

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8 No. 46

8th August 1928

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

SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

(FULL REPORT.)

Eighth Session.

July 25th 1928 (morning).

Discussion on the Report of Comrade Bukharin.

The Session is opened at 10. a m. under the chairmanship of Comrade Strachow (China). There stands on the Agenda the continuation of the discussion on Comrade Bukharin's Report.

Comrade JONES, Negro delegate (America):

Comrades, the American delegation is in full agreement with the thesis of Comrade Bukharin. Among the many points brought out in this thesis I want to touch on the following:

First, the strengthening of the position of the U. S. as a leading imperialist power in all parts of the world, which has led to the increase in the aggressiveness of American imperialism in Mexico, Nicaragua and other Central American countries, in Haiti, Santo-Domingo, Virgin Islands and other West Indian Islands, the Philippines and Southern America. I might also mention the recent development of the rubber industry in Liberia, which will involve thousands of Negro colonial workers, as a basis for American penetration into Africa.

Second, the effort of the United States together with other imperialist powers to crush the Chinese revolution under the cloak of the "open door" policy. A glaring example of this was the recent bombardment of Nanking, the details of which you all know. We must check this imperialist aggression by carrying on more intensive work in the United States among the unemployed and unorganised workers who, by enlisting in the army and navy become the tools of the imperialists.

We must also bring about a closer unity between the American Negro workers and the colonials such as Chinese, Japanese, Mexicans, Africans, who are living in the United States, and to organise them in our Party. This can be done in our youth organisation, through the schools and clubs which these various elements are attending.

Third, the sharpening and intensification of the economic rivalry between the United States and Great Britain.

Fourth, Trade Union work in which particular stress must be laid upon the organisation of the unorganised and work in the old trade unions.

Fifth, the organisation of Negroes and the necessity to raise the theoretical level of the membership of the various Parties.

I will only take up the last two points, namely: the organisation of the unorganised which includes the organisation of Negroes. The Party must conduct this work with greater energy and more efficiency than it has been done in the past. Negroes must also be placed on the Executive Committee of the T. U. E. L.

It is necessary for all Communist Parties in the imperialist countries to carry on a fight against white chauvinism in relation to the various racial and national minorities that live in or are connected with these countries.

There is more chauvinism in the American Party than in any other Party in the Comintern. This is the reason why out of a population of twelve million Negroes there is such a small number of Negro members. I can name many instances where this chauvinism and the opportunist attitude of our Party prevented it from adopting drastic measures against race prejudice. There is no place in a Bolshevik Party for this prejudice and drastic measures must be taken against those who are infected with it.

It is stated as an excuse that the drawing of a greater amount of Negro workers into the industries during and since the imperialist war has intensified the economic rivalry between black and white workers. This is basically true but that does not justify the opinion of the upper stratum of the organised white trade unionists that the Negro is a potential strike breaker, which is reflected in the attitude of some elements of our Party, particularly in the T. U. E. L.

The failure to understand the potential revolutionary possibilities of the Negro toilers as the most exploited element in America has led to the underestimation of the necessity of work among the Negroes. The American imperialists recognised these possibilities long before we did and I could give many instances to prove it.

All this has created a very unhealthy atmosphere in the Party and this can be considered as the chief reason why Negro members have adopted an anti-Party attitude and others have left the Party altogether. Many comrades say the reason is that when Negro comrades enter the Party they remain Negroes within the Party. This is true.

One of the main reasons that this atmosphere exists is that we have not carried on a consistent and energetic fight against chauvinism in the past and it is only recently that we see the beginnings of a determined effort to deal with race prejudice.

It would be untrue to say that the Party has made no efforts to organise Negroes, that we have done nothing at all. We have made efforts. That we have not been successful so far is due to mistakes and lack of a definite policy. The **Negro Labour Congress** marks an effort but it was not successful owing to insufficient preparation and poor direction, but it marks an attempt. There has been an effort to draw more Negroes into the general Party work and this effort must be intensified.

Attempts have been made to organise the Negroes into the various unions, some work has been done among the Negroes in the Passaic strike and also among the Negro miners, but all this is not enough and we should intensify our efforts in this direction.

In the recent election campaign and convention there were 25 delegates out of 250 who actively participated in all the committees. Our election platform was very clear on the Negro question, but what we have to do is to carry out what we have written.

Recently we have made attempts to penetrate the South. This is a very important thing and must be carried on to the best and fullest of our ability.

There have been many mistakes in our work and this is due to the lack of close co-operation of the Party as a whole with the work of the Negro comrades. The point raised by Comrade Bukharin concerning the necessity of raising the technical level of the Party can be applied very effectively to our Party. We must carry on an ideological campaign among the membership of our Party as a whole, from the top to the bottom.

Now a few words on the inner party situation. I know that right mistakes have been made by our Party leadership, but to say that the general policy of this leadership is a right wing policy is, in my opinion, incorrect. Furthermore, to make a factional issue of these mistakes is not the way to correct them.

The mistakes in regard to Negro work have been made by the Party as a whole and not by any particular group.

I am in full agreement with the comrade who says that drastic measures should be taken against any attempts to revive factionalism in our Party. This comrade says that the

Negro work in our Party has been made a factional football. I say that our Party as a whole has neglected this work. If the minority group has stood out sharply on a point wherein the Negro question was involved the records ought to show it. If they have not done this then they are equally guilty.

Now as to the comrade who was mentioned here as one who should have come over here with the delegation. I refer to Comrade Moore. If it is true that this comrade has been guilty of any anti-Party activities he should be corrected. I say that we should bring this comrade here to Moscow because he is the official leader of the American Negro Labour Congress and I believe he can be saved for the Party.

Some comrades in our Party attempt to make an issue of the fact that they, more than the others, are willing to admit mistakes which they made in the past. An admission of mistakes is good for the soul — in Moscow. But, we are not impressed with what is admitted here but what is carried out when these same comrades are back in the United States.

We should recognise the potential revolutionary possibilities of the Negroes and that they can be utilised in the fight against American imperialism. Our duty is to organise this mass. Only then we will be able to shake the foundations of American imperialism.

Comrade GRAHAM (Czechoslovakia):

I will speak on the second point of the Theses on "International Relations and the Problem of so-called Foreign Policy", and in this connection I will point out the role played by Czechoslovakia in the concert of the imperialist powers.

The main question is the attitude of the capitalist world towards the Soviet Union. Comrade Bukharin has quite properly placed this question foremost.

The antagonism between the imperialist powers on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other hand is nothing else but the clear and definite class antagonism: here the proletariat organised as the State; there, the bourgeoisie constituting the State.

The contradictions among the imperialist powers themselves are at bottom the contradictions between two rival groups of capitalists. These are contradictions which do not coincide with the class antagonism as to their social importance.

Insofar as the contradictions among the imperialist powers are concerned, the fundamental idea of Comrade Bukharin's theses is unquestionably right: the point of gravity lies in the relations between America and England. What is new in the theses is the stronger emphasis put upon the role of Germany in the re-alignment of the imperialist forces in Europe, and particularly, the effect of Germany's western orientation upon this re-alignment.

Since it is the aim of Germany to pursue her own imperialist policy in the direction of shaking off the influence of the United States, the present tendency in the re-alignment of forces in Europe should be considered favourable to British imperialism. But the Anglo-French antagonism still remains the most important contradiction within European imperialism. This has not been stated in the draft theses.

Notwithstanding the kaleidoscopic changes which are taking place in the regroupment of the European imperialist forces, two basic tendencies may be perceived: the first and foremost tendency has to do with an anti-Soviet bloc; the second, more mutable tendency, which is conditional upon the great dependence of capitalist Europe upon the United States, revolves around the formation of a bloc of the European capitalist powers against America. At the head of both of these tendencies is England. In this respect, too, I find a gap in the theses.

Consequently I should think it necessary to have the following points more strongly emphasised in the theses:

1. The class character of the antagonism between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union.

2. The fact that England stands at the head of the anti-Soviet front.

3. That the Anglo-French antagonism is still the most outstanding imperialist antagonism in Europe.

4. The subjective efforts of the imperialists to postpone the armed clash among themselves until after the attempt of a military attack against the Soviet Union.

The international position of Czechoslovakia is determined by her complete dependence upon the big imperialist powers. Concretely speaking, Czechoslovakia is the object of contention between France and England; lately there is also to be seen the growing influence of Germany.

Naturally, the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie endeavours to carry on independent politics within certain limits. The expression of this effort, among other things, was the Little Entente.

