capitalism (!— N. B.)"

Here I must again point out the same error on the part of Comrade Lozovsky, or rather the further development of the error already pointed out. In the first place this is not a suitable style of controversy in a matter of importance. Why say: "it seems as if Bukharin speaks of this". There is no seeming, I did speak of it, therefore one should not say "it seems as if he spoke of", but simply: he said. Secondly, I did not say (and in this case this is the decisive point) that the "trustification of State power" may be called "State capitalism". Had I asserted this, I should have "sprung over" a broad stage of development, and taken the tendency for the completed process, that is, should have attributed to actuality a character which it does not possess. But happily Comrade Lozovsky is not right in supposing me to do this, for what I spoke of was tendencies in the direction of State capitalism, that is, of tendencies preparatory to State capitalism. This is by no means the same thing. The utmost exactitude must be observed here. For lack of this Comrade Lozovsky's objections are fallacious.

I now pass on to Comrade Schatzkin. Comrade Schatzkin even attempts to prove the heresy of my thesis by quotations from the "A B C of Communism". I need not say that I do not share the opinion that we have all forgotten the "A B C of Communism", nor can I agree that I myself have forgotten what is written in the "A B C of Communism", or that I have indeed forgotten either the small letters or the capitals of the A B C of Communism.

Comrade Schatzkin has attempted a "detailed analysis", and declared the intention of "refuting" some of Comrade Bukharin's arguments. On examining conditions in a "number of countries", he comes to the conclusion that I am wrong all along the line.

I should like to examine Comrade Schatzkin's "survey" and analysis point by point. First I must make the following general observation.

When examining the internal structure of the imperialist States and their economics, we must distinguish between those elements of State capitalism in Western Europe which bear a specifically war character, and can to a certain extent be regarded as a parallel to the epoch of war communism among ourselves, and the present elements or tendencies existing in Western Europe in the directions of State capitalism. This distinction is essential, for it is clear that measures of a State

capitalist character, forced upon the capitalist countries of Western Europe by the necessities of war, gradually disappear again after the war period is past.

This does not mean however that State capitalist tendencies are altogether extinct. This difference must be grasped, if we are to avoid taking unfounded arguments for truth, or temporary tendencies for main tendencies, and if we are to be secure from confusing with one another various questions which, though connected with one another, are of essentially different content.

Let us pass on to a detailed examination of Comrade Schatzkin's arguments. Comrade Schatzkin begins with Italy, and maintains that the fact of the rise of the "corporative State" in Italy cannot by any means be used as an argument proving the existence of State capitalist tendencies, and that a reference to Italy in this respect is incorrect. Why incorrect? Because it "turns out" that "during the war we had Parliamentary governments both in Germany and in England, Parliamentary at least in so far as their formal origin is concerned, and yet these countries were State capitalist to a much greater extent than Mussolini's present corporative state".

That is to say, Schatzkin's decisive argument with regard to Italy is that State capitalist elements were stronger during the war in Germany and Great Britain than they are now, without war, in Mussolini's "corporative state". Is this an argument? Of course it is not. It was post-war Fascist Italy which developed a number of tendencies of a State capitalist nature, which did not exist there during the war. Comrade Schatzkin, in the midst of his dispute with me, is compelled to acknowledge: "It should however be said that in Italy such State capitalist tendencies really do exist". If this is so, why carry coals to Newcastle?

Comrade Schatzkin adduces another "argument", the fact that three years ago the Italian government entertained the idea of doing away with the State monopolies. Very true. But nothing came of this, which is the main point. You undertake to prove the incorrectness of my theses, and arrive at the same conclusion as I do. Hence I am perfectly satisfied with the results of your "survey" as far as Italy is concerned (Schatzkin: "Did I contest the corporative State as sign of State capitalism?") You said distinctly: "State capitalist strivings actually exist". In this question I have here brought forward a number of real proofs which you have not refuted by a word, neither the fact of State price regulation, an extremely essential factor in the development of immediate State capitalist tendencies, nor the nationalisation of the trade unions. The Italian "argument" of Comrade Schatzkin is very, very weak.

Comrade Schatzkin goes on to refute my "Vienna argument". I may observe in passing that I have not "flitted" from land to land, picking out this or that instance by accident, but chose different types of countries in which these tendencies have appeared in different ways. Comrade Schatzkin "flits" along behind me and says: "I must also refute the second argument of Comrade Bukharin, with reference to the municipality of Vienna, for the economic activities of the Vienna municipality do not differ in principle from those of other municipalities, but only in 'socialist' demagogy". From the standpoint of capitalist character the Vienna municipality does not and cannot differ in principle from other municipalities. "The Vienna municipality does not regulate and control the industries of Vienna"; thus Comrade Schatzkin asserts on one page of the stenographic report.

But when I turn the page I read: "It is true its undertakings possess a greater specific weight in Austrian national economy than is the case in other countries". But if the Vienna municipality has nothing to do with industry, how can it possess "undertakings"? (Schatzkin: I spoke of private industry). But I was not speaking of that. On the one hand Comrade Schatzkin says that the Vienna municipality has nothing to do with industry, and on the other hand the astonished listener and reader learns that, all the same, undertakings exist which "have a somewhat greater specific weight than in other countries". These undertakings may be enumerated: Production and supply of gas, electricity works, the arsenal (where agricultural machinery is also made), house building, etc. Besides these there are concessioned undertakings, controlled by the municipality of

Vienna. The electric railways and the whole transport service may be counted to these.

Let us go further. Comrade Schatzkin says: "This is however explained by the fact that after the peace of Saint Germain nothing was left of Austria but the capital and its environs". And what is the name of this capital? (Schatzkin: "Vienna".) Yes, this capital is really Vienna. Then how can you say at the same time that the municipality of Vienna has nothing to do with industry? Truly here somebody has failed to see the forest for the trees. (Laughter.) The fact remains that Comrade Schatzkin acknowledges that the undertakings of the Vienna municipality possess a greater specific weight than those of municipalities in other countries, and that Austria consists practically of Vienna. When he recognises all this, when he acknowledges that the municipality of Vienna has "something to do with industry", then I ask nothing more. Since he has once admitted so much, I do not need to deprive him of any more of his skin (Laughter. Schatzkin: "So far my skin is still quite whole".)

Comrade Schatzkin proceeds to "refute" my third argument with regard to Japan. "In Japan there are doubtless elements of State capitalism. (Laughter.) I ask: Have these elements increased of late or not? That is the decisive question, and just this you pass over in silence. I maintain that these elements have increased, you maintain silence on this point. You speak of all possible other "interesting" things, but you evade this question, and give no reply to it, although it is the pivot on which the whole discussion turns. We see that in this question again your argument is of little value.

With reference to Japan, Comrade Schatzkin continues: "As Comrade Bukharin himself admits, this (State capitalism, Ed.) has arisen as a result of the peculiar nature of the transition from feudalism to capitalism in Japan, and can therefore not be adduced as proof of an international tendency". Very good. That State capitalist tendencies arise as a result of certain peculiarities of transition is a fact naturally influencing their form. To this fact I myself have referred. But is it any argument against my argument? Admitted that I myself spoke of the development of these tendencies on the basis of a peculiar type of transition, it will be remembered that at the same time I touched upon another and equally important factor, the fact that Japan, thanks to its international situation, has been obliged to clench the "fist" of economy in its own country more than other imperialist powers, thus causing the State capitalist elements to grow with correspondingly greater rapidity. And just this bears witness to the existence of international factors forcing the development of these tendencies in Japan. What are Comrade Schatzkin's conclusions? He turns round on one spot, and is once more compelled to confirm what I said. In the question of Japan his final conclusions are again the same as mine, and I ask nothing more of him here.

Comrade Schatzkin's main argument is a reference to the conditions of development in two further countries, whereby he imagines that he reduces the whole of my argumentation to dust and ashes. He takes France and Germany, and maintains that in these two countries there is no growth of State capitalist tendencies, but rather of the opposite process. Here I must once more expressly emphasise that, firstly, I have spoken of State capitalist tendencies and not of State capitalism as an accomplished fact, and, secondly, I have spoken in this connection of the process of the amalgamation of the greatest centralised undertakings, concerns, trusts, etc., "from below upwards", with the organs of State power, by which I indicated the line of development of these tendencies.

Is the "contrary process" really going on in France? I do not know what could justify such an assertion. During the war, and immediately after it, France became for the first time a country of gigantic industries. With respect to France I must expressly repeat: Everybody, without exception, is aware that during the war, and in the period immediately following, France became a great industrial country for the first time, after having seized a great part of Germany, and after being able to "round itself off" as result of winning in the war. In spite of all the hindrances and obstacles resultant on post-war conditions (inflation, depreciation of the franc, and many other things), France has come to the forefront of late years

in Europe, as a country of industrial development and trustified industry.

These are the real facts of the post-war development of France's economic life, and these are facts which should be noted. It is incontestable that never before has there been in France such a merging of big capitalist organisations with State power as is now the case, especially under Poincaré's government. The political consequences are inevitable when the "Ironworks Committee" is identical with Poincaré, when the National Bloc is the direct expression of this gigantic organisation, and when the government is one with the great trusts, banks, and cartels. It was this upon which I laid emphasis.