The revival of German imperialism, and the re-alignment of powers in Europe as the result, was bound to shake the position of the Little Entente. At the same time, however, we see this breaking up of the Little Entente accompanied by the elements of a certain rapprochement between England and France.

The anxiety about preserving the peace treaties, particularly the Trianon Treaty, allies the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie both politically and military to French imperialism. Hence, the pressure brought to bear by England upon Czechoslovakia revolves chiefly around the political line, around the revision of the Trianon Treaty. A manifestation of this pressure was the so-called Rothermere Action and the demonstrative stand taken by Italy in regard to the revision of Hungary's borders. A further step, already of a military character, was represented by the St. Gotthard incident of smuggling Italian arms into Hungary. The third step was expressed in the rebate of the English duty on raw sugar, whereby the export of Czechoslovakian lump-sugar to England was completely stopped.

How did the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie react to the growing pressure applied by England? It yielded all along the line, whilst constantly showing its real readiness to be a partner in the united front against the Soviet Union. Of this we have many striking proofs of varying character.

Czechoslovakia has still withheld recognition from the Soviet Government. Czechoslovakia keeps silent in face of the provoking attitude of Fascist imperialism, whilst at the same time looking for a way towards "unity" with Hungary under England's pressure.

The formation of the international bourgeois government bloc in Czechoslovakia has been marked chiefly by the increased persecution of the proletarian class movement, which is carried on in order to "secure the rear" for the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie in the event of war.

As everywhere, we see also in Czechoslovakia an accelerated process of the fusion of the capitalist organisations with the apparatus of the State, as well as a fusion of the reformist leaders with the State apparatus and with the capitalist organisations. The Social Democracy gives full support to the foreign policies of the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie and frequently leads the campaign of calumny against the Soviet Union.

In addition to the Social Democracy, the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie is preparing a reserve force of Fascism. Although the so-called official Fascism in Czechoslovakia constitutes only a little group of adventurers and desperadoes, it is nevertheless backed by the government and the bourgeoisie, surely constituting a latent menace. The capitalists endeavour also to form a kind of factory Fascism, in the shape of a yellow "trade union movement" which is under direct political leadership of the party of big capital, the National Democrats. Furthermore, the bourgeoisie organises and arms a sort of Fascist militia in the shape of various corporations and associations, sporting clubs, etc. Since there are hundreds of thousands of proletarians, semi-proletarians, peasants and petty bourgeois people in these organisations, the social basis of Fascism in Czechoslovakia is rather extended. Finally, it should be mentioned that the idea of capturing the trade unions by the State was lately assiduously advocated by the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie, and just now the bourgeoisie is endeavouring to capture

the co-operative movement with the active assistance of the reformist leaders.

That Czechoslovakia is preparing for war is quite clear from the fact that a special 'preparedness fund' uncontrolled by parliament has been created outside of the ordinary military budget. The period of military service, which was to be reduced by law, has been left at 18 months. The number of officers and sub-officers has been increased. The soldiers have been deprived of electoral rights and the discipline has been made more rigid. After the French model a special military tribunal has been formed, and there is persistent talk about the imminent introduction of a Military Bill on the lines of the Paul Boncour Act in France. The munition factories are working at full pressure, and the works are extended. The aviation and chemical industries are subsidised by the State, and new branches of the chemical industry are being created. Czechoslovakia delivers arms to the Chinese counter-revolution and intends to serve as a big arsenal for the war against the Soviet Union.

At the same time there is certainly the menace of war between Czechoslovakia and Hungary, which nevertheless is pushed back by the chief antagonism between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union. It ought to be said that the C. P. of Czechoslovakia has not reacted strongly and quickly enough in the face of all these events and manifestations. It is true, the last Party Conference did take up substantially the proper standpoint upon this problem, but in regard to the practical combating of this tendency we are frequently very much behind the events, or we limit our action to comments in our press.

The cause of this failing of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia is due above all to the general provincialist tradition of the proletarian movement in Czechoslovakia in general, and also to our insufficient struggle to overcome this tradition by means of earnest and systematic study of all international questions. Finally, this is due also to our insufficient ability to link up these questions in our agitation with the actual interests and struggles of the working class.

Regardless of all these defects, it should be observed that the C. P. of Czechoslovakia has taken a considerable step forward in this respect too, and it is to be hoped that, after the adoption of the proper measures within the Party, the process of Bolshevisation will also be accelerated in this respect.

Comrade HECKERT (Germany):

The last Plenum of the E. C. C. I. decided to accentuate its struggle against reformism because the situation had, generally speaking, changed. It is clear that this challenge of the Communist International to reformism will be taken up by the other side. We witness already in a number of countries an accentuation of the reformist offensive against radical workers, particularly in trade unions. This accentuated offensive of the reformist leaders of the labour movement against the opposition has resulted in a certain inertia in our own ranks in regard to carrying out the decisions of the IX Plenum of the Executive and particularly the decisions of the IV Congress of the R. I. L. U., which conform of course with the decisions of the IX Plenum. In some countries it is said, for instance, that the decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress are dangerous, that they mean reversion to methods which were used, for instance, in Germany in the Ruth Fischer period. It is even said that by our attitude and our decisions we are calling forth ourselves expulsion of oppositional trade unions and measures against the opposition by the Amsterdammers. Finally, it is said that these decisions against reformism are merely impatience on our part, for betrayal of the working class by reformism is nothing new. In regard to this we must point out that the reformist offensive against oppositional elements in the labour movement has considerably increased lately. In all countries this offensive is carried out ruthlessly against the opposition. Everywhere reformists are working for the disruption of the trade unions, everywhere the best leading oppositional forces are thrown out of the unions.

The closer the union between reformism and the bourgeois state, the more virulent the reformist offensive against the revolutionary Marxist section of the working class. Its attitude towards the capitalist state, its narrow nationalism induces it to represent capitalist reconstruction as the duty of the working

class. Its attitude to arbitration courts is another example of this. It is for the same reason also a friend of rationalisation and encourages it in every possible way. That is why reformism is unable and unwilling to struggle against the effects of rationalisation. It prevents workers utilising the boom in order to secure higher wages, because according to its theory and views such a struggle cannot improve the position of the working class. For instance the German reformists in the Chemical Workers' Union assert that through negotiations and agreement with the heads of the chemical industry a wage rise of 6 pfennig has been obtained, whereas the metal workers secured only a 5 pf. rise after a strike which lasted four weeks. This theory leads reformism inevitably to Mondism, to industrial peace, to a new theory concerning the relation of the working class to capitalism, to economic democracy. But this theory binds reformism to the interests of national capitalism. Reformism is no longer capable of international solidarity. On the contrary, it has to take up a serious struggle against workers who want to put international solidarity into practice. We witnessed this, for instance, during the British coal strike.

We find that reformists support deliberately the war policy of the ruling national class because armoured cruisers, soldiers, submarines are essential for the protection of the home market and for the extension and security of the industry of the respective country on the world market. Therefore reformism has also a strong tendency towards Fascism in countries where the situation for capitalism is critical. It is only a small step from reformism which has developed into industrial peace, to Fascism, to the defence of an aggressive foreign policy, strict measures against the revolutionary elements of the country.

Thus we see that reformism has undergone a change and that we are compelled to accentuate our struggle against it. That this struggle is bound to have consequences, goes without saying.

But apart from these subjective reasons, there are also objective reasons — changes in the economic situation.

Rationalisation is rapidly accentuating capitalist antagonisms. Production-capacity grows very quickly and is getting gradually out of proportion with the market. This disproportion is so great that leading capitalists are compelled to admit it.

Rationalisation does not lead to lower prices, on the contrary, prices are going up. Capitalism has its neck in a noose from which there are only two escapes: war for a different distribution of markets or a new big offensive against the working class.

This we must fully realise, for we must build up our policy on this perspective. We cannot say with certainty if war will break out soon — it is probable. But the big capitalist offensive against the working class is a certainty. Industrial peace is only a capitalist offensive against the working class in a disguised form. In all countries workers' productivity of labour has increased, without an equivalent increase of their real wage. This must guide us in our whole activity in the labour movement. We must adopt once more an offensive policy. Such a policy alone will enable the Communist International to rally the proletariat and to give it a new orientation. It is essential to point this out in view of the fighting spirit which is developing among big proletarian masses in all capitalist countries. The idea that in our agitation we must take heed of reformist illusions or of the illusions spread by the reformists and still lurking in the minds of the working class, is therefore utterly erroneous. Thus, it is necessary, as already pointed out in the theses of the IX Plenum, to carry on a serious struggle against Right tendencies within the International. For instance the idea that strike committees can be only elected in unions dominated by reformists because otherwise there would be disruption in the trade union movement, that one cannot take up the struggle without the reformist leaders because this would mean playing a losing game, that such a policy leads us to Putschist action, must be energetically combated. To abstain from struggle spells defeat for the proletariat. Reformists cannot and will not fight; therefore we must lead the struggles of the labour organisations. We cannot say that we cannot lead them unless there be a guarantee of success. No one can guarantee success at the beginning of a struggle. The important thing is: when workers are led to an attack on capitalism and defeat cannot be avoided, this defeat must be given a character which encourages the workers to renewed and more energetic action.

I would like to say also a few words about the unity movement. It has come to pass that in Great Britain and also in other countries the attempts to establish a united front with Social Democratic workers over the heads of their leaders have not met with the expected success. Some say on the strength of this that the united front tactic should be dropped altogether. I think that Comrade Bukharin was right when he said that this would be a mistake. But we must say quite frankly that the united front tactic is justified only if it destroys the illusions which are still lurking in the minds of the working class. When we read, for instance, in the organ "Einheit", published in Germany, the following statement: "We hope that you still believe that the Social Democratic Party is a revolutionary party", we must say this is not doing a service to unity, but rather confusing the working class and strengthening the enemy in our ranks. Such errors must be avoided in all circumstances. This applies also to the mistakes made by our Norwegian and Finnish comrades, who allowed themselves to be persuaded by the Centrists not to ratify the Copenhagen Agreement, the Finnish-Norwegian-Russian Agreement, because they believed — again under the influence of the Centrists and Tranmael — that it was necessary to approach the Amsterdam leaders first, so as to bring about with these leaders a big general unification of the workers, of course on a class struggle basis. Amsterdam told our Norwegian and Finnish trade unions that it does not in the least intend to change its attitude to the Communists and the opposition decided upon in Vienna in 1924. This should be a lesson to us not to approach the upper strata but to look for the basis of the united front in places which we must capture for the revolutionisation of the masses, namely, big enterprises. We must admit that the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions have not yet been able to establish a firm basis in big enterprises. We are, unfortunately, still an organisation of workers employed in small enterprises, an organisation with big sections of the labour aristocracy and relics of petty bourgeois notions. If we do not work energetically for the organisation of workers in big enterprises, we will not have a revolutionary mass basis, nor will we secure leadership in the trade union movement when it comes to revolutionary struggles. We therefore ask the Congress to declare emphatically that the decisions of the IX Plenum which were given a concrete form through the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U., be made the common property of the Communist Parties and that the latter should work energetically in the direction of making the R. I. L. U. a powerful factor capable of leading the working class in the revolutionary struggle.

Comrade SAMUELSON (Sweden):

Our Delegation fully and entirely agrees with the Theses of Comrade Bukharin, but has not yet completed its final discussion, and will therefore eventually submit its proposals in the Commission.

Our capitalism, hitherto of fairly provincial character, is now endeavouring not only to assert itself upon the international market, but even to act directly as an imperialist force. This relates in the first place to the well-known Match Trust, the Kreuger concern, which has succeeded in gaining practically the world's custom in the match trade, with the exception of the Soviet Union. This trust, once upon a time purely Swedish, first attracted American capital, then from Great Britain, and eventually from all parts. We have a number of other enterprises of a similar calibre. These trusts have the direct and active interest to become a bulwark for the imperialist powers and to join the conspiracy against the Soviet Union, and also in our country there are sufficient forces engaged in direct war preparations. It is significant that the Chairman of the Swedish Social Democratic Party has recently expressed himself on this subject in the sense that Sweden's membership in the League of Nations would probably compel Sweden to join the eventual war against the Soviet Union.

It is an important phenomenon that the struggle against the workers has been considerably facilitated by the monopoly power of the industrial enterprises. Thus, for instance, a few months ago a strike occurred in the big "General Motors" factory in Stockholm. The workers lost the fight chiefly because the same firm had other plants abroad which continued working

without any difficulties. During the present General Strike in Sweden there is a band of blacklegs engaged in the loading of ships. The ore steamers proceed to Stettin and Rotterdam, where they are handled by organised dockers, nobody taking any steps to interfere with such operations.

It seems to me that the Comintern and the R. I. L. U. have paid too little practical attention to this phenomenon.

Comrades, the stabilisation process of Swedish capitalism has gone very far.

Another phenomenon is presented by the big conflicts, lockouts and strikes which are taking place in the whole of industry. At the present time we have a partial general strike in the mining industry. The organised workers of our trade unions have a mutual aid pact with the fraternal Russian trade unions, and since January 1st they have been receiving a subsidy of about 30,000 Krone a week. As against this, no support came from the Amsterdam people. Naturally, we make use of this Russo-Swedish pact as one of the best means for the promotion of international trade union unity.

Two months ago we had a big fight in the wood-pulp and paper industry, partly also in the sawmill industry, whose leadership was gained and retained by the Communists. We succeeded in carrying the fight to a victorious end despite the Social Democratic and reformist bureaucrats.

The bourgeois parties have lately enacted a compulsory law against the workers and against the trade union movement. We mobilised the workers against this measure. Our slogan was: a 24-hour protest strike against this violent deed. Although the Social Democracy was resolutely opposed to it, nevertheless it was forced to yield to the workers who had taken up our slogan. They carried out a three-hour general strike of protest, and in some places we succeeded in extending the protest strike beyond the three hours set by the trade union bureaucrats. The great importance of the event consisted in that about 300,000 workers took part in this protest strike. Nevertheless our Party is not satisfied with the results already achieved, and continues a determined fight against the compulsory law. Our slogan is: no respect for this compulsory arbitration, the defeat of the act, and the repudiation of all arbitration agreements!

Comrades, we have seen in our country also the manifestation of the international phenomenon of Mondism. Many of our trade union leaders are active adherents of the theories of Sir Alfred Mond.

Comrade Bukharin alluded to the fact that the Social Democrats are gaining more and more positions in the state and municipalities and consequently are becoming directly interested in protecting the interests of the states and municipalities, which means their direct acting against the struggle of the workers. This occurs particularly frequently in our country. Thus, some Social Democratic municipal officials have resorted to blacklegs to defeat their own Party members who were on strike.

The general march of the Social Democracy into the ranks of the bourgeoisie has been signified by a series of treacherous deeds against the workers: the passing of a preparedness programme which was hailed with approval by many conservatives in Sweden; relief in taxation for big capitalists; the introduction of new protective tariffs; increased baiting of the Soviet Union; a furious campaign against trade union unity, particularly the attempt to obstruct and annul the work of the Copenhagen Unity Conference.

Although there is a so-called opposition within the Social Democracy, nevertheless it has a rather checkered appearance, consisting partly of pacifists; of some shrewd intellectuals, and finally of some expelled members of our Party who are grouped around Höglund, who are the worst of the bunch, as is always the case with renegades.

The danger naturally arises that these sham opposition tendencies might still deceive the workers for some time, retarding the dissolution of the Social Democracy and to some extent helping in its consolidation.

Now and then there are also some proletarian Left wing tendencies to be observed. These, however, do not carry on

any continued opposition. As against this, the Left wing tendencies in the labour movement at large are of a more constant character.

Comrades, under such conditions our Party has to fight, and in the course of these fights we have gained our membership. Since the last split we have more than doubled the membership of our Party — from 7000 to 16,000 members. These members have been won in bitter fights against the bourgeoisie and the Social Democracy.

Our Party has carried out a number of successful campaigns. In connection with these campaigns and actions we have always gained new members, whilst the rank and file organisations of our Party were fairly well activated.

In our Party there are also defects and weak points. Such are: the shortage of theoretical forces, insufficient schooling, insufficient activity among the peasants and the women, and in the co-operatives. Nevertheless the process of Bolshevisation is going on in our section as well, and it is not going to cease. The members whom we have won in hard struggles, who have joined our Party because they are revolutionaries and want to help in the fight, cannot prove to be bad elements.

It would be proper for Congress to investigate why numerous sections in countries where they are able to work legally, in spite of ideological growth, cannot point to any organisational achievements, although the bourgeoisie just now is acting more brutally and relentlessly than ever before, whilst the White Terror continually claims proletariat victims, and what is more, although the Social Democracy practises the daily betrayal of Socialism. It seems to me it would be right for the leading bodies in the Comintern to try again whether it would not be possible to re-animate and realise the Leninist slogan: "Down to the Masses!"