Now to Germany. Comrade Schatzkin has ignored some of my most convincing arguments. Is it for instance a fact, or is it not a fact, that Germany is being reorganised with the aid of electrification? Is it true or not that four fifths of the total current generated is in the hands of either the State or the cities? Precisely this is the technically economic basis for the reorganisation of the whole economy of the country. Are these fundamental facts to be ignored? Comrade Schatzkin has not touched upon this by one single word, but adduced something entirely different as decisive argument.

But, Comrade Schatzkin, this second "argument" of yours, your instance of the railways, is of equally little value. You say that the railways have been given to a private company, that the railways have been sold, and that is a process going in the contrary direction to State capitalist tendencies. But in whose hands are the railways? In actual fact they are in the hands of the reparation agents. The company to which they belong is a company formed for the special purpose of giving the control over the railways into the hands of other States. In reality the enactments of the reparation agents serve obviously political State purposes, if those of other States. Other States control the railways. On the face of it, this fact is not a suitable argument to bring against my arguments.

I maintain that such gigantic combines as for instance the Steel Trust have never before been so closely connected with State power, with the German government, as they are at the present time. And I further maintain that four fifths of the current generated is in State or communal hands.

We see that the development of State capitalist tendencies advances in two main directions. On the one hand (and this is the chief tendency) there is a process of growing together between the economic organs of capital and the organs of State power. "from below" (which I have named the "trustification" of State capital); here there are none of the formal features of State capitalism, but the extremely evident and important tendencies are those preparing the ground for State capitalism, and therefore they can be rightly named the "tendencies in the direction of State capitalism", for they actually express the process of "amalgamation".

On the other hand, a certain advance is also to be observed in features bearing the formal stamp of State capitalism: State undertakings, possession of trust shares, communal undertakings, State organisation of trade unions, price regulation, etc. This process takes place "from above", so to speak. In the different countries we can observe different variations of this process. It would be wrong, hasty, and harmful, were we to leap over various stages of development and proclaim the "era" of State capitalism. But it would be equally wrong to fail to recognise the above-mentioned tendencies, which confront the proletariat to an ever increasing degree with the united forces of the closing ranks of the bourgeoisie, a bourgeoisie, which enjoys the full support of social democratic opportunism. That is what this question means.

One more observation, before I pass on to the tactical problems. In my opinion Comrade Lozovsky is perfectly right in laying such emphasis on the problems of the labour movement in the countries of the Pacific.

But, comrades, I should like to make one remark on the general estimate formed by Comrade Lozovsky of the problems of which he has treated. To me it seems that Comrade Lozovsky, in speaking of these problems, greatly over-estimates our strength, that is, the strength of the Red International of Labour Unions and the strength of Communism during the present period.

Let us take for instance the trade union movement of the Australian workers. Comrade Lozovsky counts this among ours, as if he already had it in his pocket. In reality this is by no means the case. However often the representatives of the Australian trade union movement may come all the way to our conferences, etc., still we know very well that the trade union movement in Australia is in general still extremely reformist, and that it is exceedingly incautious of Lozovsky to reckon 500,000 members of the Australian trade unions straightway and immediately to "his divisions". We have stepping off places in Australia, and we must make full use of them. At the present time there is not much foothold for success, for the Australian workers hold a comparatively extremely privileged position. We have discussed the position in Australia very thoroughly with Australian comrades, and came to the conclusion that we must not encourage exaggerated hopes for the immediate future. This is nearer the truth of the case.

II. THE MAIN LINE OF TACTICS.

Now to the main line of tactics. First of all I must place on record that all the speakers who have spoken here have unanimously solidarised with the line recently laid down by the Executive Committee of the Comintern with regard to reformism, to the united front tactics, to the election campaign, and to trade union tactics.

I must remark however that this last question, that of our trade union tactics, has not been dealt with fully either by Comrade Lozovsky or by the comrades speaking on behalf of the A. U. C. T. U. The formulation which we have reached does not by any means solve the whole problem, for the different countries offer different problems, whose solutions cannot be worked out by general formulas on the principles of trade union work.

We must emphasise that we shall not alter the principles of our tactics in the trade union movement, nor shall we under present circumstances think of leaving the reformist trade unions. Such an idea would be entirely wrong, and such tactics would be most damaging to the cause of proletarian revolution. The tactics which we have now to carry out in a number of countries, both in politics and in other spheres of work, do not in the least entail a radical change from our present course.

In my report I advanced the thesis that at the present juncture it is impossible to issue the slogan of the bourgeois nationalisation of industries, of individual branches of production, etc., just as we cannot issue the slogan of "workers control" because we are not in an immediately revolutionary situation. Comrade Lozovsky has contested this with some energy. His main argument in the question of nationalisation is as follows: To speak of nationalisation with compensation would be opportunism. But if we speak of nationalisation without compensation, what is there opportunist about this?