Comrade THOREZ (France):

I will deal with what Comrade Bukharin correctly called the "change" in the tactic of the C.I. and its most important sections and also with the ideological and political state of mind which enables the Parties to effect this change.

The question is: how does the problem of the conquest of the masses appear to us in the present situation, when on the basis of rationalisation, we witness a complicated process towards radicalisation, on the one side, and a revival of reformist illusions among the working class, on the other side, when a certain differentiation is going on in the ranks of the proletariat? While certain sections of the proletariat are directly affected by the so-called policy of "rationalisation" other sections are in a relatively favourable position. However, there are several general principles which are perfectly clear. First of all we witness a clear orientation towards the most exploited and decisive strata of the working class, also considerable skill in the organisation of the struggle for immediate demands, in formulating them, in endeavouring to find in every concrete situation, in every separate case arising in the factory or the trade union a slogan or slogans capable of rousing the proletarian masses.

But this implies two things: 1. a correct attitude to the social democrats and to the united front tactic; 2. serious trade union and organisational work.

We think that the social democrats have a strong basis in the proletarian strata which occupy in the rationalisation period a relatively favourable position; also in the ranks of functionaries and employees and finally among the radicalised strata of the petty bourgeoisie which is veering to the Left.

This is evidently one of the main reasons for the assertion that the social democratic party can no longer be considered a proletarian and labour organisation resting almost entirely on proletarian strata as many comrades still imagine it to be. The inference is that we can no longer speak of the common aims of the Communist and Socialist Parties. We must bear two things in mind: 1. Communist policy directed towards socialism and 2. "socialist" policy which turns its back on socialism and goes on strengthening the bourgeoisie.

By seemingly diverse methods and phraseology, the Right and the Left of the Socialist Party carry on the same policy.

We lay stress on this fact because when we were saying at the last plenum that there must be a break between the Communist Party and the whole Socialist Party which is allied with the bourgeoisie, there were comrades in the French Delegation who held the view that no break should take place with the whole Socialist Party, that it was rather incumbent on us to win over the Left and to widen the gulf between it and the Right.

The accentuation of our struggle against the Social Democrats does not mean renouncing united front tactics. It means that there must be a stronger orientation towards the united front at the base, towards energetic struggle in the factories.

Up to quite recently the social democrats held a very strong position among the proletariat in the North. In spite of the frantic campaign of the socialist leaders against us, our slogan "you play into the hands of reaction", resulted in Socialist, Communist and reformist workers establishing on different occasions a united front in their actions, a thing which had never happened before.

I want to say something about the necessity of serious trade union work. In France the situation in this respect is as follows: there are at present between 13 and 14 million proletarians, and only one million are organised. It is as clear as daylight that our work must be among these 12 or 13 million unorganised workers. We must take in hand the reorganisation of trade union work on the basis of factory nuclei, we must work for the greater centralisation of our movement at the top while widening democracy at the base through workers' increased participation in trade union activity and in the discussion of problems in trade union organisations. We must bring forward lists of demands, and finally, the whole problem of trade union activity must receive our serious attention. For a long time this question was considered exclusively from the viewpoint of negotiations, intercourse between the leaders of the various reformist and revolutionary organisations. We must insist on the problem of trade union unity being treated not as a leader problem but as a common struggle with the reformist workers.

Reformist tendencies are developing in our revolutionary trade union movement under the pressure of the employers and the government and also in connection with the revival of reformist illusions. There are even tendencies towards autonomism or federalism, towards participation in various organisations established on a parity basis, not for the purpose of carrying on propaganda there for the revolutionary trade unions, but for collaboration. All these tendencies have been hitherto offering sullen resistance to the Communist policy in the trade unions. This resistance does not yet come out into the open. It is for the time expressed by a certain awkwardness in the relations between the Party and the trade unions. It is absolutely necessary to convince trade unionists as well as our trade union cadres of the necessity of a revolutionary policy in the trade union movement.

We agree with Comrade Bukharin's formula for the two extreme tendencies in regard to trade union work: On the one hand, one cannot expect to direct the trade union movement in a formal and mechanical manner, but one cannot also make concessions, politically and ideologically, to the anarcho-reformist tendencies which are reappearing and developing. We are also against the opportunist theory of "trade union neutrality" introduced lately into a draft resolution of the Political Bureau. The Party must be to the fore in all struggles — even the smallest — of the working class. This does not impair the role of the trade unions whose specific tasks remain as important as ever.

Comrades, I would like to give here a brief exposé of our tactic at the recent parliamentary elections, to show you that our Party is determined to rectify its policy. This is not merely a question of our attitude towards the Social Democrats, but rather a question of breaking with the entire old ideology of "republican discipline" which assimilated our Party more or less openly to petty bourgeois and social democratic organisations. The aim of our election tactic was to set our Party against all the others. And have we succeeded? I think so. Not only has this aim been achieved, but the workers who are under the influence of our Party have understood the meaning of this policy. Here are some facts: at the first ballot the Communist Party polled 1,070,000 votes. At the second ballot, when the number of constituencies was smaller (439 instead of 612) we

polled 820,000 votes where at the first ballot we had polled 880,000 votes. This means that the unprecedented pressure of the bourgeoisie and the social democrats' fierce struggle against us did not succeed in influencing the important sections of workers who follow the C. P. For the first time we succeeded in waging the political struggle in an utterly different domain, and the workers followed us.

Was the Party unanimous in applying this tactic? No, there were defections, but a reaction took place at the base of the Party against these defections. Those who have consciously or unconsciously sabotaged the tactic of the Party had to answer for it to the Party. This reaction was such that a fortnight or three weeks later, in districts where sabotaging of the election tactic of the Party and the International had taken place, recourse was taken to expulsions and rigorous sanctions against all defaulters.

I want to tell you why we propose an amendment to that part of Comrade Bukharin's theses which refers to the situation in the French Communist Party.

We think that it is not right to place on a par struggle against Right deviation and correction of Left deviations. We propose that the passage on struggle against Right deviations be strengthened.

In the C. P. F. one should fight opportunism first and foremost, for we consider it the most serious danger.

Practically, these divergencies manifested themselves: 1. in an under-estimation of the role of French imperialism. There has been a tendency among us to combat imperialism, but particularly the imperialism of our neighbour: the imperialism of Great Britain in connection with the expedition in China. This frame of mind manifested itself also in connection with Rakovsky's recall when there was uncertainty concerning the possibility of the French government joining the imperialist united front against the U. S. S. R.

2. Divergencies manifested themselves in the appreciation of the character of repression. While we were saying from the beginning that the new wave of repression is connected with the government's and the employers' determination to proceed with rationalisation, transformation of the military apparatus and general preparations for the imperialist war, certain comrades under-estimated the character of this repression and looked upon it only as a petty parliamentary manoeuvre. This led to legalism. Comrades in the Central Committee allowed themselves to be imprisoned without protest.

3. These divergencies manifested themselves also in regard to checking the élan of the working class movement.

4. They also manifested themselves in an erroneous attitude to the election tactics which led to deliberate sabotaging of this tactic, to voting openly against the Communist Party in favour of bourgeois socialist candidates, and to passive resistance.

5. These divergencies manifest themselves by deviations from our trade union policy, by concessions to anarcho-reformist conceptions.

They finally manifest themselves in a revisionist attitude concerning organisational methods, in an attitude of "strategic retreat" concerning the organisation of factory nuclei.

Some comrades expressed these divergencies openly and defended them in committees and even at big Party meetings. Other comrades again take up an equivocal position which constitutes a great danger. In principle, they declare themselves in accord with the general analysis of the general perspectives drawn up in agreement with the C. I., but in practice, they deviate from the correct policy and do not apply it. In fact, they impede the struggle against opportunist deviations, against the Right whose conceptions they sometimes share.

This is why we consider the struggle against Right perils in the Communist Party of France the most important task.

Left deviations were frequently in the nature of a healthy reaction of rank and file workers to the opportunism of the Central Committee. Evidently the best means of removing good workers from the influence of inconsistent elements who like to talk big and who lead astray, is the adoption of a firm and correct policy.

We merely want to add that active members of the French Party who have carried on the struggle for "rectification", are determined to win the whole Party and all its cadres for the policy of the Party and the C.I. In any case, they think that if rectification is to continue, there must be political and organisational guarantees for the application of a correct policy in the Party and the C.I.