Comrade Lozovsky's second argument consists of a reference to actual practice. He says: Let us take Great Britain. Are we here to renounce the slogan of the nationalisation of the mines for instance, which has been maintained and defended for so long, and around which the intensest class struggle has waged? In the same manner he argues, with Great Britain as evidence, in favour of his general thesis demanding the support of the nationalisation slogan.

I am of the opinion that these arguments are incorrect. The fundamental conclusion to be drawn from my report is that we must fight social democracy more determinedly than ever all along the line. What is the decisive factor of social democratic ideology and its tactical attitude? Its State capitalist standpoint is decisive, the fact that it wants to draw the working class into the system of co-operation with the capitalist bourgeoisie, from work in the factory councils up to work in the League of Nations. This is the decisive factor. If we now issue the slogan of the nationalisation of some branch of production, that is, of its transference into the hands of the bourgeois State, we shall differ in nothing, in principle, from social democracy. We should find ourselves obliged to approve any number of bourgeois nationalisations and communalisations. And what would the factory councils of the undertakings concerned have to do? They would have to help. One after the other they would have to slide down the path of capitalist rationalisation, etc.

The whole line of tactics would be extremely wrong and opportunist at the present time.

It is true that we have made an exception in favour of Great Britain. Why have we done this? In Great Britain a gigantic struggle has raged around this question. It is a slogan forming part of the traditions of the revolutionary proletarian groups. An exception has been made in the case of Great Britain for the reason that this slogan is a deeply rooted tradition, and the fire has already been kindled around it. It is known that a number of other exceptions have been made for Great Britain. For instance, we remain in the Labour Party there, although its leaders are corrupt. Lenin substantiated these tactics in various of his writings. But the fact that Great Britain occupies an exceptional position does not justify our generalisation of this exception into a rule for all.

How do we stand with regard to the slogans of the control of production? The resolution passed at the III. Congress formulates the question of the production control slogan with great exactitude, as follows:

"To the extent as the struggles for partial demands, the partial struggles of separate groups of workers, expand into the general struggle of the working class against capitalism, the Communist Party must intensify its slogans in the same degree, and must generalise these to the slogan of the immediate overthrow of the opponent. When making partial demands, the Communist Parties must take care that these, whilst originating in the needs of the broadest masses of the people, not only suffice to lead the masses to the fight, but are in themselves demands organising the masses. All concrete slogans originating in the economic needs of the working masses must be guided into the channel of the struggle for the control of production, not as a plan forming part of the bureaucratic organisation of national economy under the regime of capitalism, but as part of the struggle against capitalism with the aid of the factory councils and the revolutionary trade unions."

Here it is stated plainly, in other words, that where the struggle unites the working class, and where it merges into the struggle for power, we must intensify and generalise our slogans and economic demands, and combine these with the demand for workers' control.

This means however that the question of the workers' control slogan is brought into the closest connection with the approach of the revolutionary situation. I am not opposed in general to this slogan; when an immediately revolutionary situation matures, it is the right slogan. But today, whilst the situation is not immediately revolutionary, it is entirely wrong. The slogan of the control of production is given an entirely wrong meaning when it is connected with the slogan of bourgeois nationalisation, and becomes absolutely social democratic.

III. "LEFT" OR "RIGHT" DEVIATIONS.

I now come to the question of Right and Left deviation. Comrade Schatzkin has supplemented, for the most part quite correctly, the facts which I have brought forward on the Right deviations and errors of various Parties, and has cited other facts, mistakes, and aberrations of a Right nature. I must however observe that in two places Comrade Schatzkin is wrong. For instance, when speaking of the French Party:

"A considerable group of French Comrades holds the standpoint that the radicals be supported along the whole front."

This is not true. The group of vacillating comrades mentioned by Comrade Schatzkin — members of the Political Bureau — does not demand the support of the radicals "along the whole front". (Schatzkin: "You are insufficiently informed"). On the contrary, I am sufficiently "informed", and have discussed this subject several times with a number of French comrades.

In my opinion you have greatly exaggerated here. Comrade Schatzkin exaggerates for a second time when he maintains that in Germany the Right group has greatly developed of late, after not daring to move a finger for some time. I con-

sider this assertion too to be incorrect. It is only a comparatively short time ago that a considerable part of the former Right joined the so-called Ernst Meyer group. Here in Moscow an "agreement" was made between Comrade Meyer's group and the Central Committee, with our aid and support, and Comrade Meyer, the leader of this former Right group, signed a declaration renouncing his former errors and undertaking to co-operate with the Central Committee. We have induced the leaders of this German group to consolidate with the Central Committee, and they are now working excellently. This is a fact. Of what importance is it? Does it signify the growth and development of a Right group, or the contrary? In my opinion the contrary. This cannot be denied. Some time ago Comrade Meyer was at the head of this group, whose practical leader was Gerhardt. . . . (Schatzkin: "That is not so!") You may shake your head as much you like, but I say that it is so, and everybody who is familiar with the life of the German Party. . . . (Schatzkin: "I may say that of myself as well.") Comrade Meyer was in opposition to the line of the C. C., and now he defends this line. This is an actual fact, and this fact cannot be denied by anybody.