Comrade SYPHNEIOS (Greece):

Comrades, I am speaking on behalf of the **Greek Delegation**, which fully agrees with the general line of Comrade Bukharin's report, but thinks the following addenda necessary:

a) The position of the peasantry and peasant farming; b) political activity of the peasantry and class distinctions in its ranks; c) struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat for the peasantry.

Comrades, with your permission I will give you a short exposé of the situation in Greece. The recent events in Greece: armed peasant demonstration, the demonstrations of the petty-bourgeoisie — artisans, small producers and traders, etc. which took place in many Greek towns and bore a violent character, the recent strike movements, — all this combined shows that the workers and peasants of Greece are becoming radicalised. In spite of its increasing terrorism the bourgeoisie has not been able to paralyse the resistance of the workers and peasants.

The radicalisation of the workers and peasants in Greece is of course due to the acute economic crisis of the post war period and to the political stabilisation which is effected by the Greek bourgeoisie under the leadership of the League of Nations, i. e. the London financial sharks. The recent dissolution of parliament and the reappearance of Venizelos in the political arena, a man who leads the liberal bourgeoisie and is of course the agent and lackey of European Imperialism, mean the beginning of a new political crisis in Greece. The antagonism between the monarchist and liberal bourgeoisie which is closely connected with the antagonism between British, French and American capital, is assuming a more accentuated form. Recent events have clearly shown that the struggle between monarchists and liberals in Greece is becoming very acute.

In regard to the economic and political situation in the country, one must say that stabilisation in Greece is weak and by no means steady.

As to foreign policy, you are aware that the Greek bourgeoisie, be it monarchist or liberal, is an obedient tool of British and French Imperialism. Moreover, there is antagonism between Yugoslavia and Greece because of Saloniki, i. e. in the Macedonian question. Greece is already an agent of the Italo-British bloc. The annulment of the agreement between the Soviet Union and Greece, the recent conversations re conclusion of an agreement between Italy, Greece and Turkey, bear witness that war danger exists.

As to the role of the Social Democrats there is no proper Social Democratic Party in Greece, but a so-called Democratic Alliance headed by Pananastasius which endeavours to play the role of a Social Democratic Party. There are Socialist or rather social-fascist elements in the trade unions. But there is nothing to show that the influence of the social-fascists is growing. On the contrary, the Left trade union wing is gradually increasing its influence. One can say that at present the influence of the Left Wing embraces 50—60% of the trade union movement. A concrete example of the influence of the Left Wing in trade unions is the recent strike movement, a mighty mass strike of 40,000 workers against the sabotage of the social-fascists and against the government.

As to the position within the Party, we have a rather strong opposition, the so-called **Centrist Opposition**: a liquidatory Trotskyist opposition of a frankly neo-Menshevik counter-revolutionary type. Comrades, we can say that the Party has successfully fought this opposition on Comintern lines.

Concerning Comintern guidance of the Party, we are sorry to say that the Greek Delegation cannot consider the work of the Comintern in this direction adequate and satisfactory.

Comrades, in view of the tension in the Balkans, the Greek Delegation considers the appointment of a special **Balkan Commission** by the Congress necessary. The business of this Commission should consist in discussing the general situation in the Balkans and determining what the immediate tasks of the Communist Parties in the Balkan States should be. Comrades, we hope that the Congress will accept our proposal which we consider justified.

Comrade VARGA:

Comrades, the task of our Congress is to draw the strategic lessons from an analysis of the past period, and to outline the actual tasks for the ensuing years. The central point of development during the next years is no doubt the menace of war; the central task of the whole of the Communist movement in the next years is to ward off the menace of war which threatens the Soviet Union. The theses and the report of Comrade Bukharin have furnished a complete picture of the imperialist antagonisms, of the antagonisms between the imperialist powers and the colonies, and between capitalism and the Soviet Union. Naturally, in the construction of the theses and the report the analysis of the developments within the working class, and partly also within the economic basis of capitalism, was drawn rather too briefly. This deficiency I will try to make good as far as possible.

Comrade Bukharin stated that in the last two years a far-reaching technical progress was taking place, which had assumed in some of the leading countries, e. g. the United States of America, a character approaching that of a technical revolution, as he puts it. If this be true — and it is true — then there must have also taken place tremendous changes in the economic basis and in the structure of the working class.

The technical change, economically considered, is tantamount to a diminution of the unit of labour time contained in the product; in other words, it is tantamount to a tremendous increase in the output of labour.

This increase in the output of labour has actually taken place. It is the consequence of two factors: the increased productivity of labour itself, and the increased intensity of labour. The increased productivity of labour is the direct consequence of the technical changes. This means that with the same expenditure of labour power the worker, by the use of improved and enlarged machinery, has been able to work more efficiently than hitherto. The increased intensity of labour means that the worker must spend more labour power during the same period than he did before. These two aspects usually run concurrently with one another. But it must not necessarily be so. Just lately we have seen instances where the intensity of labour in the process of rationalisation was tremendously increased without an increase in the productivity of labour, i. e. without any change in the machinery used by the worker.

In this connection I should like to deal with the following outstanding features which, to my mind, are the consequence of the new technique. Firstly, the rise of a new kind of unemployment, which I term **structural unemployment**, which is economically different from the industrial reserve army we used to know in times past. Secondly, the tendency towards the unification of the great mass of the working class. Thirdly, the tendency of the big industrial countries towards spreading out their industrial enterprises through the whole of the country. Fourthly, the tendency towards the rise of a new type of privileged worker, a new type of labour aristocracy.

I shall start with the question of **unemployment**. There was already an industrial reserve army before the war. Yet this reserve army was relatively slight, vanishing entirely during periods of brisk trade. Today we are witnessing quite a different process. For a long time we believed the mass unemployment which took place after the big crisis of 1921 to be the result of the war, of the impoverishment of Europe, of the new protective tariffs, of the tendency of the oversea dominions towards industrialisation, and so on. The experiences of the last years, however, have caused us to modify our view. In Germany, before the war, during the period of 1907—1913, i. e., during the period which included the severe crisis of 1907—08, there was an average of 2.3% unemployed among the workers organised in the trade unions. As against this we find in the last five years the following figures: 1923 — 9.6%, 1924 — 13.5%,

1925 — 6.7%, 1926 — 18%, 1927 — 8.8%. Thus, in the last four years of 1924—27, the years of the tremendous economic revival in Germany, the average rate of unemployment reached almost 12%, whilst in 1927, a year of high prosperity, there was a rate of unemployment reaching almost 9%. Obviously, comrades, it would be wrong to consider such conditions as the usual unemployment due to the ups and downs of trade and the different cycles of industry.

We find the same phenomenon in England. In England in 1923 there were 2% unemployed. During the last six years there was a steady rate of unemployment of 10% and over. Of decisive import, however, is the following: in America, in a country which stands today as the strongest capitalist power, upon a territory which is still marching along the ascending line, we find the rise of the same mass unemployment, and of a kind which clearly reveals its new character. The new character consists in that the number of workers employed by industrial capital in America has decreased in absolute figures.

The industrial capital which in taking its course through the sphere of production assumes the form of productive capital; the kind of capital whose workers are directly employed in producing surplus value whilst all the other kinds of capital contain only a portion of the surplus value appropriated by industrial capital: this capital employed in America 25 million workers in 1919, and 23 million in 1925. Thus we see a curtailment of 2 million workers; the industry itself has reduced the number of its workers from 10,700,000 to 9,700,000. At the same time, comrades, 1925 was a year of great industrial prosperity, and in spite of the reduced number of employees, the output of the manufactured goods was tremendously increased. If we consider together the four principal kinds of industrial capital in America: agriculture, mining, industry in the proper sense, and transport (railways), we find the following: taking 1919 as 100, the number of workers was in 1925: 93, which meant a decrease of 7%, the quantity of products was 120, an increase of 20%; labour efficiency stood at 129, whilst in industry alone there was an increased efficiency of labour of 40% in the last six years.

What does this development signify? This decrease in the number of employees with a tremendous increase in the productivity of labour? It means that the technical progress, the progress in the productivity and intensity of labour, has surpassed the capacity of the market. Before the war it happened that owing to technical progress some workers were temporarily thrown out of work, but owing to the expansion of the capitalist market the unemployed invariably found work again, at least such was the case in the highly developed capitalist countries. The consequence revealed themselves in India, in China, on the periphery, where unemployment was associated with the starvation and death of millions. Today we find that the expansion of the market no longer suffices to provide work again for those who have been previously thrown out of work in the imperialist countries. I believe it is no accident that precisely in the United States and in England this tendency towards the rise of a structural unemployment is particularly noticeable. It is partly due to the fact that the expansion of the capitalist market in the United States and in England is already meeting with the greatest difficulties.