With regard to the standpoint of Comrades Schatzkin and Lominadse in the question of the character and of the relations between the deviations in the Comintern, it seems to me that Comrades Schatzkin and Lominadse are not quite right here. Comrades Schatzkin and Lominadse, especially Comrade Schatzkin, underrate the Trotskyist danger in the Comintern, and in the second place they under-estimate the fact of the combination of the Trotskyists with the "Left" sign board with the openly Right elements, that is, the merging of Trotskyism into Menshevism. This is the error of the statements of both Comrades Lominadse and Schatzkin. Have patience. I shall point out exactly where these errors lie. You operate with such things. Lominadse says: "If we eliminate, as Comrade Bukharin likes to say", that is, if we omit entirely from our analysis the Trotskyist circles, Right and Left, then there still remain Right errors. This is about Comrade Lominadse's formulation. Comrade Schatzkin's is: Let us leave these Trotskyists in peace and see what is going on in our Communist International, this great community. Is this the right way to formulate the question? I think not. What does it mean, for instance, when Comrade Schatzkin says: Let us look at our Communist International. This means: Let us look at the groups now existing within the limits and confines of our Communist International, and are not expelled from it. It cannot mean anything else.

I ask you: Can we "eliminate" from "our Communist International" the Trotskyist or semi-Trotskyist elements, and say that we are perfectly clear of them, to 100 per cent? We cannot do this by any means. In actual fact the Trotskyists manoeuvre both in the foreign Parties and in our C. P. S. U.

What is Maslov doing for instance? Does he call upon all his followers to leave the Communist Party? Not at all. He is already at the head of a little party of his own, and has his feelers in our Communist Party. Just this is the danger. These elements are still present in "our Communist International". Is it true that they form a magnet to all the "dissatisfied", as our Opposition has been in Russia? In the other Communist Parties, and in the Communist International, the Trotskyist grouplets will invariably form magnets attracting all who are dissatisfied with the regime, the policy, and the tactics of the Comintern.

Let us regard all this from the standpoint of the "high politics". Tell me, if you can, how it is possible to compare today this or that Right error of this or that Communist Party, however great it may be in itself, with the "Thermidorian" campaign for instance (a Right campaign! social democratic! counter-revolutionary in its nature!), a campaign which all the Trotskyist groups have carried on against the Soviet Union? Does this treacherous campaign not go far beyond anything else, involving as it does the most important political question of all, and embodying the greatest question of "high politics". For this reason this question is the criterion for the estimation of the danger. I shall endeavour to form an estimate of this question from another aspect. If we leave on one side the great outlines of foreign policy, and turn to the the problem most important to us, that of winning over the masses: What is most harmful from this point of view? I maintain that there is no group which does us much harm (since it is a barrier across our road to the masses) as the Trotskyist Opposition. (A voice:

"Right!"). The social democratic workers coming over to us in large numbers and evincing ever growing sympathy with the Soviet Union, have not only to make their way past the official calumnies of the social democrats, but past the calumnies proceeding from an alleged communist camp. Zeretelli is carrying on a violent campaign against us in Stockholm at present, giving Trotzky as his authority. The "Vorwärts" refers to the platform of the Opposition. This is repeated everywhere. Everywhere the social democrats and the bourgeoisie carry the banner of "our" Opposition.

Within the Soviet Union the Opposition is particularly dangerous on account of its appeal to the "third force", and in the capitalist countries it has become the mouthpiece of social democracy and the bourgeoisie behind it. It is the "bearer of bourgeois influence upon the proletariat", for the enemies of the Soviet Union, the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern, set all their hopes upon it. To seek to "eliminate" this question logically and formally at the present moment would be a somewhat thankless job, for it would simply mean an inability to observe the really important things, that we can't see the wood for the trees. Comrade Schatzkin has vacillated just a little, personally, in the question of the Opposition, and it is extremely probable that his attitude today is connected with this circumstance.

It need not be emphasised that an under-estimation of the Trotskyist danger within the Comintern involves serious dangers. Comrade Lominadse has here advanced the thesis that the errors committed by the Parties and their leaders have been Right errors for the most part. This is true. But here I must ask: Is it true or untrue that all these errors, whose existence I fully acknowledge, receive the attention of the Central Committees of the Parties concerned, which correct them with the aid of the Comintern, are ready to correct them, and to carry out the directions of the Executive Committee which has pointed out the errors? There are errors and "errors". One kind of error leads to the formation of fractions. The error becomes the subject of contention, it is insisted upon, "deepened", expanded into a "theory". This is one kind of error. The other kind of error is different: It is committed, but then corrected. Comrades Schatzkin and Lominadse, who are very well informed on the activities of the Communist International, must admit that I am right here. Comrade Schatzkin has stated openly, that the Communist International combats these errors, seeks to obviate and correct them. This is a fact. And have we met with resistance as a rule in this work of correction? No. In the overwhelming majority of cases the recipients "take cognisance of and undertake to follow" the directions of the C. I. To ignore this fact is to commit an injustice against the leading cadres of the overwhelming majority of our sections. Do we, the Comintern, deny the Right danger? Not in the very least.

The question of the Right danger can be formulated somewhat differently. There are a number of Parties which have not yet been exposed to the actual fire of the enemy, and in these sections acute internal crises may arise in the course of future events. (A voice: "Right".) In my opinion it is not impossible that even in the French and Czech Parties, great Parties which have never really been under fire, such crises might arise. We are not concealing this, and are of the opinion that a Right danger exists, even a fairly considerable one. Where there are (and will be) Right errors in the leading cadres of our sections, we must do everything possible to correct them and to warn against them. We must accord the most careful attention to even the slightest errors in this direction, for comparatively small errors (if not opposed) can develop into errors of great political significance.

IV. THE CHINESE REVOLUTION.

The speech made by Comrade Lominadse on this subject here was extremely interesting on the whole, and I believe that it will have given you all much pleasure to hear it. There are however, several obvious exaggerations in Comrade Lominadse's speech.

First remark: Comrade Lominadse's formulation of Chinese feudalism is extremely vague. The point of contention was not the nature of the feudalism in China, whether a "special" or a "European" type, but the question of whether any feudalism at all exists in China. This contention is again closely bound up with the estimate formed of the classes, for the denial of the

existence of feudalism has implied (in the case of Radek for instance) the denial of the existence of a landowning class, and this denial has again led to other conclusions. Comrade Lominadse has thrown the centre of gravity on to the forms of feudalism, but in such a manner that almost all of those here present have counted him to those who deny the existence of feudalism in China.

Second remark: Comrade Lominadse has permitted himself to be dazzled by his "clear" definition of the status of the Chinese bourgeoisie. Such a declaration as that stating that the bourgeoisie has ceased to exist as a class, and consists only of individual bourgeois, is obviously incorrect. That the bourgeoisie is split up into various groups in conflict with one another is not by any means tantamount to the complete extermination of the bourgeoisie as a social class force. Here Comrade Lominadse certainly shoots far beyond the mark, and reduces an idea right in itself to absurdity.

On the whole I am fully agreed with Comrade Lominadse's prognosis of the Chinese revolution. As I have already emphasised in my report, we have no reason whatever to be pessimistic about the Chinese revolution, and shall witness a great revolutionary surge in the near future.

With regard to Comrade Mif's speech. His analysis of the question of feudalism in China may be designated as perfectly correct. In my opinion Comrade Mif is right in regarding the "Asiatic method of production" as a "form of feudalism" in the whole wide sense of the word. The peculiarity of this feudalism is reflected in the peculiarity of the landowning class in China, and in the characteristic features of the economic and political life of China. It is on this basis alone that the problem of the agrarian revolution can and must be understood.

I must however make two reservations with reference to Comrade Mif's interesting speech.

In the first place I do not believe in the possibility of a "Stolypin era" in China. The actual probability of such an era is practically non-existent. In China there are no land reserves with which manoeuvres can be carried out on "the Russian method" for the solution of the fundamental contradictions in Chinese economic life. This road is closed in China. There is no economic basis for it in the decisively important regions of China.

Secondly, I scarcely believe that Comrade Mif approaches the question of the struggle against the Chinese kulak from the right aspect. The acute question is not this struggle, but the question of exterminating the landowners. Of course it is obvious that the rich kulak, in such places where he sides with the landowner against the main mass of the peasantry (in this point conditions differ greatly in the different regions of China), must be combated. But this is not how Comrade Mif states the question.

With regard to the tactical conclusions on the question of the Chinese revolution, I believe that the discussion on this question (a large number of comrades have discussed my report and dealt with this question) has not shown any serious difference of opinion.

* * *

I now conclude. What are the lessons to be learnt from our disagreements here? The whole of our comrades now recognise that the Comintern, in spite of many difficulties, has worked out a correct line of tactics for our leadership, one which will obviously be unanimously accepted by the Party Congress. In future we shall take systematic precaution against errors, and correct them when they occur, as we have done heretofore. In spite of the gigantic difficulties encountered by our work during the last two years, we may claim to have accomplished positive results. The Communist Parties have shown great unanimity in the struggle against our Opposition and against all Trotskyism within the Comintern. Our Party has received far reaching support from other Parties in its fight against the Trotskyist Menshevik deviation. Our Party has received this support because it is the glorious Party of the international workers' revolution.