The expansion of the internal market goes on in a way that the peasant who produces in the first place to satisfy his own requirements becomes transformed into a farmer, who is producing for the market, who sells his produce and purchases the products of capitalist industry.

This has reached a stage in America where the farmers sell already over 80%, nearly 90%, of their produce on the market, and naturally purchase the equivalent quantity of products of capitalist industry. Thus, the former impetus to the expansion of the capitalist market, that of the passing of the agriculturist from natural economy to commodity economy, is coming to an end in America, whilst in England, I believe, it has already come to an end. Of course this does not mean that it has come to an end upon a world scale as well, that is in the world market; this is out of the question. Nevertheless, American industry was hitherto organised chiefly upon the basis of catering to the home market. Not more than 6% of the output of American industry was hitherto exported. Hence, this great

technical progress does not find any corresponding opportunities for expansion of the home market, and so on. Hence this structural unemployment, which is not a phenomenon due to the ups and downs of trade, but is manifestly a specific kind of unemployment characteristic of the present period of declining capitalism. By the way, it should be pointed out that Comrade Heckert was entirely wrong when he used the fact of unemployment in all countries as an argument against the actual reconstruction of capitalism. If I am right in what I am saying, then the fact of unemployment can no longer serve as a key to the industrial situation. It is quite possible, as it was for instance the case in America and Germany in late years, that the capitalists should temporarily enjoy a splendid revival of trade, whilst at the same time there is a tremendous mass of unemployment.

Hence it follows, firstly, that the struggle for markets is going to become more and more acute in the near future. The big imperialist countries will try to extend the opportunities of their circumscribed internal market by pushing their goods into foreign markets. But the opportunities for expansion are also limited in the foreign market. They are limited on account of the process of industrialisation which is going on in the oversea dominions, the high walls of protective tariffs introduced everywhere, import embargoes, etc. we may therefore predict that this development is going to continue in the near future, that unemployment is going to be a permanent and growing phenomenon.

At this point I should like to say, in order to forestall eventual objections, that what I am saying here is by no means identical with the teachings of Rosa Luxemburg. According to the theory of Rosa Luxemburg, when there are no independent producers, no third persons, the realisation of the surplus value, and consequently the accumulation is impossible. Of course, this is not true. Yet whilst this is theoretically quite untenable, it does not mean to say that the historical process of the transformation of independent producers — peasants and artisans — into elements of capitalist economy does not really signify a great expansion of the capitalist market.

These are two different things: the theoretical impossibility of accumulation without "third persons" according to the theory of Luxemburg, and the historic fact that through the transformation of peasants into farmers the capitalist market had once experienced a tremendous expansion. These two things are by no means identical, and they should not be identified.

Now comrades, what conclusions should be drawn from this fact? Obviously, that the great army of the workers, whose vanguard is the Communist Party, will be divided in the coming years into an employed and unemployed part, whilst the unemployed part will by no means constitute a negligible quantity. As regards the trade union struggle in the old sense of the term, the struggle for the amelioration of working conditions under the capitalist system, this fact of chronic mass unemployment surely constitutes an obstacle which will greatly hamper the trade union struggles. Nevertheless, on the other hand, when revolutionary situations will arise, when there will be struggles for power, the fact of this mass unemployment will naturally mean a strong impulse, an increased discontent of the workers whose very existence is menaced, and a rise in the volume of revolutionary energy.

Comrades, I should also like to deal here with the question how it happens that in America, in spite of tremendous unemployment, the living standard of the proletariat has tremendously risen in late years, even if not so generally and to such an extent as is to be gathered from official American sources. We see a certain contradiction: chronic mass unemployment, yet high and partly rising wages.

I believe the thing could be fairly simply explained. The intensity of labour in the American factories has increased to such an extent that only a well-fed worker is capable of standing this murderous pace. The intensity is so strong that in many factories there were introduced obligatory rest pauses, and that in many cases the five-day week has been introduced, as otherwise this murderous speeding up of labour cannot be carried on.

I am now turning to the second question, to the tendency of diffusion of industrial labour throughout the whole country

in the leading industrial countries. Of decisive moment here is the effect of electrification, the long distance electricity supply, high voltage, etc. This emancipates the manufacturing industries from the need of having to settle in the vicinity of coal mines. We find today that in connection with the long-distance carrying of high voltage electricity, quite new industrial districts have sprung up. This is particularly to be observed in the United States, where a mass migration of industry has taken place from the North-East to the South, where in the Southern States, which did not have a single factory some fifteen years ago, today tremendous new industries have sprung up. We see this process in England, a shifting of industry to the South and to the South East of England; we see the rise of new industries in Northern Italy, and so on.

I believe, comrades, this process is not only economically, but also strategically of particular importance to our future struggles. It will no longer happen that the industrial workers, our chief cadres, will be found only concentrated in a few districts of the big industrial countries, whereas large territories in the same country will be of purely agrarian and peasant character.

The third new factor is the tendency for the unification of the working class as the consequence of the new technique. The chief role is played here by the conveyor system and by the strong advance of the chemical industry, which is not a machine industry, but an apparatus industry. Both these factors are working in the direction which will tend towards the disappearance of the difference between skilled and unskilled workers, so that the overwhelming majority of the workers will consist of unskilled employees.

Working on the conveyor system implies that the work is absolutely subdivided into simple manipulations, into functions which any worker may learn in a few days. The chemical industry, whose importance is steadily growing, which begins to a large extent to replace mechanical work and agricultural labour, generally knows of no skilled workers. Thus we see in the I. G. Dye Industry (Germany) that they employ about 20% engineers, chemists and technical experts; whilst the rest — with very few exceptions — is made up entirely of poorly paid unskilled workers. This fact is strategically very important because, in contradistinction to unemployment, it does not constitute a separating factor, but rather a uniting factor for the whole of the working class.

The fourth moment is the rise of a class of privileged workers upon a different basis than that of skilled workers, and also upon a different basis than the labour aristocracy in the old Leninist sense of the term. We find that as the result of unemployment a new class of workers has arisen in the large factories who, in order to secure their employment, are systematically placing themselves at the service of the capitalists against the working class as a whole. I am thinking here of those elements who act as foremen on conveyor systems, who speed up the work: they get hardly better pay than the other workers, but they are never sacked! I am thinking of the members of the "Technical Emergency Aid", of the great army of spies, blacklegs, detectives, etc., who are employed in the American factories. It is interesting that a certain liaison should exist among these partly corrupt sections of the working class, the blacklegs, and certain elements of the trade union delegates and the reformist parties. Where revolutionary trade unions exist, where strong Communist movements are in existence, the representatives of the reformist trade unions and the like are never threatened with losing their jobs on account of unemployment, because instead of being the delegates of the workers they become the trusted people of the capitalists! Thus there arises a new class of corrupt and privileged workers who are secure in their employment amid the general rise of mass unemployment.

In this connection I might draw attention to one more consequence of unemployment: the fact that those trade unions which are particularly threatened by unemployment, and which try to make a stand against the capitalist offensive, are being more and more reduced to a state of collapse. The other day I saw the figures of the Miner's Federation of Great Britain which were published in connection with the Annual Congress of the Federation. The M. F. G. B. has had:

In 1925	958,000 members	
„ 1926	785,000	„ and
now	626,000	„

Thus it has lost more than one-third of the membership in the last two years. A similar process — if I understand aright — has already taken place before in the Miner's Federation of the United States.

Thus we find that unemployment enables the capitalists either to turn the trade union into subsidiary organs of capitalism, as in Italy, Poland, and partly also in Germany, or to smash them in the course of the fight and completely to disable them.

I believe it would be useful to fix in some manner in the Theses these changes which arise in connection with rationalisation and technical progress. As already pointed out by some comrades, the subject of unemployment is but casually mentioned in the Theses. I believe it would be a good thing to insert in the Theses a point dealing with the structural changes which have occurred in the working class, notably with the significance and the new character of unemployment. (Prolonged cheers.)