Comrades, in all probability we are entering on a period of great struggles. We do not know when these struggles will begin, and cannot know beforehand. But one thing we do know, and that is that in the mighty encounters between labour and capital which history is inevitably bringing us, the working class will be led by cadres of brave, steeled, and adequately experienced comrades, who will stand ready at their posts when the trumpet calls to battle.

We do not sing paeans of praise about our own work, about the heroism of the Communist Parties and their individual fighters, about our successes, in the manner of the social democratic parties and the many other parties and groups of our enemies. The Comintern loses thousands and thousands of its champions. The White Terror of the bourgeoisie is directed specially against us. Every day witnesses the sacrifice of fresh cohorts of communist martyrs of the working class. Comrade Lominadse has told us what is going on in China. But however frightful the White Terror, we communists fill up our ranks again with fearless fighters, whether in China, Poland, the Balkans, or in Italy. Our champions shrink at no danger, take upon themselves the greatest sacrifices, and lead the working masses forward into the fight. Comrades, we are beginning to grow. The basis for the expansion of the Comintern is again becoming broader. We as communists must support this movement, we must intensify our work among the masses. As the only organisations of the revolutionary working class, and as the only revolutionary labour Parties we must work more energetically, more intensely, and more boldly than ever.

We must take up the struggle against both our capitalist and our social democratic enemies with even more determination than hitherto. We must sweep away the last remains of vacillation and pessimism.

We have nothing to fear for our future. The Soviet Union is growing, the great Chinese revolution is growing, the broad ranks of the European working class are turning to the Left. And we are striding forward. We are welding an iron unity among our own ranks, we are advancing under the banner of Leninism, under the banner of the fighting Communist International. (Enthusiastic and prolonged applause, the delegates rise from their seats. The "International" is sung.)

The Composition of the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U.

(From the Report of the Chairman of the Mandate Commission.)

The Mandate Commission confirmed 898 mandates with decisive and 771 with consultative vote. In this manner a total of 1,669 mandates have been confirmed. The total number of Communists represented at the Congress is 1,236,190: Party members numbering 887,233 and candidates 348,957. Every mandate with decisive vote represents 988 Party members.

How are the mandates with decisive vote distributed according to organisations? The delegates representing industrial districts constitute 46.6%; the delegates of the agricultural districts constitute 34% and those of the nationality districts 16.3%. Ukraine, Moscow, and Leningrad have the largest delegations at the Congress. Together these three delegations constitute 37.5% of all delegates.

As far as the mandates with consultative voice are concerned they are distributed as follows: local representatives constitute 59.4% of the total and those coming from the centre constitute 40.6%.

I am now going to give a characteristic of the Congress composition. I will announce the figures concerning the delegates with decisive vote only.

The first thing I should mention concerning the composition of the Congress is as follows: Its composition is considerably new. Of the delegates present at the Congress, 449 or 50% of the total have not been at Party Congresses before. Besides, the group of delegates participating at the XIV Congress (with decisive vote) constitutes only 25.8% of this Congress and therefore compared with the XIV Congress, the present one consists of 75% new delegates. Among the delegates who participated at previous congresses, 57% were present only at two congresses and consequently, 43% were present at more than two. Thus, side by side with the old Party cadres, a huge number of new delegates who have grown up in the Party since the proletarian revolution, is present at this Congress.

Among the delegates of this Congress, the number of Party officials has declined and the group of rank and file workers considerably increased. If Party officials constituted 70% of the delegates at the XIV Congress, their percentage at this Congress has decreased by 16%, constituting only 54%. The number of factory workers has increased in absolute figures from 34 at the XIV Congress to 165 at this Congress, or from 5% to 18.4%. The group of Soviet employees has likewise grown. The group of factory administrators remained stable. The group representing trade union officials has somewhat decreased.

Of the Party officials, 100 are secretaries and members of factory, department, transport, university and rural nuclei. Among the trade union officials, 60 are chairman or members of factory committees. The rank and file Party and trade union workers together with the workers from the bench constitute 30% of all delegates with decisive vote.

By its social composition, the XIV Party Congress is a worker's Congress. Seventy-one percent of the delegates at this Congress, i. e., almost 9% more are workers than at the XIV Congress and 8% more than the XIII Congress at which 63% were workers.

In analysing the social composition of the various delegations, it should be pointed out that the Leningrad delegation ranks first in its percentage of workers who constitute 79.15% of the delegation; it is followed by the Ukraine with 76.6%; North Caucasia, 75.9%; Central Asia, 74%; Moscow, 69.6%; Urals, 68%; Siberia, 67%; Far East, 61%; White Russia, 58%; Autonomous territories and republics about 53% and Kazakstak, 50%.