Comrade LACERDA (Brazil):

I should like to start by making a little remark. It is stated in Comrade Bukharin's Theses that the Communist movement has now gripped for the first time the Latin-American countries. Comrades, this is not quite true. Not the Communist movement has manifested itself for the first time in Latin America, but rather the Communist International has for the first time taken an interest in the Communist Movement of Latin-America. In Mexico, Brazil, Argentine, Uruguay, Chile and Guatemala, our Communist Parties have been in existence since 1920, that is almost since the founding of the Communist International. Yet it is only now that the Communist International is beginning to take up questions relating to Latin-America. We hope that the Comintern is not going to relinquish its attention and that it will help us in developing our Communist Parties, which are still small today, into real mass parties.

The Latin-America countries are destined to play an ever increasing role in international politics. Latin-America is the hinterland of the mightiest imperialism, of the world's mightiest bourgeoisie. All comrades here have referred to the fact that the United States is the world ruler today. This supremacy of the United States owes in no small degree to the tremendous economic basis furnished by Latin-America. American imperialism has long since passed from the policy of peaceful conquest to that of armed intervention. Since 1900 the United States has intervened with arms in Nicaragua, Santo-Domingo, Panama, and Porto Rico. In all these countries the United States is maintaining permanent bodies of troops.

The North American capital invested in Latin-America comprises 46% of the total American investments abroad. This alone points to the importance of Latin-America to the United States. Today the American bourgeoisie in South America clashes against British imperialism as the most formidable rival. Soon, however, the United States will outstrip Great Britain and the contention between the two sets of imperialists for the South American markets and raw materials will flare up with greater force.

The spread of imperialist conquests is accompanied by the intensification of the class antagonisms. The great mass of poor and landless peasants in Latin-America is beginning to stir. We are on the eve of a tremendous agrarian revolution in South America, and the stronger the imperialist oppression, the greater the growth of class consciousness among the proletariat. The American bourgeoisie is alive to the danger contained in the revolutionary labour movement. It is therefore employing every means to capture the trade union movement of Latin America under its control. This it tries to achieve through the instrumentality of the Pan-American Federation of Labour. This organisation is nothing else but a subsidiary organ of the American bourgeoisie to corrupt the working class of Latin-America. The leaders of the Pan-American Federation of Labour are the direct agents of American imperialism. In the oil fields of Mexico, in

the mines of Peru and Chile, upon the plantations of Brazil, there are thousands of proletarians working under the whip of the imperialist exploiter. To win these masses, to organise them, and to defend them in their daily struggles against capitalist oppression, is our first and foremost task in Latin America. In the event of a world war against the Soviet Union we must do everything to sabotage the supplying of imperialist armies with corn and meat from Argentine, and the deliveries of important raw materials to the munition industries, as well as oil supplies and transports, and so on. Our slogans in the coming war must be: the fight for the emancipation of Latin-America from the imperialist exploitation and the fight against the national bourgeoisie which exploits the masses of workers and peasants in league with the foreign imperialists.

Comrade CARILLO (Mexico):

Comrades, our delegation is in agreement with the report of Comrade Bukharin. In a few words I might touch here upon the things which are of importance to Latin American countries. Important above all is the fact that America has become today the centre of imperialism. The United States is the strongest imperialist factor in the world economy. Nevertheless, the growth of American imperialism today is fostered, above all, by the tremendous hinterland possessed by the United States in the shape of the Latin American countries. The Latin American countries possess all the raw material supplies necessary for the further development of the capitalist industry of America. The imperialist penetration in Central and South America grows more and more aggressive day by day. The occupation of Nicaragua by American troops is the prelude to open warfare by the United States for the complete domination of Central and South America. These countries are being turned into reserve sources of imperialism for the event of war. It is our task to turn the workers and peasants of Latin America into a reserve force of the proletarian revolution. Therefore, in the event of war our slogan should be: a war on imperialism! A struggle for national emancipation against the dictatorship of feudal cliques and generals which is supported by imperialism in Latin America!

The struggle of the peasants for the land cannot be conducted in our countries without a simultaneous fight against imperialist domination. The struggle against the national bourgeoisie will inevitably grow into a struggle against imperialism.

Comrades, I fully concur with those comrades who have pointed out here that too little attention has been devoted in the Theses to the agrarian question. In our countries generally we cannot wage any serious fight unless we succeed in attracting the peasant masses to the movement. We have millions of poor and landless peasants whose struggle for the land constitutes today the most prominent fact of the revolutionary movement in Latin America. At this point I should like to say a few words to those comrades who have failed as yet to grasp the fact that our peasant cannot be compared with the peasant of Central Europe, or of the Balkan countries, or even with the peasant of the former Tzarist Russia. Our peasants exist under the most miserable conditions, possessing the most primitive means of production, so that they can be by no means described as a possessing class, as a petty bourgeoisie. It is a mass of millions who belong to the semi-proletariat, whom we must not only neutralise, but must also win as direct allies. Therefore the attitude of our Party upon the agrarian problem and peasant movement is of decisive significance to the role of the Party in the revolution. The experiences of the Chinese revolution, and the experiences in Bulgaria, are pointing out in clear language the things which the Party has to do, and that it is better for the Party to do more than less in regard to this question.

The brutal advance of American imperialism increases day by day the class antagonisms in our countries. The interminable revolutions and counter-revolutions in Mexico and in Central America are nothing else but the expression of this continuous differentiation of the classes. In Venezuela, in Colombia, in Peru and in Bolivia, we are on the eve of an agrarian revolution. In Brazil a political ferment has been going on for years. In Mexico there is a rapid change of revolution and counter-revolution, as is not to be witnessed in any other country.

In the course of the last years the Communist Parties in Latin America have grown stronger. Whereas we used to be groups of propagandists, today we constitute real Communist Parties and are convinced that tomorrow we shall grow into Communist mass parties. Today we may state without exaggeration that our Party is the only one in our country that is organised upon a national scale.

A few words on the trade union question. We have the impression that there is no perfectly clear line on the trade union question. Frequently there is a separate tendency on the part of the R.I.L.U., and another one on the part of the Comintern. We urge with the greatest insistence the necessity of drawing up a uniform line upon the trade union question. We are of the opinion that the tactics of the united front should be continued as the basic principle of our activity in the trade unions. The fight against the reformist leaders and the trade union bureaucracy will not be weakened by properly applied revolutionary tactics of the united front, but on the contrary will thereby be strengthened. It was only by our persistent and untiring work in the Mexican trade unions that we have succeeded, in spite of all reformist attacks, in rendering our slogans popular among the workers who are organised in trade unions.

A big role is played in Latin-America by the Anti-Imperialist League. The Anti-Imperialist League is the type of subsidiary organisation which can really be turned into a mass organisation. The fight against the domination of foreign capital constitutes the basis for gathering the large masses of the workers and peasants, and of the national-revolutionary petty bourgeoisie. This fight is not a question of agitation and propaganda, but of immediate action. This is shown by the fights in Nicaragua, this is indicated by the constant civil wars in Mexico and Central America. The problem of the Anti-Imperialist League ought to be treated as a question of international political significance. It is certainly to our disadvantage that the Workers' Party in U.S.A. has failed to grasp the significance of the Anti-Imperialist League in Central and South America. There is no real anti-imperialist organisation in existence in the United States. As long as the American comrades are unable to form such an organisation, neither will they be able to wage a serious fight against American imperialism. It is essential that we, communists, should lay stress upon the community of interests between the workers of Latin America and the United States. The existing ties between the Mexican reformists and the American Federation of Labour are enabling the reformists to stultify the consciousness of the Mexican workers and to deceive them by telling them that the reformist American trade unions would be able to prevent an eventual American intervention in Mexico. As against the alliance of the Mexican and American reformists we should urge the united action of the revolutionary labour movement of Latin and North America. This is one of the most essential tasks of our Party.

A few words as to the right and left tendencies of our parties. The right tendencies find their expression in regard to the question of the possibility of a revolution in the Latin American countries. There are comrades inclined to believe that the proletariat in the Latin American countries cannot think of capturing political power as long as the workers in the United States have not overthrown the bourgeoisie and defeated the American imperialism. This constitutes a typical reformist thesis, and we must combat such tendencies with all the energy we possess. Another right tendency consists in neglecting the peasant question. We may claim that in the Mexican Party we have fully overcome these reformist tendencies in regard to the agrarian question. Nevertheless there are still enough comrades in the other Latin American countries who maintain quite a passive attitude upon the peasant question. The third and perhaps the most dangerous right tendency is the tendency of allowing the petty bourgeoisie the hegemony in the agrarian revolution and in the revolution generally, whilst concealing the real face of the Party under general revolutionary phrases which are in no way distinguishable from the revolutionary phraseology of the national petty bourgeoisie. This is the most dangerous tendency in our parties, and it is our most essential task today to combat it. There are also ultra-left tendencies, particularly in regard to the trade union question. For a long time we had to fight the tendency of refusing to do any work in the reformist trade unions. Today we have overcome these tendencies, at least insofar as the Mexican Party is concerned.