The peasant group has increased only in absolute numbers. Its relative strength has remained unchanged as compared with the XIV Congress and constitutes 5.7%. The group of office workers constituted 31.4% of all delegates at the XIII Congress, 30.9% at the XIV Congress and at the XV Congress it dropped 7% as compared with the XIV and constitutes only 23% of the total. Of that group, 53% were underground members and 70% have a Party standing dating from before the October Revolution; 11% of the office workers are professional revolutionaries.

In respect to the Party standing of the delegates, the following should be pointed out: The relative strength of delegates who were members of underground organisations at the XII. Congress was 59%, whereas at the XV. Congress it has declined to 38.5%. This is perfectly reasonable if we take into consideration the natural loss of old underground elements on the one hand, and the growth of new Party cadres on the other. During the period 1922—27 the Party lost about 1,500 old underground members which could not but influence their relative strength at the congress. Almost one-third of the Congress have a Party standing dating from the civil war, i. e., from 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920. Their relative strength at the Congresses has changed as follows: At the XIII. Congress they comprised 14% and at the XV. Congress 33%, i. e., a 2.5 times increase.

Besides, 76% of the delegates at this Congress served in the army or in institutions in the military zone during the civil war. These figures are the best denial of the slander circulated by the Opposition in their "platform" that there is a process of squeezing out the old Party members, who have gone through underground experience or who have at least participated in the civil war, from the Party.

Our figures showing that 38.5% of the Congress delegates were underground members while they constitute only 1.2% of the Party membership, that one-third of the delegates with decisive vote have a Party standing dating from the civil war and 76% of all delegates took part in the civil war, entirely refute this Opposition slander.

As far as the group extracted from other Parties is concerned, it is continuously declining and at the XV. Congress it constitutes 9% of all delegates; 22% of them belonged to other Parties during the underground period and about 50% up to the October Revolution.

The age composition of the XV. Congress is somewhat higher than that of the XIV. Congress. The group under 30 years of age has decreased 9%, their place has been occupied by the older groups. The group under 30 years of age constitutes 55% of the Party membership and the delegates of this age at the Congress are equal only to 13.8%; the group ranging between 30 and 39 constitutes 32% of the Party membership and their relative strength at the Congress is 62%, i. e., almost twice as high as their relative strength in the Party. Then comes the group ranging between 40 and 49 years which constitutes 11.4% of the Party and 20% of the Congress, and finally, the group of delegates over 50 years of age which constitutes 2.8% of the Party membership and 4% of the delegates of the XV. Congress. Thus, the group between 30 and 39 years of age is the skeleton of the Congress.

The number of women delegates at the Congress is still inadequate. However, their number is not stable but increases, which may be seen from the following figures: The women

with decisive vote at the XIV. Congress constituted 2.4% and at the XV. Congress, 4.6%. Then if we take the figures concerning women with consultative vote they constituted at the XIV. Congress 5.4% and at the XV. 7.5%. The women from local organisation with consultative vote constitute 11.9% at the Congress as against 12.9% of women in the Party.

Thus, the aggregate number of women at the XIV. Congress was 3.9% of the aggregate number of delegates; at the XV. Congress they constitute 5.9%. The following two delegations have the largest number of women: Moscow with 11 delegates and Leningrad with 7.

Finally, a few words concerning the national composition of the Congress. Compared with the XIII. Congress, the Russian group has somewhat increased — from 60.8% to 62%; the relative strength of the Ukrainians has increased from 4.7% to 9.8%, i. e., almost double. There is also a relative increase in the White Russian delegates — from 1.2% to 2.9% and Turko-Tartars from 1% to 1.6%. As far as the other nationalities are concerned, their strength has either remained stable or has somewhat decreased. There is a considerable decrease in representatives of nationalities which have no territories of their own, including the Jews, — from 11.3% to 7.4%; and Letts from 7% to 4.7%.

The Constitution of the New Central Committee of the C. P. S. U.

Moscow, 20th December 1927.

After the close of the Party Congress a plenary session of the new Central Committee took place.

The Political Bureau was elected with the following members: Bukharin, Vorozhilov, Kalinin, Kuibichev, Molotov, Rykov, Rudsutak, Stalin, and Tomsy with the following candidates: Petrovsky, Uglanov, Andreiev, Kirov, Mikoyan, Kaganovitch, Tchubar and Kossior.

Comrade Stalin was re-elected General Secretary and comrades Molotov, Uglanov, Kossior and Kubyak secretaries.

Comrades Stalin, Molotov, Uglanov, Kossior, Kubyak, Moskvina, Bubnov, Artukina, Andreiev, Dogadov, Smirnov, Ruchimovitch and Gulimov were elected into the Organisation Bureau.

Comrade Bukharin was re-elected as the responsible editor of the "Pravda".