We support fully and entirely the remarks made by Comrade Bukharin as to the need of ideological schooling. Nevertheless we must point out that the E. C. C. I., regardless of many requests on our part, did not undertake anything to provide the opportunity for the Spanish speaking countries to gain theoretical knowledge by means of Communist literature. So far almost nothing has been published in the Spanish language. The most important documents of the C. I. are not published in Spanish, so that it is naturally exceedingly difficult for our comrades to become politically and ideologically developed. We wish to reiterate the request that the Executive might furnish in the future the most important documents in the Spanish language for the advantage of our Parties.

A few more words about Mexico. You have all learned from the newspapers that the elected President was assassinated on July 1st. This signifies an immediate outbreak of a new civil war in Mexico. From the standpoint of the struggle against American imperialism, Mexico constitutes the most essential crucial point of the American continent. Mexico, a country with rich oil wells and mines, lies as an obstacle before the door of the United States. The disorders in Mexico are the result of this situation. A normal situation in Mexico will be brought about only when the workers and peasants will have taken power into their own hands. The struggle of the Mexican workers and peasants is the struggle against American imperialism, against the strongest bourgeoisie in the world, against the worst enemy of the Soviet Union. This struggle is, therefore, of tremendous international importance. We are convinced that in the event of a war against the Soviet Union, the Mexican workers and peasants will take up the fight against imperialism, and that the coming war in the Latin American countries will be a signal to the revolution.

Comrades, we shall carry aloft the banner of Communism, the banner of the international solidarity and world revolution.

Comrade SALA (Uruguay):

Comrades, I would like to associate myself first of all with the declarations of the other comrades of our delegation in regard to the importance of Latin America from the viewpoint of the world economy and the revolutionary movement, as well as from the viewpoint of the anti-imperialist and anti-war questions and the peasant problem.

I must say a few words on the economic and political situation in Latin America. In all the countries of Latin America, except Chile, agrarian capitalism prevails. All the land is concentrated in a few hands. Industry is in an embryonic state. Consequently, we have but a small proletariat and big sections of peasants who lead a very miserable existence.

In all the countries of Latin America political power is in the hands of big agrarian capitalists except in Mexico where the petty bourgeoisie predominates, and the Argentine Republic where the recent elections have placed power into the hands of the Party of industrial capital and the petty bourgeoisie. Governments in Latin America are generally tools of Yankee or British imperialism. The Brazilian government is subordinate to the British imperialism. The other countries of Latin America are more or less under the domination and direct influence of North American imperialism.

Most of the governments in Latin America are nothing but "big capital" dictatorships. They are trying to suppress the revolutionary movement by violent means. In Peru, Columbia, Venezuela and Nicaragua, in the whole of Central America, in Cuba and the Antilles oppression and terrorism reign supreme. A very strict law was promulgated recently in Columbia against all workers and peasant movements. It is particularly directed against the Communist movement.

This state of affairs in Latin America has resulted in a revolutionary situation in Brazil, Venezuela, Columbia, etc. These countries are on the eve of a democratic-bourgeois revolution. There is also a revolutionary situation in Mexico but there it is a question of peasant revolution. There it will be a democratic-bourgeois revolution and at the same time an anti-imperialist revolution. If in the course of the revolution the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party, are able

to secure leadership over the revolutionary movement, it will be possible to transform this bourgeois-democratic revolution into a workers' and peasants' revolution.

Therefore we want the C. I. and the international Communist movement to attach more importance to the revolutionary movement in Latin America.

The trade union movement in Latin America is young and therefore very weak. But it is of a "revolutionary" character. The trade union movement of Latin America — except in Mexico where the majority of the working class is organised in big unions — absorbs only a small percentage of the proletariat; but its political influence on the masses is out of proportion with its organisational strength.

Formerly the trade union movement in Latin America was under anarchist influence; today this influence is gone. But in South America the danger of American and European reformism, the reformism of the Pan-American Federation of Labour and of the Amsterdam International, is making its appearance. The Pan-American Federation of Labour is nothing but the agent of the North American imperialism in the South American movement; its mission is to divert the labour movement and the masses of workers who are fighting against imperialism from the revolution, to bribe the trade union leaders and to bring the unions under the influence of the Amsterdam International, which is the agent of the European imperialism.

It is characteristic that the C. O. P. A. (Pan-American Federation of Labour) made its appearance in Latin America as soon as important trade union movements with a revolutionary orientation were initiated. The policy of the C. O. P. A. consists in bribing the leaders of the labour movement. It has succeeded in this to a certain extent. We know, for instance, that the leaders of the C. R. O. M. in Mexico succumbed to the influence of the North American imperialism and its agents.

Another typical fact: the trade union bureaucrats in Porto-Rico declare in the statutes of their Labour Federations that Porto-Rico should be made a North-American province.

Formerly, the Amsterdam International never concerned itself with the trade union movement in Latin America. But it is different now. It organised recently in Geneva a "delegate" meeting of the organisations of Latin America. An agreement was arrived at by which the delegates undertake to do their utmost for the constitution of a base for the reformist trade union movement in their countries: European imperialism which has recuperated after the war and has increased its production, stands in need of new markets. It feels strong enough to compete with American capitalism and this, among other reasons, has induced the Amsterdam International to create a base for its imperialism in Latin America.

The other reason is that the last congress of the R. I. L. U. decided to work energetically in Latin America for the purpose of organising there a revolutionary trade union movement. The Pan-American Federation of Labour is also sure to react to this.

The Latin American Secretariat of the revolutionary trade unions constituted in Montevideo, is functioning. The general congress of the revolutionary trade unions of Latin America will be held in Montevideo in May 1929. We must do our utmost to keep the proletariat of Latin America on the revolutionary and anti-imperialist path, so that it could contribute to the liberation of the workers and peasants. We must arouse the interest of the whole proletariat in the Montevideo congress in 1929, so as to ensure its success. The R. I. L. U. and the C. I. must give us their support and political help to enable us to do justice to our big tasks.

We say emphatically that our success against imperialism depends to a great extent on success in the struggle against the social-imperialists in America and Europe.

Comrade Bukharin criticised in his report the Communist Parties in general for not having attached sufficient importance to the working youth. We must say that this criticism applies also to our Parties in Latin America. In these countries Young Communist Leagues either do not exist at all or are very weak.

Hitherto all the Parties have under-estimated this task, they must put this right and pay more attention to the capture of the working youth and the formation of a Young Communist mass organisation in every country.

We think that the most important mass organisations for our movement are trade unions and peasant leagues. But there are three other organisations in Latin America destined to play an important role and capable of developing into mass organisations. They are the Anti-Imperialist League, the International Red Aid and the Red Sport International.

The Anti-Imperialist League is destined to play an important role in Latin America. The atmosphere is favourable to the capture and organisation of the masses, not only the proletariat and the peasantry but also the anti-imperialist petty bourgeoisie.

Owing to the atmosphere of repression and white terror in most of the countries of Latin America, the Red Aid enjoys an enormous prestige by its intervention in the every day struggles of the workers and peasants; it will be possible to bring into its ranks thousands of workers in every country.

The Sport Leagues can also draw into their ranks thousands of South American workers. In Argentine, Uruguay, Chili, Peru, in fact in all our countries, sport attracts considerable numbers of workers, and the bourgeoisie is using this means very successfully. We must struggle against the bourgeois sport organisations by forming proletarian sport organisations of a definite class character. In Uruguay and Argentine we brought, in a comparatively short time and with very little effort, 2 or 3,000 members into the ranks of the sport organisations. We think that all the Parties can form proletarian sport leagues and develop them into mass organisations.

Young Communist Leagues have all the necessary characteristics for successful work among young sporting elements, and there is every chance of bringing many of them into our ranks.

The Delegation of Latin America is fully aware of the tasks incumbent upon it. It feels confident that with the energetic and steady support of the C. I., the Communist Parties of Latin America will do their duty and will capture the masses of the workers and peasants for the proletarian revolution.

TO OUR READERS!

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

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

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

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